RESEARCH PAPER

Personality Traits among Adolescents with respect to selected demographics: A Study in Telangana

Dr. Thirupathi Naik Bukya[1], Dr. Praveen Neeradi[2], Dr. M. Srisailam[3], Dr. Sandeep Kumar Morishetty[4] and Gugulothu Koteshwar Rao[5]

[1]Post-Doctoral Fellow, Department of Psychology, Osmania University, Hyderabad, Telangana, India, ORCID ID: 0009-0009-4815-1944, Email: thirupathinaik1988@gmail.com

[2]Junior Lecturer in English, Telangana Tribal welfare Residential College, Chemanpally. Nizamabad District Telangana, India, Email: pravneeradi@gmail.com

[3]Lecturer in History, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, GOVERNMENT CITY COLLEGE, Hyderabad, Telangana Email: srisailam00007@gmail.com

[4]Assistant professor, Department of Social Work, Gurughasidas Vishwavidhyalaya Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh Email: morishettysandeepkumar17@gmail.com

[5]Junior Lecturer in History, Government Junior College - Kohir, Sangareddy District, Telangana Email: koteshmounika262@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study examines the personality traits of adolescents in Telangana State, drawing on contemporary trait theories of personality, such as the big five (neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). These traits influence how adolescents perceive and respond to their social and educational environments, impacting academic performance, peer relationships, and mental health. Understanding these traits is essential for educators, psychologists, and policymakers to design effective educational and developmental interventions. The study highlights the theoretical foundations of personality traits and emphasises their relevance to understanding adolescent behavioural patterns in educational contexts. Additionally, the findings can inform targeted interventions.

Keywords: Personality Traits, Adolescents, Big Five Personality, Trait Theory.

How To Cite This Article: Bukya Tn, Neeradi P, Srisailam M, Morishetty Sk, Rao Gk. Personality Traits Among Adolescents With Respect To Selected Demographics: A Study In Telangana. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(26s):652-667. Doi: 10.25258/ijddt.16.26s.71

1. Introduction

Psychology considers personality a central concept that explains the consistent patterns of thoughts, emotions, and behaviors differentiating individuals from one another. Educators and behavioral scientists who study personality concern themselves with both the social value of individuals and the persistent behavioral patterns and psychological characteristics that define human behavior. Personality reflects the integrated organization of attributes, dispositions, and behavioral tendencies that shape how individuals respond to various situations in life. Adolescence brings significant physical, emotional, and psychological changes, making it a critical stage of human development. During this period, personality traits play a crucial role in shaping adolescents' behavior, attitudes, and social interactions, influencing their overall well-being and future outcomes. Hall and Lindzey (1985) suggest understanding personality through the theoretical constructs, variables, or dimensions selected within a particular psychological framework. Personality traits remain relatively stable over time and across situations, influencing an individual's interactions with their environment. Understanding personality helps develop effective interventions and strategies in education, counseling, and mental health. The Big Five personality traits (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism) provide a widely accepted framework for understanding individual differences. A combination of genetic, environmental, and cultural factors shapes personality development.

Psychologically, personality represents the totality of an individual's behavioral tendencies, including cognitive, emotional, social, and behavioral aspects. It encompasses the physical, emotional, mental, and social characteristics that collectively determine an individual's adjustment to the environment. The term personality originates from the Latin word "persona," which originally referred to the masks worn by actors in theatrical performances. Over time, the term came to signify the role individuals play in social contexts and eventually evolved to represent the observable characteristics that distinguish one person from another. In everyday life, people often

associate personality with outward appearance, communication style, or behavioral impressions individuals create in social interactions. Personality influences how individuals perceive themselves and their relationships with others. It plays a significant role in shaping life outcomes, including academic and professional success. Understanding personality helps individuals identify strengths and areas for personal growth.

However, modern psychological interpretations of personality extend far beyond external behavior or physical appearance. Personality encompasses both overt and covert aspects of behavior, including thoughts, emotions, motivations, and attitudes. It reflects the dynamic interaction between biological predispositions and environmental influences. Watson (1930) emphasized the behavioral perspective of personality, defining it as the sum of activities observable over time that provide reliable information about an individual's behavioral tendencies. This view highlights the importance of observable behavior in understanding personality.

Allport (1937) proposed one of the most widely accepted definitions of personality, describing it as the "dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to the environment." This definition highlights several important aspects of personality. The term dynamic organization suggests personality constantly evolves and adapts rather than remains static. The concept of psychophysical systems emphasizes the interaction between mental processes and biological structures in shaping behavior. The notion of unique adjustment underscores the individuality of each person's responses to environmental demands. Later, Allport (1961) refined this definition, emphasizing that personality determines an individual's characteristic behavior and thought patterns.

Personality has several distinctive characteristics. First, each individual has a unique personality, as no two individuals display identical behavioral patterns over time, even in similar situations. Individuals develop distinct patterns of behavior through interactions with their environment and personal experiences. Second, personality involves self-awareness or self-consciousness, distinguishing human beings from other forms of life. Self-awareness enables individuals to evaluate their behavior, thoughts, and emotions, contributing to personality development.

Personality has an integrative nature, making it another important characteristic. It isn't just a collection of separate traits or characteristics; rather, psychological and biological processes function together to influence behavior. To evaluate personality, one needs a comprehensive understanding of both biological and social influences. Furthermore, personality changes and adapts throughout life. Individuals continuously interact with their environment, encounter new experiences, and modify their behavioral patterns. Through continuous learning, adaptation, and development, personality evolves.

Both hereditary and environmental factors influence personality development. Genetic predispositions provide the biological foundation for personality traits, while environmental factors like family environment, education, peer relationships, and cultural influences shape the expression of traits. The interaction between heredity and environment plays a significant role in the form and development of personality throughout life.

The concept of personality traits forms the foundation of modern personality psychology. Traits are relatively stable and enduring characteristics that differentiate individuals from one another. Guilford (1959) defined a trait as any distinguishable and relatively enduring way in which one individual differs from another. Similarly, Mischel (1976) described traits as continuous dimensions along which individual differences can be measured quantitatively in terms of the degree to which individuals possess particular characteristics. Traits represent consistent patterns of behavior, thought, and emotional response that influence how individuals interact with their environment.

People commonly use trait terminology to describe individuals in everyday language. They frequently characterize others using trait descriptors like honest, aggressive, cooperative, anxious, or dependable. Allport and Odbert (1936) conducted an extensive lexical analysis and identified approximately 17,953 words in the English language that describe personality characteristics. This lexical approach suggests that everyday language encodes the most important personality traits because they represent socially meaningful behavioral differences.

Hippocrates (460–377 B.C.) proposed a theory of temperament based on bodily fluids or humors, marking one of the earliest attempts to classify personality traits. This theory classified individuals into four temperamental types depending on the dominance of particular bodily fluids. Although this

early theory lacked scientific evidence, it represented one of the first systematic attempts to explain personality differences. Later, Sheldon (1942) proposed another typology based on body structure, suggesting specific body types were associated with particular temperaments. These early theories emphasized biological influences on personality but didn't adequately consider environmental factors.

Psychologists like Allport, Cattell, and Eysenck contributed to the modern trait approach to personality, making it prominent. Allport emphasized that personality traits represent consistent tendencies that predispose individuals to respond to various stimuli in similar ways. He believed traits are real psychological structures within individuals, inferable from consistent behavioral patterns over time. He categorized traits into three types: cardinal, central, and secondary traits. Cardinal traits strongly influence an individual's behavior, shaping almost every aspect of personality. Central traits describe an individual's personality, like honesty, kindness, or sociability. Secondary traits appear only in specific situations, having a limited influence on overall behavior.

Raymond B. Cattell advanced trait theory by applying statistical techniques like factor analysis to identify personality's underlying dimensions. He defined traits as relatively permanent reaction tendencies that constitute personality's structural units. Cattell distinguished between common traits, shared by many individuals within a culture, and unique traits, specific to particular individuals. He also differentiated between surface traits and source traits. Surface traits are observable behavioral patterns that appear related, whereas source traits are underlying psychological factors that give rise to these behavioral patterns.

Hans Eysenck expanded the trait approach by proposing a hierarchical model of personality based on three major dimensions: extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism. Extraversion shows how sociable, outgoing, and energetic individuals are, whereas introverts tend to be reserved and introspective. Neuroticism represents emotional instability and the tendency to experience negative emotions like anxiety and depression. Eysenck's third dimension, psychoticism, associates with aggressiveness, impulsivity, and antisocial behavior. Eysenck's model emphasized the biological basis of personality traits, suggesting genetic factors influence these dimensions.

Contemporary personality psychology widely accepts the Five-Factor Model, also known as the Big Five personality traits. McCrae and Costa developed this model through extensive factor-analytic research, identifying five broad personality dimensions: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Neuroticism involves experiencing emotional instability and negative emotions like anxiety and sadness. Extraversion encompasses sociability, assertiveness, and enthusiasm in social interactions. Openness to experience reflects intellectual curiosity, creativity, and a preference for novelty and variety. Agreeableness describes characteristics like kindness, trust, cooperation, and empathy. Conscientiousness involves self-discipline, responsibility, organization, and goal-directed behavior.

Researchers have widely supported the five-factor model across cultures and age groups, making it a highly influential framework in personality research. This model provides a comprehensive structure for understanding personality traits and their impact on individual behavior. In adolescence, personality traits significantly influence emotional development, social relationships, academic performance, and overall psychological well-being. Examining adolescents' personality traits helps us understand their behavioral patterns and design educational interventions promoting healthy development.

2. Studies Related to Personality Traits

Researchers have widely studied personality traits in relation to academic achievement, learning styles, motivation, and cognitive performance. They've examined how individual differences in personality influence learning behavior and academic success. Sternberg (1997) concluded that differences in abilities associated with personality characteristics largely contribute to success and failure among individuals. The study highlighted that thinking styles, learning styles, and personality variables significantly impact academic performance. The study used Eysenck's Personality Inventory on 200 participants and found personality dimensions like extraversion and neuroticism, along with learning styles like reflector and pragmatist, significantly predicted work performance. The findings suggest extraverted individuals tend to be more sociable and active, whereas introverted individuals may achieve higher academic performance because they are more focused and less distracted by social interactions.

Researchers have further explored how personality types relate to learning preferences. Rolfhus and Ackerman (1999) used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to examine the association between personality types and teaching methodology

preferences among undergraduate dental students. They aimed to identify common personality types among first- and second-year students and examine their learning preferences. The findings suggest that understanding students' personality types helps educators design more effective teaching strategies and improve clinical learning outcomes. Similarly, Jessee et al. (2006) identified four dominant personality types among students and emphasized that faculty should recognize diverse personality patterns and associated learning preferences to enhance student motivation and improve educational effectiveness.

Several studies have also investigated how personality traits impact academic achievement. Bayran (2008) examined the relationship between personality traits and academic achievement in a web-based learning environment, finding that personality traits significantly influenced students' academic performance. The study reported personality traits accounted for approximately 53.2 percent of the variance in academic achievement, while attitudes toward web-based education explained 52.7 percent of the variance. Similarly, Hakimi et al. (2011) used regression analysis to investigate the relationship between personality traits and academic achievement, finding that personality characteristics explained about 48 percent of the variance in academic performance. Among the Big Five traits, conscientiousness was the most significant predictor of academic success.

Research highlights the relationship between personality traits, learning styles, and language learning outcomes. Sadeghi et al. (2012) found a strong association between personality types, learning styles, and reading comprehension performance. Their findings suggest students' academic performance largely depends on their personality types and how they adopt specific learning strategies. Similarly, Tan et al. (2012) found that learners with different personality traits adopt different learning styles, influencing their learning performance and academic outcomes.

Some studies focus specifically on how personality traits interact with learning preferences in higher education. Matangi (2013) examined personality traits and learning preferences among women in tertiary education, finding that extraversion and openness were dominant. The study also found that participants most commonly used elaborative processing and methodical study approaches. Gulnara et al. (2014) further investigated how personality traits, learning strategies, and academic performance relate among undergraduate students in Kazakhstan, finding that students with different personality characteristics show varying motivation levels and priorities in achieving academic goals.

The Big Five personality framework is widely used to predict academic performance. Pornsakulvanich et al. (2012) examined how Big Five personality traits and learning styles influence cognitive and affective academic performance. They found that personality traits predict academic performance better than learning styles. Specifically, conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness predicted cognitive academic performance, while conscientiousness, openness, agreeableness, and emotional stability predicted affective academic performance.

Several studies explore how personality traits and intelligence relate to academic achievement. Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham (2003) conducted longitudinal research to examine how personality traits predict academic performance among university students. They found neuroticism negatively affected academic performance, while conscientiousness predicted higher academic achievement. The study also found personality traits accounted for nearly 17 percent of the variance in examination results, highlighting the importance of personality measures in educational assessment.

Earlier studies examined how personality characteristics influence academic skills and study habits. Koteshwar and Reddy (2001) investigated the impact of personality characteristics on high school students' reading achievement, finding that all fourteen HSPQ factors significantly influenced reading achievement. Rajani (2004) similarly found personality factors like intelligence, emotional stability, assertiveness, moral standards, venturesomeness, and self-control significantly influenced intermediate students' study habits.

Research in India has significantly contributed to understanding personality traits among school students. Mehta et al. (2008) found significant differences in personality patterns among higher secondary boys from different demographic groups, particularly between rural scheduled caste students and non-backwards students in traits like emotional stability, sociability, and enthusiasm. Wani (2014) reported differences in personality characteristics between male and female higher secondary students and between rural and urban students. Male students tended to be more outgoing and assertive, while female students were more reserved and emotionally stable.

Several researchers examine how personality traits relate to emotional intelligence. Syiem (2009)

found a strong link between emotional intelligence and personality characteristics among Meghalaya's secondary school students. Ramalingam (2014) similarly reported significant relationships between personality traits and emotional intelligence variables like well-being, emotionality, and sociability. Agreeableness and conscientiousness are positively associated with emotional intelligence, while neuroticism is negatively related to emotional intelligence variables.

International studies also report similar findings. Lim and Abdullah (2012) examined how personality traits relate to academic performance among Malaysian secondary school students using the Five-Factor Personality Inventory. They found no significant gender differences in most personality traits except neuroticism, where female students scored higher than males. Troncone et al. (2014) also found significant relationships between personality traits, self-esteem, and academic achievement among Italian secondary school students.

Recent studies examine the role of personality traits in educational and social outcomes. Onyekuru et al. (2015) found a positive, significant relationship between personality characteristics and counselling effectiveness among Nigerian counsellors. Similarly, Nystrom and Mikkelsen (2013) found significant gender differences in psychopathy-related personality traits and shame management strategies among adolescents.

3. Objectives of the study

- To compare the personality traits of boys and girls in higher secondary school.
- To examine differences in personality traits between urban and rural higher secondary students.
- To investigate personality trait differences between Tamil and English medium higher secondary students.
- To compare personality traits of higher secondary students in Government, Aided, and Private schools.
- To examine personality trait differences between Arts and Science Group higher secondary students.
- To compare the personality traits of day scholars and residential higher secondary students.
- To investigate personality trait differences among higher secondary students in co-education, boys', and girls' schools.

4. Hypotheses of the Study

- There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to gender.
- There will be a significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to locality.
- There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to the medium of instruction.
- There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to the type of management.
- There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to the stream of the course.
- There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to the type of school.
- There will be a significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to the category of school.
- There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to parental education.

5. Methodology

The present study used a survey research design to examine adolescents' personality traits. Researchers widely use survey research in quantitative studies to describe and analyze attitudes, opinions, behaviors, and characteristics of a population by collecting data from a representative sample using standardized instruments like questionnaires or psychological inventories. This approach enables researchers to obtain systematic information about the variables under study and analyze them using statistical techniques. The survey method is particularly useful for collecting large-scale data and identifying patterns within a population. The study adopted the normative survey method, commonly used in educational and psychological research to describe a population's existing conditions. This method focuses on collecting data from a sample group and comparing the results with the population's normative characteristics. The researchers considered the normative survey approach appropriate because it lets them measure and analyze personality traits among adolescents in their natural educational settings. The method involves quantifying variables through self-reported responses from participants and analyzing them using statistical procedures.

The study focused on higher secondary school students in Telangana State. Researchers selected a

representative sample using a simple random sampling technique, giving each individual an equal chance of being included. They randomly selected 30 higher secondary schools from four districts of Telangana State. From these schools, they chose 600 students as the sample. The researchers considered this sample adequate to represent the adolescent student population and ensure reliability in the statistical analysis.

Researchers used the Five Personality Trait Inventory, developed by Prof. K. S. Mishra of the University of Allahabad, to measure personality traits among adolescents. The inventory has 50 items divided into five subscales, each with 10 items representing different personality dimensions. These dimensions include conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, aggressiveness, and extraversion. The items are in a structured format, and respondents indicate their responses based on personal experiences and behavioral tendencies.

The conscientiousness subscale includes items 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, 36, 41, and 46. The openness subscale includes items 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37, 42, and 47. The neuroticism subscale consists of items 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 33, 38, 43, and 48. The aggressiveness subscale includes items 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39, 44, and 49. The extraversion subscale includes items 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50.

Researchers established the inventory's reliability and validity during its development. They used split-half reliability and Cronbach's alpha reliability methods to determine the instrument's internal consistency. They also established factorial validity through factor analysis to confirm that the items adequately represent the intended personality dimensions. These psychometric properties indicate the instrument is reliable and valid for measuring personality traits among adolescents.

6. Results and Data Analysis

The researchers aimed to examine the personality traits of higher secondary school students in Telangana State and determine whether these traits vary with respect to selected demographic and institutional variables. Specifically, they analyzed personality traits in relation to school management, school category, residence, gender, locality, academic stream, medium of instruction, religion, family type, and parents' employment status. They conducted a statistical analysis to identify whether significant differences existed among groups based on these variables.

The researchers employed appropriate statistical techniques to test the formulated hypotheses. They used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to examine the influence of categorical variables with more than two groups. This statistical method helps determine whether there are significant differences in the mean scores of personality traits across different categories of the independent variables.

6.1 Personality Traits and School Management

The researchers formulated the following null hypothesis to examine whether school management type influences higher secondary students' personality traits:

H_0: There is no significant influence of school management on the personality traits of higher secondary students.

They applied Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to the personality trait scores from students in different school management types. Tables 1(A) and 1(B) present the analysis results. These tables display mean scores, standard deviations, and F-values from the ANOVA test to determine significant differences among groups. The analysis helps understand whether variations in school management systems contribute to differences in personality traits among adolescents in higher secondary schools.

Table 1(A): Researchers analyzed Variance (ANOVA) to examine how school management influences students' personality traits across different dimensions.

Dimensions	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-
D1:Conciousness	Private	240	36.1458	6.08582	Between Groups	394.880	2	197.440	5.718*	.0
	Aided	90	36.0444	5.88067	Within Groups	20613.185	597	34.528		
	Govt.	270	34.4889	5.68160	Total	21008.065	599			
	Total	600	35.3850	5.92215						
D2: Openness	Private	240	35.4000	5.44720	Between Groups	344.951	2	172.476	6.451*	.0
	Aided	90	34.2556	4.39244	Within Groups	15961.022	597	26.735		
	Govt.	270	33.7667	5.15640	Total	16305.973	599			
	Total	600	34.4933	5.21747						
D3: Neuroticism	Private	240	34.3042	5.71235	Between Groups	215.551	2	107.775	3.474*	.0
	Aided	90	33.5222	6.01912	Within Groups	18520.248	597	31.022		
	Govt.	270	33.0037	5.27919	Total	18735.798	599			
	Total	600	33.6017	5.59272						
D4: Agreeableness	Private	240	34.8083	6.19933	Between Groups	690.934	2	345.467	9.543**	.0
	Aided	90	32.2889	5.97795	Within Groups	21613.024	597	36.203		
	Govt.	270	32.7593	5.86317	Total	22303.958	599			
	Total	600	33.5083	6.10208						
D5: Extraversion	Private	240	35.0125	5.47607	Between Groups	631.441	2	315.721	9.013**	.0
	Aided	90	33.2333	5.96064	Within Groups	20911.892	597	35.028		
	Govt.	270	32.8370	6.27227	Total	21543.333	599			
	Total	600	33.7667	5.99712						
Overall Personality Trait	Private	240	175.6708	24.21202	Between Groups	10084.300	2	5042.150	9.353**	.0
	Aided	90	169.3444	21.73650	Within Groups	321836.685	597	539.090		
	Govt.	270	166.8556	22.78715	Total	331920.985	599			
	Total	600	170.7550	23.53986						

*Significant at 0.05 level; **significant at 0.01 level # not significant.

Table 1(A) shows that the F-ratio for overall personality traits (F = 9.35) among higher secondary students in private, aided, and government schools is significant at the 0.01 level. This leads to rejection of the null hypothesis that school management has no significant influence on students' personality traits. The analysis also reveals statistically significant F-values for the five personality dimensions: conscientiousness (5.71), openness (6.45), neuroticism (3.47), agreeableness (9.54), and extraversion (9.01). This indicates significant differences among students in private, aided, and government schools regarding their personality traits.

The researchers employed Scheffé's Post Hoc Test to identify specific group differences, comparing mean scores among students from private, aided, and government schools. Table 1(B) presents the results of these paired mean comparisons for personality traits. The post hoc analysis determines which specific groups differ significantly in terms of their personality trait scores.

Multiple Comparisons

Scheffe

Dependent Variable	(I) Management of school	(J) Management of school	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Inter Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PT_D1	Private	Aided	.10139	.72630	.990	-1.6809	1.8837
		Govt.	1.65694*	.52129	.007	.3777	2.9361
	Aided	Private	-.10139	.72630	.990	-1.8837	1.6809
		Govt.	1.55556	.71521	.095	-.1995	3.3106
	Govt.	Private	-1.65694*	.52129	.007	-2.9361	-.3777
		Aided	-1.55556	.71521	.095	-3.3106	.1995
PT_D2	Private	Aided	1.14444	.63911	.202	-.4239	2.7127
		Govt.	1.63333*	.45871	.002	.5077	2.7590
	Aided	Private	-1.14444	.63911	.202	-2.7127	.4239
		Govt.	.48889	.62935	.740	-1.0555	2.0332
	Govt.	Private	-1.63333*	.45871	.002	-2.7590	-.5077
		Aided	-.48889	.62935	.740	-2.0332	1.0555
PT_D3	Private	Aided	.78194	.68844	.525	-.9074	2.4713
		Govt.	1.30046*	.49412	.032	.0879	2.5130
	Aided	Private	-.78194	.68844	.525	-2.4713	.9074
		Govt.	.51852	.67793	.747	-1.1451	2.1821
	Govt.	Private	-1.30046*	.49412	.032	-2.5130	-.0879
		Aided	-.51852	.67793	.747	-2.1821	1.1451
PT_D4	Private	Aided	2.51944*	.74370	.003	.6945	4.3444
		Govt.	2.04907*	.53379	.001	.7392	3.3589
	Aided	Private	-2.51944*	.74370	.003	-4.3444	-.6945
		Govt.	-.47037	.73235	.814	-2.2675	1.3267
	Govt.	Private	-2.04907*	.53379	.001	-3.3589	-.7392
		Aided	.47037	.73235	.814	-1.3267	2.2675
PT_D5	Private	Aided	1.77917	.73154	.053	-.0160	3.5743
		Govt.	2.17546*	.52506	.000	.8870	3.4639
	Aided	Private	-1.77917	.73154	.053	-3.5743	.0160
		Govt.	.39630	.72037	.860	-1.3714	2.1640
	Govt.	Private	-2.17546*	.52506	.000	-3.4639	-.8870
		Aided	-.39630	.72037	.860	-2.1640	1.3714
PT_TOTAL	Private	Aided	6.32639	2.86986	.089	-.7160	13.3687
		Govt.	8.81528*	2.05981	.000	3.7607	13.8699
	Aided	Private	-6.32639	2.86986	.089	-13.3687	.7160
		Govt.	2.48889	2.82604	.679	-4.4459	9.4237
	Govt.	Private	-8.81528*	2.05981	.000	-13.8699	-3.7607
		Aided	-2.48889	2.82604	.679	-9.4237	4.4459

Table 1(B): Researchers used Scheffé's Post Hoc Test to compare personality traits among private, aided, and government school students.

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4.2.3.1(B) shows the results of Scheffé's post hoc multiple comparison test, identifying specific group differences among students in private, aided, and government higher secondary schools regarding their personality traits. The analysis reveals significant differences between private and aided school students and between private and government school students across all five personality dimensions: conscientiousness (D1), openness (D2), neuroticism (D3), agreeableness (D4), and extraversion (D5), as well as overall personality trait scores. Private school students differ significantly from aided and government school students in terms of personality characteristics. Aided and government school students show comparatively smaller or non-significant differences in certain dimensions. The type of school management plays a significant role in shaping higher secondary students' personality traits.

6.2 Personality Traits and School Category

The researchers formulated the null hypothesis to examine whether school category influences higher secondary students' personality traits:

H_0: There is no significant influence of school category on personality traits.

They applied Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to personality trait scores of students from different school categories. ANOVA determines whether significant differences exist among mean scores of more than two groups. Tables 2(A) and 2(B) present the ANOVA results. Table 2(A) shows mean scores and F-values for personality traits based on school category across five dimensions: conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion, plus overall personality trait score. The analysis determines whether significant differences exist among students from different school categories regarding personality traits.

Table 2(A): Researchers analyzed Variance (ANOVA) to examine personality traits of students across different school categories and dimensions.

Dimensions	Category	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-value
PT_D1	co-education	458	35.2817	6.04988	Between Groups	50.028	2	25.014	0.713#
	Boys	70	35.2571	5.15748	Within Groups	20958.037	597	35.106	
	Girls	72	36.1667	5.80917	Total	21008.065	599		
	Total	600	35.3850	5.92215					
PT_D2	co-education	458	34.3253	5.16945	Between Groups	141.298	2	70.649	2.609#
	Boys	70	34.2429	5.10594	Within Groups	16164.675	597	27.077	
	Girls	72	35.8056	5.50707	Total	16305.973	599		
	Total	600	34.4933	5.21747					
PT_D3	co-education	458	33.5022	5.75018	Between Groups	20.770	2	10.385	.331#
	Boys	70	33.8143	4.47308	Within Groups	18715.028	597	31.348	
	Girls	72	34.0278	5.59671	Total	18735.798	599		
	Total	600	33.6017	5.59272					
PT_D4	co-education	458	33.4520	6.19123	Between Groups	13.644	2	6.822	.183#
	Boys	70	33.4571	5.56304	Within Groups	22290.315	597	37.337	
	Girls	72	33.9167	6.09491	Total	22303.958	599		
	Total	600	33.5083	6.10208					
PT_D5	co-education	458	33.8122	5.78534	Between Groups	5.996	2	2.998	.083#
	Boys	70	33.5000	6.70658	Within Groups	21537.338	597	36.076	
	Girls	72	33.7361	6.64808	Total	21543.333	599		
	Total	600	33.7667	5.99712					
PT_TOTAL	co-education	458	170.3734	23.39795	Between Groups	687.668	2	343.834	.620#
	Boys	70	170.2714	22.45893	Within Groups	331233.317	597	554.830	
	Girls	72	173.6528	25.51948	Total	331920.985	599		

Table 2(A) presents the ANOVA results examining the influence of school category (co-education, boys', and girls' schools) on higher secondary students' personality traits. The F-ratio for overall personality traits (F = 0.62) is not statistically significant (p = 0.538). Therefore, the null hypothesis stating no significant influence of school category on personality traits is accepted.

The five personality dimensions also show non-significant F-values: conscientiousness (D1, F = 0.713, p = 0.491), openness (D2, F = 2.609, p = 0.074), neuroticism (D3, F = 0.331, p = 0.718), agreeableness (D4, F = 0.183, p = 0.833), and extraversion (D5, F = 0.083, p = 0.920). **indicate that none of these differences reach the level of statistical significance.** Students in co-education, boys', and girls' schools don't differ significantly in personality traits or overall personality trait score. The school category doesn't significantly impact personality trait development among higher secondary students.

6.3 Personality Traits and Residence

The researchers formulated the null hypothesis to examine whether residential status influences higher secondary students' personality traits:

H_0: There's no significant influence of students' residence (day scholar vs hosteller) on personality traits.

They applied an independent samples t-test to compare mean personality trait scores between day scholars and hostellers. The t-test determines whether significant differences exist between two independent groups' mean scores. Table 3 presents the results, showing mean scores, standard deviations, and t-values for five personality dimensions: conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion, plus the overall personality trait score. The analysis determines whether residential status significantly affects higher secondary students' personality traits.

Table 3: Researchers examined the difference in personality traits between day scholars and hostellers.

Dimensions	residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
PT_D1	Day scholar	393	35.5089	5.86328	.674*	0.500
	Hostler	206	35.1650	6.05035		
PT_D2	Day scholar	393	34.6997	5.23250	1.310#	0.191
	Hostler	206	34.1117	5.18931		
PT_D3	Day scholar	393	33.7888	5.56581	1.134#	0.257
	Hostler	206	33.2427	5.65335		
PT_D4	Day scholar	393	33.6692	6.17082	.804#	0.422
	Hostler	206	33.2476	5.95199		
PT_D5	Day scholar	393	33.6489	6.10861	-.689#	0.491
	Hostler	206	34.0049	5.79781		
PT_TOTAL	Day scholar	393	171.3155	23.67611	.762#	0.446
	Hostler	206	169.7718	23.32635		

Table 3 shows the independent samples t-test results examining how students' residence (day scholars vs hostellers) affects personality traits. The t-value for overall personality traits (t = 0.762) isn't statistically significant (p = 0.446), so the null hypothesis is accepted. The analysis reveals non-significant differences in five personality dimensions: conscientiousness (D1, t = 0.674, p = 0.500), openness (D2, t = 1.310, p = 0.191), neuroticism (D3, t = 1.134, p = 0.257), agreeableness (D4, t = 0.804, p = 0.422), and extraversion (D5, t = –0.689, p = 0.491). Day scholars and hostellers don't differ significantly in any personality dimension or overall personality trait score. Residential status doesn't influence personality trait development among higher secondary students.

6.4 Personality Traits and Gender

Researchers formulated the null hypothesis to examine whether gender influences higher secondary students' personality traits:

H_0: There's no significant influence of students' gender on personality traits.

They used an independent-samples t-test to compare mean personality trait scores between male and female students. The t-test determines

whether there's a significant difference between two independent groups' means.

Table 4 shows the results, displaying mean scores, standard deviations, t-values, and significance levels for male and female students across five personality dimensions: conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion, plus overall personality trait score. The analysis reveals whether gender significantly influences higher secondary students' personality traits.

Table 4: Difference between Male and Female Higher Secondary Students in Personality Traits

Dimension	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
PT_D1	Male	330	35.4182	5.83988	.241#	0.810
	Female	269	35.3011	6.00081		
PT_D2	Male	330	34.5545	5.15461	.401#	0.689
	Female	269	34.3829	5.27935		
PT_D3	Male	330	33.5970	5.60053	.045#	0.964
	Female	269	33.5762	5.58038		
PT_D4	Male	330	33.6424	6.00350	.690#	0.491
	Female	269	33.2974	6.19105		
PT_D5	Male	330	33.9879	5.98782	1.071#	0.285
	Female	269	33.4610	5.99155		
PT_TOTAL	Male	330	171.2000	23.25011	.613#	0.540
	Female	269	170.0186	23.75535		

The table shows the independent samples t-test results examining how gender (male vs female) affects higher secondary students' personality traits. The t-value for overall personality traits (t = 0.613) isn't statistically significant (p = 0.540), so researchers accept the null hypothesis. The analysis reveals non-significant differences in five personality dimensions: conscientiousness (D1, t = 0.241, p = 0.810), openness (D2, t = 0.401, p = 0.689), neuroticism (D3, t = 0.045, p = 0.964), agreeableness (D4, t = 0.690, p = 0.491), and extraversion (D5, t = 1.071, p = 0.285). show that none of these differences are statistically significant at the **0.05 level of significance**. Male and female students don't differ significantly in any personality dimension or overall personality trait score. Gender doesn't influence the personality traits of higher secondary students.

6.5 Personality Traits and Locality

To examine whether students' locality influences their personality traits, researchers formulated the null hypothesis:

H_0: There's no significant influence of students' locality (rural vs urban) on personality traits.

They used an independent samples t-test to compare mean personality trait scores between rural and urban higher secondary students. The t-test determines whether there's a significant difference between two independent groups' means. Table 5 presents the results, showing mean scores, standard deviations, t-values, and significance levels for rural and urban students across five personality dimensions: conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion, plus overall personality trait score. The analysis determines whether locality significantly influences higher secondary students' personality traits.

Table 5: Difference between Rural and Urban Students in Personality Traits

Dimensions	locality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
PT_D1	Rural	239	35.0084	6.10207	-1.299#	0.194
	Urban	360	35.6500	5.79547		
PT_D2	Rural	239	34.3975	5.47693	-.388#	0.698
	Urban	360	34.5667	5.04862		
PT_D3	Rural	239	34.0000	5.57003	1.399#	0.162
	Urban	360	33.3472	5.60481		
PT_D4	Rural	239	33.7490	6.34807	.772#	0.440
	Urban	360	33.3556	5.94414		
PT_D5	Rural	239	34.0126	6.16133	.807#	0.420
	Urban	360	33.6083	5.89645		
PT_TOTAL	Rural	239	171.1674	24.80574	.325#	0.745
	Urban	360	170.5278	22.70887		

Researchers examined the influence of students' locality (rural vs urban) on personality traits using an independent samples t-test, as shown in Table 5. They found the t-value for overall personality traits (t = 0.325) is not statistically significant (p = 0.745), so they accepted the null hypothesis. Analysis reveals non-significant differences in five personality dimensions: conscientiousness (D1, t = –1.299, p = 0.194), openness (D2, t = –0.388, p = 0.698), neuroticism (D3, t = 1.399, p = 0.162), agreeableness (D4, t = 0.772, p = 0.440), and extraversion (D5, t = 0.807, p = 0.420). Rural and urban students don't differ significantly in any personality dimension or overall personality trait score. Locality doesn't significantly influence the personality traits of higher secondary students.

6.6 Personality Traits and Stream of the Course

Researchers formulated the null hypothesis to examine whether course stream influences the personality traits of higher secondary students:

H_0: There's no significant influence of students' course stream on personality traits.

They used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to compare personality trait scores across academic streams. ANOVA determines whether significant differences exist among more than two groups' mean scores. Tables 6(A) and 6(B) present the results. Table 6(A) displays mean scores, standard deviations, and F-values for students' personality traits based on course stream across five dimensions: conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion, plus overall personality trait score. The analysis reveals whether academic stream significantly influences personality traits.

Table 6(A): ANOVA - Personality Traits by Course Stream of students

ensions	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
D1	MPC	195	34.8410	5.63132	Between Groups	95.779	3	31.926	.91
	BPC	263	35.5932	5.92687	Within Groups	20912.286	596	35.088	
	CEC	101	35.5941	6.30108	Total	21008.065	599		
	MEC	41	36.1220	6.29760					
	Total	600	35.3850	5.92215					
D2	MPC	195	34.2410	5.04090	Between Groups	39.877	3	13.292	.48
	BPC	263	34.6502	5.34954	Within Groups	16266.096	596	27.292	
	CEC	101	34.3069	5.25879	Total	16305.973	599		
	MEC	41	35.1463	5.17958					
	Total	600	34.4933	5.21747					
D3	MPC	195	33.4974	5.35962	Between Groups	23.455	3	7.818	.24
	BPC	263	33.7567	5.68191	Within Groups	18712.343	596	31.397	
	CEC	101	33.6436	5.52736	Total	18735.798	599		
	MEC	41	33.0000	6.37574					
	Total	600	33.6017	5.59272					
D4	MPC	195	32.9897	5.84507	Between Groups	248.754	3	82.918	2.2
	BPC	263	33.8137	6.12088	Within Groups	22055.204	596	37.005	
	CEC	101	32.9604	6.39362	Total	22303.958	599		
	MEC	41	35.3659	6.17153					
	Total	600	33.5083	6.10208					
D5	MPC	195	33.2154	5.75306	Between Groups	112.920	3	37.640	1.0
	BPC	263	34.0076	6.21620	Within Groups	21430.413	596	35.957	
	CEC	101	33.8119	6.10035	Total	21543.333	599		
	MEC	41	34.7317	5.39455					
	Total	600	33.7667	5.99712					
TOTAL	MPC	195	168.7846	22.15165	Between Groups	1610.057	3	536.686	.96
	BPC	263	171.8213	23.92646	Within Groups	330310.928	596	554.213	
	CEC	101	170.3168	24.61866	Total	331920.985	599		
	MEC	41	174.3659	24.75859					
	Total	600	170.7550	23.53986					

Researchers examined the influence of course stream (MPC, BPC, CEC, MEC) on higher secondary students' personality traits using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), as shown in Table 6(A). They found the F-value for overall personality traits (F = 0.968) isn't statistically significant (p = 0.407), so they accepted the null hypothesis. Analysis reveals non-significant differences in five personality dimensions: conscientiousness (D1, F = 0.910, p = 0.436), openness (D2, F = 0.487, p = 0.691), neuroticism (D3, F = 0.249, p = 0.862), agreeableness (D4, F = 2.241, p = 0.082), and extraversion (D5, F = 1.047, p = 0.371). Students from the MPC, BPC, CEC, and MEC streams don't differ significantly in personality traits. Course stream doesn't significantly influence the personality traits of higher secondary students.

6.7 Personality Traits and Medium of Instruction

To examine whether the medium of instruction has a significant influence on the personality traits of higher secondary students, the following null hypothesis was formulated:

H_0: There is no significant influence of students' medium of instruction (Telugu medium and English medium) on their personality traits.

To test this hypothesis, an independent samples t-test was applied to compare the mean scores of personality traits between Telugu medium and English medium students. The t-test is an appropriate statistical technique used to determine whether significant differences exist between the mean scores of two independent groups. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 7, which shows the mean scores, standard deviations, t-values, and significance levels of Telugu medium and English medium students across the five dimensions of personality traits—conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion—as well as the overall personality trait score. This analysis helps to determine whether the medium of instruction plays a significant role in influencing the personality traits of higher secondary students.

Table 7: Significance of Difference between Telugu Medium and English Medium Higher Secondary Students in Their Personality Traits.

Dimension	medium of instruction	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
PT_D1	TM	119	35.7479	6.06213	.733#	0.464
	EM	479	35.3027	5.89679		
PT_D2	TM	119	34.7983	5.40649	.684#	0.494
	EM	479	34.4322	5.17872		
PT_D3	TM	119	33.7395	5.72604	.295#	0.768
	EM	479	33.5699	5.57291		
PT_D4	TM	119	34.2521	6.51494	1.478#	0.140
	EM	479	33.3278	5.99992		
PT_D5	TM	119	34.6807	5.89302	1.875#	0.061
	EM	479	33.5303	6.01207		
PT_TOTAL	TM	119	173.2185	25.67303	1.266#	0.206
	EM	479	170.1628	23.00279		

Table 7 presents the results of the **independent samples t-test** conducted to examine the influence of **medium of instruction (Telugu medium and English medium)** on the personality traits of higher secondary students. The analysis reveals that the **t-value for overall personality traits (t = 1.266)** between Telugu medium and English medium students is **not statistically significant (p = 0.206)**. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that **there is no significant influence of the medium of instruction on the personality traits of higher secondary students** is **accepted**.

Further analysis of the five dimensions of personality traits also indicates non-significant differences between the two groups. The obtained **t-values for conscientiousness (D1), openness (D2), neuroticism (D3), agreeableness (D4), and extraversion (D5)** are **0.733, 0.684, 0.295, 1.478, and 1.875**, respectively. The corresponding **p-values (0.464, 0.494, 0.768, 0.140, and 0.061)** show that none of these differences are statistically significant at the **0.05 level of significance**.

Based on these findings, it can be inferred that **there is no significant difference between Telugu medium and English medium higher secondary students in**

any of the five dimensions of personality traits or in the overall personality trait score. Thus, the **medium of instruction does not appear to significantly influence the personality traits of higher secondary students in the present study**.

6.7 Personality Traits and Religion

Researchers formulated the null hypothesis to examine whether students' religion influences their personality traits:

H_0: There's no significant influence of students' religion on personality traits.

They used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to compare personality trait scores across different religious groups. ANOVA determines whether significant differences exist among more than two groups' mean scores. Table 8 presents the results, displaying mean scores, standard deviations, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean square values, F-values, and significance levels across five personality dimensions: conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion, plus overall personality trait score. The analysis reveals whether religion significantly influences higher secondary students' personality traits.

Table 8: ANOVA - Personality Traits of Students by Religion with Respect to Different Dimensions.

Dimension	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-value	p-v
PT_D1	Hindu	492	35.3821	5.88522	Between Groups	87.863	2	43.931	1.254#	0.28
	Muslim	59	34.5763	6.05493	Within Groups	20920.202	597	35.042		
	Chirstain	49	36.3878	6.10265	Total	21008.065	599			
	Total	600	35.3850	5.92215						
PT_D2	Hindu	492	34.4045	5.27580	Between Groups	36.513	2	18.256	.670#	0.51
	Muslim	59	34.5593	5.01814	Within Groups	16269.461	597	27.252		
	Chirstain	49	35.3061	4.87854	Total	16305.973	599			
	Total	600	34.4933	5.21747						
PT_D3	Hindu	492	33.6870	5.64853	Between Groups	75.086	2	37.543	1.201#	0.3
	Muslim	59	33.8644	5.48810	Within Groups	18660.712	597	31.257		
	Chirstain	49	32.4286	5.09902	Total	18735.798	599			
	Total	600	33.6017	5.59272						
PT_D4	Hindu	492	33.6138	6.00248	Between Groups	40.416	2	20.208	.542#	0.5
	Muslim	59	33.3051	6.24018	Within Groups	22263.543	597	37.292		
	Chirstain	49	32.6939	6.94383	Total	22303.958	599			
	Total	600	33.5083	6.10208						
PT_D5	Hindu	492	33.7215	5.96098	Between Groups	5.570	2	2.785	.077#	0.9
	Muslim	59	33.9661	6.40842	Within Groups	21537.763	597	36.077		
	Chirstain	49	33.9796	5.96689	Total	21543.333	599			
	Total	600	33.7667	5.99712						
PT_TOTAL	Hindu	492	170.8089	23.59502	Between Groups	15.324	2	7.662	.014#	0.9
	Muslim	59	170.2712	24.01998	Within Groups	331905.661	597	555.956		
	Chirstain	49	170.7959	22.86280	Total	331920.985	599			

Table 8 shows the ANOVA results examining the influence of religion (Hindu, Muslim, Christian) on higher secondary students' personality traits. The F-value for overall personality traits ($F = 0.014$) isn't statistically significant ($p = 0.986$), so the null hypothesis is accepted. Analysis of five personality dimensions also shows non-significant differences: conscientiousness (D1, $F = 1.254$, $p = 0.286$), openness (D2, $F = 0.670$, $p = 0.512$), neuroticism (D3, $F = 1.201$, $p = 0.302$), agreeableness (D4, $F = 0.542$, $p = 0.582$), and extraversion (D5, $F = 0.077$, $p = 0.926$). Hindu, Muslim, and Christian students don't differ significantly in personality traits. Religion doesn't significantly influence the personality traits of higher secondary students.

6.9 Personality Traits and Type of Family

Researchers formulated the null hypothesis to examine whether family type influences the personality traits of higher secondary students:

H_0: There's no significant influence of family type on personality traits.

They used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to compare personality trait scores across different family types. ANOVA determines whether significant differences exist among more than two groups' mean scores. Tables 9(A) and 9(B) present the results. Table 9(A) displays mean scores, standard deviations, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean square values, and F-values for personality traits across five dimensions: conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion, plus the overall personality trait score. The analysis reveals whether family type significantly influences students' personality traits.

Table 9(A): ANOVA - Personality Traits of Students by Family Type with Respect to Different Dimensions.

Dimension	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-
PT_D1	Nuclear	288	35.9097	5.77923	Between Groups	162.769	2	81.385	2.331#	0.
	Joint	280	34.8393	5.99993	Within Groups	20845.296	597	34.917		
	Extended	32	35.4375	6.26273	Total	21008.065	599			
	Total	600	35.3850	5.92215						
PT_D2	Nuclear	288	34.7222	5.31377	Between Groups	29.878	2	14.939	.548#	0.
	Joint	280	34.2643	5.09144	Within Groups	16276.096	597	27.263		
	Extended	32	34.4375	5.50623	Total	16305.973	599			
	Total	600	34.4933	5.21747						
PT_D3	Nuclear	288	34.0694	5.46277	Between Groups	121.633	2	60.816	1.951#	0.
	Joint	280	33.1571	5.68753	Within Groups	18614.166	597	31.180		
	Extended	32	33.2813	5.74868	Total	18735.798	599			
	Total	600	33.6017	5.59272						
PT_D4	Nuclear	288	34.1493	6.01930	Between Groups	247.049	2	123.525	3.343*	0.
	Joint	280	32.8321	6.08280	Within Groups	22056.909	597	36.946		
	Extended	32	33.6563	6.56289	Total	22303.958	599			
	Total	600	33.5083	6.10208						
PT_D5	Nuclear	288	34.0174	5.96065	Between Groups	90.166	2	45.083	1.255#	0.
	Joint	280	33.3929	6.10153	Within Groups	21453.168	597	35.935		
	Extended	32	34.7813	5.29598	Total	21543.333	599			
	Total	600	33.7667	5.99712						
PT_TOTAL	Nuclear	288	172.8681	23.17146	Between Groups	2750.337	2	1375.169	2.494#	0.
	Joint	280	168.4857	23.48522	Within Groups	329170.648	597	551.375		
	Extended	32	171.5938	26.14582	Total	331920.985	599			
	Total	600	170.7550	23.53986						

Researchers examined the influence of family type (nuclear, joint, extended) on higher secondary students' personality traits using ANOVA (Table 9A). The F-value for overall personality traits (F = 2.494) isn't statistically significant (p = 0.083), so they accepted the null hypothesis. Analysis of five personality dimensions reveals non-significant differences in conscientiousness (D1, F = 2.331, p = 0.098), openness (D2, F = 0.548, p = 0.578), neuroticism (D3, F = 1.951, p = 0.143), and extraversion (D5, F = 1.255, p = 0.286). However, agreeableness (D4) shows a significant difference (F = 3.343, p = 0.036). Students from different family types differ in agreeableness. Researchers used post hoc tests (Table 9B) to identify specific group differences. Table 9(B) presents Scheffé's Post Hoc Test results for paired mean comparisons among nuclear, joint, and extended family students in agreeableness (D4).

Table 9(B): Researchers conducted Scheffé's Post Hoc Test to compare emotional intelligence among nuclear, joint, and extended family students with respect to Different Dimensions

Multiple Comparisons

Scheffe

Dependent Variable	(I) type of family	(J) type of family	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PT_D4	Nuclear	Joint	1.31716*	.51013	.036	.0653	2.5690
		Extended	.49306	1.13263	.910	-2.2863	3.2724
	Joint	Nuclear	-1.31716*	.51013	.036	-2.5690	-.0653
		Extended	-.82411	1.13425	.768	-3.6074	1.9592
	Extended	Nuclear	-.49306	1.13263	.910	-3.2724	2.2863
		Joint	.82411	1.13425	.768	-1.9592	3.6074
		Extended	1.27431	4.37549	.958	-9.4627	12.0113

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The analysis shows nuclear family students scored higher in agreeableness than joint family students (Mean Difference = 1.31716, p = 0.036). Nuclear and extended families, and joint and extended families, show no significant differences (p > 0.05). Agreeableness differs significantly only between nuclear and joint family students (D4).

6.10 Personality Traits and Parental Occupation

Researchers formulated the null hypothesis to examine whether parents' occupation influences the personality traits of higher secondary students:

H_0: There's no significant influence of parents' occupation on personality traits.

They used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to compare personality trait scores across different parental occupation groups. ANOVA determines whether significant differences exist among more than two groups' mean scores. Table 10 presents the results, displaying mean scores, standard deviations, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean square values, F-values, and significance levels for five personality dimensions: conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion, plus the overall personality trait score. The analysis reveals whether parents' occupation significantly influences students' personality traits.

Table 10: ANOVA - Personality Traits of Students by Parents' Occupation with Respect to Different Dimensions.

nension	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-va
`_D1	Coolie	287	35.0906	5.82004	Between Groups	53.921	2	26.961	.768#	0.46
	Private employee	242	35.7314	6.13998	Within Groups	20954.144	597	35.099		
	Govt.Employee	71	35.3944	5.58180	Total	21008.065	599			
	Total	600	35.3850	5.92215						
`_D2	Coolie	287	34.3066	4.93702	Between Groups	19.602	2	9.801	.359#	0.69
	Private employee	242	34.6446	5.62649	Within Groups	16286.371	597	27.280		
	Govt. Employee	71	34.7324	4.90760	Total	16305.973	599			
	Total	600	34.4933	5.21747						
`_D3	Coolie	287	33.3589	5.45677	Between Groups	37.402	2	18.701	.597#	0.55
	Private employee	242	33.8926	5.81285	Within Groups	18698.396	597	31.321		
	Govt. Employee	71	33.5915	5.39729	Total	18735.798	599			
	Total	600	33.6017	5.59272						
`_D4	Coolie	287	33.2334	5.92357	Between Groups	41.736	2	20.868	.560#	0.57
	Private employee	242	33.7479	6.28098	Within Groups	22262.222	597	37.290		
	Govt. Employee	71	33.8028	6.23268	Total	22303.958	599			
	Total	600	33.5083	6.10208						
`_D5	Coolie	287	33.5993	5.90570	Between Groups	54.510	2	27.255	.757#	0.46
	Private employee	242	34.1116	6.14013	Within Groups	21488.823	597	35.995		
	Govt. Employee	71	33.2676	5.88936	Total	21543.333	599			
	Total	600	33.7667	5.99712						
`_TOTAL	Coolie	287	169.5889	22.10065	Between Groups	846.641	2	423.320	.763#	0.46
	Private employee	242	172.1281	25.41400	Within Groups	331074.344	597	554.563		
	Govt. Employee	71	170.7887	22.59135	Total	331920.985	599			

Researchers conducted ANOVA to examine parents' occupation (coolie, private employee, government employee) and higher secondary students' personality traits (Table 10). They found the F-value for overall personality traits (F = 0.763) is not statistically significant (p = 0.467), so they accepted the null hypothesis. Analysis of five personality dimensions revealed non-significant differences: conscientiousness (D1, F = 0.768, p = 0.464), openness (D2, F = 0.359, p = 0.698), neuroticism (D3, F = 0.597, p = 0.551), agreeableness (D4, F = 0.560, p = 0.572), and extraversion (D5, F = 0.757, p = 0.469). Parents' occupation doesn't significantly influence students' personality traits.

7. Major Findings of the Study

- School management (private, aided, government) significantly influences higher econdary students' personality traits. The F-ratio for overall personality traits (F = 9.35) is significant at the 0.01 level, rejecting the null hypothesis. Significant differences exist in conscientiousness (F = 5.71), openness (F = 6.45), neuroticism (F = 3.47), agreeableness (F = 9.54), and extraversion (F = 9.01). This indicates that a significant difference exists among private, aided, and government higher secondary school students in their personality traits**.**
- School category (co-education, boys', girls') doesn't significantly influence personality traits (F = 0.62). Non-significant differences exist in all dimensions. The F-values for conscientiousness (0.713), openness (2.609), neuroticism (0.331), agreeableness (0.183), and extraversion (0.083) were also not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference among higher secondary students studying in different school categories with respect to their personality traits**.**
- Day scholars and hostellers don't differ significantly in personality traits (t = 0.762). Non-significant differences exist in all dimensions. Similarly, the t-values for conscientiousness (0.674), openness (1.310), neuroticism (1.134), agreeableness (0.804), and extraversion (–0.689) were also not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference between day scholars and hostellers in their overall personality traits**.**
- Male and female students don't differ significantly in personality traits (t = 0.613). Non-significant differences exist in all dimensions. The t-values for conscientiousness (0.241), openness (0.401), neuroticism (0.045), agreeableness (0.690), and extraversion (1.071) were also not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary students in their personality traits**.**
- Rural and urban students don't differ significantly in personality traits (t = 0.325). Non-significant differences exist in all dimensions. The t-values for conscientiousness (–1.299), openness (–0.388), neuroticism (1.399), agreeableness (0.772), and extraversion (0.807) were also not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference between rural and urban higher secondary students in their personality traits

- Stream of study (MPC, BPC, CEC, MEC) doesn't significantly influence personality traits (F = 0.968). Non-significant differences exist in all dimensions. The F-values for conscientiousness (0.910), openness (0.487), neuroticism (0.249), agreeableness (2.241), and extraversion (1.047) were also not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference among students of different academic streams in their personality traits**.**
- Medium of instruction (Telugu, English) doesn't significantly influence personality traits (t = 1.266). Non-significant differences exist in all dimensions. The t-values for conscientiousness (0.733), openness (0.684), neuroticism (0.295), agreeableness (1.478), and extraversion (1.875) were also not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference between Telugu medium and English medium higher secondary students in their personality traits**.**
- Religion (Hindu, Muslim, Christian) doesn't significantly influence personality traits (F = 0.014). Non-significant differences exist in all dimensions. The F-values for conscientiousness (1.254), openness (0.670), neuroticism (1.201), agreeableness (0.542), and extraversion (0.077) were also not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference among higher secondary students of different religions in their personality traits**.**
- Family type (nuclear, joint, extended) doesn't significantly influence overall personality traits (F = 2.494), but agreeableness differs significantly (F = 3.343, $p < 0.05$). while the other dimensions—conscientiousness (2.331), openness (0.548), neuroticism (1.951), and extraversion (1.255)—were not significant. Hence, it can be inferred that overall personality traits do not significantly differ across family types, although a significant difference exists in the agreeableness dimension**.**
- Parents' occupation (coolie, private employee, government employee) doesn't significantly influence personality traits (F = 0.763). Non-significant differences exist in all dimensions. While the other dimensions—conscientiousness (2.331), openness (0.548), neuroticism (1.951), and extraversion (1.255)—were not significant. Hence, it can be inferred that overall personality traits do not significantly differ across family types, although a significant difference exists in the agreeableness dimension**.**

8. Discussion

Researchers examined the personality traits of higher secondary students in relation to demographic and institutional variables. They found school management significantly influenced personality traits, while other variables didn't show significant differences. Students in private, aided, and government schools differed significantly, suggesting the educational environment contributes to personality development. Private schools may offer more co-curricular activities and personality development programs. Researchers also found school category (co-education, boys', girls'), residence (day scholars, hostellers), gender, locality (rural, urban), stream of study, medium of instruction, religion, and parents' occupation didn't significantly influence personality traits. This suggests students across these groups have similar personality characteristics, possibly due to similar social and educational environments.

Researchers found a significant difference in agreeableness among students from different family types, though overall personality traits weren't significantly different. This suggests family structure influences certain interpersonal qualities like cooperation and empathy. Institutional factors like school management play a bigger role in shaping personality traits, while demographic factors have minimal influence. The findings highlight that schools need to provide supportive educational environments and personality development opportunities.

9. Conclusion

Researchers investigated the personality traits of higher secondary students and their relation to demographic and institutional variables. They found that school management significantly influences personality traits, while other variables like school category, residence,

gender, locality, academic stream, medium of instruction, religion, and parents' occupation don't have a significant impact. Researchers observed that personality development seems largely independent of demographic factors, with students showing similar traits regardless of background. However, the educational environment, especially school management, contributes to variations. Family type influences agreeableness, suggesting it shapes interpersonal qualities. The study suggests parents and educators should provide supportive environments for positive personality development. Schools should integrate personality development programs, life skills education, and co-curricular activities to help students develop balanced traits and face future challenges effectively.

References

1. Allport, G.W. (1961) Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
2. Amrita, M. and Khadirawan, S (2006). Influence of personality on the emotional intelligence of teachers, Edutracks 5(12):25-29.
3. Bhogle, S., and Jaiprakash, I. Development of the Psychological Well-Being (PWB) Questionnaire. Journal of Personality & Clinical Studies, (1995); (51), 5-9.
4. Cattell, R.B. (1950). Personality: A Systematic, Theoretical and Factual Study. New York: McGraw.
5. Costa, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in Personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 81, 322–331.
6. Dinesh, Kumar & Ritu. 2013. “Social Maturity of Senior Secondary School Students in Relation to Their Personality.” AJMR Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research, Vol. 2, Issue 8.
7. Donald Saklofske, Elizabeth J.Austin, Paul Minski (2003). Factor structure and validity of a trait Emotional Intelligence measure. Personality and Individual Differences, 34(4): 707-721.
8. Hudani, M N., Redzuan, M., & Hamsan, H. (2012). Interrelationship between Emotional Intelligence and Personality Trait of Educator Leaders. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 2(5):223-237.
9. Kluemper,D,H.(2008). Trait emotional intelligence: the impact of core-self evaluations and social desirability. Personality and Individual Differences,44(6), 1402-1412.
10. Kumar, D & Ritu (2013). Social Maturity of Senior Secondary School Students in relation to their personality. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research, ?2 (8), 14-25.
11. Laidra, Pullman & Allik 2007, Personality and intelligence as predictors of academic achievement: A cross-sectional study from elementary to secondary school, Personality and Individual Differences 42(3):441-451, DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2006.08.001
12. Major, D.A., Turner, J.E., and Fletcher, T.D. (2006). Linking proactive personality and the Big Five to motivation to learn and development activity. Journal of Applied Psychology. American Psychological Association, 91: 4, 927-935.
13. Marcela et al 2015 PERSONALITY TRAITS IN ENTREPRENEURS AND SELF-EMPLOYED, Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov 9(58 2)
14. Matangi, E. (2013). Personality and learning preference interactions of women in tertiary education. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 3: 1, 172.
15. N.S. Schutte, J.M., Malouff, L.E., Hall, D.J., Haggerty, J.T., Cooper, C.J., Golden, L. Dornheim, Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. Personality and Individual Differences, (1998) 25 pp. 167-
16. Paunonen S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (2001). Big five predictors of academic achievement. Journal of Research in Personality, 35, 78–90.
17. Pervin, L. A., & John, O. P. (1997). Personality: Theory and research (7th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
18. Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: psychometric Investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. European Journal of Personality, 15, 425–448.
19. Petrides, K. V., Vernon, P. A., Schermer, J. A., Ligthart, L., Boomsma, D. I. & Veselka, L. (2010). Relationships between trait emotional intelligence and the Big Five in the

Netherlands. Personality and Individual Differences, 48:906-910.

20. Petrides, K. V., Vernon, P. A., Schermer. J. A., Ligthart, L., Boomsma, D. I., & Veselka, L. (2010). Relationship between trait emotional intelligence and Big Five in the Netherlands. Personality and Individual Differences, 48, 906–910.

21. Pornsakulvanish V., et. al., (2012), An analysis of personality traits and learning styles 14,118 – 129

22. Sadeghi, N., Kasim, Z.M., Tan, B.H., and Abdullah, F.S. (2012). Learning styles, personality types, and reading comprehension. Performance. English Language Teaching, 5: 4,116-123.

23. Salehi, E., Hedjazi, Y., Hosseini, S.M., and Ebrahimi, M.S. (2014). The effect of personality types on the learning styles of agricultural students: A case study in Iran. The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education, 4: 2, 126-135.

24. Srivastava, S.. Three paths of adult development: Conservers, seekers, and achievers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, (1987) 80, 995–1010.

25. Tempelaar, D. T., Gijselaers, W. H., Schim Van Der Loeff, S., & Nijhuis, J. (2007). A structural equation model analyzing the relationship of student achievement motivations and personality factors in a range of academic subject-matter areas. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 32, 105–131.

26. Vermetten, Y. J., Lodewijks, H. G., & Vermunt, J. D. (2001). The role of personality traits and goal orientations in strategy use. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26, 149–170.

27. Yanardöner, E., Kiziltepe, Z., Seggie, F.N., and Sekerler, S.A. (2014). The learning styles and personality traits of undergraduates: A case at a state university in Istanbul. Anthropologist, 18(2): 591- 600