

# Effect of Gender, Area and Categories on Big Five Personality

Dr. Jyotsna J. Parvadia

Department of Psychology Kamani Science and Pratapraji Arts College, Amreli, Gujarati, India

## ABSTRACT

The principal goal of the present study was to note the effect of the gender, residential area and categories (General and SC/ST) on the big five personality of students of higher secondary school of Amreli district. In view to above purpose 222 factorial design the sample of 320 was selected by random sampling method. The research tool used to elicit information was Big five personality inventory (BFI) standardized by Ramila Maru. The collected data were analyzed using 'F' test and main as well as interactions effect were discovered. According to the received results the gender and categories have significant effects on big five personality of students and residential area does not effect significantly on big five personality of students.

**Key word :** Big Five Personality, OCEAN, CANOE, ANOVA

## I. INTRODUCTION

The big five personality traits, also known as the five factor model (FFM), is a model based on common language descriptors of personality. When factor analysis is applied to personality survey data, some words used to describe aspects of personality are often applied to the same person. For example, someone described as "conscientious" is more likely to be described as "always prepared" rather than "messy". This theory is based therefore on the association between words but not on neuropsychological experiments. This theory uses descriptors of common language and therefore suggests five broad dimension communions commonly used to describe the human personality and psyche. The five factors been defined as openness to experience, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness and neuroticism, often represented by the acronyms OCEAN or CANOE. Beneath each proposed global factor, there are a number of conflated and more specific primary factors. For example, extroversion is said to include such related qualities as gregariousness, assertiveness, excitement seeking, war math, activity and positive emotions.

In the 1980 Lewis Goldberg started his own lexical project, emphasizing five broad factors one again. He later coined the term "Big Five" as a label for the factors.

In a 1980 symposium in Honolulu, four prominent, researchers, Lewis Goldberg, Naomi Takemoto-Chock, Andrew comrey, and John M. Digman, reviewed the available personality instruments of day. This event was followed by widespread acceptance of the five factor modal among personality researchers during the 1980s. Peter saville and his team included the five factor "Pentagon" modal with the original OPQ in 1984. Pentagon was closely followed by the NEO five factor personality inventory, published by Costa and McCrae in 1985.

### Objective:

The objective of the study was to find out the impact of gender, residential area and categories on big five personality of students of higher secondary school of Amreli district

### Hypotheses:

1. There is no significant mean difference between male and female students and their big five personality.
2. There is no significant mean difference between rural and urban students and their big five personality.
3. There is no significant mean difference between general and SC/ST students and their big five personality.
4. There is no significant mean difference between students gender and residential area joint interaction effect and their big five personality.
5. There is no significant mean difference between students gender and categories joint interaction effect and their big five personality.
6. There is no significant mean difference between students residential area and categories joint interaction effect and their big five personality.
7. There is no significant mean difference between students gender, residential area and categories joint interaction effect and their big five personality.

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Sample:

The sample of this study consisted of 320 students of higher secondary school of Amreli district. The

random sampling techniques was used for this purpose. 160 urban and 160 rural students were selected this purpose.

### Data collection tool:

The aim of study was to ascertain the effect of gender, residential area and categories on big five personality. For the measurement of big five inventory (BFI), which was constructed by John, Donahue and Kentlein in 1991, Gujarati version by Ramila maru. It measured an individual on the big five factors of personality which included extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness.

### Statistical Analysis:

Keeping in view the purpose the present study, the data collection was made by 222 factorial designed. Its analysis of variance was done.

### Result and Discussion:

Having done analysis by 'F' test (ANOVA) of acquired information. We come know the result as under. A= gender (male/female), B= residential area (rural/urban), C= categories (general/SC/ST).

**Table 1.** ANOVA Results of mean scores in Relation to gender, area and categories (320)

Variable	Sum of square	Df.	Mean Square	'F'	Sig. Level
A	1840.795	1	1840.795	8.995**	0.01
B	309.4	1	309.9	1.515	NS
C	542.1	1	542.1	2.655**	0.01
AB	2399.275	1	2399.295	11.73**	0.01
AC	2562.16	1	2562.16	12.525**	0.01
BC	1630.885	1	1630.886	7.975**	0.01
ABC	5080.355	1	5080.355	12.42**	0.01
Wss	64634.785	313	206.50		
Tss	78999.78	319	247.648		

Sig. Level at 0.05 = 1.97\*

Sig. Level at 0.01 = 2.59\*\*

Observing the table 01, we can see that in reference to the higher secondary school students' gender the students' big five personality 'F' value is got 8.995 which is significant at 0.01 level. Therefore HO.1 was rejected. We can say that their difference between personality of students of male and female.

In the reference at the residential area. We found no significant different between rural and urban students. There personality 'F' value is got 1.515. So the HO.2 is accepted hear. We found not different of big five personality between rural and urban students. We can see that in reference to the students' categories the students' personality 'F' value is 2.655 which is significant at 0.01 level. Therefore HO.3 was rejected. We can say that their difference between big five personality of general and SC/ST categories students.

In reference to big five personality of student's gender and residential area's interaction effects 'F' value is 11.73 which is significant at 0.01 levels. HO.4 is rejected. We can say that the students are suffering from the interaction effect of their gender and residential area. The 'F' value of gender and categories' interaction effect of big five personality is 12.52 which is significant at 0.01 level. HO.5 is rejected. We can say that the students are suffering from the interaction effect of their gender and categories. The 'F' value of residential area and categories' interaction effect of big five personality is 7.97 which is significant at 0.01 level. HO.6 is rejected. We can say that the students are suffering from the interaction effect of their residential area and categories.

The 'F' value of joint interaction effect is 12.42 which is significant at 0.01 level. HO.7 is rejected. Therefore we can say that the joint effect of Trio variable has effected on their big five personality.

### III. CONCLUSION

1. There is significant difference between male and female students toward big five personality.

2. There is no significant difference between rural and urban students toward big five personality.
3. There is significant difference between general and SC/ST categories students toward big five personality.
4. There is interaction effect of students gender and residential area on their big five personality.
5. There is interaction effect of students gender and categories on their big five personality.
6. There is interaction effect of students residential area and categories on their big five personality.
7. There is combined effect of students gender, residential area and categories on their big five personality.

### IV. REFERENCES

- [1]. Goldbarg, L.R. (1981) Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons, In wheeler (ed) Review of personality and social psychology, Vol 1, 141-165. Beverly Hills, CA: sage.
- [2]. Goldbarg, L.R. (1993) " The structure of phenotypic personality traits" American psychologist, 48:26-34 doi: 10.1037/0003.066x.48.1.26.
- [3]. Costa, P.T. Jr & McCrae, R.R. (1992) Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-FF) Manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- [4]. Matthews, Gerald, Deary, Ian J, Whiteman, Martha C. (2003) Personality Traits (2nd ed) Cambridge University Press, ISBN 978-0-521-83107-9.
- [5]. Saville & Holdworth Ltd. (1984) Occupational personality questionnaires manual, Esher, Surrey: Saville & Holdworth Ltd.