

Personality Assessment of Rural and Urban Adolescent Boys from Disorganized Families

Savita and Krishna Duhan

*Department of Human Development and Family Studies, I. C. College of Home Science,
CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar 125 004, Haryana, India*

KEYWORDS Adolescents. Disorganization. Personality Traits. Multidimension

ABSTRACT The present investigation was an attempt to study personalities of rural and urban adolescents from disorganized families. The study was conducted in purposively selected Hisar district of Haryana state. Lists of students of disorganized families, within the age group of 13-18 years were prepared and 45 rural and 45 urban respondents were selected randomly. Multidimensional Assessment of Personality Series (MAP Series Form-T) for Teens was used to assess the personality. Results showed that rural adolescents were significantly higher in their boldness, leadership, sensitivity and social warmth. Significant results were also found in the level of general ability, guilt proneness, mental health, self-sufficiency and tension.

INTRODUCTION

Family disorganization is basically breakdown of a family system. It may be associated with parental overburdening or loss of significant others who served as role model for children or support system for family members (Mosby's Medical Dictionary 2009).

Adolescence is defined as the period of transition between childhood to adulthood that involves biological, cognitive, and socio-emotional changes and personality changes in whole. A key task of adolescents is preparation for adulthood. Indeed, the future of any culture depends on how effective this preparation and how sound this personality is (Larson et al. 2002). Personality is the individual's relatively distinct and consistent manner of perceiving, thinking, feeling, and behaving. This pattern of existence is sometimes used to infer the fundamental essence of the individual functioning in the physical, psychological, and social worlds. It is the individual's attitudes and interest, his manner of acting and his personal philosophy of life (Magill and Delgado 1995).

Disorganization in families creates difficulty for the family members to meet each other's need. Due to the absence of one parent, the adolescents not only miss out on important emotional, and psychological backing but also may face insecurity and low self-esteem (Tuckman and Youngman 1989). Family disorganization with the associated factors of emotional deprivation in formative years gives rise to a multitude of personality problems which take differ-

ent forms, like mental illness, delinquency, low achievement motivation, loss of adult role to follow, economic hardship, low academic achievement, poor health and nutrition, conflicts, frustration, stress, tension and destructive effect on adolescents (Demo and Acock 1988). Adolescents of single parent families are likely to face more social problems (Kumari 2002).

Considering the personality changes in adolescent period and effects of family breakdown and disorganization on adolescent's personality, the study was conducted with the objective to assess and compare the personality traits of adolescents in disorganized families.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Sample

Present study was conducted in purposively selected Hisar city of Haryana state in the year 2009-10 (November-February). City area of the selected district was taken purposively to have urban respondents. From the selected city area, 5 senior secondary schools were selected. For the rural sample, Hisar I block was selected randomly, three villages Kaimeri, Mangali and Gangwa were selected purposively from selected block, and further three higher/senior secondary schools were selected from the selected villages.

A list of adolescent (13-18 years) boys belonging to disorganized families was prepared. A sample of 45 adolescent boys was selected randomly each from both rural and urban areas

thus, making a total sample of 90 adolescent respondents.

Tool for Data Collection

Personality of adolescents was assessed by Multi Dimensional Personality Assessment form for Teens developed by Vohra (1996). The data were analyzed by frequency, percentage and Z-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Assessment of Adolescent's Personality Aspects

Data in Table 1 shows the distribution of the respondents for different personality aspects. The result in the table highlighted that higher percentage (54.44%) of the respondents were average in their adaptability. Area wise comparison highlighted that majority of the respondents of rural as well as urban area was average in adaptability scores with 57.78 per cent and 51.11 per cent respectively. However, more urban respondents (31.11%) displayed above average adaptability against 26.66 per cent of rural respondents.

Table 1: Frequency distribution of rural and urban respondent's personality aspects

S. No.	Personality aspects	Area		Total n=90f (%)
		Rural n=45 f (%)	Urban n=45 f (%)	
1.	<i>Adaptability</i>			
	Below average	7(15.56)	8(17.78)	15(16.67)
	Average	26(57.78)	23(51.11)	49(54.44)
	Above average	12(26.66)	14(31.11)	26(28.89)
2.	<i>Academic Achievement</i>			
	Below average	7(15.56)	3(6.67)	10(11.11)
	Average	32(71.11)	37(82.22)	69(76.67)
	Above average	6(13.33)	5(11.11)	11(12.22)
3.	<i>Boldness</i>			
	Below average	3(6.67)	18(40.00)	21(23.33)
	Average	28(62.22)	25(55.56)	53(58.89)
	Above average	14(31.11)	2 (4.44)	16(17.78)
4.	<i>Competition</i>			
	Below average	9(20.00)	8(17.78)	17(18.89)
	Average	30(66.67)	28(62.22)	58(64.44)
	Above average	6(13.33)	9(20.00)	15(16.67)
5.	<i>Enthusiasm</i>			
	Below average	12(26.67)	4 (8.89)	16(17.78)
	Average	33(73.33)	38(84.44)	71(78.89)
	Above average	0 (0.00)	3 (6.67)	3 (3.33)
6.	<i>Creativity</i>			
	Below average	15(33.33)	14(31.11)	29(32.22)

Table 1: Contd.....

S. No.	Personality aspects	Area		Total n=90f (%)
		Rural n=45 f (%)	Urban n=45 f (%)	
	Average	27(60.00)	19(42.23)	46(51.11)
	Above average	3 (6.67)	12(26.66)	15(16.67)
7.	<i>Excitability</i>			
	Below average	6(13.33)	15(33.33)	21(23.33)
	Average	34(75.56)	26(57.78)	60(66.67)
	Above average	5(11.11)	4 (8.89)	9(10.00)
8.	<i>General Ability</i>			
	Below average	23(51.11)	7(15.56)	30(33.33)
	Average	18(40.00)	33(73.33)	51(56.67)
	Above average	4 (8.89)	5(11.11)	9(10.00)
9.	<i>Guilt Proneness</i>			
	Below average	23(51.11)	7(15.56)	30(33.33)
	Average	18(40.00)	33(73.33)	51(56.67)
	Above average	4 (8.89)	5(11.11)	9(10.00)
10.	<i>Individualism</i>			
	Below average	7(15.56)	3 (6.67)	10(11.11)
	Average	27(60.00)	26(57.78)	53(58.89)
	Above average	11(24.44)	16(35.55)	27(30.00)
11.	<i>Innovation</i>			
	Below average	14(31.11)	6(13.33)	20(22.22)
	Average	28(62.22)	37(82.23)	65(72.22)
	Above average	3 (6.67)	2 (4.44)	5 (5.56)
12.	<i>Leadership</i>			
	Below average	9(20.00)	33(73.33)	42(46.67)
	Average	32(71.11)	12(26.67)	44(48.89)
	Above average	4 (8.89)	0 (0.00)	4 (4.44)
13.	<i>Maturity</i>			
	Below average	18(40.00)	6(13.33)	24(26.67)
	Average	22(48.89)	23(51.11)	45(50.00)
	Above average	5(11.11)	16(35.56)	21(23.33)
14.	<i>Mental Health</i>			
	Below average	9(20.00)	20(44.44)	29(32.22)
	Average	21(46.67)	19(42.23)	40(44.45)
	Above average	15(33.33)	6(13.33)	21(23.33)
15.	<i>Morality</i>			
	Below average	8(17.78)	13(28.89)	21(23.33)
	Average	32(71.11)	32(71.11)	64(71.11)
	Above average	5(11.11)	0 (0.00)	5 (5.56)
16.	<i>Self- control</i>			
	Below average	24(53.33)	14(31.11)	38(42.22)
	Average	20(44.44)	27(60.00)	47(52.22)
	Above average	1 (2.23)	4 (8.89)	5 (5.56)
17.	<i>Sensitivity</i>			
	Below average	4 (8.89)	8(17.78)	12(13.33)
	Average	22(48.89)	25(55.56)	47(52.23)
	Above average	19(42.22)	12(26.66)	31(34.44)
18.	<i>Self- sufficiency</i>			
	Below average	23(51.11)	4 (8.89)	27(30.00)
	Average	17(37.78)	26(57.78)	43(47.78)
	Above average	5(11.11)	15(33.33)	20(22.22)
19.	<i>Social Warmth</i>			
	Below average	8(17.78)	13(28.89)	21(23.33)
	Average	27(60.00)	31(68.89)	58(64.45)
	Above average	10(22.22)	1 (2.22)	11(12.22)
20.	<i>Tension</i>			
	Below average	14(31.11)	3 (6.67)	17(18.89)
	Average	30(66.67)	32(71.11)	62(68.89)
	Above average	1 (2.22)	10(22.22)	11(12.22)

Regarding academic achievement, data in Table 1 showed that urban respondents were slightly better against the rural respondents in their academic achievement. Majority of the urban respondents (82.22%) had average level of academic achievement against 71.11 per cent rural adolescents. Further, 15.56 per cent rural respondents also fall in below average category against 6.67 per cent of urban respondents. As far as boldness is concerned, majority of the respondents (58.89%) were in average category for total sample. Comparative analysis of results revealed that 62.22 per cent of rural respondents were in average level of boldness as compared to 55.56 per cent of urban respondents. This was followed by above average level of boldness (31.11%) for rural respondents. In contrast, a good percentage (40%) of urban respondents was also in below average level of boldness.

Results related to competition and enthusiasm revealed that majority of the respondents (66.67% and 62.22%) from rural and 73.33 and 84.44 per cent from urban area were in average level of competition and enthusiasm, followed by nearly 20 per cent respondents from both areas found in below average level of competition. For enthusiasm 26.67 per cent of rural respondent were in below average level against 8.89 per cent urban respondents.

For creativity, Table 1 revealed that most of the rural respondents (60%) were having average level of creativity followed by 33.33 per cent in below average category. Urban respondents were almost equally distributed for all levels of creativity, that is: low (31.11%), medium (42.23%) and high (26.66%). With regards to excitability, majority of the respondents were in average level of excitability from both urban (57.78) and rural (75.56) area. However, large number of urban respondents (33.33%) was in below average level in comparison to 13.33 per cent of rural respondents.

It is evident from the Table 1 that approximately fifty per cent (51.11%) rural respondents were having below average level of general ability, followed by 40 per cent of average and 8.89 per cent of above average general ability level. Urban results were more contrasting as around 73.33 per cent of urban respondents were having average level of general ability and 11.11 per cent were having above average general ability which was slightly better than rural respondents.

Guilt proneness was more evident in urban respondents as 73.33 per cent respondents were having average level of guilt proneness. In comparison, 51.11 per cent rural respondents were having below average level of guilt feeling. Nearly 60 per cent of respondents were at average level of individualism in both rural and urban areas followed by 24.44 per cent rural and 35.56 per cent urban respondents in above average level of individualism. As far as innovation is concerned, majority of the respondents (72.22) from total sample were in average category, which was more for urban respondents (82.23%) as compared to rural respondents (62.22%), followed by only 13.33 per cent urban respondents in comparison to 31.11 percent of rural respondents in below average category.

Leadership aspect of personality revealed highly contrasting results for both rural and urban respondents, where 71.11 per cent rural respondents had average leadership quality, followed by 20 per cent in below average and only 8.89 per cent in above average level of leadership. Data further explained that majority of the urban respondents (73.33%) were in below average level of leadership followed by 26.67 per cent respondents in average level of leadership and none of the respondents found in above average level.

Results regarding maturity level showed that higher percentage of urban (51.11%) and rural respondents (48.89%) were having average level of maturity, followed by 35.56 per cent urban respondents in above average level of maturity. For total sample fifty percent of the respondents were having average level of maturity followed by 26.67 per cent of respondents in below average and 23.33 per cent respondents in above average level of maturity.

As far as mental health is concerned, 46.67 per cent of the rural respondents were having average level, followed by above average (33.33%) level of mental health for urban respondents where nearly same percentage of respondents had average (42.23%) and below average (44.44%) level of mental health. For morality aspect, the data revealed that majority of the respondents (71.11%) of rural as well as urban areas were in average category of morality, followed by 28.89 per cent urban and 17.78 per cent rural respondents in below average level of morality. Further, 11.11 percent rural respondents scored above average in morality and not a single urban respondent was in above average category.

It is clear from Table 1 that 52.22 per cent of total respondents were average in scores of self-control. Area wise comparison revealed slightly interesting results as 60 per cent urban respondents showed average level of self-control. Majority of the rural respondents (53.33%) were below average in self-control followed by 44.44 percent respondents in average level of self-control. Only 2.23 percent of rural respondents were in above average category in comparison to 8.89 percent of urban respondents.

Table 1 further highlighted that higher percentage (52.23%) of the total respondents were average in sensitivity level. Area wise results depicted that both rural and urban respondents shared approximately equal percentage (48.89% and 55.56% respectively) for average level scores, followed by contrastingly more rural respondents (42.22%) in above average level of sensitivity against to 26.66 per cent urban respondents. It is clear from Table 1 that more than half urban respondents (57.78%) were having average level of self-sufficiency in comparison to 37.78 per cent rural respondents who were having average level of self-sufficiency. Moreover, majority of the rural respondents (51.11%) were below average in self-sufficiency level. Urban respondents (33.33%) were comparatively better than rural respondents (11.11%) in above average level of self-sufficiency.

Results regarding social warmth and tension showed a negative distribution, as majority of the rural respondents (60% and 66.67%) were average in social warmth and tension, followed by 22.22 per cent rural respondents with above average level of social warmth and 31.11 per cent of the respondents with below average level of tension. Majority of urban respondents (68.89%) were average in their social warmth and level of tension (71.11%). Urban respondents were comparatively poor in social warmth with 28.89 per cent respondents in below average level followed by only 2.22 per cent having above average level of social warmth. A good percentage (22.22%) of urban respondents was also at above average level of tension.

Comparison of Adolescents' Personality Aspects on the Basis of Area

Data in Table 2 showed the differences regarding all the aspects of respondents' personality on the basis of area of residence. Area wise

comparative results revealed significant differences for boldness ($Z=5.46^*$), general ability ($Z=2.57^*$), guilt proneness ($Z=2.52^*$), leadership ($Z=5.90^*$), mental health ($Z=1.98^*$), self-sufficiency ($Z=4.74^*$), sensitivity ($Z=2.50^*$), social warmth ($Z=2.46^*$) and tension ($Z=2.55^*$). The higher level of tension in urban adolescents might be because their parents, teachers and the society want to see them succeed. Fariza (2005) reported that urban families and adolescents were at high levels of expectation.

Table 2: Comparison of rural and urban adolescents' personality (N= 90)

S. No.	Personality aspects	Area		Z-value
		Rural n=45 Mean $\pm$ SD	Urban n=45 Mean $\pm$ SD	
1.	Adaptability	5.72 $\pm$ 1.51	5.18 $\pm$ 1.74	0.38
2.	Academic achievement	4.96 $\pm$ 1.26	4.98 $\pm$ 1.47	0.03
3.	Boldness	7.74 $\pm$ 1.45	5.89 $\pm$ 1.73	5.46*
4.	Competition	5.18 $\pm$ 1.91	5.72 $\pm$ 1.98	1.29
5.	Enthusiasm	5.06 $\pm$ 1.57	5.26 $\pm$ 1.23	0.73
6.	Creativity	4.79 $\pm$ 1.65	5.08 $\pm$ 2.40	0.80
7.	Excitability	5.34 $\pm$ 1.52	4.66 $\pm$ 2.10	1.12
8.	General ability	2.72 $\pm$ 1.42	3.49 $\pm$ 1.44	2.57*
9.	Guilt proneness	5.57 $\pm$ 1.07	6.65 $\pm$ 1.55	2.52*
10.	Individualism	6.38 $\pm$ 1.48	6.38 $\pm$ 1.54	0.00
11.	Innovation	3.23 $\pm$ 1.42	3.52 $\pm$ 1.05	1.09
12.	Leadership	6.44 $\pm$ 1.45	4.58 $\pm$ 1.54	5.90*
13.	Maturity	5.39 $\pm$ 1.56	5.64 $\pm$ 1.59	0.81
14.	Mental health	5.26 $\pm$ 1.15	4.60 $\pm$ 1.60	1.98*
15.	Morality	5.87 $\pm$ 1.73	5.54 $\pm$ 1.68	0.88
16.	Self control	5.38 $\pm$ 1.62	6.00 $\pm$ 1.74	1.74
17.	Sensitivity	7.34 $\pm$ 1.74	6.36 $\pm$ 1.96	2.50*
18.	Self sufficiency	4.87 $\pm$ 2.08	6.78 $\pm$ 1.71	4.74*
19.	Social warmth	6.14 $\pm$ 1.81	5.20 $\pm$ 1.51	2.46*
20.	Tension	5.63 $\pm$ 2.01	6.34 $\pm$ 1.44	2.55*

* Significant at 5% level

On the basis of obtained mean scores, urban respondents were comparatively better in competition ($X=5.72\pm1.98$), enthusiasm ($X=5.26\pm1.23$), innovation ($X=3.52\pm1.05$), maturity ($X=5.64\pm1.59$) and self-control ($X=6.00\pm1.74$) than the rural respondents.

Rural respondents were higher on their mean scores of adaptability ($X=5.72\pm1.51$), excitability ($X=5.34\pm1.52$) and morality ($X=5.87\pm1.73$) level in comparison to urban respondents. The reason of lower level of boldness and adaptability among urban respondents might be due to the greater willingness of urban adolescents to disagree openly with their parents, a greater intensity of conflict and lower levels of cohesion with their parents (Wenxin and Fuligni 2006). Rural respondents were comparatively

lower on their academic achievements. The results are in line of Singh's (1970) views that the low achievers covering significantly larger percentage belong to rural area. Roscigno and Crowley (2001) noted that the academic performance of rural children typically lagged behind that of urban and suburban children.

CONCLUSION

Results revealed that majority of the respondents were in average category on different aspects of personality. Comparatively, a higher percentage of rural respondents had average and above average adaptability, boldness, excitability, leadership, mental health, morality, sensitivity, and social warmth than urban respondents. Whereas, higher percentage of urban respondents had average and above average level of academic achievement, competition, creativity, general ability, guilt proneness, individualism, innovation, self-control, sensitivity, self-sufficiency, maturity, social warmth and tension.

Results further revealed significant differences between rural and urban respondents' personality on the basis of Z values. Rural respondents were significantly higher on boldness, leadership and mental health whereas, the urban respondents were higher on general ability, self-sufficiency and tension level. Further, the level of self-sufficiency was also found very low among rural adolescents; the observed reasons for this may be ignorance on the part of parents, lack of awareness and knowledge of futuristic goals in adolescents, which may be improved through providing interventions by parents, teachers and community. They can provide them information on their career selection and help them to take decisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Urban parents must understand that adolescence is the preparatory phase of adult-

hood period so they must help their adolescents in undertaking the responsibilities.

- Parents should take care of their adolescents' mental health, their level of stress, tension and guilt. They should organize at homes discussion sessions, where adolescents can put forward their views.
- In rural areas, due to lack of well-organized and well-equipped schools, children remain below average in their general awareness and intelligence level. So, here teachers should take the responsibility for enhancing the level of adolescent's education and knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Demo D, Acock C 1988. The impact of divorce on children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50: 619-648.
- Fariza M 2005. Effects of socio-personal factors on academic stress among adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 16(4): 539.
- Kumari KS 2002. *Status of Single Women in India*. New Delhi: Uppal Publishing House.
- Larson R, Wilson S, Brown B, Frustenberg F, Verma S 2002. Changes in adolescents' interpersonal experiences: Are they being prepared for adult relationship in the 21st century? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12: 31-68.
- Magill F, Delgado H 1995. *International Encyclopedia of Sociology*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publication, pp. 1545-1552.
- Mosby's Medical Dictionary 2009. 8th Edition. From <<http://medicaldictionarythefreedictionary.com/family+disorganization>> (Retrieved on 28 April, 2009).
- Roscigno VJ, Crowley JL 2001. Rurality, institutional disadvantage, and achievement / attainment. *Rural Sociology*, 66: 268-298.
- Singh A 1970. Divorce, remarriage, and adolescent substance use: A prospective longitudinal study. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 52 (1): 157-169.
- Tuckman J, Youngman F 1989. *Suicide and Family Disorganization*. Philadelphia: Department of Public Health.
- Vohra S 1996. *Multi-dimensional Assessment of Personality*. 2nd Edition. New Delhi: Psy-com Services.
- Wenxia D, Fuligini T 2006. Rural-urban comparison of contextual associations with self-reported mental health status. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 16 (4): 527 - 537.