

## Personality in Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children in Districts Anantnag and Srinagar

Shafia Nazir<sup>a</sup>, Nilofer Khan<sup>a</sup>, N. A. Nadeem<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Institute of Home Science, University of Kashmir

<sup>b</sup>Department of Education, Central University of Kashmir

Corresponding author : Shafia Nazir

### Abstract

Physically challenged children differ in their characteristics attitudes, interests, behaviour, needs and achievements. Undoubtedly there are differences in their personalities. The limitations and demands imposed by their disabling conditions have a definite impact on their lives. These limitations may lead to poor personality development. The main emphasis of this study was to assess and compare the rural/urban physically challenged and normal school going children on personality factors. The sample comprised of 360(180 physically challenged and 180 normal school going children)selected from various private and government schools of rural and urban areas of districts Anantnag and Srinagar. Purposive and random sampling was used for the selection of physically challenged and normal school children respectively.Children's Personality Questionnaire by Potter and Cattell (1979) was the tool used for assessing the personality factors in physically challenged and normal school children. Data was statistically analyzed using mean and standard deviation and t-test for significance of difference between means. Results revealed a significant difference in physically challenged school going children and their normal peers on personality factors A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. The rural/urban comparison of physically challenged school going children depicted a significant difference on personality factors A, B, D, J, N and O. The comparison of rural/urban normal school going children revealed a significant difference on personality factors A, B, C, D, E, F, N and O.

**KEYWORDS:** Children, normal, personality factors, physically challenged, rural, urban

### INTRODUCTION

Disability in one or the other form is experienced by one billion people or 15% of the world's population. One-fifth of the estimated global total, or between 110 million and 190 million people experience significant disabilities. (WHO, 2001)Among the several types of disabilities, physically disabled people are deprived of their basic rights to the extent that they cannot meet their needs of standard survival.(Harpur 2012) In the past, physically challenged children were vulnerable to practices such as infanticide, slavery, physical abuse and abandonment. Many civilizations accepted infanticide as a necessary means of controlling population growth and ensuring that only the strongest would survive in societies highly dependent on "Living off the Land". Physically challenged children were excluded from the purview of nominal experience. But with the advent of advanced medical knowledge, awareness among the masses and emergence of laws supporting the rights of physically challenged

children, it was recognized that significant physical, behavioral and learning differences are found in every society' (Hardman et al., 2014)

Personality is the set of psychological traits and mechanisms within the individual that are organized and relatively enduring and influence his or her interactions with, and adaptations to, the intrapsychic, physical and social environments (Larsen and Buss 2005). Personality continues to develop throughout lifetimes. Some traits change dramatically while others remain constant throughout a person's life. With the rapid growth and development during childhood personality development is more obvious. Usual and unusual life events greatly influence the personality development. Personality traits are psychological in nature and state the stable characteristics of individuals which provide reasons why individuals behave in a certain way. These traits assess and determined an individual's cognitive, emotional and behavioral tendencies. personality can be defined by various features. These domains are dispositional, cognitive, experiential, biological, social cultural context and adjustment domains. Cognitive experiential domain concerns with conscious behavior such as, emotion, feelings, desires, and beliefs. Adjustment domain states to the competing, acquiring, and adjusting in daily changeable life events. Intra-psychic domain referred with mental phenomena of personality which works at an unconscious level. Domain deals with the individual differences are called dispositional domain. Some personality characteristics describe human is collections of biological coordination are called biological domain and deal with Psychophysiology of an individual personality.(Larsen and Buss2005)

Bhardwaj (2010) analyzed the personality factors and self-concept of selected nature and degree of disabilities classified into blind, partially blind, deaf; hard of hearing, upper and lower extremity affected orthopedically crippled (12-15) year's old boys. A group of 300 subjects (50 in each category) randomly selected from various schools and rehabilitation centers of Punjab, Haryana, Delhi, M.P. and Chandigarh formed the sample for this investigation. High school personality questionnaire (HSPQ) was employed for data collection. Significant difference in personality factors among the sample groups was observed. Orthopedically crippled students were found to be more out-going, warm hearted, participative, over-active, lively, impatient, assertive and independent. Visually impaired children were less out-going, highly intelligent, demanding, impatient and inactive. Similarly, the finding pertaining to the hearing-impaired children indicated that they possessed personality traits like emotional stability, intelligence, assertiveness, independence and obedience. Jabeen et al. (2016) compared the personality traits of upper and lower limbs physically disabled and normal students. 100 upper and lower limbs physically disabled students from Kingston school Inclusive education system Abbotabad and 100 normal students from various schools of Abbotabad Haripur were purposively selected for the resent study. Goldberg five big personality traits scale was used to measure the personality of the sample. Results indicated a significant difference on personality between physically disabled and normal students. Normal students attained a high score on Personality traits as compared to the physically disabled students.

Nazir et al., (2016) studied self-esteem (a vital component of personality) in 180 physically challenged school children who were equally categorized into visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled and 180 typically growing school children of district Srinagar (J&K) using Cooper Smith's Self-esteem inventory. Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and t-test for significance of difference between means were the statistical measures used. The results indicated that physically challenged children had low self-esteem than their typical participants. The

rural physically challenged school going children and their typical participants had no significant difference with respect to their self-esteem. Urban physically challenged school going children reflected more self-esteem than normal school going children. Researchers concluded that there existed a significant difference between the physically challenged and normal students on personality factors.

## **OBJECTIVES**

To assess and compare the rural/ urban physically challenged and normal school going children on personality factors.

## **MATERIALS AND METHOD**

The present study was conducted on 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> standard physically challenged and normal boys and girls selected from various private and government schools of rural and urban areas of Anantnag and Srinagar districts. Purposive sampling was used to select physically challenged school going children and normal children were selected randomly in the same schools. The size of the sample was 360 (180 physically challenged and 180 normal school going children). 180 physically challenged school going children were categorized into three main classes with equal distribution i.e., (30 visually impaired), (30 hearing impaired) and (30 orthopedically crippled).

**TOOL USED** Children's Personality Questionnaire (CPQ) by Potter and Cattell (1979) was the tool used in the investigation. It is a test, the whole design of which is aimed at giving the maximum information in the shortest time about the greatest number of dimensions of personality. It measures a set of fourteen factorially independent dimensions of personality. These dimensions are identified and referred to by letters of the alphabet, A through Q<sub>4</sub>. In addition to the symbols, they have technical names, which give the most accurate meaning to them in the light of present psychological knowledge. The full factor by factor description of each of the fourteen dimensions is given below in table 1

## **STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED**

Data were analyzed using SPSS software version 16. Mean, standard deviation (S.D.) and t-test for significance of difference between means were the statistical techniques used.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

To determine the significance in mean personality scores of physically challenged and normal school going children t-test was computed. Details have been presented in the tables below. Each fourteen personality factors have been presented in the three separate tables.

Table 2 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children with N=180 in each case on first five factors of Personality Characteristics on Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). The table highlights the existence of a significant difference between the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children on factors A, B, C, D and E. More specifically the results indicated that physically challenged children in comparison to the normal school going children were Schizothymic/reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, phlegmatic/undemonstrative and obedient.

Whereas, the normal school going children were warm hearted, more intelligent, emotionally stable, excitable and assertive.

Table 3 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children with N=180 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics on Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). The table highlights the existence of significant difference between the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children on factors F, G, I and J. More specifically the results indicated that physically challenged children in comparison to the normal school going children were sober, disregarded rules, more tender minded and zestful. Whereas the normal school going children were enthusiastic, conscientious, less tender minded and circumspect. However, the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children did not differ significantly on factor H of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

Table 4 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children with N=180 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics on Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). The table highlights the existence of a significant difference ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) in the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children on factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. More specifically the results indicated that physically challenged children in comparison to the normal school going children were forthright, apprehensive, less controlled and tense. Whereas, the normal school going children were artful, self-assured, more controlled and relaxed.

The mean and t-value comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children with N=90 in each case on first five personality factors can be seen in Table 5. It is evident from the data that rural physically challenged school children differ significantly ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) from urban school going children on three personality factors of CPQ. The factors are A, B and D. More specifically the findings revealed that rural physically challenged school going children in comparison to the urban physically challenged school going children were reserved, less intelligent and undemonstrative. Whereas the normal school going children were warm hearted, more intelligent and excitable. However, the two groups i.e., rural physically challenged school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors C and E.

Table 6 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children with N=90 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data reveals a significant difference ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) in rural physically challenged school going children and their urban peers on personality factor J. More specifically the results indicated that the rural physically challenged school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less zestful. Whereas the urban physically challenged children were more zestful. However, the two groups i.e., rural physically challenged school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors F, G, H and I of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

Table 7 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children with N=90 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) in rural physically challenged school going children and their urban peers on personality factors N and O. More specifically the results indicated

that the physically challenged rural school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less forthright and self-assured. Whereas the normal school going children were more forthright and apprehensive. However, the two groups i.e., rural physically challenged school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>.

Table 8 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children with N=90 in each case on first five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) in rural normal children and their urban peers on all personality factors i.e., factor A, B, C, D and E of CPQ (Children Personality Questionnaire). More specifically the results indicated that the rural normal school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less warm hearted, less intelligent, less emotionally stable, undemonstrative and obedient. Whereas, the urban normal school going children were more warm-hearted, more intelligent, more emotionally stable, excitable and assertive.

Table 9 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children with N=90 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) in rural normal school going children and their urban peers on personality factor F of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). More specifically the results indicated that the rural school going children in comparison to their urban participants were sober. Whereas, the urban normal school going children were enthusiastic. However, the two groups i.e., rural normal school going children and their urban participants had no significant ( $p \geq 0.05$ ) difference on personality factors G, H, I and J.

Table 10 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children with N=90 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) in rural normal school going children and their urban peers on personality factors N and O. More specifically the results indicated that the rural normal school going children in comparison to their urban participants were artful and self-assured. Whereas the urban normal school going children were forthright but less self-assured. However, the two groups i.e., rural normal school going children and their urban participants had no significant ( $p \geq 0.05$ ) difference on personality factor Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>.

## DISCUSSION

Physically challenged school going children and normal school going children have been found to differ significantly on personality factors A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. Thus, the physically challenged children in comparison to the normal school going children were Schizothymic/reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, undemonstrative, obedient, sober, disregarded rules, more tender minded, zestful, forthright, apprehensive, less controlled and tense. Whereas, the normal school going children were warm hearted, more intelligent, emotionally stable, excitable, assertive, enthusiastic, conscientious, less tender minded, circumspect, artful, self-assured, more controlled and relaxed. The two groups did not differ significantly on factor H of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). The finding is in accordance to the finding of the investigation conducted by Jabeen et al. (2016) who revealed a significant difference on personality between physically disabled and normal students. Normal students attained a high score on personality traits as compared to the physically disabled students. Sangeeta (2006) conducted a study on

personality traits of the visually challenged. The findings revealed the visually impaired boys were found to have a feeling of inadequacy and depression, were likely to be more sensitive, aggressive, tense and restless in comparison to their sighted peers. No significant difference on neuroticism and anxiety was observed between the visually impaired and sighted boys. Sharma (2004) investigated the personality characteristics of school children with learning disabilities and their non-learning-disabled peers and found a significant difference at (0.01 level) in the personality characteristics of the two groups with a maladaptive tendency of personality disposition of learning disabled children in comparison to the non-learning-disabled children.

The comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children depicted a significant difference on personality factors A, B, D, J, N and O. More specifically the findings revealed that rural physically challenged school going children in comparison to the urban physically challenged school going children were reserved, less intelligent, undemonstrative, zestful, less forthright and self-assured. Whereas the normal school going children were warm hearted, more intelligent, excitable, circumspect, more forthright and apprehensive. However, the two groups i.e., rural physically challenged school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors C, E, F, G, H, I, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>

The comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children revealed a significant difference on personality factors A, B, C, D, E, F, N and O of CPQ (Children Personality Questionnaire). More specifically the results indicated that the rural normal school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less warm hearted, less intelligent, less emotionally stable, undemonstrative, obedient, sober, forthright and less self-assured. Whereas, the urban normal school going children were more warm-hearted, more intelligent, more emotionally stable, excitable and assertive, enthusiastic, forthright and less self-assured. However, the two groups i.e., rural normal school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors G, H, I, J, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. The finding is consistent with the results of the study conducted by Peerzada (2014) who investigated the personality characteristics of rural and urban adolescents of districts Anantnag and Srinagar. The results revealed a significant difference in rural and urban adolescents on personality. The urban adolescents were found to be outgoing, emotionally stable, assertive, enthusiastic, adventurous, zestful, apprehensive, and resourceful, whereas rural adolescents were reserved, emotionally less stable, obedient, sober, shy internally restrained, self-assured and sociable.

## CONCLUSION

It is evident from the results of the investigation that the personality of physically challenged children lagged significantly compared with the corresponding personality of their normal peers. Moreover, the rural physically challenged school going children were not found to be at par with their urban peers on personality factors. Also, the rural normal children were not found to have a well-developed personality in comparison to their urban peers.

## REFERENCES

1. Bhardwaj, Vikas. (2010) Comparative analysis of personality traits and self-concept with respect to nature and degree of physical disabilities. Thesis, University of Gwalior M.P, India.
2. Harpur, P. (2012) Embracing the new disability rights paradigm: the importance of the convention on the rights of persons with disabilities. *Disabil Soc* 27(1),1–14.
3. Heward, W. C. (2000) *Exceptional children. An introduction to special education.* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall; 2000.
4. Larsen, R. J and Buss, D. M. (2005) *Personality psychology: domains of knowledge about human nature.* 2nd ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
3. Michael, I. Hardman., Clifford, J. Drew and M, Winston. Egan. (2014). *Human Exceptionality; School, Community & Family*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. (p. p 5,6,9,11). Wadsworth. Nazir, Shafia., Khan Nilofer., and Nadeem,
4. N. A. (2016) Self-esteem in Physically challenged and typically growing school going children in Srinagar (J&K), *International Educational Scientific Research Journal* Vol:2, 15-17.
5. Peerzada, Najma. (2014) A comparative study on personality characteristics of rural and urban adolescents of districts of Anantnag and Srinagar (J & K), India. *Journal of Educational Research and Behavioral Sciences.* Vol 3 (4) 081-086.
6. Rutherford, B. Porter., Raymond, B. Cattell and IPAT staff (1979) *Handbook for the Children's Personality Questionnaire.* Institute for Personality and ability testing, Inc. Champaign Illinois, U.S.A.
7. Sangeeta. (2006) *Personality Traits of the Visually Challenged.* The Associated Publications, Ambala. 87-88, 162.
8. Sharma, Gitanjali. (2004) A Comparative Study of the Personality Characteristics of Primary-School Students with Learning Disabilities and Their Non-learning-disabled Peers. *Learning Disability Quarterly* Vol. 27 (3) 127-140.
9. Tahira, Jabeen., Syeda, Farhana. Kazmi., Atiq, ur. Rehman., Sajjad, Ahmad. (2016) Upper and lower limbs disability and personality traits. *Journal of Ayub Medical College Abbottabad*; 28 (2), 349-3521.
10. World Health Organization (2005) *Disability, including prevention, management and rehabilitation* Geneva Switzerland Author.
11. World Health Organization (2001) *International classification of functioning, Disability and Health: ICF.* Geneva.

**Table 1: Primary source traits measured by the CPQ Children Personality Questionnaire**

Low score Description	Factor	High Score Description
Reserved, Detached, Critical, Cool, Aloof (Sizothymia)	A	Warmhearted, Outgoing, Easygoing participating (Affectothymia, formerly Cyclothymia)
DULL (crystallized, power measure) (Low intelligence)	B	Bright (Crystallized, power measure) (High intelligence)
Affected by Feelings, Emotionally Less Stable, Easily Upset (Lower ego strength)	C	Emotionally stable, Faces Reality, Calm, Mature (Higher ego strength)
Phlegmatic, Undemonstrative, Deliberate, Inactive, Stodgy (Phlegmatic temperament)	D	Excitable, Impatient, Demanding, Overactive, Unrestrained (Excitability)
Obedient, Mild, Accommodating, Easily Led (Submissiveness)	E	Dominant, Assertive, Competitive, Aggressive, Stubborn (Dominance)
Sober Prudent, serious. Taciturn (Desurgency)	F	Enthusiastic, Happy-go-lucky, Heedless (Surgency)
Expedient, Disregards Rules (Weaker superego strength)	G	Conscientious, Persevering, Staid, Rule bound (Stronger superego strength)
SHY, Threat- sensitive, Diffident, Timid (Threctia)	H	Venturesome, Socially Bold, Uninhibited (Parmia)
Tough-Minded, Self-reliant, Realistic, Non-sense (Harria)	I	Tender-Minded, Sensitive, Over-protected (Premsia)
Zestful, Likes Group Action, Vigorous (Zeppic)	J	Circumspect Individualism, Reflective, Internally Restrained (Co asthenia)
Forthright, Natural, Artless, Sentimental (Artlessness)	N	Shrewd, Calculating, Artful (Shrewdness)
Self-Assured, Confident, Secure, Complacent (Untroubled adequacy)	O	Guilt-Prone, Apprehensive, Worrying, Troubled, Insecure (Guilt Proneness)
Undisciplined Self Conflict, Follows own urges, Careless of Social Rules (Low self-sentiment integration)	Q <sub>3</sub>	Controlled, Socially Precise, Following Self-image, Compulsive (High self-concept control)
Relaxed, Tranquil Torpid, Composed, Unfrustrated (Low ergic tension)	Q <sub>4</sub>	Tense, Frustrated, Driven, Overwrought, Fretful (High ergic tension)

**Table 2: Mean comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children on I<sup>st</sup> five personality factors**

Factors	Groups	Mean ± S D	t-value	Level of Significance
A	P C	5.00 ± 1.57	4.71	p≤0.05
	Nrml	5.79 ± 1.60		
B	P C	4.88± 1.65	4.03	p≤0.01
	Nrml	5.62± 1.84		
C	P C	4.96± 1.70	2.89	p≤0.01
	Nrml	5.49± 1.78		
D	P C	4.60 ± 1.65	2.42	p≤0.05
	Nrml	5.03± 1.69		
E	P C	4.26± 1.53	4.85	p≤0.01

Nrml 5.08± 1.67

P.C = Physically Challenged  
Nrml = Normal

**Table 3: Mean comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children on next five personality factors**

Factors	Groups	Mean ± SD	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>F</b>	P C	4.60 ± 1.65	2.42	p≤ 0.05
	Nrml	5.03± 1.69		
<b>G</b>	P C	4.99± 1.59	2.40	p≤ 0.05
	Nrml	5.42± 1.76		
<b>H</b>	P C	4.94± 1.65	0.59	p≥0.05
	Nrml	5.04± 1.54		
<b>I</b>	P C	5.91± 1.84	4.72	p≤ 0.01
	Nrml	5.02± 1.72		
<b>J</b>	P C	4.65± 1.89	3.07	p≤ 0.01
	Nrml	5.25± 1.69		

P C =Physically Challenged  
Nrml =Normal

**Table 4: Mean comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children on last personality factors (N, O, Q<sub>3</sub>, Q<sub>4</sub>)**

Factors	Groups	Mean± SD	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>N</b>	P C	4.39 ±1.79	3.49	p≤ 0.01
	Nrml	5.01 ±1.50		
<b>O</b>	P C	5.12 ±1.86	5.84	p≤ 0.01
	Nrml	4.10 ±1.66		
<b>Q<sub>3</sub></b>	P C	5.07 ±1.77	5.00	p≤ 0.01
	Nrml	5.94 ±1.52		
<b>Q<sub>4</sub></b>	P C	5.76 ±1.74	5.21	p≤ 0.01
	Nrml	4.80 ±1.77		

P.C = Physically Challenged  
Nrml = Normal

**Table 5: Mean comparison of rural/urban physically challenged school going children on I<sup>st</sup> five personality factors**

Factors	Groups	Mean ±SD	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>A</b>	Rural	4.67± 1.47	2.90	p≤ 0.01
	Urban	5.33± 1.60		
<b>B</b>	Rural	4.49± 1.40	3.24	p≤ 0.01
	Urban	5.27±1.78		
<b>C</b>	Rural	4.74± 1.45	1.71	p≥0.05

<b>D</b>	Urban	5.18± 1.91	3.82	p≤ 0.01
	Rural	4.14± 1.55		
<b>E</b>	Urban	5.06± 1.63	0.87	p≥0.05
	Rural	4.36± 1.50		
	Urban	4.16± 1.56		

**Table 6: Mean comparison of rural/urban physically challenged school going children on next five personality factors**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean± SD</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>F</b>	Rural	4.51± 1.56	0.79	p≥0.05
	Urban	4.69± 1.44		
<b>G</b>	Rural	4.97±1.66	0.18	p≥0.05
	Urban	5.01± 1.53		
<b>H</b>	Rural	5.08± 1.76	1.12	p≥0.05
	Urban	4.80 ± 1.54		
<b>I</b>	Rural	5.70±1.80	1.50	p≥0.05
	Urban	6.11± 1.87		
<b>J</b>	Rural	4.21± 1.64	3.31	p≤ 0.01
	Urban	5.12 ± 2.02		

**Table 7: Mean comparison of rural/urban physically challenged school going children on last four personality factors**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean ± SD</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>N</b>	Rural	4.02 ± 1.77	2.83	p≤ 0.01
	Urban	4.77 ± 1.75		
<b>O</b>	Rural	4.57 ± 1.69	4.16	p≤ 0.01
	Urban	5.68 ± 1.88		
<b>Q<sub>3</sub></b>	Rural	5.26 ± 1.77	1.38	p≥0.05
	Urban	4.89 ± 1.77		
<b>Q<sub>4</sub></b>	Rural	5.70 ± 1.64	0.51	p≥0.05
	Urban	5.83 ± 1.84		

**Table 8: Mean comparison of rural/urban normal school going children on I<sup>st</sup> five personality factors**

Factors	Groups	Mean ± SD	t-value	Level of Significance
A	Rural	5.56 ± 1.46	1.97	p ≤ 0.05
	Urban	6.02 ± 1.70		
B	Rural	5.19 ± 1.67	3.23	p ≤ 0.01
	Urban	6.06 ± 1.91		
C	Rural	5.17 ± 1.77	2.49	p ≤ 0.01
	Urban	5.82 ± 1.74		
D	Rural	4.67 ± 1.56	2.91	p ≤ 0.01
	Urban	5.39 ± 1.75		
E	Rural	4.61 ± 1.45	3.87	p ≤ 0.01
	Urban	5.54 ± 1.76		

**Table 9: Mean comparison of rural/urban normal school going children on next five personality factors**

Factors	Groups	Mean ± SD	t-value	Level of Significance
F	Rural	4.72 ± 1.59	2.64	p ≤ 0.01
	Urban	5.38 ± 1.72		
G	Rural	5.51 ± 2.01	0.71	p ≥ 0.05
	Urban	5.32 ± 1.48		
H	Rural	5.12 ± 1.57	0.72	p ≥ 0.05
	Urban	4.96 ± 1.52		
I	Rural	4.78 ± 1.57	1.87	p ≥ 0.05
	Urban	5.26 ± 1.83		
J	Rural	5.12 ± 1.62	1.01	p ≥ 0.05
	Urban	5.38 ± 1.77		

**Table 10: Mean comparison of rural/urban normal school going children on last four personality factors**

Factors	Groups	Mean ± SD	SD	t-value	Level of Significance
N	Rural	5.14 ± 1.40	1.40	2.83	p ≤ 0.01
	Urban	4.87 ± 1.59	1.59		
O	Rural	4.14 ± 1.48	1.48	4.16	p ≤ 0.01
	Urban	4.06 ± 1.83	1.83		
Q <sub>3</sub>	Rural	5.83 ± 1.51	1.51	1.38	p ≥ 0.05
	Urban	6.06 ± 1.53	1.53		
Q <sub>4</sub>	Rural	4.83 ± 1.74	1.74	0.51	p ≥ 0.05
	Urban	4.77 ± 1.81	1.81		