

Research Paper

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

Dr. Lova Kumari Kadim^{1*}, Dr. Thirupathi Naik Bukya²

ABSTRACT

This study explores the personality traits of adolescents in Uttar Pradesh State, how the personality traits impact adolescents perceive and respond to their social and educational environments, peer relationships, mental health, and impacting peer relationships, and mental health. Drawing on contemporary trait theories of personality, such as the big five (neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). These traits are 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 mental health situations.

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

Psychology studies personality, an essential notion that explains the constant patterns of thoughts, emotions, and behaviors differentiate individuals from one another. Educators and behavioral scientists who study personality 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. Personality also has an integrative nature. It isn't just a collection of separate traits; rather, psychological and biological processes function together to influence behavior. To evaluate personality, one needs a comprehensive understanding of both biological and social influences, as the interaction between heredity and environment plays a significant role. 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, these traits significantly influence emotional development, social relationships, academic performance, and overall psychological well-being. Examining adolescents'

¹Visiting Faculty, Department of Psychology, Amity University, Noida, UP

²Postdoctoral Researcher, Department of Psychology, Osmania University, Hyderabad, Telangana

*Corresponding Author

Received: May 6, 2026; Revision Received: May 13, 2026; Accepted: May 17, 2026

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

personality traits helps us understand their behavioral patterns and design educational interventions promoting healthy development. 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, counselling, and mental health, and also helps individuals identify strengths and areas for personal growth. Psychologically, personality encompasses the totality of an individual's behavioural tendencies, including cognitive, emotional, and social aspects, as well as physical and mental 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 and plays a significant role in shaping life outcomes, including academic and professional success. However, modern psychological interpretations of personality extend far beyond external behavior or physical appearance. It encompasses both overt and covert aspects of behaviour, including thoughts, emotions, motivations, and attitudes, and reflects the dynamic interaction between biological predispositions and environmental influences. 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. 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.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Annalakshmi (2019), Adolescents from joint families scored higher on agreeableness and lower on extraversion than those from nuclear families, reflecting exposure to multiple caregivers. Reddy et al. (2021) studied 300 adolescents in Hyderabad and Warangal. Urban girls showed higher Neuroticism ($M=28.4$) vs boys ($M=24.1$), $p<0.01$. Rural gender differences were smaller, suggesting urbanization moderates gendered personality expression. Rao & Kumar (2019) compared 200 students from GHMC limits vs. the Mahbubnagar villages. Urban sample had higher Openness, $t=3.42$, $p<0.001$. Rural sample showed higher Conscientiousness, possibly due to early responsibility in agrarian families. Internet penetration in urban Telangana was cited as a factor for higher Openness. Sahoo &

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

Mohanty (2015): Urban adolescents scored higher on Openness (M=34.2) and Extraversion (M=31.8) than rural counterparts (M=29.1, 27.4). Rural adolescents showed higher Agreeableness, linked to collectivist community values. Allik & McCrae (2004) found urban populations score higher on Openness and Extraversion due to exposure to diversity and opportunities. Singh & Sharma (2016) on 400 Delhi adolescents found girls had significantly higher Neuroticism and Agreeableness than boys. Boys scored higher on Openness. Kumari & Kang (2018) attributing differences to socialization patterns where emotional expression is more accepted in girls. The Five-Factor Model (FFM) by McCrae & Costa (1999) is the most widely accepted taxonomy for personality research. It identifies five broad dimensions: Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism (OCEAN). Research shows these traits are 40-60% heritable but significantly shaped by environment during adolescence (Bleidorn et al., 2018).

Hypotheses

- **H1:** There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to gender.
- **H2:** There will be a significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to locality.
- **H3:** There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to the medium of instruction.
- **H5:** There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to the stream of the course.
- **H6:** There will be no significant difference in the personality traits of higher secondary students with respect to the type of school.

Objectives

- To compare the personality traits of boys and girls in a higher secondary school.
- To examine differences in personality traits between urban and rural higher secondary students.
- To explore personality trait differences between Hindi and English medium higher secondary students.
- To compare personality traits of higher secondary students in Government, Aided, and Private schools.
- To investigate personality trait differences among higher secondary students in co-education, boys', and girls' schools.

Samples

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.

Research design

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

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

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.

Statistical analysis

The data obtained was tabulated and analysed using SPSS 25 (IBM) to assess the findings of the study.

Variables

- **Independent Variables:** Personality Traits of Adolescents
- **Dependent Variables:** Demographic Variables

Instruments

A measure was used in this study, 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.

Procedure

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 analysis of 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.

Data Collection

Participants were recruited offline and online through personality traits forums, university emails, and social media platforms.

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.

Personality Traits and School Management

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

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

Table 1 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-value
D1: Conscientiousness	Private	240	36.1458	6.08582	Between Groups	394.880	2	197.440	5.718*	.003
	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*	.002
	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*	.032
	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**	.000
	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**	.000
	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**	.000
	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 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.

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

Table 2 Used Scheffé's Post Hoc Test to compare personality traits (PT) among private, aided, and government school students.

Multiple Comparisons							
Scheffe							
Dependent Variable	(I) Management of school	(J) Management of school	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						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

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

Table 2 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

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

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.

H₀: There is no significant influence of school management on the personality traits of higher secondary students.

Personality Traits and School Category

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

Table 3 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	p-value
PT_D1	co-education	458	35.2817	6.04988	Between Groups	50.028	2	25.014	0.713#	0.491
	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#	.074
	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#	.718
	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#	.833
	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#	.920
	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#	.538

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

Dimensions	Category	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value
	Boys	70	170.2714	22.45893	Within Groups	331233.317	597	554.830		
	Girls	72	173.6528	25.51948	Total	331920.985	599			
	Total	600	170.7550	23.53986						

Table 3 shows 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.

H₀: There is no significant influence of school category on personality traits.

Personality Traits and Gender

Researchers formulated the null hypothesis to examine whether gender 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 4 presents the results of an independent-samples t-test 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 is 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.

H₀: There's no significant influence of students' gender on personality traits.

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

Personality Traits and Locality

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

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		

Table 5 shows 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.

H₀: There's no significant influence of students' locality (rural vs urban) on personality traits.

Personality Traits and Stream of the Course

Researchers formulated the null hypothesis to examine whether the course stream influences the personality traits of higher secondary students: **H₀:** There's no significant influence of students' course stream on personality traits.

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

Dimensions	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PT_D1	MPC	195	34.8410	5.63132	Between Groups	95.779	3	31.926	.910#	0.436
	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						
PT_D2	MPC	195	34.2410	5.04090	Between Groups	39.877	3	13.292	.487#	0.691
	BPC	263	34.6502	5.34954	Within	16266.096	596	27.292		

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

Dimensions	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
					Groups					
	CEC	101	34.3069	5.25879	Total	16305.973	599			
	MEC	41	35.1463	5.17958						
	Total	600	34.4933	5.21747						
PT_D3	MPC	195	33.4974	5.35962	Between Groups	23.455	3	7.818	.249#	0.862
	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						
PT_D4	MPC	195	32.9897	5.84507	Between Groups	248.754	3	82.918	2.241#	0.082
	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						
PT_D5	MPC	195	33.2154	5.75306	Between Groups	112.920	3	37.640	1.047#	0.371
	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						
PT_TOTAL	MPC	195	168.7846	22.15165	Between Groups	1610.057	3	536.686	.968#	0.407
	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						

Table 6 demonstrates the influence of course stream (MPC, BPC, CEC, MEC) on higher secondary students' personality traits using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). They found the F-value for overall personality traits ($F = 0.968$) is not 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.

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:

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

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	HINDI	119	35.7479	6.06213	.733#	0.464
	EM	479	35.3027	5.89679		
PT_D2	HINDI	119	34.7983	5.40649	.684#	0.494
	EM	479	34.4322	5.17872		
PT_D3	HINDI	119	33.7395	5.72604	.295#	0.768
	EM	479	33.5699	5.57291		
PT_D4	HINDI	119	34.2521	6.51494	1.478#	0.140
	EM	479	33.3278	5.99992		
PT_D5	HINDI	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 (Hindi 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 Hindi 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.

Based on these findings, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between Hindi 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.

H₀: There is no significant influence of students' medium of instruction (Hindi medium and English medium) on their personality traits

Personality Traits and Type of Family

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

Table 8: 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-value
PT_D1	Nuclear	288	35.9097	5.77923	Between Groups	162.769	2	81.385	2.331#	0.098
	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#	0.578
	Joint	280	34.2643	5.09144	Within	16276.096	597	27.263		

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

Dimension	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value
					Groups					
	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#	0.143
	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*	0.036
	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#	0.286
	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#	0.083
	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						

Table 8 presents the influence of family type (nuclear, joint, extended) on higher secondary students' personality traits using ANOVA (Table 8). 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.

H₀: There's no significant influence of family type on personality traits.

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

Table 9: 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.

Table 9 shows that 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).

Major Findings of the Study

- School management (private, aided, government) significantly influences higher secondary 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.
- 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.

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

- Medium of instruction (Hindi, 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.
- 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.

DISCUSSION

Researchers examined the personality traits of higher secondary students in relation to demographic and institutional variables. They found that 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 that 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.

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

- Allport, G.W. (1961). *Pattern and Growth in Personality*, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Amrita, M. and Khadirawan, S (2006). Influence of personality on the emotional intelligence of teachers, *Edutracks* 5(12):25-29.
- Bhogle, S., and Jaiprakash, I. Development of the Psychological Well-Being (PWB) Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality & Clinical Studies*, (1995); (51), 5-9.
- Cattell, R.B. (1950). *Personality: A Systematic, Theoretical and Factual Study*. New York: McGraw.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Kluemper, D.H. (2008). Trait emotional intelligence: the impact of core-self evaluations and social desirability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44(6), 1402-1412.
- 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.
- 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
- 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.
- Marcela et al 2015 Personality Traits in Entrepreneurs and Self- Employed, *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov* 9(58 2)
- Matangi, E. (2013). Personality and learning preference interactions of women in tertiary education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3: 1, 172.
- 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-
- Paunonen S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (2001). Big five predictors of academic achievement. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35, 78–90.
- Pervin, L. A., & John, O. P. (1997). *Personality: Theory and research* (7th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: psychometric Investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 425–448.
- 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.

Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh

- 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.
- Pornsakulvanish V., et. al., (2012), An analysis of personality traits and learning styles 14,118 – 129
- 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.
- 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.
- Srivastava, S., Three paths of adult development: Conservers, seekers, and achievers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (1987) 80, 995–1010.
- Tempelaar, D. T., Gijsselaers, 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.
- 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.
- 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

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Kadim, L.K. & Bukya, T.N. (2026). Personality Traits among Adolescents with Respect to Selected Demographics: A Study in Uttar Pradesh. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 14(2), 1178-1193. DIP:18.01.111.20261402, DOI:10.25215/1402.111