



PERSONALITY TRAITS OF WORKING & NON WORKING WOMEN

DR. BINDA RAM

Associate Professor

Jiwachh College, Motipur

B.R.A.Bihar University, Muzaffarpur

INTRODUCTION

Personality is all of a person's attributes and qualities and the way they are combined to make that person different from every other person. In a psychologist's terms, however, everyone has personality that is every person has a unique style of interacting with others and of reacting to his environment. Never the less it cannot be denied that some people have a more attractive personality and are more pleasant to be with than others.

personality is a specific social quality acquired by an individual and it is individual and it is individual's social effectiveness. According to Cattell (1970), "personality is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in the given situations." According to Eysenck (1970), "Personality is a more or less stable and enduring organization of a person's character, temperament, intellect and physique, which determines his unique, adjustment to the environment." Thus the term Personality is the total integration of physical, emotional, intellectual and character make up of an individual which is expressed in terms of behavior, manner, attitude believes, aspiration, habits, sentiments, ambitions, temperaments and traits.

Personality has been conceptualized from a of theoretical perspectives, and at various levels of abstraction or breadth (John, Hampson, & Goldberg, 1991; Mcadams, 1995). Each of these levels has made unique contributions to our understanding of individual differences in behaviour and scales designed to measure them, escalated without an end in sight (Goldberg, 1971). Researchers, as well as practitioners in the field of personality scales from which to choose, with little guidance and no overall rationale at hand. What made matter worse was that scales with the same name often measure concepts that are not the same, and scales with different names often measure concepts that are quite similar.

Attempting to understand and classify what people who they are has been a longstanding challenge in the word of personality psychology. Numerous theories and model have been



developed over the years to better understand aspect of human personality. Most trait theor models attempt to accurately describe aspects of personality.

The focus of this lesson in on the Big Five personality traits. In psychology, the ‘Big Five’ is a term used to describe the five broad traits of human personality. In current practice, it is sometimes used interchangeably with the ‘five-factor model!

Each of the traits, or factors, indentified as the Big Five are independent of each other and accout for the infinite number of unique aspects that comprise human personality. Understanding each of the Big Five factors will help you better grasp the concept of personality traits.

The Big Five personality traits are:

.Openness

.Conscientiouness

.Extraversion

.Agreeableness

.Neuroticism

An easy way to remember the Big Five is to remember the word ‘OCEAN.’ The first letter of each trait creates the word ocean.

The Big Five traits have been subjected to rigorous testing over the post several decades. The research continues to support the notion that we all porest each of the five personality characteristics to some degree. And even though we share only five common personality traits, the possible combinations, or personality types, are endless when you consider the varying degrees of each trait. For example, not all of us are equally agreeable or neurotic.

Here, we first review the history of the Big Five, including the discovery of the five dimensions.

. Extroversion (E) is the personality trait of seeking fulfilment form sources outside the self or in community. High scorers tend to be very social while low scorers prefer to work on their project alone.



-
- . Agreeableness (A) reflects much individuals adjust their behaviour to suit others. High scorers are typically polite and like people Low scorers tend ‘tell it is’.
 - . Conscientiousness (C) is the personality trait of being honest and hardworking. High scorers tend to follow rules and prefer clean homes. Low scorers may be messy and cheat others.
 - . Neuroticism (M) is the personality trait of being emotipnal.

Hypotheses

There will be significant difference between the working and non-working woman in respect of their Personality Traits. (as like neuroticism)

Simple Data

Data collection was done through direct personal survey method with questionnaire properly oriented for the purpose. A well-structured, perspective schedule was used for the purpose of data collection.

The sample consisted of 100 working and 100 non-working (total 200) to see and the Stress, Adjustment traits among them. The sample was selected randomly and preference basis form various areas of Muzaffarpur.

In our sample size, all the participants (for data collection purpose) are form the age group of 25 to 50 and belongs to middle to upper class family. Their education level is graduation and above (since we have to compere the Stress, Adjustment and personality traits of working and non-working woman) Here we did not include the labour class woman with either low or no educational background because they work in different seasons and participate in seasonal Employment pattern only.

Procedure:

All the participants of the study were individually (or in group) informed about the purpose of the study and were asked to complete sing’s Personal Stress Source inventory. The scores of both the groups i.e., working woman and non-working woman were randomly divided in tow equal groups of experimental and control group.

Tools



The following standardized tools were selected for the study:

Eysenck's Personality inventory (EPI)

Eysenck (1971): Personality is more or less stable and enduring organization of a person's character's character, temperament, intellect, and physique which is determine his unique adjustment to the environment.

Eysenck (1952, 1967, 1982,) developed a very influential mode of personality. Based on the results of analyses of responses on personality questionnaires he identified three dimension of personality: extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism.

Eysenck (1947) found that their bhaviour could be represented by two dimensions: Introversion / Extroversion (E), Neuroticism / Stability (N). Eysenck called these second-order personality traits. According to Eysenck, the two dimensions of neuroticism (stable vs. unstable) and introversion-extroversion combine to form a variety of personality characteristic

Extraverts are sociable and crave excitement and change, and thus can become bored easily. They tend to be carefree, optimistic and impulsive.

Introverts are reserved, plan their actions and control their emotions. They tend to be serious, reliable and pessimistic.

Neurotics /unstable tend to be anxious, worrying and moody They are overly emotional and find it difficult to calm down once upset.

Stable are emotionally calm, unreactive and unworried. Eysenck (1966) later added a third trait / dimension-Psychoticism- e.g. lacking in empathy, cruel, a loner aggressive and troublesome. Here are some questions regarding the way you behave, feel and act. Each question has radio buttons to answer YES or NO. Try to decide whether YES or NO represents your usual way of acting or feeling. Then check those radio named YES or NO. work quickly, and don't spend too much time over any question, we want your first reaction, not a long drawn-out thought process. The whole questionnaire shouldn't take more than a few minutes. Be sure not to omit any questions. Start now, work quickly and remember not to answer every question. There are no right or wrong answers, and this isn't a test of intelligence or ability, but simply a measure of the way you behave.



Result & Discussion:

Stress becomes universal phenomenon. Every person wants and more for the attainment of pleasure, due to this competition is increased in every field of life and this competition generates stress among people no doubt the competition is must but we don't ignore its result in the recent years as more women are coming to take on many jobs. Stress is common among the working women at workplace. In the present study it was hypothesized that would be no significant mean difference in the stress level of working women and house wives. Mean for the stress level of working women was 60.78 and for non-working women was 43.3 which clearly indicate that mean higher among the working women in comparison to non-working women.

It was also hypothesized that there would be a significant difference between in the stress level of working women and non-working women. Table-4.1 shows the mean, standard and "t" values for stress level of working women and non-working women. The mean for working women was 60.78, SD=11.957 and for non-working women was 43.3 and SD=12.051. t value was 10.92 which were significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence here the null hypothesis was rejected which clarifies that there is a significant difference in the stress level of working women and non-working women. The stress is higher among the working women in comparison to non-working women. It has been determined that total stress scores of working women. was higher compared to non-working women and that there is a significant difference between women status and total stress scores. working women had higher level of stress than non-working women. These working women are stressed because they have to perform various roles. total stress

They have the pressure of balancing work and family. The work load cause women to be affected from stress even when women don't work outside home, they are confronted with high levels of stress. Such role of women as cause situation as overloading or role and role conflict and may become a reason for stress.

Analysis & interpretation for Adjustment of Working and Non-Working Woman:



Table-1

Comparative Table showing Neuroticism level of 100 working women and 100 non-Working Women

Group of Comparison	Mean	S.D.	t	dt	p
Working women Neuroticism	22.7	11.634	3.1	19 8	<.01
Non-working woman Neuroticism	29.9	20.346			

It was found that the working woman and non-working women neuroticism factor of personality is varies and the non-working neuroticism factor of personality is more than the working women. Again the ‘t’ value interpret that there is significant difference between neuroticism level of non-working and women.

Total-2

Mean, SD, and “t” ratio for working and non-working women

Stress level		Working (N=100)	Non-working women (N=100)	t	df	P
	M	60.78	43.3	10.92*	98	P<0.01 (significant)
	SD	11.957	12.051			

Comparison between working woman and non-working on the basis of personal life reveals that the adjustment patterns of both the groups of working women and non-working woman differs significantly in the areas of home and emotional, as the computed t-values between the groups of non-working women in these two are as exceeds the critical value at the



level of significance Comparison between working women on the basis of duration of working life reveals that the adjustment pattern between the two groups of working woman differs significantly in the areas of home, as the computed t-values between the two groups of working women in these two are as exceeds the critical value at the level of significance.

When compared between non-working women and working women with less than 5 years of working life in terms of their adjustment pattern, it has been found that the adjustment pattern between these two groups differs significantly in the areas of home and emotional, as the computed t-values between these two groups in these two are as exceeds the critical value at the level of significance. Similarly, when compared between non-working women and working with more than 5 years of working life in terms of their adjustment pattern, it has been found that the adjustment pattern between these two groups differs significantly in the area of occupation, the computed t-value between these two groups in this area exceeds the critical values at the level of significance.

Discussion:

All of the objectives of this present study have been carefully examined. The results reveal that the adjustment pattern of non- working women and are significantly different form each other. The Computed t-values of the score obtained by the non-working women and the working and the working women exceeds the critical value at the level of significance in the area of the adjustment of both the groups differs significantly in the areas of significance in the areas of home , heath and emotion, which indicates the adjustment of both the groups differs significantly in the area of home, health and emotion. On the other hand the computed t-values between the two groups in the areas of social and occupation, which is quite smaller than the critical values at the level of significance, reveals that the differences in the adjustment pattern of both the groups in these two areas is insignificant and may be due to chance factors. In the obtained mean value show that working women are better adjusted than the non-working women in the areas of health, emotion, social and occupation, whereas, the non-working women are better adjusted than the working women in the area of home.



REFERNCES

1. Bhattacharjee, Pratima, Bhatt, K. Kusum. 1983 Family adjustment of married working and non-working women's Indian journal of clinical psychology. Vol. 10 (2) 497-501.
2. Canlon. B. 1986 Sexual dysfunction and disorder patterns of working and non-working wives. Journal of sex and material therapy. Vol. 12 (2). 93-107.
3. Ellen Hock. 1978.working and non-working mothers with infants. Journal of developmental psychology. Vol. 14(1),37-43.
4. Hans Selye 1979 The stress of life. M C Graw hill. New York.
5. Heer, David. M. 1962. Husband and wife perception of family, power, structure and family living. Vol. 65-67.
6. Hoffman, Lois wadif. 1960. Effect of the employment of mothers on parental power relation and and the division of hole tasks marriage and family living. Vol. 22, 27-35.
7. Pascal. 1992. Stress and coping. The Indian experience sage pat. New Delhi.
8. Singal.W.R.1974. Journal of education. Singh M.(2002) Stress scale.
9. Spielberger C. 1979. Understanding stress and anxiety. New York.
10. Muntazir M, Neharshi S, Manju P (2014) A comparative study of mental health among working women and house wives. Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing 5:1398-1400.
11. Hamiton S, Fagot Bi (1988) Chronic stress and coping styles: A comparison of male and female undergraduates. J pers soc psycho 55: 819-823.
12. American psychological Association (2008) Stress in American Psychological Association, USA.
13. Swanson NG (2000) Working and Stress. Journal of the American Woman's Medical Association 55: 76-79.
14. Selye H (1956) The stress of life. McGraw Hill, New York.