

## **“A Study of Self-concept and Personality Traits of Urban and Rural Girl Students in Context to Their Socioeconomic Status”**

Ajay Kumar<sup>1,3, \*</sup> and Dhaneshwar Ram<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, S.D. College, Kaler (M.U., Bodhgaya)

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor and Head, Department of Psychology, A.M. College, Gaya (M.U., Bodhgaya)

<sup>3</sup>Ph.D. Research Scholar, P.G. Department of Psychology, M.U., Bodhgaya

---

### **Abstract**

*Self-confidence and personality characteristics (like sociability, self-confidence, and ambitions) are concerned to cope with the reality of the person in his different life situations. Well-structured personality organisation and positive self-concept of girl students help them in achieving their life goals and in adjusting to a complex world. Factors like urban-rural habitation and socioeconomic status have their impacts on self-concept and personality development. The present study attempted to accomplish a relationship between these factors. The study was conducted on 200 girl students (100 rural and 100 urban) of classes 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> from the Govt. girls' high schools of the Gaya district. Sentence Completion Test (SCT) by Dubey and Dubey (for personality characteristic measurement), Self-concept Questionnaire by Saraswat, and Socio-Economic Status Scale (Urban and Rural) by Kalia and Sahu were used to collect the data. The result shows a significant difference in self-concept and personality characteristics of urban-rural, and high and low-SES girl students, favouring that urban and high-SES girl students have better self-concept and personality characteristics than their rural and low-SES counterparts. The self-concept of girl subjects is positively and significantly correlated to their personality characteristics.*

**Keywords:** *Self-concept, sociability, self-confidence, ambitions, socioeconomic status, urban-rural habitation.*

---

### **I. Introduction**

Current interest in the self-concept has transcended its original locus in the therapy situation and has become a subject for investigation under laboratory and field conditions. As children grow, parents and others react to their behaviour, sometimes in a positive way and sometimes with disapproval. Children thus learn to regard some of their actions, thoughts, and feelings as unworthy, and they often react by distorting or denying these aspects of self. In mature, adjusted people, there is congruence between the total person and the self, and well-adjusted people can accept the full range of their experiences without distorting or avoiding them. Studies by Jonkmann et al. (2012) and Mamta and Sharma (2013) revealed that personality organisation and self-concept of the individual are positively and significantly correlated with each other. Generally speaking, the term 'self' has two distinct sets of meanings. One set has to do with people's attitudes about themselves; their picture of the way they look and act; the impact they believe they have on others; and their perceived traits, abilities, foibles, and weaknesses. This collection constitutes what is known as the "self-concept", or "self-image", "attitudes, feelings, perceptions, and evaluations of.....self as an object" (Hall and Lindzey, 1978). The second set of meanings relates to the executive functions – processes by which the individual manages, copes, thinks, remembers, perceives, and plans. According to Rogers (1959), self-concept denotes "the organised consistent conceptual gestalt composed of perceptions of the characteristics of the 'I' or 'me' and the perceptions of the relationship of the 'I' or 'me' to others and various aspects of life, together with the values attached to these perceptions. It is a gestalt that is available to awareness though not necessarily in awareness. It is a fluid and changing gestalt, a process, but at any given moment it is a specific entity."

Tiller et al. (2003) stated that how someone is to behave depends on his self-concept, which is about what he thinks about himself, including strengths, weaknesses and personality. He will use his self-concept while judging, whether he will succeed or fail in his efforts. Self-concept will also influence his expectations, dreams and actions. According to Strage and Brandt (1999), self-concept can be classified into two major types that are positive and negative self-concept. The positive self-concept is about a circumstance or situation in which an individual is confident and sure of him, have good interests, is objective and is not too sensitive. This individual may accept criticism from others and may be able to give views and opinions if the circumstances are not logical or rational. On the contrary, a negative self-concept is when an individual has too subjective a nature.

Several factors are responsible for the forming and influencing of the self-concept in an individual. A person's maturity, nature, and natural surroundings are responsible for the development of self-concept Azizi and Jaafar (2005). In the development of self-concept in a person, one's self, parents, peers, socioeconomic status,

surrounding area of residence etc. plays a very important role. Further, the self-concept of a person plays a vital role in the adjustment to their environment and achievement in their life such as in education, competition, and business (Morgan and King, 1986). Some studies have reported that urban students have better self-concepts than their rural counterparts (Alam, 2000; Wankhade, 2016). Some other studies have reported that high-SES girl students have better self-concepts than their rural counterparts (Parmar, 2014; Islamiyah et al., 2018).

An important characteristic of the human life cycle is the relatively long period of childhood, during which an individual is expected to acquire the information and competencies essential for adult functioning in future. When a problem arises, it is perceived, thought about, and acted upon with the self; that is, the individual's personality as a whole comes to perceive himself as an active agent in determining his behaviour – as indicated by such statements as “I know” (knower), “I want” (striver), and “I will” (doer). If we view each person as striving, evaluating, and adapting to the system in his or her own right, then we might consider “self” as the final determinant of personality instead of the passive result of heredity and environment (Baron, 2001).

Sociability, self-confidence, and ambitiousness features of the personality of an individual play key roles in achievement and adjustive behaviours in life. Brook and Schmidt (2020) asserted that sociability is an important dimension of personality. Sociability is a determinant factor of the human condition because it influences human behaviour. During childhood and adolescence, sociability developed through cooperation that is reinforced through social rewards (Shiner and DeYoung, 2013).

Self-confidence is faith in one's abilities. According to Basavanna (1975), “Self-confidence refers to an individual's perceived ability to act effectively in a situation to overcome and to get things to go all right.” According to Bandura (1986), “Self-confidence is considered one of the most influential motivators and regulators of behaviour in people's everyday life.” Self-confidence involves self-respect and having the courage, to tell the truth about what you are, what you like, and what you believe.” Genuine self-confidence is the precursor to achievement. Self-confidence is the prerequisite for development, progress and success. Confidence is not inherited but a learned characteristic. Confident students have profound faith in their future and can assess their capabilities. Self-confident persons perceive themselves to be intellectually adequate, socially competent, emotionally mature, satisfied, decisive, optimistic, successful, independent, forward-moving, fairly assertive, self-reliant, self-assured, and having leadership qualities. However, overconfidence is also undesirable as such students may have unrealistically high expectations and beliefs in their abilities, motivating them to take unwarranted risks (Lone, 2021).

According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary (2003), ambition is defined as “an ardent desire for rank, fame or power”, while aspiration is defined as “a strong desire to achieve something high or great.” When someone is ambitious, they do what it takes to achieve. Thus, an ambitious person is “someone always striving to reach a goal.” Through hard work, dedication, and perseverance – an ambitious person does not give up on their target. He or she pushes forward and is determined to succeed. Some studies have reported that urban subjects have better personality organization to different characteristics than their rural counterparts (Najmah and Yusuf, 2016; Jaykishanbhai, 2019, etc.). Some studies of personality characteristics in context to socioeconomic status have revealed that high-SES students have better personality organisation than their rural counterparts (Sinha and Mishra, 1982; Fang and Stephane, 2017; Dheeraj and Bhat, 2019 etc.).

Girl children are blooming flowers in the guards of society. They are the most valuable assets of the nation and their importance in the nation-building process cannot be undermined. Girls of today are the potential citizen of tomorrow. Their experience of today would ultimately determine the quality of the future population of the nation (Verma, 2018). The present study has its aims to reveal the issues of self-concept and personality characteristics of the girl students in the context of their socioeconomic status and area of residence.

### **The objective of the study:**

The main objectives of the present study are as under:

1. To investigate the impact of area (urban-rural residence) differences on the personality traits of the girl students.
2. To investigate the impact of area (urban-rural residence) differences on the self-concept of the girl students.
3. To examine the effect of socioeconomic status on the personality traits of the girl students.
4. To examine the effect of socioeconomic status on the self-concept of the girl students.
5. To study and correlate the personality traits of the girl students with their self-concept.

### **Hypotheses:**

1. There would be a significant impact of area (urban-rural) on the girl students to their personality traits.
2. There would be a significant impact of area (urban-rural) on the girl students to their self-concept.
3. The high and low-SES girl students would differ significantly in their personality traits.
4. The high and low-SES girl students would differ significantly in their self-concept.
5. There would be a positive relationship between self-concept and personality traits of urban rural girl students.

## II. Methodology:

### Sample:

The present study was conducted on a sample of a total of 200 Govt. high school girl students from Gaya, Manpur, Tekari, and Khijarsarai Block areas of the Gaya district, Bihar. Students were selected through incidental-cum-purposive sampling method from different Govt. girls' high schools of 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> classes. The age range of students was from 13 to 18 years

### Tools Used:

The following tools were used for the collection of data in the present study:

1. The Sentence Completion Test (SCT). By Dubey and Dubey, 2017. For the measurement of three personality traits namely, sociability, self-confidence, and ambitions SCT was used.
2. Self-concept Questionnaire developed by R.K. Saraswat (2019). Used to assess the self-concept of the girl students. It measures six different dimensions of self-concept. These dimensions include physical, social, temperamental, educational, moral, and intellectual self-concept.
3. Socioeconomic Status Scale (Urban and Rural). Developed by Kalia and Sahu (2012). The scale was used to measure the social and economic position of a person in urban and rural areas according to the lifestyle prevailing in both regions.

### Statistical Analysis and Results:

Mean, S.D., t-ratio, and coefficient of correlation by the product-moment method were applied for statistical analysis of obtained data. After statistical analysis of the obtained data results is summarised in the table.

**Table-1**  
**Mean comparison table of Personality Traits of Rural and Urban Girl Students.**

Personality Traits	Area of Residence	N	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio	p-value
Sociability	Urban	100	24.21	2.38	8.49	< .01
	Rural	100	21.16	2.69		
Self-confidence	Urban	100	33.42	3.38	9.72	<.01
	Rural	100	28.37	3.95		
Ambitious	Urban	100	26.12	2.19	6.48	< .01
	Rural	100	23.06	4.18		
Overall	Urban	100	84.88	6.10	15.50	< .01
	Rural	100	71.38	6.21		

**Table-2**  
**Mean comparison table of Self-concept of Urban and Rural Girl Students.**

Subjects	N	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio	p-value
Urban	100	152.76	10.07	7.14	< .01
Rural	100	140.63	13.72		

**Table-3**  
**Mean comparison table of Personality Traits of High and Low-SES girl students.**

Personality Traits	Subjects	N	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio	p-value
Sociability	High SES	100	25.40	3.57	1.12	> .05
	Low SES	100	23.02	3.18		
Self-confidence	High SES	100	32.22	5.86	2.34	< .05
	Low SES	100	30.43	4.89		
Ambitious	High SES	100	24.62	4.65	3.30	< .01
	Low SES	100	23.16	4.76		
Overall	High SES	100	78.50	12.08	2.06	< .05
	Low SES	100	73.06	10.88		

**Table-4**  
**Mean comparison table of Self-concept of High and Low-SES of Girl Students.**

Subjects	N	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio	p-value
High SES	100	152.75	13.23	4.28	< .01

<b>Low SES</b>	100	144.62	13.57		
----------------	-----	--------	-------	--	--

**Table-5**  
**Coefficient of correlation between Self-concept and Personality traits of the Urban-Rural Girl Students.**

<b>Areas of Personality Traits</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>r</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Sociability</b>	200	0.42	< 0.01
<b>Self-confidence</b>	200	0.46	< 0.01
<b>Ambition</b>	200	0.39	< 0.01
<b>Overall Traits</b>	200	0.48	< 0.01

### III. Discussion:

Table 1 shows that there is a significant difference between urban and rural girl students in personality characteristics – sociability, self-confidence, ambition, and overall these. Urban girl students have a higher mean score, 24.21 on sociability, 33.42 on self-confidence, 26.12 on ambitiousness, and 84.88 on overall personality characteristics than their rural counterparts (Mean score of sociability 21.16, on self-confidence 28.37, ambitiousness 23.06, and overall 71.38). The difference between these mean scores is significant at a 0.01 level of confidence. The result indicates that urban girl students have better personality characteristics in sociability, self-confidence, ambitiousness, and overall than rural girl students.

Table 2 clearly shows that there is a significant difference between urban and rural girl students in self-confidence. Urban girl students obtained a higher mean score (152.76) on the self-concept questionnaire than their rural counterparts (140.63). The difference between the two mean scores is significant at a 0.01 level of confidence. The result indicates that urban girl students have better self-concepts than rural girl students.

Data presented in Table 3 indicates that socioeconomic status as an independent variable has effects on personality characteristics among the subjects. The mean scores of high-SES girl students on self-confidence, ambition, and overall are 32.22, 24.62, and 78.50 respectively while low-SES counterparts have a mean score of 30.43, 23.16, and 73.06 on the same traits which is significant at 0.05, 0.01, and 0.05 level of confidence respectively. But, the high-SES girl students obtained a mean score of 25.40 on sociability characteristics as compared to their low-SES counterparts (M=23.02). But this difference between mean scores was found insignificant in the t-test ( $t= 1.12$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ).

Table 4 clearly shows that there is a significant difference between high and low-SES girl students in self-confidence. High-SES girl students obtained a higher mean score (152.75) on the self-concept questionnaire than their low-SES counterparts (144.62). The difference between the two mean scores is significant at a 0.01 level of confidence. The result indicates that high-SES girl students have better self-concepts than their low-SES girl counterparts.

Table 5 indicates a significant positive correlation between self-concept and personality traits of the urban and rural girl students. The self-concept of the urban and rural girl students has been found positively correlated to sociability traits ( $r = 0.42$ ), self-confidence traits ( $r = 0.46$ ), ambition traits ( $r = 0.39$ ), and overall traits ( $r = 0.48$ ) and found significant at 0.01 level. It shows that girl subjects with better self-concept have better sociability, self-confidence, and ambitious characteristics. The result shows that the higher the self-concept of the girl subjects more organised their personality.

### IV. Conclusion:

It is concluded that the area of residence (rural and urban) is significantly related to personality characteristics (sociability, self-confidence, ambition, and overall) and self-concept of the high school girl students. Urban girl students have better personality organisation and self-concept than their rural counterparts. In the case of socioeconomic status high-SES girl students have better self-concept than their low-SES girl students. But in personality characteristics, no significant difference was observed between the high and low-SES girl students on sociability traits. High and low-SES girl students significantly differ in self-confidence, ambition, and overall personality characteristics and high-SES girls were found to be better on self-confidence, ambition, and overall personality characteristics than their low-SES counterparts. It was also observed that self-concept is positively and significantly correlated with personality characteristics (sociability, self-confidence, ambitiousness, and overall).

In personal life, classroom situations, and different social situations, thus, self-concept and personality characteristics play a very important role on the girl students, which is affected by their habitation and socioeconomic status.

### References:

- [1]. Alam, S. (2000). Psycho-social study of the adjustment problems of Muslim students. An unpublished Ph. D. thesis. Department of Psychology, M.U. Bodhgaya.
- [2]. Azizi, Y. and Jaafar, S. L. (2005). Development of self-concept. Pahang: PTS Publishing Sdn Bhd.
- [3]. Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- [4]. Baron, R. A. (2001). Psychology (Fifth Edition). Published by Pearson Education, Inc. and Dorling Kindersley Publishing Inc. (in South Asia). ISBN 978-81-7758-385-4.
- [5]. Basavanna, M. (1975). Manual for self-confidence inventory. Varanasi: Rupa Psychological Centre.
- [6]. Brook, C. A. and Schmidt, L. A. (2020). Lifespan trends in sociability: Measurement invariance and mean-level differences in ages 3 to 86 years. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 152 (August 2019). 109579.
- [7]. Dheeraj, V. K. and Bhat, S. A. (2019). Self-esteem and self-confidence among adolescents living in different socioeconomic statuses. *Suraj Punj Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*. Vol. 9, Issue 4, pp. 513-528. ISSN 2394-2886.
- [8]. Dubey, L. N. and Dubey, A. (2017). Manual for Sentence Completion Test. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- [9]. Fang, R. and Stephan, C. (2017). Higher social class predicts higher leadership ambition. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*. Vol. 2016, No. 1; doi. Org/10.5465/ambpp.2016.12654.
- [10]. Hall, C. S. and Lindzey, G. (1978). Theories of Personality. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Wiley Eastern Limited. ISBN 0 85226 352 X.
- [11]. Islamiyah, L. D., Hariastuti, R. T., and Naqiyah, N. (2018). Relationship between self-concept and socioeconomic status with student career planning in the vocational school. *Advances in Social Science, Education, and Humanities Research*. Atlantis press. Vol. 212, pp. 252-255.
- [12]. Jaykishanbhai, T. P. (2019). A comparative study of big five personality traits between urban and rural students. *International Journal of Yogic, Human Movement and Sports Sciences*. 2019, 4(1):1166-1167; ISSN: 2456-4419.
- [13]. Jonkmann, K. Becker, M., Marsh, H. W., Ludtke, O., and Trautwein, U. (2012). Personality traits moderate the Big-Fish-Little-Pond effect of academic self-concept. *Learning and Individual Difference*. 22, 736-746. Doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2012.07.020.
- [14]. Kalia, A. K. and Sahu, S. (2012). Manual for Socio-Economic Status Scale (Urban and Rural). National Psychological Corporation.
- [15]. Lone, R. A. (2021). Self-confidence among students and its impact on their academic performance: A systematic review. *International Journal of Creative Research Thought*. Vol. 9, Issue 5, May 2021, pp. 561-565. ISSN: 2320-2882.
- [16]. Mamta, N. and Sharma, N. R. (2013). Resilience and self-efficacy as correlates of well-being among the elderly persons. *J. Acad. Applied Psychol*. 39, 281-288.
- [17]. Morgan, C. T., King, R. A., Weisz, J. R., and Schopler, J. (1986). Introduction to Psychology, McGraw-Hill Book Co. Singapore.
- [18]. Najmah, P. and Yousuf, M. (2016). Personality adjustment and academic achievement of rural and urban higher secondary school students: A comparative study. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*. Vol. 2, Issue 4; April 2016, pp. 7-11. ISSN: 2455-2070.
- [19]. Parmar, S. D. (2014). Gender and economic status effect on self-esteem among college students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(1), 168-172.
- [20]. Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centred framework. In S. Koch (Ed.). *Psychology: a study of science*. Vol. 3. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959, pp. 184-256.
- [21]. Saraswat, R. K. (2019). Self-concept Questionnaire (Manual). National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- [22]. Shiner, R. L. and DeYoung, C. G. (2013). The structure of temperament and personality traits: A developmental perspective. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- [23]. Sinha, D. and Mishra, G. (1982). Deprivation and its motivational and personality correlates. In (deprivation and Its Social Roots and Psychological Consequences (Ed.). Sinha, D, Tripathi, R. C. and Misra, G. 1982. Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, Ch. 12, pp.195-209.
- [24]. Strage, A. and Brandt, T. S. (1999). Authoritative parenting and college students' academic adjustment and success. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 146-156.
- [25]. Tiller, A. E., Betsy Garrison, Block, M. E., Cramer, K., and Tiller, V. (2003). The influence of parenting style on children's cognitive development. *Undergraduate Research Journal for the Human Sciences*, 2, 1-21.
- [26]. Verma, R.B. (2018). Girls are the future of society. *Patliputra Journal of Indology*. Vol. 11, Issue 2, July 2018. ISSN: 2320-351X.
- [27]. Wankhade, V. r. (2016). Comparison of self-concept between rural and urban school-going adolescents. *International Journal of Physical Education, Sports, and Health*. 2016, 3(1): 90-93; P-ISSN: 2394-1685; E-ISSN: 2394-1693.