

A Study on Personality Adjustment of Academically Bright and Dull Secondary School Student in Kashmir Province

QAIMA JAN

Ph.D. Scholar

School of Education and Behavioural Sciences, University of Kashmir, Kashmir (J&K) India

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to identifying the personality adjustment and find significant difference of academically bright and dull secondary school students. The Sample subjects comprised of 600 hundred academically bright and dull secondary school students (300 hundred bright and 300 hundred dull students) were selected with the help of systematic random technique. The selection was made from 10th grade students of the government school in district Srinagar, Baramulla and Anantnag of Kashmir province. California Test of personality (CTP) designed by Louis P. Thorpe, Willis W. Clark and Ernest W. Tieg (1953) used to collect the data on personal and social adjustment of the sample subject. Result indicated that there is significant difference between academically bright and dull and bright male and dull male secondary school students on personality adjustment.

Key Words : Personality adjustment, Bright and Dull Students

INTRODUCTION

Adjustment holds a cardinal place in all progress and prosperity of human endeavor. Man is unable to attain the height of excellence without adjustment. Psychologically, the term adjustment is different from adaptation with respect to social and inter-personal relations of an individual in the society. Adjustment not only copes with the demands and pressures of the outside world but also needs desires and conflict experiences from within. Gates, Jersild, Crow and Crow define adjustment as the maintenance of a harmonious relationship between man and his environment. An individual need to modify himself in some way or the other to accommodate himself with his environment. On the basis of empirical studies, it is the well established fact that child's adjustment to school and academic achievement is immensely influenced by social, personal, emotional characteristics. Raju and Rahamtulla (2007) Shows in their study school variables plays important role for the adjustment of school children like the class room

in which children's are studying, medium of instruction, and the type of school management and it is also affected by Parents education and occupation. The responsible job of Educationists to focus on educational problems and made unceasing efforts to design the best methods and curriculum to meet the present need of the students. Academically bright and dull students also have been recognized as one of the important concern of education throughout the world. It has been generally observed that learners placed in an identical set of academic situations but vary in their scholastic achievement. On the basis of empirical studies, they are classified bright and dull on their rate of learning. Extensive researches have been conducted to examine the role of different variables on bright and dull students like Shubnum (2015), Khan *et al.* (2015), Nahida (2015), Bala (2014), Kit-Ling Lau and Chan (2001), Phyllis and Reznikoff (1979), Stroud (1952), Lightfoot (1951), Carroll (1930), Pyle (1915). The literature highlights that Bright and dull students studied with respective many variables like personality characteristics, Mental health, vocational interest, study

habits, adjustment, career goals, emotional intelligence, need achievement, difficulty and accuracy in a motor memory task, reading abilities.

Shubnum (2015) found that mental health of bright adolescents is better than dull adolescents. Khan *et al.* (2015) found that the Personality Characteristics of Bright adolescents are more intelligent, excitable, demanding, overactive, enthusiastic, happy-go-lucky, conscientious, persistent, and moralistic and have stronger super ego strength than the dull adolescents. Nahida (2015) found in her study that there is significant difference between bright and dull adolescents with respect their vocational and study habits. Bala (2014) Findings show that high achievers and low achievers differ from one another on one or more values. Results also shows high achievers are superior on school adjustment in comparison to low achievers, whereas, low achievers have more adjustment problems on school adjustment scale. Kit-Ling Lau and Chan (2001) the findings of the study reveal that motivational variables were important aspects in discerning under-achievers and high achievers. Study also depicts that under-achievers had poor academic attainment value in learning, low self-concept and deficiencies in using effective learning strategies, they did not demonstrate maladaptive characteristic pattern as described in Western studies. Phyllis and Reznikoff (1979) this study showed significant differences between groups with regard to their goals. Achievers aspired significantly higher than underachievers in their educational goals. In addition, they were significantly more contemporary in their career goals and more committed to these goals than the underachievers. In contrast to underachievers, achievers also had a more contemporary view of the roles women should assume in society and, on the other hand, showed more FOS in fantasies about women succeeding in contemporary roles, but these differences did not reach statistical significance. Stroud (1952) found that the bright group was judged to display reliably more of the following traits by one of the measuring instruments: achievement, affiliation, autonomy, cognizance, creativity, dominance, appearance, recognition, play, aggression, exhibition placidity. The dull group was judged to display reliably more of the following on one or more instrument; dependence, seclusion dependence, placidity and recognition. Lightfoot (1951) found in their study that there is a significant difference between two group's bright and dull children on various personality traits. Carroll (1930) found in his study that

the bright children error more with respect to single letters, the dull error more with groups of letters. The bright are clearly superior in both kind and number of errors. The principal factor in the difference is phonetic generalization, which the dull child is less able to make. Pyle (1915) found that there is possibility of determining mental differences between the bright and the dull pupils on the basis of school work success. These studies shows that bright or higher achievers remarkable and outstanding performance in worthwhile task, as compared to the dull or underachievers.

After making an in-depth study from different research journals, surveys published and unpublished thesis and dissertations. However, it is important to note the above studies signify that bright and dull students has been studied with several other variables and are explored the cause of academic success and failure of child but hardly any study which is conducted on personality adjustment of academically bright and dull secondary school students in Kashmir province. Personality adjustment is the paramount foundation for happy and contented life. Psychologically, personality adjustment helps the children to maintain the balance the demands and pressures of external world as well as needs derives and conflicts experiences from within. With this background the present investigator decided to make a humble attempt to understand the personality adjustment of academically bright and dull secondary school students.

Objectives of the study:

The study planned with the following objectives which have been formulated as under.

1. To study, personality adjustment of academically bright and dull secondary school students.
2. To compare academically bright male and dull male secondary school students on personality adjustment

Hypotheses:

The following hypotheses have been formulated for the present investigation.

1. Academically bright and dull secondary school students differ significantly on personality adjustment
2. Academically Bright male and dull male secondary school students differ significantly on personality adjustment.

Operational definition of the variables:

Personality adjustment: Personality adjustment for

the present study refers to the scores obtained by the subjects on California personality adjustment inventory. It has two dimensions,

- (a) Personal adjustment
- (b) Social adjustment

Academically bright students: Academically bright students for the present study refer to the students who have obtained 80% and above marks in their 8TH class examination.

Academically dull students: Academically dull students refer to the students who have obtained below 40% marks in their 8th class examination.

METHODOLOGY

This study falls under the category of descriptive research and survey method adopted to carry out the work.

Sample:

Looking at the nature of the study. Systematic random sampling technique was used to select the required sample of Bright and dull secondary school students. The sample for the present investigation consists of 600 students (300 bright and 300 dull) taken from the 10th grade of various secondary schools of three (3) districts in Kashmir province viz., Srinagar, Baramullla, and Anantnag. The breakup of the sample shall be as under:

Group	Three Districts			Sample	Total
	Srinagar	Baramulla	Anantnag		
Academically Bright	100	100	100	300	600
Academically Dull	100	100	100	300	

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Table 1 shows that mean comparison between academically bright and dull secondary school students on various dimensions of personal adjustment. The table reveals that bright students differ significant at 0.01 level on Self reliance (1A), Sense of personal worth (IB), Sense of personal freedom (IC), Feeling of belongingness (ID), Withdrawing tendencies, (1E), Nervous symptoms (1F) of personal adjustment. This indicates that academically bright students have more self reliant, sense of personal worth and freedom, they are enable to make cordial relationship in general, withdrawing tendencies

and freedom from nervous symptoms whereas academically dull students have lack of self reliant, personal worth and freedom, they are unable to maintain social behavior. Thus the above table stipulates that academically bright secondary school students have satisfactory personal adjustment than academically dull secondary school students. Therefore the hypothesis No. 1 which reads as “Academically Bright and dull secondary school students differ significantly on personal adjustment” stands accepted.

The Table 2, shows that the mean comparison between academically bright and dull secondary school students on various dimensions of social adjustment. The table reveals that bright students differ significantly at 0.01 level on Social Adjustment (2A), Social skill (2B), Anti-social Tendencies (2C), Family Relation(2D), School Relations (2E), Community relations (2F) of social adjustment. This indicates that academically bright students have more leadership qualities, well socially skillful, They enjoy the freedom from anti-social tendencies, well adjusted with his family, school and community whereas academically dull secondary school students have poor social adjustment, lack of social skills, having low ability to maintain relation with his family, school and community. Thus the above table stipulates that academically bright secondary school students have satisfactory social adjustment than academically dull secondary school students. Therefore the hypothesis No. 2 in which reads as “Academically Bright and dull secondary school students differ significantly on social adjustment” stands accepted.

The Table 3 shows that mean comparison between academically bright and dull secondary school students on overall personality adjustment. The table reveals that bright students differ significantly personality adjustment at 0.01 levels. This indicates that academically bright secondary school students have more self reliant, capable, optimistic, friendly relations, leadership qualities, they are well socially skilled and personally well adjusted, whereas academically dull secondary school students do not show such above characteristics. Thus from the confirmation of the above table that academically bright secondary school students have more desirable personality adjustment than the academically dull secondary school students. Therefore the hypothesis No.3 which reads as “Academically bright and dull secondary school students differ significantly on overall personality adjustment” stands accepted.

Table 1 : Mean comparison of Academically Bright and Dull secondary school students on various dimensions of Personal Adjustment

Dimensions	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significant
Self reliance	Bright Students	300	8.88	2.50	12.09	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	6.75	1.71		
Sense of personal worth	Bright Students	300	9.44	2.02	12.14	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	7.38	2.12		
Sense of personal freedom	Bright Students	300	9.23	2.10	14.04	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	6.83	2.09		
Feeling of belongingness	Bright Students	300	9.18	2.24	11.20	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	7.05	2.40		
Withdrawing tendencies	Bright Students	300	8.03	2.28	10.34	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	6.15	2.16		
Nervous symptoms	Bright Students	300	6.38	2.02	10.89	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	8.28	2.23		
Personal Adjustment	Bright Students	300	53.03	8.13	19.35	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	40.55	7.65		

Table 2 : Mean comparison of Academically Bright and Dull secondary school students on various dimensions and of Social Adjustment

Dimensions	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significant
Social Adjustment	Bright Students	300	8.78	1.55	15.74	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	6.61	1.81		
Social skill	Bright Students	300	8.64	1.63	17.51	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	6.25	1.71		
Anti-social Tendencies	Bright Students	300	8.26	2.26	13.20	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	5.98	1.95		
Family Relation	Bright Students	300	8.93	2.07	12.44	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	6.81	2.10		
School Relations	Bright Students	300	8.63	1.90	13.42	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	6.57	1.85		
Community relations	Bright Students	300	9.19	1.69	11.23	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	7.37	2.23		
Social Adjustment	Bright Students	300	52.44	6.53	22.68	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	39.60	7.31		

Table 3 : Mean comparison of Academically Bright and Dull secondary school students on various dimensions of overall Personality Adjustment

Dimensions	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significant
Personality Adjustment	Bright Students	300	105.48	13.09	23.95	Significant at 0.01 level
	Dull Students	300	80.14	12.80		

The Table 4 shows that mean comparison between academically bright male and the dull male secondary school students on various dimensions of personal adjustment. The table illustrate that bright male students differ significant at 0.01 level on Self reliance (1A), Sense of personal worth (IB), Sense of personal freedom (IC), Feeling of belongingness (ID), Withdrawing tendencies, (1E), Nervous symptoms (1F) of personal adjustment.

this indicates that academically bright students have more self reliant, sense of personal worth and freedom, feeling of belongingness, withdrawing tendencies and freedom from nervous symptoms whereas academically dull students lack of self reliant, lack of personal worth and freedom, having no good social behavior. Thus the above table stipulates that academically bright male secondary school students have satisfactory personal adjustment than

academically dull male secondary school students. Therefore the hypothesis No.4 which reads as “Academically Bright male and dull male secondary school students differ significantly on personal adjustment” stands accepted.

The Table 5 shows that the mean comparison between academically bright male and dull male secondary school students on various dimensions of social adjustment. The table reveals that bright male students differ significantly at 0.01 level on Social Adjustment (2A), Social skill (2B), Anti-social Tendencies (2C), Family Relation (2D), School Relations (2E), Community relations (2F) of social adjustment. This indicates that

academically bright male students have more leadership qualities, well socially skillful, they have ability to well adjusted with his family, school and community whereas academically dull male secondary school students have poor social adjustment, having low ability to maintain relation with his family, school and community. Study also no significant differences have been found between two groups on dimension social skill and antisocial tendencies. This signifies both the groups have same level of confidence. Thus the Table 4 stipulates that academically bright male secondary school students have satisfactory social adjustment than academically dull male secondary school students. Therefore the hypothesis No. 5 which

Table 4 : Mean comparison of Academically Bright Male and Dull Male secondary school students on various dimensions of Personal Adjustment

Dimensions	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Sig.
Self reliance IA	Bright Male	119	8.87	1.68	9.67	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	6.89	1.60		
Sense of personal worth IB	Bright Male	119	9.43	2.05	8.06	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	7.38	2.02		
Sense of personal freedom IC	Bright Male	119	9.24	1.97	10.45	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	6.62	2.03		
Feeling of belongingness ID	Bright Male	119	9.17	2.32	7.72	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	6.90	2.37		
Withdrawing tendencies IE	Bright Male	119	8.28	2.20	8.15	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	6.06	2.15		
Nervous symptoms IF	Bright Male	119	6.25	1.75	8.67	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	8.40	2.17		
Personal	Bright Male	119	53.39	12.01	8.74	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	40.10	12.39		

Table 5 : Mean comparison of Academically Bright Male and Dull Male secondary school students on various dimensions of Social Adjustment

Dimensions	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Sig.
Social Adjustment 2A	Bright Male	119	8.61	1.66	9.69	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	6.56	1.71		
Social skill 2B	Bright Male	119	6.14	3.42	1.62	Insignificant
	Dull Male	139	5.60	1.78		
Anti-social Tendencies 2C	Bright Male	119	5.09	3.23	1.36	Insignificant
	Dull Male	139	5.53	1.83		
Family Relation 2D	Bright Male	119	9.00	2.09	8.63	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	6.84	1.93		
School Relations 2E	Bright Male	119	8.76	1.97	9.30	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	6.59	1.77		
Community relations 2F	Bright Male	119	9.16	1.84	7.04	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	7.28	2.36		
Social	Bright Male	119	46.22	14.24	4.48	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	38.94	11.41		

Table 6 : Mean comparison of Academically Bright Male and Dull Male secondary school students on various dimension and composite score of overall personality adjustment

	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Sig.
Personality Adjustment	Bright Male	119	106.19	12.29	17.37	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Dull Male	140	79.49	12.35		

reads as “Academically Bright male and dull male secondary school students differ significantly on social adjustment” stands accepted.

The Table 5 shows that mean comparison between academically bright male and dull male secondary school students on overall personality adjustment. The table reveals that bright male students differ significantly at 0.01 level on personality adjustment. This indicates that bright male students have more self reliant, capable, optimistic, friendly relations, leadership qualities, socially skillful and well adjusted, whereas academically dull secondary school students do not show such above characteristics. Thus from the confirmation of the above table that academically bright secondary school students have more desirable personality adjustment than the academically dull secondary school students. Therefore the hypothesis No.6 which reads as “Academically bright male and dull male secondary school students differ significantly on personality adjustment stands accepted”.

The above results are in line with the previous studied like Ganzanfar (2009), Ara (2015), Singh (2013), George (1966), Ghose and Khuram (1986), Sangeeta and Chirag (2012).

Ganzanfar (2009) found that high gifted boys and girls had better personal and social adjustment than the low gifted boys and girls. Ara (2015) found that bright adolescents are over all adjusted, autonomous, possesses independence and self-determination in thinking than the dull adolescents. Singh (2013) who found that high academic achiever is significantly better in terms of their level of adjustment. George (1966) found that pupils with high intelligence were identified as better adjusted. Ghose and Khuram (1986) found that there was no significant difference between boys and girls in their level of adjustment. Sangeeta and Chirag (2012) in their study found that students with high academic achievement have less adjustment problems and students with low academic achievements have more adjustment problems.

REFERENCES

- Ara, S. S (2015). Mental Health of Bright and Dull Adolescents, *J. Humanities Soc. Sci. & Education*, **2** (4): 43-51
- Bala (2014). Values and Adjustment Problems of High Achievers and Low Achievers. *Internat. J. Educational Planning & Administration*, **4** (2) : 113-118.
- Bliesmer, E.P. (1954). Reading abilities of bright and dull children of comparable mental ages. *J. Educational Psychology*, **45**(6): 32-331.
- Carroll, H. A. (1930). Generalization of bright and dull children, A comparative study with special reference to spelling. *J. Educational Psychology*, **21** : 489-499.
- Cornell Dewey, G. and Grossberg Ingrid, W. (2013). On Family Environment and Personality Adjustment in Gifted Program Children. *J. Gifted Child Quarterly*, **31** (2): 59-64.
- Ganzanfar, S. (2009). Personality Adjustment of Gifted Adolescents, Unpublished M.ed dissertation, Department of Education, University of Kashmir.
- George, E.I. (1966). A Comparative Study of the Adjustment And Achievement of 10 Years and 11 Years Schooling in Kerala State. Third Survey of Educational Research, 1966, 664
- Khan, M.A, Ganaie, M.Y. and Ara, S S (2015) Personality Characteristics of Bright and Dull Adolescents. *Researcher*, **7**(3):36-43.
- Kit-Ling, L. and David, W.C. (2010). Motivational characteristics of under-achievers in Hong Kong. *Internat. J. Experimental Educational Psychology*, Vol **21**.
- Lightfoot, G.F. (1951) “Personality characteristics of bright and dull children”, *The Elementary School Journal*, Vol. **5**. Bureau publication.
- Nahida (2015). A study of vocational interest and study habits of Bright and Dull Adolescents, unpublished dissertation, Kashmir university Department of education.
- Phyllis, Topol and Reznikoff, Marvin (1979). Achievers and underachievers: A comparative study of fear of success, education and career goals, and conception of woman's role among high school senior girls. *Sex Roles*, **5** (1) : 85-92.
- Pyle, W.H. (1915). A psychological study of bright and dull pupils. *J. Educational Psychology*, **6** : 151-156.
- Raju, M.V.R. and Rahamtulla, T. Khaja (2007). Adjustment

- Problems among School Students. *J. Indian Academy Applied Psychology*, **33** (1) : 73-79.
- Renu, B (2014). Values and Adjustment Problems of High Achievers and Low Achievers. *Internat. J. Educational Planning & Administration*, **4** : 113-118.
- Sangeeta and Chirag (2012). A Study Of Adjustment Problems of College Students in relation to Gender, Socio-Economic Status & Academic Achievement. *Internat. J. Behavioral Social & Movement Sciences*, **1**(2) : 46.
- Singh, S.K. (2013). Anxiety and Adjustment Pattern of High and Low Academic Achievers. *Global Research Analysis*, **2** (1).
- Stroud, J.B. (1952). Personality Characteristics of Bright and Dull Children. *J. Educational Psychology*, **43**(8) : . 499-500.
- Topol, P. and Marvin, R (1979). Comparative study of fear of success, education and career goals, and conception of woman's role among high school senior girls sex roles. *J. Res.*, **5** (1) : 85-92.
