PERSONALITY AND INTEREST PATTERN OF MEN IN DIFFERENT OCCUPATIONS AT ESCORTS LIMITED, FARIDABAD

Monika Mahindra and Dr. K. Bharathi Kumari

ABSTRACT

The main objective of the present study is to find out the personality and interest pattern HRD personnel managers, computer professionals and engineers. The sample for the present investigation consisted of 75 professionals taken from three professional groups i.e HRD personnel manager, computer professionals and engineers. The sample consisted of 75 subjects representing 25 from each group. The 16 PF questionnaire (Cattell, 1951) and Thurstones interest schedule (Thurstone, 1948) were administered to all the people. The subjects were classified into very good and acceptable on the basis of performance and potential assessments Performa used at Escort Limited. The salient findings of the study were as follows. The HRD personal manager and computer professionals and engineers differed significantly in E,F,G and H factors. The HRD personnel managers and engineers have not differed significantly.

In the interest area there is significant difference between the HRD personnel and computer professionals in humanities. There is no significant difference in the computer professionals and engineers as far as interest is concerned. The predominant interest is in executive area for HRD personnel manager where as the computer professionals predominant interest is in physical sciences and executive area. The engineers have obtained highest mean in physical sciences.

Keywords: Personality, Interest Patterns, Escorts Limited.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is generally believed that individuals differ widely in their native capacity. The need for vocational guidance becomes greater each year because of rapidly charging economic and social conditions. According to Holland there are six personality types that explain human behaviour and determine an individuals preference for a particular vocation. They are the realistic type the investigative type, the artistic type, the social type the enterprising type and the conventional type.

The concept of interest focus attention on the cathected objects and modes of activity rather than upon the needs that are enraged. Shane points out that interest is something with which the child identifies the personal well being. Interest is present when we are aware of our set disposition towards the object. We like the object when we are prepared to react toward it. Interest is a tendency to give attention to be attached by to like and find satisfaction in an activity object or person.

Brown and Cross (1993) compared personality profiles of first year engineering students. Results showed no significant differences between white African – American and the female students. Factor analysis revealed 8 factors from the first year students scores namely effectiveness, over assertive, likeable demanding, analytical, cool façade logical interpretation and positive self regard.

According to Harris (1994) engineering students were found to be high on cognitive structure and endurance.

Brown and Joslin (1995) compared male and female engineering students on personality characteristics measured by Adjective checklist. Compared to college norms group the engineering students tend to be more dependable, responsible productive, hard working goal directed, forceful, determined and outspoken. Brown (1997) examined whether there are significant racial differences in measured personality characteristics for female engineering majors. Results showed significant mean differences between black and white women with black women having higher mean score on achievement dominance, counselling readiness, self confidence, military leadership, masculinity and A-4.

Gaeddert and Hanson (1993) developed a composite measure of interest diversity and identified gender differences in interest diversity and as well as occupational group differences.

The four quadrant model of personality explains four personality types. They are analytical, driver, expressive and amiable. The analytic type is perfectionists by nature and always do any of the tasks they take up. The next is driver personality and they are known to be very dominating. They are the in born leaders and do not take the perspective of others. The third is the expressive type who is enjoying the social event. They are sensitive, compassionate and thoughtful. They can make friends very easily. The fourth is amiable who

conform to the wishes of others and they are rational, caring and are keen observers as well. The HR professionals while recruiting people look for personality types test.

Several studies have focused on personality types in computer science and engineering. Some of the important studies are by McCauley et al (1987) Felder and Silverman (1988) Thomas et al (2002) Silton and Chmelis (1984) Bush and Schkade (1985) and Hardiman (1997).

II.OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of the study are

1. To find out the predominant personality factors of different professionals groups, (HRD and personnel managers, computer professionals and engineers) at Escorts Ltd.
2. To find out the predominant interest of different professionals groups, (HRD and personnel managers, computer professionals and engineers) at Escorts Ltd.

III. HYPOTHESIS

1. There is no significant difference in the personalities of computer professionals, engineers, HRD and personnel managers.
2. There is no significant difference in the interests of computer professionals, engineers, HRD and personnel managers.

IV.METHODOLOGY

A. Procedure:

The sample was drawn from Computer Professionals who were employed at Escorts Limited, Agri Machinery Group, Faridabad. As group testing was not possible, the sampled individuals were approached individually and requested to complete the two tests, namely, (a) The 16PF Test and (b) Thurstone Interest Schedule in two sessions. Although, full and clear instructions were written on each of the tests, the investigator first, familiarized the testees with these two tests and made them clear all about the tests and the manner in which they had to respond to the test items. They were requested to go through the instructions of each test before actually starting to respond to the tests.

The supervisor of the testee was approached to provide evaluation to the testee on the performance appraisal form used in the Company. The supervisors

followed the clear cut directions printed on the performance appraisal form. Each supervisor was requested to be objective in his rating of the person concerned.
In this manner, 25 computer professionals, 25 engineers and 25 HRD and personnel manages were tested.

B. Sample:
The sample of the present investigation consisted of a total of 25 computer Professionals, 25 engineers and 25 HRD and personnel managers. It was a randomly selected sample and hence, their ages were not given due importance. However, care was taken to select only those individuals who had one year of experience in their present job at Escorts Limited.

C. Description of the tools:
In the research study carried out at Escorts Limited, the following tools have been used for the collection of the data.

1. 16PF Questionnaire (Cattell, 1957)
2. Thurstone Interest Schedule (Thurstone, 1984)
3. Performance Review & Potential Assessment Perform used at Escort Limited.

V. RESULTS
Table 1 (a) is the mean table for HRD personnel manager and computer professionals. The highest mean was for factor H in both the groups where as the lowest mean was for factor B (less intelligent vs more intelligent). Much difference is not, there between the two groups with the exception for factor F (t=2.07*) and G (t=2.46*). The HRD personnel manager has obtained higher mean than the computer professionals.
In Table 1 (b) the highest mean was obtained for the personality factor H and the lowest was for factor B in both the computer professionals and engineers. Both the groups have obtained the average sten value of 5 and 6 respectively. Both the groups differed significantly in the personality factors R, F, G and H (t=3.47**, 2.08*, 3.15** and 2.37* respectively). The engineers has obtained higher mean in 8 factors than the computer professionals. The scores were converted into stens and both the groups has obtained average sten value.
In Table 1 (c) the highest mean was for personality factor H and the lowest was for B. Both the groups has obtained the average category when scores were converted into stens.

The table 2(a) indicates that the highest mean was obtained for interest area E (11.04) for the HRD-Personnel Managers and PS (10.72) for the Computer Professionals. On the other hand, the lowest mean was found to be for the interest 10.96. Thus, the predominant interests of the two groups lie in the humanitarian area with HRD-Personnel Managers showing a greater interest.
The data in Table 2 (b) indicates that the highest mean and the lowest mean was obtained from interest areas PS and M respectively, for both the sample groups, namely, Computer professionals and Engineers. There is no significant difference in the groups.

From the table 2 (c) it is clear that the interest areas E and PS have the highest mean value for the HRD-personnel Manages and Engineers respectively. The lowest mean value is for the interest area M in both the groups. Much significant difference is not there in the mean values of the two groups. The only exception is area H ($t = 2.82^*$). The HRD-Personnel Managers has significantly more interest in the humanitarian field than the Engineers.

VI. DISCUSSION

Hypothesis I states that there is no significant difference among the different personality factors for the three sample groups. The hypothesis pertains to the interpretations of the table 1 (a), (b) and (c).

The results of the table 1(a) showing the comparison between HRD –Personnel Managers and Computer Professionals the highest mean is for the factor H for both the groups. From the profile, it is clear that sten value of 6 is an average score. A high score on personality factor H indicates that the person is venturesome, uninhibited, socially bold, and spontaneous whereas a low score indicates that a person is shy, restrained and diffident. But since in both groups, there is an average sten score, such groups are likely to fall in between such qualities. However, there is a significant difference in the mean values of two personality factors, F and G for t he two groups which indicates that the former group falls in the average categories. Thus, HRD-Personnel group is likely to be happy-go-lucky, impulsive lively and at the same time sober and prudent than the other group. Thus, since significant differences have been found in the personality factors of the two groups, the nul hypothesis is rejected.
The results of table 1 (b) shows the comparison between Computer Professionals and Engineers. The highest mean was for the factor H for both the groups. A high score on personality factor H indicates that the person in venturesome,

uninhibited, socially hold, and spontaneous whereas a low score indicates that a person is shy, restrained and diffident. But since in both groups, there is an average sten score, such groups are likely to possess a personality in between such qualities. However, there is a significant difference in the mean values for personality factors E, F,G and H with the Engineers scoring higher mean values. The sten values are average thus; this group is more likely to show characteristics, which are in between humble and assertive, independent and accommodating, aggressive and conforming, serious and gay, expedient and conscientious, venturesome and shy, uninhibited and restrained. The Computer professionals show less of these characteristics. Thus, since there are significant differences in the two groups in their personality factors the nul hypothesis is rejected.

The results of table 1 (c) shows the comparison between HRD-Personnel Managers and Engineers. The highest mean is obtained for the factor H for both the groups. From the profile, it is clear that sten value is an average score of 6. a high score on personality factor H indicates that the person is venturesome, uninhibited, socially bold.

Hypothesis 2 states that there is no significant difference among the different interest areas for the three sample groups.

This hypothesis pertains to the interpretations of the table 2 (a), (b) and (c). These tables indicate whether there is any significant difference in the interest areas when any two groups are compared.

The results of table 2 (a) showing the comparison between HRD-Personnel managers and Computer professionals indicates that the highest mean was obtained for interest area E (11.04) for the HRD-Personnel managers and PS (10.72) for the Computer professionals. On the other hand, the lowest mean was found to be for the interest area M for both the groups. We can also interpret from the table that there is not much significant difference in the mean values of both the groups. The only significant difference was found for the interest area H (1.96). It is found that in this significant mean difference value, the HRD-Personnel Managers have higher mean value of 10.96. Thus, the predominant interest of the two groups lie in the humanitarian area with HRD-Personnel Managers showing a greater interest. Besides this, they are also interested in executive jobs while Computer professionals are also interested in

physical sciences. Both the groups have least interest in music. This result shows that both the groups have right people for the right jobs. Because of a significant difference found, the hypothesis 5 is rejected.

The results of table 2 (b) indicates that the highest mean and the lowest mean was obtained for interest areas PS and M respectively, for both the sample groups, namely, Computer professional and Engineers 1-test values indicate that there is no significant difference in the means of the two groups. Thus, hypothesis 2 is accepted. This shows that both the groups have predominant interests in physical sciences and music. Since, both are from technical field, this result can be considered to be right.

REFERENCES

Bishop-Clark, C. (1995). Cognitive style, personality, and computer programming. Computers in Human Behavior, 11(2) 241-260.

Brown (1997) Description of personality similarities and differences of a sample of black and white female engineering students. *Psychological report*. 81, 703-610.

Brown and Cross (1993) Retention in engineering and personality. *Educational and Psychological measurement*. 53, 661-671.

Brown and Joslin (1995) Comparison of female and male engineering students. *Psychological reports*. 77, 35-41.

Bush, C. M., & Schkade, L.L. (1985). In search of the perfect programmer. Datamation, 31(6), 128-132.

Cattell, R.F. et al (1957) The 16PF manual New Delhi. The Psycho Centre.

Felder, R.M., & Silkverman, L.K. (1988). Learning and teaching styles in engineering education. *Engineering Education*, 78, 674-681.

Gaeddert and Hansen (1993) Development of a measure of interest diversity. *Journal of Career Assessment*. 1, 294-308.

Hadiman, L.T. (1997). Personality types and software engineers. *Computer,* 30(10), 10.

Harris (1994) perceptions of engineering nursing and psychology students personality. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*. 26, 484-491.

Hoermann and Maschke (1996). On the relation between personality and job performance of airline pilots. *International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, 6, 171-178.

Jackson and Corr (1998) personality performance correlation at work. Individual and aggregate levels of analysis. *Personality and individual differences*. 24, 815-920.

Piedmont and Weinstein (1994) Predicting supervisor ratings of job performance using the NEO personality inventory. *Journal of Psychology*, 128, 255-265.

Sitron, S., & Ghmelir, G. (1984). The intuitive computer programmer. *Datamation*, 30(20), 137-140.

Smith, D.C. (1989). The personality of the systems analyst: An investigation. *ACM Computer Personnel*, 12(2), 12-14.

Thoms, L., Ratcliffe M., Woodbury, J., & Jaman, E. (2002). Learning styles and performance in the introductory programming sequence. *Proceedings of SIGCSE'02*, PP.33-37.

Thurstone L.L. (1948) Thurstone interest schedule. Agra National Psychological Corporation.

Toshima (1993) Standardization of an integrated aptitude test for system engineers, intellectual abilities and personality factors. *Japanese psychological research*. 35, 182-192.

Table 1 (a) Means, Standard Deviations and the t-test Value of each personality factor for two sample groups.

Personality Factor	HRD-Personnel Managers		Computer professionals		t-test Value
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
A	10.12	2.26	10.08	3.35	0.05
B	6.52	1.96	6.08	1.96	0.80
C	12.92	4.12	12.88	3.71	0.04
E	14.48	4.71	12.44	2.62	1.89
F	15.04	3.72	12.80	3.84	2.09*
G	12.76	3.56	10.60	2.57	2.32*
H	15.96	4.69	13.92	3.46	1.47
I	9.88	3.75	9.36	2.29	0.99
L	9.08	2.66	10.44	2.84	1.78
M	13.04	3.21	12.32	4.10	0.69
N	9.36	2.41	9.44	2.93	0.11
O	11.64	4.20	12.88	5.08	1.2
Q1	9.60	2.83	9.64	2.41	0.05
Q2	8.04	3.19	8.84	3.70	0.82
Q3	10.64	3.38	11.16	3.56	0.53
Q4	11.20	4.09	12.64	4.91	1.13

Table 1 (b) Means, Standard Deviations and the t-test Value of each personality factor for two sample groups.

Personality Factor	Computer Professionals		Engineers		t-test Value
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
A	10.08	3.35	9.44	3.19	0.69
B	6.08	1.96	6.44	3.03	0.50
C	12.88	3.71	11.28	3.90	1.48
E	12.44	2.62	16.12	4.59	3.47**
F	12.80	3.84	14.80	2.90	2.15*
G	10.60	2.57	13.40	3.65	3.18**
H	13.92	3.46	16.36	3.83	2.34*
I	9.36	2.29	8.32	2.54	1.12
L	10.44	2.84	9.32	2.58	1.46
M	12.32	4.10	13.32	3.85	0.89
N	9.44	2.93	9.12	3.28	0.36
O	12.88	5.08	12.64	3.44	0.20
Q1	9.64	2.41	9.00	3.10	0.82
Q2	8.84	3.70	9.08	3.83	0.22
Q3	11.16	3.56	10.72	2.46	0.51
Q4	12.64	4.91	12.72	3.53	0.07

Table 1 (c) Means, Standard Deviations and the t-test Value of each personality factor for two sample groups.

Personality Factor	HRD-Personnel Managers		Engineers		t-test Value
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
A	10.12	2.26	9.44	3.19	0.87
B	6.52	1.96	6.44	3.03	0.11
C	12.92	4.12	11.28	3.90	1.44
E	14.48	4.71	16.12	4.59	1.24
F	15.04	3.72	14.80	2.90	0.26
G	12.76	3.56	13.40	3.65	0.63
H	15.96	4.69	16.36	3.83	0.33
I	9.88	3.75	8.32	2.54	1.65
L	9.08	2.66	9.32	2.58	0.32
M	13.04	3.21	13.32	3.85	0.28
N	9.36	2.41	9.12	3.28	0.29
O	11.64	4.20	12.64	3.44	0.92
Q1	9.60	2.83	9.00	3.10	0.71
Q2	8.04	3.19	9.08	3.83	1.47
Q3	10.64	3.38	10.72	2.46	0.10
Q4	11.20	4.09	12.72	3.53	1.41

Table 2 (a) Means, Standard Deviations of each interest area for two sample groups

Interest Area	HRD-Personnel Managers		Computer professionals		t-test Value
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
PS	9.64	3.96	10.72	3.90	0.97
BS	6.52	3.70	7.44	4.17	0.83
C	8.12	2.73	8.08	4.06	0.04
B	8.16	2.69	9.08	4.47	0.89
E	11.04	3.85	10.24	3.63	0.76
P	8.36	3.00	7.88	4.42	0.45
L	10.92	3.91	9.00	4.39	1.63
H	10.96	3.51	8.92	3.80	1.96*
A	8.04	4.87	8.12	4.01	0.07
M	6.20	4.08	6.92	3.73	0.65

Table 2 (b) Means, Standard Deviations of each interest area for two sample groups

Interest Area	Computer professionals		Engineers		t-test Value
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
PS	10.72	3.90	11.36	2.93	0.65
BS	7.44	4.17	7.08	4.48	0.26
C	8.08	4.06	7.2	3.33	0.84
B	9.08	4.47	8.72	3.03	0.33
E	10.24	3.63	10.08	4.28	0.14
P	7.88	4.42	7.64	3.05	0.22
L	9.00	4.39	9.16	4.50	0.13
H	8.92	3.80	8.28	3.2	0.65
A	8.12	4.01	9.08	4.09	0.84
M	6.92	3.73	7.04	4.19	0.11

Table 2 (c) Means, Standard Deviations of each interest area for two sample groups

Interest Area	HRD-Personnel Managers		Engineers		t-test Value
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
PS	9.64	3.96	11.36	2.93	1.74
BS	6.52	3.70	7.08	4.48	0.48
C	8.12	2.73	7.2	3.33	1.07
B	8.16	2.69	8.72	3.03	0.61
E	11.04	3.85	10.08	4.28	0.84
P	8.36	3.00	7.64	3.05	0.84
L	10.92	3.91	9.16	4.50	1.49
H	10.96	3.51	8.28	3.2	2.85
A	8.04	4.87	9.08	4.09	0.84
M	6.20	4.08	7.04	4.19	0.68

Dr. Bharathi Kumari is retired professor from Department of Psychology, Jamia Millia Ismalia, New Delhi. She is having more than 3 decades of research and teaching experience in institutes of national repute. She has guided more than forty PG dissertations and four Ph.D. dissertations.