

Psycho-social Personality Features Among N.W.F.P. Male Population

Farhana Jahangir
Head of the Psychology Department
University of Peshawar, Peshawar, Pakistan.

The main objective of the present investigation was to study the psychological and social aspects of the personality of the participants vis-a-vis their socioeconomic status. The authors realizing the degree of importance attached to the social status in Pakistani society and its resultant characterizations of the individuals in the shape of varied interests of the classes, personality traits etc, planned the present project. For this purpose CPI and MMPI were administered upon the participants. (N=695). The design of the study was 2x3 factorial, with 2 (low-high scoring subjects on the CPI sub-scales and the neurotic triad of MMPI) and 3 (socioeconomic classes: upper-middle-lower). The results showed a significant difference between the low-high scoring subjects on the two tests, for the three socioeconomic groups .

According to Allport, Personality is the dynamic organization of those psychophysical systems within the individual that determines his unique adjustment to his environment. Personality may be defined in terms of attributes and qualities that is highly typical of an individual and is an important part of an overall impression created by others (Hall & Lindzey, 1991).

People from different socio-economic backgrounds have different learning experiences. This study emphasized the learning perspective of personality development. Experiences attached with being raised in different socio-economic status (SES) classes are thought to give way to different personality traits prevalent in that class system. People belonging to upper class for example can provide more facilities such as good schooling, exposure to media, respect from the lower classes etc. to their children and a better chance in acquiring healthy personality characteristics. Similarly being free from economic tensions save such children from developing psychological disorders.

The opposite phenomena can be seen in the lower classes i.e. having most of their energies allocated to earning, they are unable to give much time to child rearing practices and are mostly frustrated. This frustration creates a hindrance in developing useful personality traits in their children who in turn become vulnerable to develop disorders.

The interrelationships and the emotional attachments within a family differ from culture to culture and from strata to strata in a specific society.

Stratification into various strata in a society (i.e. upper-middle-lower classes) takes place to define relationship of people belonging to same group and to others on the basis of their uniqueness.

According to Stagner (1961) middle class children in almost all the cultures across the globe balance their long-term goals, hard work at school and control of their aggression in an organized way. They are expected (by parents) to be cooperative with their authorities but not at the expense of their achievement and competitiveness. On the other hand, the lower class youngsters except for socially ambitious ones, are brought up in a less controlled manner with an erratic and a less consistent disciplinary mode. Moreover, most of them experience physical and verbal abuse. Their future rests on an ambition of a secure job, good pay and not on an achievement oriented ambition with clear aims. It is due to the lack of control on parent's part that may result in delinquent behavior of the child and more and more dropouts from school. The children from lower class leave school much earlier than middle and higher classes.

Stagner further asserts that higher class is clearly distinct from other two, because of being a small group of wealthy property owners whose life style is such that even parental control does not exist, children by virtue of their wealth and other accessories can have higher education in the most prestigious institutions. They can afford an expensive living and have much permissive and organized way of life, whereas, middle class life is being more rationally ordered in

comparison with the higher and lower classes.

Lal (1987) provided an empirical evidence of the effects of socioeconomic status upon the self-perception, self-concept, self-image and self-esteem, when he studied boys and girls from high, middle and low socioeconomic classes for his research. In another study, Sacchi, Minzi & Maria (1983), examined the relationship of socioeconomic status and personality variables in Argentina. They found that high socioeconomic class students were more creative, able to express aggression in a controlled manner and were more adept to normal thinking than the lower SES subjects. Lower SES subjects showed more stereotyped thinking and inhibition of affection. In yet another research by Atherley (1991) with 213 children from different SES classes and academic ability concluded that children with low SES reported themselves to be less well-behaved and less happy than those with higher SES and ability.

Hence, it is the contention of the author of this research that successful life is to be seen in the context of one's economic level, which is directly related to the family's occupational and social status that enables individuals to attach meaning to their activity in daily life as also mentioned by Khan, Anila & Pervez (1991). Hypotheses for the present research are as under.

1. The participants belonging to upper class would score higher on CPI as compared to the participants of middle and lower classes.
2. The participants belonging to upper class would have lesser neurotic traits in comparison with those participants who belong to middle and lower classes.

Method

Sample

The sample consisted of 695 male participants who belonged to different geographic locations of North West Frontier Province (NWFP) of Pakistan. The ages of the participants ranged between 18-35 years. The participants were divided into two groups according to their educational qualification i.e. intermediate to Masters and professionals (Medical Doctors, Engineers etc.). 60 out of 695 participants belonged to upper class, 201 from middle and 434 were from lower class.

Each participant was assigned a socioeconomic class (upper-middle-lower) according to his/her annual/monthly income. Those having income of Rs. 30,000 or more were included in upper class, while participants receiving Rs. 15,000-25,000 were put in

the middle class category. Monthly income of Rs. 10,000 or less was categorized with lower class.

Instruments

1. *Personal Information Questionnaire (PIQ)* was constructed by the researcher that included age, name, education, place of residence, monthly as well as annual family income and parental education etc .

2. *California Psychological Inventory, (CPI)* .

Translated and adapted version of California Psychological Inventory (CPI) (Ahmed, 1985), which comprised of 18 subscales was used in the present study. It was initially developed at the University of California by Gough (1957) and two revisions were made in 1987 and in 1995 by the same author. From the latter two revisions, culturally loaded items have been dropped and from original 480 items the number reduced to 462 and 434 respectively. The main goal behind its development was to get the description of normal personality. Its scales principally address to personality characteristics important for social living and interaction. These scales are Dominance, Capacity for status, Sociability, Self-presence, Self-assurance, Well-being, Responsibility, Self control, Tolerance, Achievement-via independence, Intellectual efficiency, Flexibility, Socialization, Good impression, Communality, Achievement via conformance, Psych mindedness, Femininity and Law enforcement. There are four clusters of scales measuring (1) Poise, Ascendancy, Self-assurance, and Interpersonal adequacy (2) Socialization, Maturity and Social responsibility (3) Achievement potential and Intellectual efficacy (4) Personal orientation and Attitude towards life. While three of its scales: Well being, Good impression and Communality are the validity scales designed to check the fake, good, bad and highly popular responses. The CPI has mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. For the present study 12 out of 18 subscales of CPI were used because they were thought to be more relevant with the goals of the present study.

In the present investigation KR-20 reliability indices were used for the subscales of CPI for the total sample of 695 participants. The obtained indices of reliability ranged from .72 to .97 with a median value of .89.

3. *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)*.

MMPI is most widely used for both clinical and

research purposes. Translated and adapted Urdu version of MMPI (Mirza, 1977) was used in this study. It is composed of three validity indicators: Lie (L), Validity (F), correction (K) and ten clinical scales: Hypochondriasis (Hs); Depression (D); Hysteria (Hy); Psychopathic deviate (Pd); Masculinity/Femininity (Mf); Paranoia (Pa); Psychasthenia (Pt); Schizophrenia (Sc); and Hypomania (Ma). However, the reported reliability of the MMPI appears to be quite satisfactory.

Only the neurotic triad out of 13 sub-scales was used in the present study, which comprised of Hysteria (Hy), Depression (D) and Hypochondriasis (Hs) scales. The participants were arranged into low and high scorers according to the standard scores of T=70 on MMPI. The KR-20 indices of reliability indicate a high internal consistency of neurotic triad of MMPI for the present research.

For the present study the inter-correlation among the CPI and MMPI sub-scales were also established.

Research Design and procedure

In this study 2x3 factorial design was used. The participants were arranged into low and high scorers on CPI and MMPI sub-scales according to the standard scores of T=50 in case of CPI and T=70 on MMPI. Hence, the 2x3 design for CPI is: 2 (low-high scorers on CPI sub-scales) and 3 (socioeconomic classes: upper-middle-lower), and 2x3 design for MMPI is: 2 (low-high scores on MMPI neurotic triad) and the 3 (socioeconomic classes: upper-middle-lower).

CPI and MMPI were administered to the participants in a group setting, with 30 participants tested daily according to a fixed schedule and time. Before starting administration, the purpose of the study was explained to the participants and their consent was obtained to participate in the study. The participants filled the Personal Information Questionnaire after completing CPI and MMPI. The scores obtained on the two tests were transferred into standard scores by using the Install Equation Editor and double. This enabled the researcher to divide the scores into low-high categories, i.e. above and below the standard scores prescribed for the two tests.

Results

The results are presented in tables 1-4. Percentages were calculated of participants falling in the low-high score categories for three classes of socioeconomic status (upper-middle-lower) in order

to find the highest and lowest percentage of participants in a particular socioeconomic class.

Table 1

Percentages of participants in High and Low score categories on 12 sub scales of CPI for their socioeconomic status (upper-middle-lower).

Sub-scales	Score	Socio-economic status		
		Upper %	Middle %	Lower %
Do	High	30	25.3	10.6
	Low	70	74.6	89.8
Cs	High	51.7	44.8	25.8
	Low	48.3	52.2	74.2
Sy	High	25	35.3	19.8
	Low	75	64.7	80.2
Sp	High	46.7	36.8	19.1
	Low	53.3	63.1	80.9
Sa	High	63.3	66.2	47.7
	Low	36.7	33.8	52.3
Wb	High	40	31.3	17.5
	Low	60	68.7	80.5
Re	High	51.7	57.7	53.2
	Low	48.3	42.3	46.8
Sc	High	53.3	45.8	40.6
	Low	46.7	54.2	59.4
To	High	58.3	47.8	37.6
	Low	41.7	52.2	62.4
Ai	High	43.3	36.3	29.5
	Low	56.7	63.7	70.5
Ie	High	41.7	31.8	16.1
	Low	58.3	68.2	83.9
Fx	High	36.7	27.9	22.8
	Low	63.3	72.1	77.2

Note: Do = Dominance, Cs = Capacity for status, Sy = Sociability, Sp = Self-presence, Sa = Self-assurance, Wb = Well-being, Re = Responsibility, Sc = Self control, To = Tolerance, Ai = Ach-via independence, Ie = Intellectual efficiency, Fx = Flexibility

Table 1 represents the percentages of participants falling in the high-low score categories of socioeconomic status. The percentage of participants falling in the three categories: upper-middle-lower socioeconomic classes, is greater for the high scoring

participants on the 12 CPI sub-scales than the low scoring ones except for the scales; Self assurance, Sociability and Responsibility. Further, the highest percentage among the three SES categories is for the upper class followed by the middle and the lower class respectively.

Table 2
Percentages of participants according to socioeconomic status and low and high scores on the neurotic triad of MMPI.

Table-2 indicates percentage of participants

MMPI Scales	Score	Socio-economic status		
		Upper %	Middle %	Lower %
Hy	High	9.9	13.1	14.2
	Low	90.9	86.6	85.7
D	High	27.3	34.1	35.0
	Low	72.6	65.8	65.0
Hs	High	8.3	10.4	13.3
	Low	91.6	89.5	86.6

falling in the low-high score categories for their socioeconomic status (upper-middle-lower) on the neurotic triad of MMPI. The percentage of low scoring participants is greater than the high scoring participants. Moreover among high scoring participants belonging to low socioeconomic status have a high percentage followed by the middle and the upper class respectively. Whereas the low scoring subjects have an opposite percentage to the above.

Table 3
A 2x3 Chi-squared analyses between three SES groups (upper-middle-lower) and high and low scores on the neurotic triad (Hy-D-Hs) of MMPI. (df=2)
The results in Table 3 show a highly significant

Neurotic Triad	χ^2	p
Hy	53.60	.000
D	115.77	.000
Hs	52.78	.000

difference between the low-high scoring participants for the three SES classes on the neurotic triad.

Table 4 represents a 2x3 chi-square analyses of the low high scoring participants on the 12 sub-scales of CPI for their socioeconomic status.

Table 4

A 2x3 Chi-Squared Analyses between the three SES groups (Upper, Middle, Lower) and high and low scores on the 12 subscales of CPI. (df=2)

The result shows a highly significant difference

CPI Scales	χ^2	p
Dominance (Do)	32.52	.0000
Capacity for status (Cs)	31.88	.0000
Sociability (Sy)	17.74	.0000
Self presence (Sp)	35.52	.0000
Self assurance (Sa)	21.01	.0000
Well being (Wb)	24.65	.0000
Responsibility (Re)	1.31	.000
Self Control (Sc)	4.29	.000
Tolerance (To)	12.77	.000
Achievement via independence	6.30	.000
Law enforcement (Ie)	32.36	.000
Flexibility (Fx)	6.18	.000

between the low- high scoring participants on the 12 sub-scales for the socioeconomic status of the participants.

Discussion

The results of the study show that the low and high scoring participants belonging to different socioeconomic classes are significantly different on the 12 sub-scales of CPI and the neurotic triad of MMPI. The significantly differentiating sub-scales of CPI and MMPI are meant to identify strong, dominant, influential individuals, who are to take initiative and exercise leadership, have qualities that lead to ambition, self assurance, an undisturbed sense of personal worth, possessing secure and balanced self concept in contrast to those who are devoid of the above qualities. (Megargee 1972, Mckinley, Hathaway & Meehl, 1948).

It is generally considered that the social status plays a vital role in the development of personality, and this in turn shapes the relationships of people with one another and the community as a whole. This social status seems to be cuboid, for it shadows a relation with personality, the occupational and educational system, the income and the social expectancies. In other words people are expected to behave in a particular manner. Socioeconomic status is considered

to be the pillar for the healthy growth and enhancement of a family structure from a total perspective. Economic upheaval or status is a factor, which is overt and can be seen directly affecting the personality of an individual.

Since, the present investigation dealt with a study of personality characteristics through the contribution of participants socioeconomic status, therefore the result of the present study reveals that the participants belonging to the higher SES are scoring high on most of the CPI scales, followed by middle class and the lower class respectively. While on MMPI, lower class has secured the highest percentage, followed by middle class and the upper class on the neurotic triad. This trend of the data endorses hypothesis: that participants belonging to upper class would score highest on CPI and would score low on the neurotic triad of MMPI.

The second hypothesis that the participants belonging to lower class would exhibit more underlying psychological problems in comparison to the middle and the upper class is supported by the results of the study, that the participants belonging to lower class have scored the lowest on all the CPI sub-scales and the highest on the neurotic triad of MMPI. Results of the present study are in line with suggestions based on the findings of Idown and Dere (1983) who suggested as argued earlier that economic soundness leads to mental and physical satisfaction as majority of our desires could be gratified, and this economic satisfaction leads to personal worth, health, confidence, tolerance intellectual and social awareness, and a sense of achievement etc. Schultz (1993), based on his findings also suggested that the higher the socioeconomic status, the higher the aspiration level of the participants. In higher classes external influences, parental influence, extrinsic reward and intrinsic reward are the motivation to the aspirations in various fields of life. Therefore, it is of no surprise that subjects scoring high on CPI sub-scales and low on the neurotic triad have these qualities by virtue of their status. The higher socioeconomic status provides facilities and confers privileges to nurture egoistic gratifications.

While talking of the lower class performance in relation to the present study we expect income differences to be associated with some greater biological and social frustrations i.e. less palatable food, less comforts, less adequate housing has an impact and affects on a persons perception of the world he lives in (Drucker & Remmers, 1952; Atherley, 1991), hence the performance of the subjects belonging to the lower class is understood in relation

to the struggle against the increasing concentration of economic power associated with more worries, less sufficiency etc. It is therefore concluded, by referring to the results of the study that the socioeconomic status plays a pivotal role in the personality makeup of the individuals.

It can be suggested on the basis of the present study that a person belonging to lower SES has less opportunities to develop healthy personality traits which can help him in his future success. So we should keep a soft approach towards lower SES people i.e. in not setting a rigid criteria for selection of candidates for jobs, giving admission in school etc. Similarly government schools should improve their teaching so that the class difference in education at least is minimized.

References

- Ahmad I. (1985). *Development of Urdu Version of California Psychological Inventory (CPI) in Pakistan*. National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Atherley, C. A. (1991). The effects of academic achievement and socioeconomic status upon the self concept in the middle years of school: A case study. *Educational Research*, 32, 224-229.
- Drucker, A. J., & Remmers, H. H. (1952). Environmental discriminants of basic difficulty problems. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 47, 379-381.
- Gough, H. G. (1957). *Manual for the California Psychological Inventory*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Idown, I. A., & Dere, O. A. (1983). Relationship of SES and occupational aspirations of high school seniors in Nigeria and the relationship of SES and motivators for occupational preference. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 20, 186-192.
- Khan, S., Anila, K., & Pervez, S. (1991). Adaptation of Home Inventory (Infant version) for Pakistani Children. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 6, 13-23.
- Lal, J. N. (1987). Social class differences in self perception. *Psychological Research*, 10, 30-36.
- Mckinley, J. C., Hathaway, S. R., & Meehl, P. E.

(1948). The MMPI: VI: The K Scale. *Journal of consulting Psychology*, 12, 20-31.

Megargee, E. I. (1972). *The California Psychological Inventory Handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Mirza, L. (1977). *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)*. Unpublished Manual. Lahore, Pakistan.

Sacchi, C., Minzi, R., and Maria, C. (1983). Preliminary study about marginal children's personality. *Interdisciplinaria*, 4, 167-183.

Schultz, G. F. (1993). Socioeconomic advantage and

achievement motivation important mediators of academic performance in minority children in urban schools. *Urban Review*, 25, 221-222.

Stagner, R. (1961). *Psychology of personality* (3rd ed.). London: McGraw-Hill.