

## **Personality development among Student teachers of colleges of education**

**M.Senthilkumar, M.Sc.,M.Ed.,M.Phil.,(Edn)**

*Assistant Professor, PKD College of Education, Pollachi 642002, Coimbatore DT*

### **Introduction**

The learning is the change in behavior. Education gives opportunities for an individual to understand his innate potentialities. In the olden days, the taught had to reach the places where education was available. Modern concept of education is that it should reach the doorsteps of the individuals and create chances for them to develop themselves. According to Kothari Commission (Indian Education Commission 1964-66) the destiny of the country is decided in the classroom. It very well shows that the role of the teacher is important in shaping the future citizens of the country. As is the teacher so is the teaching; as is the teaching so is the student.

The review of many research studies has indicated that the personality of the teacher is reflected in the behaviour of the students. This naturally necessitates the personality development of the teacher. Unless the teacher is a man with good personality, he cannot help the students to develop their personality. So education at present is not the question of survival of fittest as it was. Now it is the matter of developing adjustment to environment, neighbours, society in which one lives. Now, true education lies only on academic achievement. It is decided by many other factors such as optimistic approach, adjustment, endurance, hard work, free expression, clear thought and action etc. If we put together all the terms, it is nothing but 'Integrated Personality' which is the ultimate aim of any educational institution, any organization.

### **Objectives of the study**

- To study the personality development among student teachers of colleges of education.
- To find out the difference between the personality of the student-teachers on the basis of gender, locality, nature of colleges, subjects of their study and educational qualification such as graduation and post graduation.

**Hypotheses**

1. There is no significant difference between male and female student teachers in their personality.
2. There is no significant difference between rural and urban student teachers in their personality.
3. There is no significant difference between Government and Aided student teachers in their personality.
4. There is no significant difference between Self finance and Aided student teachers in their personality.
5. There is no significant difference between Government and Self finance student teachers in their personality.
6. There is no significant difference between Arts and Science teachers in their personality.
7. There is no significant difference between Undergraduate and Post graduate student teachers in their personality.

**Method and tool used in the study**

The investigator adopted survey method for the present investigation and he selected self constructed questionnaire as the tool for this study. The reliability coefficient of the tool is 0.83.

**Sample and sampling technique of the Study**

A total 300 of student teachers of colleges of education were chosen as the sample and for this selection, Stratified Random Sampling technique was employed.

**Delimitations of the study**

The present study was made only with student teachers of Coimbatore District only and confined only to B.Ed learners. The investigator has made generalisations in this study on the basis of the responses of the student teachers of colleges of education to the various items of the tool used for the present study.

**Analysis of Data and Discussion**

The investigator used the t -test in order to find out significant difference in the personality of Student teachers.

The table 1 shows the Mean, SD and t- value of Personality Score with respect to gender, locality, nature of colleges, subjects of their study and educational qualification such as graduation and post graduation.

Hypothesis	With respect to	Variable	Mean	SD	t-value	Remarks
1	Gender	Male	113.90	09.51	1.7549	Accepted
		Female	115.61	07.58		
2	Locality	Rural	108.53	24.21	6.0400	Rejected
		Urban	120.99	07.01		
3	Nature of colleges	Govt	114.88	19.34	0.7352	Accepted
		Aided	113.38	06.53		
4	Nature of colleges	Self finance	101.12	38.21	3.1600	Rejected
		Aided	113.38	06.53		
5	Nature of colleges	Govt	114.88	19.34	3.2100	Rejected
		Self finance	101.12	38.21		
6	Subject	Arts	114.31	09.61	1.2903	Accepted
		Science	115.31	00.17		
7	Qualification	Under graduate	114.88	08.14	0.4810	Accepted
		Post graduate	114.38	09.25		

1. From the above table it is clear that the t- value 1.75 is less than the table value at 5% significant level. This reveals that there is no significant difference between student teachers in their personality with respect to gender. Hence the null hypothesis 'There is no significant difference between male and female student teachers in their personality' is accepted.
2. From the above table it is clear that the t- value 6.04 is greater than the table value at 5% significant level. This reveals that there is a significant difference between student teachers in their personality with respect to locality. Hence the null hypothesis 'There is no significant difference between rural and urban student teachers in their personality.' is rejected. When compared to mean value of personality scores it also reveals that urban student teachers have perceived more personality development than rural student teachers.

3. From the above table it is clear that the t- value 0.73 is less than the table value at 5% significant level. This reveals that there is no significant difference between student teachers in their personality with respect to nature of colleges in accordance with government and aided colleges. Hence the null hypothesis 'There is no significant difference between Government and Aided student teachers in their personality.' is accepted.
4. From the above table it is clear that the t- value 3.16 is greater than the table value at 5% significant level. This reveals that there is a significant difference between student teachers in their personality with respect to nature of colleges in accordance with self finance and aided colleges. Hence the null hypothesis 'There is no significant difference between Self finance and Aided student teachers in their personality.' is rejected. When compared to mean value of personality scores it also reveals that student teachers of aided colleges have perceived more personality development than student teachers of self finance colleges.
5. From the above table it is clear that the t- value 3.21 is greater than the table value at 5% significant level. This reveals that there is a significant difference between student teachers in their personality with respect to nature of the colleges in accordance with government and self finance. Hence the null hypothesis 'There is no significant difference between Government and Self finance student teachers in their personality.' is rejected. When compared to mean value of personality scores it also reveals that student teachers of government colleges have perceived more personality development than student teachers of self finance colleges.
6. From the above table it is clear that the t- value 1.29 is less than the table value at 5% significant level. This reveals that there is no significant difference between student teachers in their personality with respect to subjects. Hence the null hypothesis 'There is no significant difference between Arts and Science teachers in their personality.' is accepted.
7. From the above table it is clear that the t- value 0.48 is less than the table value at 5% significant level. This reveals that there is no significant difference between student teachers in their personality with respect to qualification. Hence the null hypothesis 'There is no significant difference

between Undergraduate and Post graduate student teachers in their personality.' is accepted.

#### **Implications of the study**

In the light of the research findings and the experience gained by the investigator during informal discussions and interviews with the students of B.Ed colleges, the following are the recommended for the personality development of the student teachers.

- Learning to relax
- Practice Acceptance
- Talk rationally to yourself
- Get Organized
- Exercise
- Reduce Time Urgency
- Quiet Time
- Watch Your Habits
- Spend Time with Friends

#### **Conclusion**

In the modern world, the student-teachers are facing many problems both inside and outside of the campus. The development of modern technology and mass media has great impact on the personality development of the student-teachers of B.Ed course. The development of the personality traits of the student-teachers definitely contributes not only the progress of the individual personality but also the entire society. As is the learning, so is the student. Therefore it is always important to see that the teacher maintains balanced emotional maturity. In this study the investigator attempted to bring out the personality of the student-teachers of B.Ed colleges. The college authorities should understand their responsibility in creating a good college atmosphere so that the student-teachers of Bed course can develop integrated personality. This will help them to become a contributing member of this society.

**Reference**

1. Adler. A (1930) The practice and theory of individual psychology. New York.
2. Aggarwal, Y.P. (1988). Statistical Methods: Concepts, Application and Computation. 2<sup>nd</sup> Revised Ed., New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Ltd.
3. All port. G.(1955) Becoming Basic considerations for a psychology of personality (New Haven Conn : Yale)
4. Arun Kapur. 2007. Transforming Schools, Empowering Children, Sage Publication, New Delhi.
5. Batta, P.C. "Exploring Cultural Perspectives in Education" A research paper, May 3-6, 2007 at Glasgow, Scotlan
6. Best J.W. (1962). Research in Education. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. New Delhi: Prentice
7. Hall of India Private Limited.
8. Bonnet, Gabrielle. Quarterly Review of Comparative Education, v38 n3
9. p325-344 Sep 2008
10. Chaliha Mala (1996). Indian Educational Abstracts. Indian Journal of
11. Psychometry
12. and Education Vol. 27(2) 87-92.
13. Caplin, M.D. (1966). The relationship between self - concept and academic
14. achievement and between level of aspiration and academic achievement.
- 15.