

A STUDY OF PERSONALITY FACTORS AND VALUES OF EMPLOYEES WORKING IN DIFFERENT PROFESSIONS

Dr. Ravi Kumar Bhat

Department of Education, University of Kashmir (J&K), India

E-mail: shahrufedah@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study was conducted to compare the Personality factors and Values of employees in different professions. The sample for the present investigation consists 320 employees 80 from each profession working in the professions of teaching, Health, Law, and Agriculture in Kashmir province. The sample subjects were indentified on the basis of information given by Directorate of Health, Higher Education, Agriculture High court and various District courts of Kashmir Province. In order to select the sample from the respective professions systematic random sampling technique was involved. From all the four professions both male and female subjects were included in the sample. The investigator used two standardized tools R.B. Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire and N.Y. Reddy's Indian Adaptation value scale to collect the data from the field. The investigator used different statistical analysis viz, percentage, mean, S.D and t-test to analyze the data. It was found Doctors in comparison to teachers have been found outgoing, more intelligent, emotionally stable, humble, sober, conscientious, sensitive, socially aware, trusting self assured, resourceful. The teachers on the other hand have been found a dissimilarity have been found between doctors and teachers on their personality profiles. A significant dissimilarity have been found between personality profiles of Doctors and Lawyers. A significant dissimilarity have been found between Doctors and Agriculture Assistants on their personality profiles. A significant dissimilarity have been found between the personality profiles of Teachers and Lawyers. A dissimilarity have been found between the personality profiles of Teachers and Agriculture Assistants. A significant dissimilarity have been found the personality profiles of Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants. Doctors in comparison to Lawyers have higher theoretical, economic and aesthetic values. On the other hand Lawyers have high political and religious values. Doctors and Lawyers have similar social value. Doctors in comparison to Agriculture Assistants have higher theoretical and religious values where as Agriculture Assistants have higher economic and social values. Doctors and Agriculture Assistants have similar aesthetic and political values. Teachers in comparison to Lawyers have higher economic, aesthetic and social values where as Lawyers have higher theoretical and political values. The teachers and Lawyers have similar religious values. Teachers in comparison to Agriculture Assistants have higher social, political and religious values where as Agriculture Assistants have higher theoretical and economic values. The two groups (Teachers and Agriculture Assistants) have similar aesthetic values. Lawyers in comparison to Agriculture Assistants have higher political and religious values. On the other hand Agriculture Assistants have higher economic, aesthetic, and social values. Both the groups have similar theoretical values.

Keywords: Personality factors, values, employees, working, professions

Introduction

Job satisfaction is widely accepted psychological aspect of functioning in the profession of Engineering, Medicine, teaching etc. Job-satisfaction may be defined as favorableness which

workers view with their job. It expresses the extent of match between workers expectations and the rewards the job provides and the values it creates and gets cherished. Satisfaction is an important focus because it is the source of motivation to sustain effort, in

performing over and extent period, the many routine but necessary tasks that are required for teaching. The work satisfaction of teachers, Doctors, Agriculture Assistants and Lawyers refer to how contented or well pleased they feel about their work and the circumstances surrounding their work. Job satisfaction in nutshell may be defined as how much an individual is adjusted in his work because adjustment is more overt and more easily manipulated, while satisfaction is covert and being visible aspect of teachers make-up. He concept of satisfaction however gets closer to the powerful resources of intrinsic motivation in adults, which will produce sustained work efforts. Satisfaction of today may produce motivation for tomorrow. While commenting on job satisfaction, Ringness (1961) states that the teachers satisfaction with the job is pre-requisite of his efficiency, high academic qualification may raise the standard of education, but professionally dissatisfied teachers, inspite of having a good academic career and professional training, will do much harm as they will not whole heartedly contribute towards the excellence of education. Grinder (1978) has found that many young people say that the most important consideration in choosing a type of work is the need to obtain satisfaction. Hurlock (1979) found that an individual satisfied with the vocation is well adjusted and finds reasonable satisfaction in the work.

Nanda (1957) Kakkar (1964) Pataal (1967) and Agarwal (1970) have found in their studies that influences of values and adjustment on job-entrance, job-satisfaction and productivity have shown a positive relationship between vocational outcomes and vocational adjustment as a model of adjustment. Matto (1972) has shown that average adultman's happiness depends largely on satisfactory vocational adjustment. The personality, Values and Job Satisfaction of various professional groups. Professional groups have balanced personality, good

value pattern and are satisfied with their jobs than they try to work efficiently so that the nation, will make profession the field of education, medicine and decision making. Therefore the present study shall become the guideline for the policy planners and educationists.

Values are established throughout one's life as a result of accumulating life experiences, and values tend to be relatively stable. The values that are important to a person tend to affect the types of decisions they make, how they perceive their environment, and their actual behaviors. Moreover, a person is more likely to accept a job offer when the company possesses the values he or she cares about. Value attainment is one reason people stay in an institution. When a job does not help them attain their values, they are likely to decide to leave if they are dissatisfied with the job.

Values a person holds will affect their employment. For example, someone who values stimulation highly may seek jobs that involve fast action and high risk, such as firefighter, police officer, or emergency medicine. Someone who values achievement highly may be likely to become an entrepreneur or intrapreneur. And an individual who values benevolence and universalism may seek work in the nonprofit sector with a charitable organization or in a "helping profession," such as nursing or social work. Like personality, values have implications for organizing activities, such as assigning duties to specific jobs or developing the chain of command; employee values are likely to affect how employees respond to changes in the characteristics of their jobs. Every aspect of our life has value. In fact, values permeate the role of human existence and are a major factor in deciding what sort of human beings we are. Every one of us has needs, urges and aspirations. Anything that satisfies the urges and helps us in realizing the aspirations has value. Values are the acquired and affective aspects in life, which an

individual internalizes through the process of socialization. Values figure at the core of one's life and form the spring of human endeavours. As such they are significant and fundamental dimensions of human life and indicate how one adheres, attaches and reacts in life situations or circumstances. Values are also the blueprints or action plans, which orient and decide the thinking, actions, feelings and behaviors. Value is a "conception explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group of those desirable traits which influence the selection from available modes and ends of action."

Design of the Study

Sample: The sample for the present investigation consists 320 employees 80 from each profession working in the professions of teaching, Health, Law, and Agriculture in Kashmir province. The sample subjects were indentified on the basis of information given by Directorate of Health, Higher Education, Agriculture High court and various District courts of Kashmir Province. In order to select the sample from the respective professions systematic random sampling technique was involved. From all the four professions both male and female subjects were included in the sample. The breakup of the sample is as under:

Group	Male	Female	Total
Doctors	40	40	80
Teachers	40	40	80
Lawyers	40	40	80
Agriculture Assistants	40	40	80
Total	160	160	320

The data for the present study has been collected with the help of following tools.

1. R.B. Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire.
2. N.Y. Reddy's Indian Adaptation value scale.

Procedure

The four professional groups (Doctors, Teachers, Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants) have been administered R. B. Cattell's personality factors, questionnaire and N.Y. Reddy's Indian Adaptation Value scale. The investigator personally visited the respective institutions of the sample subjects and administered the tests strictly in accordance with the instructions provided in the manuals. After the collection of the data the scoring was done as per the manuals of the tests.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

**Table No: 1: Mean Comparison of Doctors and Teachers on personality factors
(N=80 in each group)**

Group	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Doctors	\bar{X} 6.33	6.25	6.11	5.22	3.02	8.33	7.11	7.14	7.19	5.23	8.45	5.23	6.43	6.22	8.13	4.12
	SD 2.11	1.13	1.42	1.59	1.97	2.01	2.95	2.13	2.22	1.84	2.21	1.97	1.84	1.73	2.49	1.33
Teachers	\bar{X} 4.23	5.11	3.25	6.13	6.23	6.45	8.23	4.44	8.13	5.35	7.14	6.13	7.42	3.25	7.12	7.45
	SD 1.25	1.61	1.73	2.13	2.15	2.19	2.84	1.42	2.22	1.42	2.13	1.93	1.84	1.22	2.13	2.22
t. Value	7.65	5.18	11.42	3.06	9.89	5.65	2.44	9.32	2.67	0.46	3.81	2.91	3.40	12.54	2.75	11.50
Level of Significance	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.05 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.05 level	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.05 level	Sig. at 0.01 level

The above table shows the mean comparison of Doctors and Teachers on personality factors it is evident from the table that the two groups (Doctors and Teachers) differ significantly on factors. A,B,C,E,F,G,I,N,O,Q1,Q2 and Q4 at 0.01 level where as on factors H,L and Q3 the two groups differ significantly at 0.05 level. On factor the two groups do not differ significantly. The table further indicates that scientific (Moralistic) G+, Sensitive I+,H- Hesitant, Socially aware N+Trusting L-, Self assured O-, Doctors were found outgoing A+, more intelligent B+, emotionally stable C+, humble E-, Sober F-, and conscientious (Moralistic)

G+, Sensitive I+,H- Hesitant, Socially aware N+Trusting L-, Self assured O-, Conservative Q1-, Resourceful Q2+, Low Integration,Q3+, Relaxed Q4-, were as Teachers were found reserved, A-, less intelligent B-, affected by feelings C-, Assertive E+, Enthusiastic F+, Expedient G-Venturesome H+Tough minded I-,Trusting L-, forthright N-, Apprehensive O+, Experimenting Q1+, Group Oriented Q2-, Socially precise Q3 and Tense Q4+. The groups Doctors and Teachers have been found similar on factors M (Practical V/S Imaginative).

**Table No: 2: Mean Comparison of Doctors and Lawyers
On personality factors (N=80 in each group)**

Group		A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Doctors	\bar{X}	6.33	6.25	6.11	5.22	3.02	8.33	7.11	7.14	7.19	5.23	8.45	5.23	6.43	6.22	8.13	4.12
	SD	2.11	1.13	1.42	1.59	1.97	2.01	2.95	2.13	2.22	1.84	2.21	1.97	1.84	1.73	2.49	1.33
Lawyers	\bar{X}	5.22	7.33	2.33	6.45	3.12	4.22	3.11	9.00	4.21	5.33	8.11	9.22	8.32	3.12	2.14	9.13
	SD	1.12	1.48	0.41	1.58	1.03	1.38	0.48	1.85	1.13	1.05	2.13	2.41	2.04	0.62	0.58	2.41
t. Value		4.15	5.18	22.87	4.90	0.40	15.07	11.97	5.89	10.70	0.42	0.99	11.46	6.53	15.08	2.95	16.27
Level of Significance		Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level

A perusal of the above table shows the mean comparison of Doctors and Lawyers on personality factors it is evident from the table that Doctors and Lawyers differ significantly at 0.01 level. On factors A, B,C,E,G,H,I,L,O,Q1,Q2,Q3 and Q4. Whereas the two groups do not differ significantly on factors F,M and N.

The Doctors have been found to be out going A+ less intelligent B-, emotionally stable C+, humble E-, Conscientious G+, Venturesome H+, Tough minded I-, Suspicious L+, Self Assured O-, Conservative Q1-, self sufficient, Q2 +, Socially precise Q3+ and relaxed Q4- whereas Lawyers have been found reserved A-, more intelligent B+, emotionally less stable C-, Assertive E+, Expedient G-, Timid H-, Tender minded I+, Trusting L-, Apprehensive O+, Experimenting (Liberal) Q1+, Group oriented Q2-, Careless of Social rules Q3- and tense Q4+. The Doctors and Lawyers have been found to be similar on factors F,(Sober V/S Enthusiastic), M (Practical

V/S Imaginative) and N (forthright V/S Shrewd). Therefore hypothesis No. 2 which reads already as “Doctors and Lawyers differ significantly on personality factors” stands almost accepted.

**Table No: 3 : Mean Comparison of Doctors and Agriculture Assistants
On personality factors (N=80 in each group)**

Group		A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Doctors	\bar{X}	6.33	6.25	6.11	5.22	3.02	8.33	7.11	7.14	7.19	5.23	8.45	5.23	6.43	6.22	8.13	4.12
	SD	2.11	1.13	2.42	1.59	1.97	2.01	2.95	2.13	2.22	1.84	2.21	1.97	1.84	1.73	2.49	1.33
Agriculture Assistants	\bar{X}	4.25	7.11	7.22	6.00	6.12	5.32	6.01	6.45	6.07	5.23	8.00	7.13	7.17	7.20	5.03	7.13
	SD	0.63	1.84	1.84	1.23	1.75	0.78	1.87	2.11	1.87	0.87	2.12	1.89	1.99	1.83	1.45	1.93
t. Value		8.44	3.56	3.26	3.47	10.52	12.48	2.81	2.05	3.45	0.00	1.31	6.22	2.44	3.48	9.62	11.48
Level of Significance		Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.05 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not sig.	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.05 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level

A perusal of table No. 4.3 shows the mean comparison of Doctors and Agriculture Assistants on personality factors it is evident from the table that on factors A,B,C,E,F,G,H,L,O,Q2,Q3 and Q4. The two groups differ significantly at 0.01 level where as on factors I and Q1 the Doctors and Agriculture Assistants differ significantly at 0.05 level. On factors M and N the Doctors and Agriculture Assistants do not differ significantly. The Doctors have been found outgoing A+, Less intelligent B-, affected by feelings C-, Submissive E-,Sober F-, Enthusiastic G-, venturesome H+, Tough minded I+, Suspicious L+, Self Assured O-,

Group dependent Q2-, Socially precise Q3+ and relaxed Q4-. Whereas Agriculture Assistants have been found reserved A-, more intelligent B+, emotionally stable C+, Dominant E+, Enthusiastic F+, Expedient G-, venturesome H+, Trusting (accepting conditions) L- Apprehensive O+, prefers own decisions Q2+, Careless of social rules Q3- and tense Q4+. The Doctors and Agriculture Assistants are found to be similar on factors I , M (Practical V/S Imaginative) ,and N (Forthright V/S Shrewd).

**Table No: 4: Mean Comparison of Teachers and Lawyers
On personality factors (N= 80 in each group)**

Group		A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Teachers	\bar{X}	4.23	5.11	3.25	6.13	6.23	6.45	8.23	4.44	8.13	5.35	7.14	6.13	7.42	3.25	7.12	7.45
	SD	1.25	1.61	1.73	2.13	2.15	2.19	2.84	1.42	2.22	1.42	2.13	1.93	1.84	1.22	2.13	2.22
Lawyers	\bar{X}	5.22	7.33	2.33	6.45	3.12	4.22	3.11	9.00	4.21	5.33	8.11	9.22	8.32	3.12	2.14	9.13
	SD	1.12	1.48	0.41	1.58	1.03	1.38	0.48	1.85	1.13	1.05	2.13	2.41	2.04	0.62	0.58	2.41
t. Value		5.27	9.08	4.62	1.07	11.66	7.70	15.69	17.48	14.07	0.10	2.88	8.95	2.93	0.85	20.17	4.58
Level of Significance		Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.05 level	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level

A quick look of above table shows the mean comparison of Teachers and Lawyers on personality factors the table reveals that Teachers and Lawyers differ significantly on factors A, B, C, F, G, H, I, L, N, O, Q3 and Q4 at 0.01 level where as Teachers and Lawyers differ significantly on factor Q1 at 0.05 level. The two groups do not differ significantly on factors E, M and Q2. The table further indicates that teachers have been found reserved A-, less intelligent B-, emotionally stable C+, Enthusiastic F+, Conscientious G+, venturesome H+, Tough minded I-, hard to fool L+, forthright (genuine) N+, self assured O-, conservative Q1-, Socially precise Q3+ and relaxed Q4-. The Lawyers have been found outgoing A+,

more intelligent B+, affected by feelings C-, Sober F-, Expedient G-, Timid H- Sensitive I+, trusting L- Shrewd N+, Apprehensive O+, Experimenting (Liberal) Q1+, undisciplined Q3- and restless Q4+. The Teachers and Lawyers are similar on factors E (submissive V/S dominant), M (practical V/S Imaginative) and Q2 (group oriented V/S self sufficient).

**Table No: 5: Mean Comparison of Teachers and Agriculture Assistants
On personality factors (N= 80 in each group)**

Group		A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Teachers	\bar{X}	4.23	5.11	3.25	6.13	6.23	6.45	8.23	4.44	8.13	5.35	7.14	6.13	7.42	3.25	7.12	7.45
	SD	1.25	1.61	1.73	2.13	2.15	2.19	2.84	1.42	2.22	1.42	2.13	1.93	1.84	1.22	2.13	2.22
Agriculture Assistants	\bar{X}	4.25	7.11	7.22	6.00	6.12	5.32	6.01	6.45	6.07	5.23	8.00	7.13	7.17	7.20	5.03	7.13
	SD	0.63	1.84	1.84	1.23	1.75	0.78	1.87	2.11	1.87	0.87	2.12	1.89	1.99	1.83	1.45	1.93
t. Value		0.12	7.31	14.05	0.47	0.35	4.34	5.83	7.06	6.34	0.64	2.55	3.31	0.82	16.06	7.25	0.97
Level of Significance		Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.05 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not Sig.

A glimpse of above table shows the mean comparison of Teachers and Agriculture Assistants on personality factors. The table reveals that on factors B, C, G, H, I, L, O, Q2 and Q3. The two groups differ significantly at 0.01 level N Teachers and Agriculture Assistants differ significantly at 0.05 level. The Teachers and Agriculture Assistants do not differ significantly on factors A,E, F, M,Q1 and Q4. The Teachers have been found less intelligent B-, affected by feelings C-, conscientious G+, venturesome H+, Tough minded I- , Suspicious L+, Self assured O-, group oriented Q2- and socially precise Q3+ whereas Agriculture Assistants have

been found more intelligent B+, emotionally stable C+, expedient G-,shy H-, tender minded I+, apprehensive O+, self sufficient Q2+ and undisciplined Q3-. The two groups have been found similar on factor A (Reserved V/S Outgoing), E (submissive V/S dominant), F (sober V/S Enthusiastic), M (practical V/S Imaginative), Q1 (conservative V/S Experimenting) and Q4 (relaxed V/S tense).

**Table No: 6: Mean Comparison of Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants
On personality factors (N= 80 in each group)**

Group		A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Lawyers	\bar{X}	1.22	7.33	2.33	6.45	3.12	4.22	3.11	9.00	4.21	5.33	8.11	9.22	8.32	3.12	2.14	9.13
	SD	1.12	1.48	0.41	1.58	1.03	1.38	0.48	1.85	1.13	1.05	2.13	2.41	2.04	0.62	0.58	2.41
Agriculture Assistants	\bar{X}	4.25	7.11	7.22	6.00	6.12	5.32	6.01	6.45	6.07	5.23	8.00	7.13	7.17	7.20	5.03	7.13
	SD	0.63	1.84	1.84	1.23	1.75	0.78	1.87	2.11	1.87	0.87	2.12	1.89	1.99	1.83	1.45	1.93
t. Value		6.75	0.83	23.20	2.01	13.21	6.20	13.43	8.12	7.61	0.65	0.32	6.10	3.60	18.88	16.55	6.20
Level of Significance		Sig. at 0.01 level	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.05 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not sig.	Not Sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level

A quick look of above table shows the mean comparison of Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants on personality factors. It is evident from the table that on factors A, C, F, G, H, I, L, O, Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4. The two groups differ significantly at 0.01 level. Whereas on factors E both the groups differ significantly at 0.05 level. On factors B, M and N, Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants do not differ significantly. The table further reveals that Lawyers have been found outgoing A+, affected by feelings C-, Sober F-, Expedient G-, Timid H- tender minded I+, accepting conditions L-, apprehensive O+, experimenting Q1+, group oriented Q2-, undisciplined Q3- and tense Q4+. On the other side Agriculture Assistants have been found reserved A-, emotionally stable C+, Enthusiastic F+,

conscientious G+, venturesome H+, tender minded I, suspicious L+, self assured O-, Conservative Q1-, self sufficient Q2+, socially precise and relaxed Q4-. The lawyer and Agriculture Assistants are similar on factors B (less intelligent V/S more intelligent), M (Practical V/S Imaginative) and N (forthright V/S Shrewd).

**Table No: 7: Value Hierarchy of Four Professional Groups
(N=80 in Each Group)**

Group	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Doctors	\bar{X} 47.25	32.75	44.33	41.67	33.00	40.00
Teachers	\bar{X} 36.30	30.70	43.45	48.55	37.23	43.77
Lawyers	\bar{X} 43.43	27.57	35.53	42.47	46.65	44.35
Agriculture Assistants	\bar{X} 43.75	41.25	44.65	45.35	32.77	32.22

A quick look of the above table shows the value hierarchy of four professional groups. It is evident from the table that Doctors have higher theoretical value (47.25) followed by Aesthetic (44.33), Social (41.67), Religious (40.00), Political (33.00), and Economic (32.75) values. The Teachers have higher social value (48.55) followed by religious (43.77), Aesthetic (43.45), Political (37.23), Theoretical (36.30.), and Economic values (30.70),

Lawyers have highest political value (46.65) followed by religious (44.35), theoretical (43.43), social (42.47), Aesthetic (35.53), and Economic values (27.57). The Agriculture Assistants have dominant social value (45.35), followed by Aesthetic (44.65), theoretical (43.75), Economic (41.25), Political (32.77) and Religious values (32.22).

Table No: 8” Comparison on the basis of value pattern of Professional Groups based on dominant value (N=80 in each Group)

Value Pattern	Doctors	Teachers	Lawyers	Agriculture Assistants
Theoretical	22.5% (9)	17.50% (7)	20.00% (8)	20.00% (8)
Economic	12.5 % (5)	10.00% (4)	10.00% (4)	17.50% (7)
Aesthetic	20.00% (8)	17.50% (7)	12.5% (5)	20.00% (8)
Social	17.50% (7)	22.5% (9)	17.50% (7)	22.5% (9)
Political	12.5% (5)	12.5% (5)	22.5% (9)	10.00% (4)
Religious	15.00% (6) N=40	20.00% (8) N=40	17.50% (7) N=40	10.00% (4) N=40
	Theoretical	Social	Political	Social
	Aesthetic	Religious	Theoretical	Theoretical
	Religious	Theoretical	Social	Aesthetic

The above table shows the comparison of value patterns of professional groups based on dominant value. The table indicates that the dominant value pattern of Doctors have been found as theoretical (22.5%), Aesthetic (20%) , Religious (15%), Social (17.50%),Economic (12.5%) and

Political (12.5 %) were as teachers dominant values have been found as under:
Social (22.5%), Religious (20%), Theoretical (17.50%), Aesthetic (17.50%), Political (12.5%) and Economic (10%). On the other hand Lawyers dominant value pattern have been found as Political

(22.5%), Theoretical (20%), Social (17.50%), Religious (17.50%), Aesthetic (12.5%) and Economic (10%). The dominant value patterns of Agriculture Assistants have been found as Social (22.5%), Theoretical (22 %), Aesthetic (20%), Economic (17.50%), Political (10%) and Religious (10%). The table further indicates that the

dominant three values of each professional group have been found as under:

Doctors:- Theoretical, Aesthetic and Religious;
 Teachers:- Social, Religious and Theoretical.
 Lawyers:- Political, Theoretical, Social and Agriculture Assistants Social, Theoretical and Aesthetic

Table No: 9: Mean Comparison of Doctors and Teachers on values (N= 80 in each group)

Group	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Doctors	\bar{X} 47.25	32.75	44.33	41.67	33.00	40.00
	SD 6.50	5.33	7.25	8.23	5.27	7.32
Teachers	\bar{X} 36.30	30.70	43.45	48.55	37.23	43.77
	SD 5.44	5.23	7.43	8.12	6.22	7.23
t. Value	11.55	2.45	0.75	5.32	4.64	3.27
Level of Significance	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.05 level	Not sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level

The above table shows the mean comparison of Doctors and Teachers on values. It is evident from the table that on theoretical, social political and religious values Doctors and Teachers differ significantly at 0.01 level where as on economic value the two groups differ significantly at 0.05 level. On Aesthetic value Doctors and

teachers do not differ significantly. The table further reveals that Doctors have higher theoretical and economic values than the Teachers where as Teachers have high Social, political and religious values. Doctors and Teachers have similar Aesthetic value.

Table No: 10: Mean Comparison of Doctors and Lawyers On values (N= 80 in each group)

Group	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Doctors	\bar{X} 47.25	32.75	44.33	41.67	33.00	40.00
	SD 6.50	5.33	7.25	8.23	5.27	7.32
Lawyers	\bar{X} 43.43	27.57	35.53	42.47	46.65	44.35
	SD 7.38	4.83	5.75	7.32	8.42	7.77
t. Value	3.47	6.44	8.50	0.64	12.29	3.64
Level of significance	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not sig. 0.05	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level

A quick look of above table shows the mean comparison of Doctors and Lawyers on values. It is evident from the table that Doctors and Lawyers differ significantly at 0.01 level on theoretical, economic, Aesthetic, political and religious values. Whereas on social value Doctors and Lawyers do not differ significantly. The table

further indicates the Doctors have high theoretical, economic and Aesthetic values than the Lawyers on the other hand Lawyers have high political and religious values. Doctors and Lawyers have similar Social value.

**Table No: 11: Mean Comparison of Doctors and Agriculture Assistants
On values (N= 80 in each group)**

Group	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Doctors	\bar{X} 47.25	32.75	44.33	41.67	33.00	40.00
	SD 6.50	5.33	7.25	8.23	5.27	7.32
Agriculture Assistants	\bar{X} 43.75	41.25	44.65	45.35	32.77	32.22
	SD 7.32	6.58	8.43	7.65	5.83	5.97
t. Value	3.19	8.97	0.25	2.92	0.26	7.36
Level of significance	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not sig.	Sig. at 0.05 level	Not sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level

A glimpse of above table shows the mean comparison of Doctors and Agriculture Assistants on values it is evident from the table that on theoretical economic and religious values Doctors and Agriculture Assistants differ significantly at 0.01 level On social value Doctors and Agriculture Assistants differ significantly at 0.05 level where as on Aesthetic and political values the two groups do

not differ significantly. The table further reveals that Doctors have higher Theoretical and religious values on the other hand Agriculture Assistants have higher economic and social values. Doctors and Agriculture Assistants have similar Aesthetic and Political values.

**Table No: 12” Mean Comparison of Teachers and Lawyers
On values (N= 80 in each group)**

Group	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Teachers	\bar{X} 36.30	30.70	43.45	48.55	37.23	43.77
	SD 5.44	5.23	7.43	8.12	6.22	7.23
Lawyers	\bar{X} 43.43	27.57	35.53	42.47	46.65	44.35
	SD 7.38	4.83	5.75	7.32	8.42	7.77
t. Value	6.95	3.93	7.54	4.97	8.04	0.48
Level of Significance	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not sig.

A quick look of above table shows the mean comparison of Teachers and Lawyers on values. The table reveals that on theoretical, economic, Aesthetic, Social and political values Teachers and Lawyers differ significantly at 0.01 level. On religious value Teachers and Lawyers do

not differ significantly. Teachers have higher economic, Aesthetic and Social values than the Lawyers where as Lawyers have higher theoretical and political values. The Teachers and Lawyers have similar religious values.

**Table No: 13: Mean Comparison of Teachers and Agriculture Assistants on values
(N= 80 in each group)**

Group	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Teachers	\bar{X} 36.30	30.70	43.45	48.55	37.23	43.77
	SD 5.44	5.23	7.43	8.12	6.22	7.23
Agriculture Assistants	\bar{X} 43.75	41.25	44.65	45.35	32.77	32.22
	SD 7.32	6.58	8.43	7.65	5.83	5.97
t. Value	7.30	11.22	1.03	2.56	4.67	11.01
Level of Significance	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Not sig.	Sig. at 0.05 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level

A glimpse of above table shows the mean comparison of Teachers and Agriculture Assistants on values. The table indicates that on theoretical, economic, political and religious values Doctors and Agriculture Assistants differ significantly at 0.01 level. On Aesthetic values Doctors and Agriculture Assistants do not differ significantly. Whereas on social value Doctors and Agriculture

Assistants differ significantly at 0.05 level. The table further indicates that the Teachers have high Social, Political and Religious values than the Agriculture Assistants where as Agriculture Assistants have high theoretical and economic values. The Teachers and Agriculture Assistants have similar Aesthetic value.

**Table No: 14: Mean Comparison of lawyers and Agriculture Assistants on values
(N=80 in each group)**

Group	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Lawyers	\bar{X} 43.43	27.57	35.53	42.47	46.65	44.35
	SD 7.38	4.83	5.75	7.32	8.42	7.77
Agriculture Assistants	\bar{X} 43.75	41.25	44.65	45.35	32.77	32.22
	SD 7.32	6.58	8.43	7.65	5.83	5.97
t. Value	0.27	14.99	7.99	2.43	12.12	11.07
Level of Significance	Not sig.	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.05 level	Sig. at 0.01 level	Sig. at 0.01 level

The above table shows the mean comparison of Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants on values. The table reveals that on economic Aesthetic, Political and Religious values Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants differ significantly at 0.01 level. Whereas on Social values, Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants, differ significantly at 0.05 level. on theoretical value Lawyers and

Agriculture Assistants do no differ significantly. The table further indicates that Lawyers have high political and religious values than Agriculture Assistants on other side Agriculture Assistants have higher economic, Aesthetic and social values than the Lawyers. Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants have similar theoretical value.

DISCUSSION

1. Personality factors of professional groups:-

The data on personality factors was subjected to two kinds of statistical treatment. This included “t” test for testing the hypotheses and also using profile similarity coefficient as recommended by Cattell’s (Handbook for the 16PF, Appendices 3 occupational group 1970). The techniques have enabled the investigator to establish with sufficient amount of confidence. The profile similarity or dissimilarity among the professional groups. The results after employing “t” test have revealed that Doctor’s as compared to teachers have been found to be outgoing, emotionally expressive, ready to cooperate, attentive to people, soft hearted, adaptable, more intelligent, tends to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner, tends to be emotionally mature, realistic about life, better able to maintain social group, morale, submissive humble,

accommodative, sober, confirming, moralistic, tend to be exacting in character dominated by sense of duty, and responsible, sensitive, demanding of attention and help, relaxed and satisfied, not frustrated, where as teachers have been found reserved, tend to be stiff, cool and aloof. They are likely to be precise and rigid in their way of doing things and in their personal standards, less intelligent, tend to be slow to learn and grasp, affected by feelings, easily annoyed and emotional. Assertive, enthusiastic, expedient, and tough – minded, critical group oriented, tense and impatient. For the confirmation of these results further analysis was undertaken in terms of drawing the profile similarity comparison of Doctors and teachers on personality. A dissimilarity has been found in the personality profiles of Doctors and teachers ($r_p = -.24$) insignificant.

Doctors as compared to lawyers on personality have been found outgoing, participating, liking people, good-natured, less intelligent, slow to learn and grasp, emotionally stable, mature realistic about life, humble conscientious, dominated by sense of duty, venturesome, ready to try new things spontaneous and abundant in emotional response, tough minded, realistic down to earth, independent, responsible, socially precise, tend to have strong control of their emotions, on the other side, lawyers have been found reserved, detached, more intelligent, tend to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner, easily annoyed, assertive self assured, independent minded, expedient, tender minded, sensitive, day dreaming, apprehensive, self blaming guilt person, insecure worrying. A profile similarity comparison was also worked between Doctor's and Lawyers on personality ($r_p = -.55$) (significant at 0.01 level). It indicates that there is significant dissimilarity between the personality profiles of Doctors and Lawyers.

Doctors as compared to Agriculture Assistants on personality have been found outgoing, good natured, easy going emotionally expressive, ready to cooperation, attentive to people, soft hearted, enthusiastic, cheerful active, expressive, venturesome, sociable, ready to try new things, suspicious group oriented, socially precise, have strong control on their emotions, relaxed. Agriculture Assistants as compared to Doctors have been found reserved, emotionally stable, mature, realistic about life, dominant, assertive aggressive, enthusiastic, expressive cheerful, active, talkative, venturesome, bold, trusting, apprehensive. A profile similarity comparison was also worked out between Doctors and Agriculture Assistants on personality. The r_p coefficient is $-.3$ which is significant at 0.05 level. It indicates that there is a perfect dissimilarity between the personality profiles of Doctors and Agriculture Assistants.

Teachers as compared with Lawyers on personality have been found detached tend to be stiff, cool, aloof, less intelligent tending to be slow learners, emotionally stable, mature realistic about life, possessing ego strength, expressive cheerful, active conscientious, moralistic, dominated by sense of duty, venturesome, ready to try new things, abundant, tough minded, realistic, socially

precise and relaxed. Lawyers as compared to teachers have been found outgoing participating, likes people, attentive to people, more intelligent, quick grasp ideas, diplomatic, calculating, apprehensive, have a strong sense of obligation and high expectations of themselves, sensitive. For the confirmation of above results further analysis was undertaken in order to draw the profile similarity comparison of teachers and Lawyers on personality. The r_p coefficient is $-.55$ significant at 0.01 level. It reveals that there is significant dissimilarity between the personality profiles of teachers and Lawyers.

Teachers as compared with Agriculture Assistants on personality have been found less intelligent, tends to be slow learner affected by feelings, conscientious, tend to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, venturesome, bold ready to try new things, tough minded, realistic, responsible, suspicious, hard to fool, group oriented, prefer to work and make decisions with other people and like and depend on social approval and admiration and socially precise where as Agriculture Assistants have been found more intelligent, quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner, emotionally stable, mature, realistic about life, tender minded, apprehensive, guilt prone, making decisions and taking account on their own and undisciplined. Profile similarity comparison was worked out between teachers and Agriculture Assistants. The r_p coefficient is $-.25$, which is insignificant. It indicates that there is dissimilarity between the personality profiles of teachers and Lawyers.

Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants have been compared on personality factors Lawyers have been found out-going, participating, likes people, sober, introspective, expedient, tender minded, sensitive, apprehensive, experimenting, group oriented, undisciplined, restless, where as Agriculture Assistants, have been found reserved, stiff, cool, emotionally stable, self assured, feels free of guilt, untroubled, self satisfied and relaxed. Profile similarity comparison was also worked out between Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants. The r_p coefficient is $-.33$ which is significant at 0.05 level. It indicates that there is a perfect dissimilarity between the personality profiles of Lawyers and Agriculture Assistants.

It is appropriate to make a mention of some of the studies conducted earlier. The findings of these studies support the findings of the present investigation. **Sinha S. P. (1980)** in the study of interest and personality patterns of successful men in different occupations found the personality pattern of engineers in rank order was: conscientious, more intelligent, controlled, self-sufficient and venturesome; that of doctors was, more intelligent, controlled, Conscientious, shrewd and emotionally stable; while as that of teachers included conscientious and more intelligent. Engineers were found experimenting, happy go lucky while as doctors and teachers experimenting and tense. **Agarwal K.G. and Sharma B. R. (1977)** revealed that teachers were found least intelligent and lawyers the most intelligent. From composite factor scores doctors were little more intelligent than others. Teachers have the higher score and Lawyers the lowest score on character dimension.

2. Values of Professional groups

The data on values of four professional groups was subject to two kinds of statistical treatment. These included value hierarchy and t-test in value hierarchy of professional groups, Doctor's have higher theoretical value and the lower economic value. Teachers have higher social value and the lowest economic value whereas Lawyers have highest political value and the lowest economic value. On the other side Agriculture Assistants have dominant social value and the lowest religious value. Three professional groups such as Doctors, Teachers and Lawyers have lowest economic value. These professional groups are not interested in Trade, Business and Commerce. Doctors as compared to teachers have higher theoretical value. The doctors have the interest in the discovery of truth, pursuit of their goals. They characterically take a cognitive attitude. The doctors are empirical, critical, rational, frequently a scientist or philosopher where as teachers have high social, political and religious value. The teachers have the love of people, are kind sympathetic and unselfish. Further the teachers as compared to doctors are interested in politics, have high power value, take part in competition and struggle. The teachers are mystical

and seek to comprehend the cosmos as a whole, to relate themselves to its embracing totality than doctors.

Doctors as compared to Lawyers have high theoretical, economic and aesthetic values. It indicates the doctors are interested in the discovery of truth are empirical, critical, rational, intellectual, scientist, philosopher than Lawyers. It further indicates that doctors are interested in the satisfaction of bodily needs develop their love for the practical affairs of business world, the production, marketing and consumption of goods than Lawyers. Further the doctors have highest aesthetic sense, finding their interest in the artistic episodes of life. The Lawyers are interested in politics, power prestige, competition and struggle than doctors. The Lawyers have highest value of the religion are mystical, seek to comprehend the cosmos as a whole to relate themselves to its embracing totality than doctors.

Doctors as compared to Agriculture Assistants have higher theoretical and religious values and the doctors are interested in discovery of truth are empirical, critical, scientists, philosophers than Agricultural Assistants. Further the doctors have highest religious value and mystical beliefs in the final judgment of Almighty than Agriculture Assistants. The Agriculture Assistants have higher economic and social values. It further indicates that Agriculture Assistants are kind, sympathetic and unselfish and have the human relationship than doctors. Further Agriculture Assistants are interested in business Commerce, marketing, and trade, than doctors.

Teachers as compared to Lawyers have higher economic, aesthetic and social values. The teachers are interested in trade, business, production Commerce than Lawyers where as teachers are kind, sympathetic, loving, unselfish, have human relationship than Lawyers. Further the teachers are interested in the artistic episodes of life than Lawyers. The Lawyers have higher theoretical and political values, are interested in the discovery of truth. Further the Lawyers are interested in politics, power; want to become leaders, generally have high power value and take part in competition and struggle than teachers.

Teachers as compared to Agriculture Assistants have high, social, political and religious

values. The teachers have been found kind sympathetic, unselfish, loving and have sense of human relationship. Further the teachers are politically aware, try to become leaders, have sense of power, competition and struggle. Teachers have the highest value with regard to religious affairs, are mystical, believe in the principles of religion than the Agriculture Assistants. Agriculture Assistants have high economic and theoretical value than teachers. Agriculture Assistants have the dominant interest in the discovery of truth in their pursuit of their goal. They are empirical, critical, rational and frequently scientists. Their aim in life is to order and systemize their knowledge. Further Agriculture Assistants are interested in practical affairs of business world, production marketing and consumption of goods than teachers.

Lawyers as compared with Agriculture Assistants have high political and religious value. The Lawyers have the interest in power, prestige, competition and struggle than the Agriculture Assistants. Further the Lawyers have been dominated by religion, where as Agriculture Assistants have higher economic and aesthetic value than Lawyers. The Agriculture Assistants are interested in commerce business, trade, and marketing and have interest in the artistic episodes of life than Lawyers.

The findings of the following studies favour the findings of the present investigation **Magrey M.Y. (1982)** found the doctors value profiles sums:- The hierarchy of values for engineers is: theoretical, social, economic, political, religious and aesthetic. This group is strongly inclined to theoretical, with a minimum consideration of religious and aesthetic value. The doctor's value profile sums from high mean score on theoretical, through political and economic to social, religious and aesthetic. Teachers are more inclined to theoretical, political and aesthetic value and less inclined to religious, economic and social value. Agriculture graduates bear a profile similarity with that of doctors being highly inclined towards theoretical and moderately open to political and economic values. Agriculture graduates are less moved by the religious and aesthetic values.

Pal S. K. (1967) in a study of value patterns of Engineers, Law, Medical, Teacher

training students in India found that in case of Engineering students economic value was the highest value and the religious as lowest. In case of law students political value immersed as the highest value followed by economic value. In case of Medical students theoretical value immersed as the highest value followed by social value. In case of teacher training students political value was the first followed by theoretical value. **Ganai M. Y. and Roufa Rasheed (2011)** study the values of college teachers in district Srinagar found that Science college teachers have high theoretical, Economic and religious value than social science college teachers. Commerce college teachers have high economic value than social science college teachers. Social science college teachers have high political value than science and Commerce college teachers.

References

1. Allport G.W. (1966), Manual of Study of Values: Boston Houghton; Mifflin.
2. Amar A. Rath. (2008), Study of Personality Factors. Bombay Hospital Journal, vol. 50, No. 2, 2008 245.
3. Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1993), Autonomy as a moderator of the relationship between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 111-118.
4. Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1996), Effects of impression management and self-deception on the predictive validity of personality constructs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 261-272.
5. Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K. & Strauss, J.P. (1993), Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives: Test for the mediating effect of goal setting. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 715-722.
6. Cattell, R.B. (1972), Manual for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. IPAT
7. Chatman, J. (1988), Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

8. Digman, J.M. (1990), "Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model". *Annual Review of Psychology* 41: 417-440
9. Dinesh Kumar (2010), A Study on Personality Characteristics and Job Satisfaction of Heads of Secondary School in Relation to Gender and Experience. *Indian Educational Abstracts*, Vol. 5. No. 1 & 2 Jan. & July 2012.
10. Ganai, M.Y. (2003), Value Oriented Education. *Insight Journal of Applied Research in Education*. vol. 9, no. 1 (p.60).
11. Garner Ronald W. (2005), Personality Factors, Values and Leadership Behaviour of Effective Principal as perceived by Elementary, Middle, and High School Teachers. *Journal of Educational Research and Extensions*, vol. 24 No. 2.
12. Hall and Lindzey (1957), *Theories of Personality*: New York Mc Graw Hill.
13. Hall, C.S and Lindzey, G. (1998), *Theories of Personality*. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Ltd. Pp. 439-443.
14. Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000), Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869-879.
15. Islam, S. (2002), A study of value pattern of college students in relation to some select socio-educational variables. New York, USA, Simon and Schuster Custom Publishing.
16. Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1987). Effect of values on perception and decision making: A study of alternative work values measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 666-673.
17. Law, L.Y., Walker, A., & Dimmock, C. (2003), The influence of principals' values on their perception and management of school problems. New York, USA, McGraw Hill.
18. Lee Ray Bryant. (2007), An Investigation of factors influencing Job Satisfaction of Principals in Low-Performing and Exemplary Schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Vol. 68, No. 6, Dec. 07 p.2252.
19. Lidhoo, M. L. (1982), A comparative Study of Engineers, Doctors and University Teachers in relation to Intelligence, Level of Frustration, Extraversion, Introversion and Neuroticism. *Ind. Edu. Rev.* April, 108-118.
20. Lindzey & Hall (1957), *Personality*, Thompson Press (India) Ltd.
21. Mehta, R.D. (1985), An Investigation into the Change in the Attitudes and Values of Teacher Trainees with Respect to some of their Personality Variables. Ph.D Ed: Delhi:u, 4th Survey of Educational Research pp. 960-961.
22. Mine Sancer. (2008), Personality Factors of School Principals in relation to Teacher Job Satisfaction in North Cyprus. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vo. 68, No.3, September 2008, pp. 823-A.
23. Muth, D.N. (1980), An Attitudinal and Personality Study of Effective Teachers, Ph.D. Psy; Jod.U 3rd survey of Ed. Research. pp.824.
24. N.Venkataiah & N. Sandhya (2004), *Research in Value Education*, New Delhi, APH Publishing Corporation.
25. N.Venkataiah (1998), *Value Education*, New Delhi, APH Publishing Corporation.
26. Najma, Nighat (2004), A Comparative Study of the Personality factors of teachers working at Elementary, Sec., higher Sec., College and University levels. unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation Kashmir University, Department of Education pp. 34-35.
27. Trivedi, T. (1985), A Study of Personality and Professional Attitude of Burnout Teachers. Lucknow University, Lucknow.
28. Van Horn, Dorothy K. (2008), Job Satisfaction of ASAH private special Education Principals in New Jersey. *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vo. 22 No.3 pp. 214-228.
29. White, k. (1965), Personality Characteristics of Educational Leaders: A Comparison of Administrators and Researchers. *The School Review*, 73: (3), 292-300.
30. Yaseen, M. U. (2007), Personality Factors and Attitude towards Professions of Teachers at Elementary Level. Unpublished M. Phil dissertation, Department of Education, Kashmir University.