The Social Sciences 7 (2): 268-269, 2012
ISSN: 1818-5800

Influence of Personality Profile on Academic Achievement of Undergraduate Students

Tayebeh Jalali
Al-Zahra Technical Institute of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Abstract: To find the relationship between the personality profile and academic performance of students studying graphics of Al-Zahra Technical Institute, Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was administered to a group of 95 students. The findings showed that there was a significant difference in the academic performance of students between the Thinking (T) and the Feeling (F) type. The findings also suggested that students with the Thinking (T) type had better grades than the Feeling (F) type. Also, it was shown that there was a significance difference between the Judging (J) type and Perceiving (P) type.

Key words: Students, feeling, thinking, personality profile, academic performance, perceiving, Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

INTRODUCTION

Personality characteristics have become one of the areas for many researchers to research for the relationship between personality and academic performance in many disciplines (Wheeler, 2001). One objective of this study is to investigate whether there is any relationship between students' personality profile and their academic performance in the graphic field. Many of the education researches are undertaken by Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers and McCaulley, 1985) to identify the faculty (academic staff or lecturers) and students' personality profile (Rosati, 1993; Felder *et al*., 1988; Felder and Brent, 2005).

The MBTI personality instrument consists of 93 forced choice questions and based on Jung's personality theory identified four basic divided scales, namely: Extraversion (E) vs. Introversion (I), Sensing (S) vs. intuition (N), Thinking (T) vs. Feeling (F) and Judging (J) vs. Perceiving (P).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The MBTI was applied for the students from graphic discipline at Al-Zahra Technical Institute. A total of 95 students from graphic major completed the MBTI Form G. The academic results based on cumulative average of the participants had been recorded and analyzed. Participation was voluntary.

Comparisons between personality profiles and academic performance were done using SPSS application by running the t-test for four divided scales to find out whether there were any significant differences between the four scales with respect to the academic performance of students.

Table 1: Independent samples t-test on cumulative average for E-I, S-N, T-F, J-P of students

Scale	Sample size	Mean±SD	t	df	p-values
E	51	62.405±11.545	1.2495	94	0.3075
I	44	66.945±12.650			
S	58	55.465±11.970	0.2675	94	0.7925
N	37	65.17±13.2650			
T	38	68.705±11.580	1.8055	94	0.2905
F	57	62.14±12.2950			
J	42	66.15±13.1250	2.5235	94	0.1615
P	53	61.895±9.2300			

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Independent samples t-test (Table 1) were used to compare the academic performance (cumulative average) of for each scale. There was no significant difference in academic performance between E and I between S and N and between J and P of students. However, the difference in academic performance of students who preferred Thinking (T) and students who preferred Feeling (F) was highly significant.

According to Cohen (1988) for the social sciences and organizational research, a small effect is viewed as a d of about 0.2, a medium effect as about 0.5 and a large effect as 0.8 or more. In this case, the performance of T students was significantly better than F students and the effect size was large.

CONCLUSION

The result showed that students who were of thinking type performed significantly better than those of feeling type and the margin of difference were considerably large. This might told us that the nature of the graphic subject is more favorable for the T type students but may not be appealing to the F type students.

REFERENCES

Cohen, J., 1988. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. 2nd Edn., Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, ISBN: 0-8058-6283-5, Pages: 128.

Felder, R.M. and R. Brent, 2005. Understanding student differences. J. Eng. Educ., 94: 57-72.

Felder, R.M., G.N. Felder and E.J. Dietz, 1988. The effects of personality type on engineering student performance and attitudes. J. Eng. Educ., 91: 3-17.

Myers, I. and M. McCaulley, 1985. Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-briggs Type Indicator. 2nd Edn., Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.

Rosati, P., 1993. Student retention from first-year engineering related to personality type. Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Conference on Engineering Education: Renewing America's Technology and Frontiers in Education, November 6-9, 1993, IEEE., pp: 37-39.

Wheeler, P., 2001. The myers-briggs type indicator and applications to accounting education research. J. Account. Educ., 16: 125-150.