



Influence of Personality Traits on Political Participation of Tribal People

Author's Name- Rakesh Devara

Address- Assistant Professor- Political Science

Department of Political Science

Government Post Graduate College, Alirajpur (M. P.), Pin- 457887

Abstract

Present research was a survey type of research. The objective of the research was to compare the mean scores of political participation of scheduled tribe people of extrovert, ambivert and introvert personality. A total of 122 scheduled tribe people were selected as a sample from the Alirajpur district (M. P.) with the use of convenient sampling. Personality was the independent variable and political participation was the criterion variable. Personality was assessed with the help of Personality Inventory developed by S. S. Jalota and S. D. Kapoor. Political participation was assessed with the help of questionnaire developed by the researcher. Data of the present study were analyzed with the help of one way analysis of variance. It was found in the present study that- i) Political participation of extrovert personality scheduled tribe people was found to be significantly higher than the political participation of introvert personality scheduled tribe people, ii) Political participation of extrovert personality scheduled tribe people was found to be significantly higher than the political participation of ambivert personality scheduled tribe people and iii) Political participation of scheduled tribe people with ambivert and introvert personality has been found to be similar.

Keywords- Political Participation, Personality traits, Tribal people

Introduction with rationale

Political Participation is one of the many important concepts of the subject Political Science. Political participation includes all those activities through which a person contributes to a political system. Through political participation a person actively participates in political system and is involved in the process of shaping all the decisions that affect his life. In general, participation at different levels of the political system is called political participation. According to the **Verba and Lucian Pye (2015)** political participation as activities by private citizens aimed more or less directly at influencing the selection and/or actions of government officials. According to **Almond and Powell (2020)** political participation can be defined as the involvement of the members of the society in the decision making process. Political participation is of great importance in various governance systems. By this political systems get support, as a result of which they get stability. It also works to connect more and more people with the political system. That is why there is great emphasis on political participation in all developing countries.

Personality is a very important variable in psychological variables. Through this, an important place can be obtained in the life. Personality generally refers to the totality of external and internal characteristics of a person. Personality is the dynamic organization of the psycho-physiological systems in the individual that determine his unique adjustment to the environment. Does personality have any effect on political participation? To know this, the present research title was selected by the researcher.

In the review of related researches, the researcher found that less work has been done on the present research area. Gerber, A. S. and others (2011) studied personality traits and participation in political processes. Gallego, A. and Oberski, D. (2012) conducted a study on personality and political participation: The mediation hypothesis. Ackermann, K. (2022) conducted a research on the personality, motives, and political participation. Aryanpour, H., Iranpour, A. and Fattahi Ardakani, H. (2023) investigated the structural relationships of personality traits and political participation of students with the mediating role of religious beliefs. Mokhtari, M., Rasekh, K. and Khodami, A. (2021) investigated the effect of personal values and personality traits on political participation among the citizens of Behbahan. None of these research works has studied the influence of personality on political participation in relation to tribal area. For this reason the researcher chose this title.

Objective

The objective of the research was to compare the mean scores of political participation of scheduled tribe people of extrovert, ambivert and introvert personality.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis of the research was there will be no significant difference between the mean scores of political participation of scheduled tribe people of extrovert, ambivert and introvert personality.

Sample

Scheduled tribe people of Alirajpur district was the identified population of the research. From this population, sample was selected through the use of convenient sampling. 122 scheduled tribe people were selected from the Alirajpur district (M. P.). Sample included both male and female students. The age of people was between 18-50 years. Sample included both urban and rural people and represented all the three levels of socio-economic status, i.e., low, average and high. The sample included both working and non-working people, along with educated and uneducated.

Type of Research and Variables

Present study was survey type of research, in which 122 scheduled tribe people of Alirajpur district were surveyed for political participation on the basis of their personality. Personality was the independent variable and political participation was the criterion variable of the research.

Tools

In the present research, data were collected in terms of political participation and personality. Personality was assessed with the help of Personality Inventory developed by S. S. Jalota and S. D. Kapoor was used. Political participation was assessed with the help of questionnaire developed by the researcher. Various aspects of political participation such as voting, supporting political parties, participating in activities of political parties, participating in campaign programs during elections etc. related total 25 questions were included in this questionnaire by the researcher.

Procedure of Data Collection

First of all with the help of convenience sampling, Alirajpur city of Alirajpur district was selected for the research. After this people from Alirajpur city were randomly selected. The persons, with whom contact was established for the research, were first informed about the purpose of the present study and established a rapport with them. After that personality inventory developed by S. S. Jalota and S. D. Kapoor was administered on the scheduled tribe people included in the sample. After the administration of this test, questionnaire on political participation developed by the researcher was used on the sample. According to the standard answers and as per manual of the tool, the data related to the personality were collected. On the basis of the responses on questionnaire the data related to the political participation were collected.

Data Analysis

One way analysis of variance was used to compare the mean scores of political participation of scheduled tribe people of extrovert, ambivert and introvert personality.

Result and Interpretation

The results of one way analysis of variance are given in Table 1.

Table 1- Summary of One way Analysis of Variance of Political Participation

Source of Variance	df	SS	MSS	F	Level of Significance
Personality	2	713.43	356.71	14.86	0.00
Error	119	2855.49	23.99		
Total	121	3568.92			

From the Table 1 it is evident that the 'F' value for personality is 14.86, whose level of significance is 0.00 with $df = 2, 121$; which is less than 0.01 level of significance, hence the value of 'F' for personality is significant at 0.01 level of significance with $df = 2, 121$. It means there is a significant difference between mean scores of political participation of scheduled tribe people of extrovert, ambivert and introvert personality. In the light of this the null hypothesis that "There will be no significant difference between the mean scores of political participation

of scheduled tribe people of extrovert, ambivert and introvert personality” is rejected.

Further, to find out the significant differences of means **Bonferroni Test for pair wise comparisons** was applied. The results are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Pair wise comparisons of personality in terms of political participation

Pair	Mean difference	Standard Error	Significance level
Extrovert- Introvert	5.07	1.034	0.000
Extrovert- Ambivert	5.05	1.144	0.000
Ambivert - Introvert	0.02	1.123	1.000

From the Table 2 it is evident that mean difference of political participation of extrovert and introvert group is 5.07, whose level of significance is 0.00, which is less than 0.01 level of significance, hence the mean difference is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means there is a significant difference between mean scores of political participation of extrovert and introvert group. In the light of this the null hypothesis that “There will be no significant difference between mean scores of political participation of extrovert and introvert group” is rejected.

Table 3: Personality wise mean scores of political participation

Personality	Mean scores of Political Participation
Extrovert	31.30
Ambivert	26.25
Introvert	26.23

Further, it is clear from the Table 3 that the mean score of political participation of extrovert personality group is 31.30, which is significantly higher than that of introvert personality group whose mean score of political participation is 26.23. It may therefore be concluded that the political participation of extrovert personality people was found to be significantly higher than the political participation of introvert personality people.

Further, from the Table 2 it is evident that mean difference of political participation of extrovert and

ambivert group is 5.05, whose level of significance is 0.00, which is less than 0.01 level of significance, hence the mean difference is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means there is a significant difference between mean scores of political participation of extrovert and ambivert group. In the light of this the null hypothesis that “There will be no significant difference between mean scores of political participation of extrovert and ambivert group” is rejected.

Further, it is clear from the Table 3 that the mean score of political participation of extrovert personality group is 31.30, which is significantly higher than that of ambivert personality group whose mean score of political participation is 26.25. It may therefore be concluded that the Political participation of extrovert personality people was found to be significantly higher than the political participation of ambivert personality people.

Further, from the Table 2 it is evident that mean difference of political participation of ambivert and introvert group is 0.02, whose level of significance is 1.00, which is higher than 0.01 level of significance, hence the mean difference is not significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means there is no significant difference between mean scores of political participation of ambivert and introvert group. In the light of this the null hypothesis that “There will be no significant difference between mean scores of political participation of ambivert and introvert group” is not rejected. It may therefore be concluded that the political participation of people with ambivert and introvert personality has been found to be similar.

Findings

The following were the findings of the present study.

1. Political participation of extrovert personality scheduled tribe people was found to be significantly higher than the political participation of introvert personality scheduled tribe people.
2. Political participation of extrovert personality scheduled tribe people was found to be significantly higher than the political participation of ambivert personality scheduled tribe people.
3. Political participation of scheduled tribe people with ambivert and introvert personality has been found to be similar.

References

1. **Allport, G. W. (1937).** *Personality*. Holt, Rinehart and Winrston.
2. **Pye, L. W., & Verba, S. (2015).** *Political culture and political development*. Princeton University Press.
3. **Almond, G. A. (2000).** The study of political culture. *Culture and Politics: A reader*, 5-20.
4. **Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., Raso, C., & Ha, S. E. (2011).** Personality traits and participation in political processes. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(3), 692-706.
5. **Gallego, A., & Oberski, D. (2012).** Personality and political participation: The mediation hypothesis. *Political behavior*, 34, 425-451.
6. **Ackermann, K. (2022).** Personality, Motives, and Political Participation.
7. **Aryanpour, H., Iranpour, A., & Fattahi Ardakani, H. (2023).** Investigating the structural relationships of personality traits and political participation of students with the mediating role of religious beliefs. *Studies in Islam and Psychology*.
8. **Mokhtari, M., Rasekh, K., & Khodami, A. (2021).** Investigating the Effect of Personal Values and Personality Traits on Political Participation among the Citizens of Behbahan. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(8).

