

## *Appendices*

---

## QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR PILOT STUDY

Dear Students,

I am conducting a survey to identify the learning approaches adopted by college students, and their level of career planning. For the questions given below kindly circle the option you feel is the right response. The data collected will be kept confidential and used for research purpose only.

Regards,

Y. Benazir, Research Scholar,

PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore

### Demographic Details

- 1) Name:
- 2) Age: a) 20 years b)21 years c)22 years d)23 years e) 24 years f) 25 years
- 3) Educational qualification:  
**Under Graduation:** a) Arts and Science b) Engineering c) Management  
**Post Graduation:** a) Arts and Science b) Engineering c) Management
- 4) Location of Residence: a)Rural b)Urban c) Semi-Urban

Please select the option that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement to the statements given below. The description for the options are; **5 – Completely Agree;** **4 – Agree;** **3 – Neither Agree nor Disagree;** **2 - Disagree;** **1 – Completely Disagree**

**Kindly indicate to what extent the statements given below describe you.**

P1	My remarks, sometimes, deeply, offend other students	5	4	3	2	1
P2	I think that, when doing things, people can be trusted as having goodwill	5	4	3	2	1
P3	I accept people as they are	5	4	3	2	1
P4	It is easy for me to get back to people	5	4	3	2	1
P5	I don't like drawing people's attention to myself	5	4	3	2	1
P6	I make friends easily	5	4	3	2	1
P7	I can easily attract my counterparts and hold their attention	5	4	3	2	1
P8	I prefer keeping a low profile in my campus	5	4	3	2	1
P9	I have frequent mood swings	5	4	3	2	1
P10	Generally, I don't bother about people views and attitude towards me	5	4	3	2	1
P11	I often panic, easily, about things around me	5	4	3	2	1
P12	Generally, I am very pleased with my self	5	4	3	2	1
P13	I carry out my plans to reach my goals	5	4	3	2	1
P14	I often find myself unwilling to do my study work	5	4	3	2	1
P15	I often pay attention to details	5	4	3	2	1
P16	I often waste my time by doing unnecessary things	5	4	3	2	1
P17	I am not interested in abstract ideas	5	4	3	2	1
P18	I prefer voting for conformist leaders of students	5	4	3	2	1
P19	I tend to support liberal students' leaders	5	4	3	2	1
P20	I avoid logical/practical discussions in class	5	4	3	2	1

**Kindly indicate to what extent the statements given below describe the learning style adopted by you.**

L1	I usually set out to understand for myself the meaning of what we have to learn.	5	4	3	2	1
L2	When I'm reading an article or book, I try to find out for myself exactly what the author means	5	4	3	2	1
L3	When I am reading I stop from time to time to think what I am trying to learn from it	5	4	3	2	1
L4	Before tackling a problem or assignment, I first try to work out what is required.	5	4	3	2	1
L5	I try to relate ideas I come across to those in other topics whenever possible	5	4	3	2	1
L6	When I'm working on a new topic, I try to see in my own mind how all the ideas go together.	5	4	3	2	1
L7	Ideas in books make me think of ideas of my own	5	4	3	2	1
L8	I like to play around with ideas of my own even if they don't get me very far	5	4	3	2	1
L9	I look at the proof carefully and try to understand what I'm studying	5	4	3	2	1
L10	Often I find myself questioning things I hear in lectures or read in books	5	4	3	2	1
L11	When I read, I examine the details carefully to see how they fit in with what's being said	5	4	3	2	1
L12	It's important for me to be able to follow the argument, and understand the reason behind things	5	4	3	2	1
L13	I find myself relating ideas from lectures when I'm doing other things	5	4	3	2	1
L14	I find that studying academic topics can be quite exciting at times	5	4	3	2	1
L15	Some of the ideas I come across is very interesting	5	4	3	2	1
L16	I sometimes get interested in academic topics and feel like going on studying them	5	4	3	2	1

L17	I go over the work I've done carefully to check for errors	5	4	3	2	1
L18	I think about what I want to achieve to keep my learning focused	5	4	3	2	1
L19	Before starting work on an assignment or exam question, I think first how best to tackle it	5	4	3	2	1
L20	When I have finished a piece of work, I check it through to see if it really meets the requirements	5	4	3	2	1
L21	I manage to find a place to study which allows me to do my work easily	5	4	3	2	1
L22	I think I'm quite systematic and organized when I revise for exams	5	4	3	2	1
L23	I'm good at following up some of the reading suggested by lecturers	5	4	3	2	1
L24	I usually plan out my week's work in advance, either on paper or in my head	5	4	3	2	1
L25	I organize my study time carefully to make the best use of it	5	4	3	2	1
L26	I'm pretty good at doing work whenever I need to	5	4	3	2	1
L27	I work steadily through the term or semester, rather than leave it all until the end	5	4	3	2	1
L28	I generally make good use of my time during the day	5	4	3	2	1
L29	It's important for me to feel that I'm doing my best in my course	5	4	3	2	1
L30	I feel that doing well, and this helps me put more effort into my work	5	4	3	2	1
L31	I put a lot of effort into studying because I'm determined to do well	5	4	3	2	1
L32	I don't find it difficult to motivate myself	5	4	3	2	1
L33	When working on an assignment, I think how best to impress my teacher	5	4	3	2	1
L34	I look carefully at tutors' comments on my work to see how to get higher marks next time	5	4	3	2	1
L35	I keep in mind who is going to correct my assignment and what they're likely to be looking for	5	4	3	2	1

L36	I keep an eye open for what lecturers seem to think is important and concentrate on that	5	4	3	2	1
L37	Often I think whether the work I am doing here is really useful	5	4	3	2	1
L38	There's not much that I find interesting or relevant in my studies	5	4	3	2	1
L39	When I look back, I sometimes think why I ever decided to come here	5	4	3	2	1
L40	I'm not really interested in this course, but I have to take it for other reasons	5	4	3	2	1
L41	I have to learn a lot of portions by heart	5	4	3	2	1
L42	Much of what I'm studying makes little sense: it's like unrelated bits and pieces	5	4	3	2	1
L43	I'm not sure what is important, so I try to leave off all I can	5	4	3	2	1
L44	I often have trouble in making sense of the things I have to remember	5	4	3	2	1
L45	I feel I have the right amount of portions to study	5	4	3	2	1
L46	I often worry about whether I'll ever be able to cope with the work properly	5	4	3	2	1
L47	I often seem to panic if I am late in my work	5	4	3	2	1
L48	Often I keep worrying about work that I think I may not be able to do	5	4	3	2	1
L49	I tend to read very little more than what is actually required to pass	5	4	3	2	1
L50	I concentrate on learning just those bits of information I have to know to pass	5	4	3	2	1
L51	I gear my studying closely to just what seems to be required for assignments and exams	5	4	3	2	1
L52	I like to be told precisely what to do in essays or other assignments	5	4	3	2	1

**Kindly indicate to what extent the statements given below describe your level of career planning.**

CA1	I am good at adapting to new work settings	5	4	3	2	1
CA2	I can adapt to change in my career plans	5	4	3	2	1
CA3	I can overcome potential barriers that may exist in my career	5	4	3	2	1
CA4	I enjoy trying new work-related tasks	5	4	3	2	1
CA5	I can adapt to change in the world of work	5	4	3	2	1
CA6	I will adjust easily to shifting demands at work	5	4	3	2	1
CA7	Others would say that I am adaptable to change in my career plans	5	4	3	2	1
CA8	My career success will be determined by my efforts	5	4	3	2	1
CA9	I tend to bounce back when my career plans don't work out quite right	5	4	3	2	1
CA10	I am rarely in control of my career	5	4	3	2	1
CA11	I am not in control of my career success	5	4	3	2	1
CO12	I get excited when I think about my career	5	4	3	2	1
CO13	Thinking about my career inspires me	5	4	3	2	1
CO14	It is difficult for me to set career goals	5	4	3	2	1
CO15	It is difficult to relate my abilities to a specific career plan	5	4	3	2	1
CO16	I understand my work-related interests	5	4	3	2	1
CO17	I am eager to pursue my career dreams	5	4	3	2	1
CO18	Thinking about my career frustrates me	5	4	3	2	1
CO19	I am unsure of my future career success	5	4	3	2	1
CO20	It is hard to discover the right career	5	4	3	2	1
CO21	Planning my career is a natural activity	5	4	3	2	1
CO22	I will definitely make the right decisions in my career	5	4	3	2	1
CK23	I am good at understanding job market trends	5	4	3	2	1
CK24	I do not understand job market trends	5	4	3	2	1
CK25	It is easy to see future employment trends	5	4	3	2	1

**Thank You for the time....**

## QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR THE STUDY

Dear Students,

I am conducting a survey to identify the learning approaches adopted by college students, and their level of career planning. For the questions given below kindly circle the option you feel is the right response. The data collected will be kept confidential and used for research purpose only.

Regards,

Y. Benazir, Research Scholar,

PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore

### Demographic Details

1) Name:

2) Age: a) 20 years b)21 years c)22 years d)23 years e) 24 years f) 25 years

3) Educational qualification:

**Under Graduation:** a) Arts and Science b) Engineering c) Management

**Post Graduation:** a) Arts and Science b) Engineering c) Management

4) Location of Residence: a)Rural b)Urban c) Semi-Urban

Please select the option that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement to the statements given below. The description for the options are; **5 – Completely Agree; 4 – Agree; 3 – Neither Agree nor Disagree; 2 - Disagree; 1 – Completely Disagree**

**Kindly indicate to what extent the statements given below describe you.**

P1	My comment sometimes deeply hurt other students	5	4	3	2	1
P2	I think that, when doing things, people can be trusted as having goodwill	5	4	3	2	1
P3	I accept people as they are	5	4	3	2	1
P4	It is easy for me to get back to people	5	4	3	2	1



P5	I don't like drawing people's attention to myself	5	4	3	2	1
P6	I make friends easily	5	4	3	2	1
P7	I can easily attract my counterparts and hold their attention	5	4	3	2	1
P8	I prefer keeping a low profile in my campus	5	4	3	2	1
P9	I have frequent mood swings	5	4	3	2	1
P10	Generally, I don't bother about people views and attitude towards me	5	4	3	2	1
P11	I often panic, easily, about things around me	5	4	3	2	1
P12	Generally, I am very pleased with my self	5	4	3	2	1
P13	I carry out my plans to reach my goals	5	4	3	2	1
P14	I often find myself unwilling to do my study work	5	4	3	2	1
P15	I often pay attention to details	5	4	3	2	1
P16	I often waste my time by doing unnecessary things	5	4	3	2	1
P17	I am not interested in abstract ideas	5	4	3	2	1
P18	I prefer voting for accepted leaders of students	5	4	3	2	1
P19	I tend to support liberal students' leaders	5	4	3	2	1
P20	I avoid logical/practical discussions in class	5	4	3	2	1

**Kindly indicate to what extent the statements given below describe the learning style adopted by you.**

L1	I usually try to understand by myself the meaning of what we have to learn.	5	4	3	2	1
L2	When I'm reading an article or book, I try to find out for myself exactly what the author means	5	4	3	2	1
L3	When I am reading I stop from time to time to think what I am trying to learn from it	5	4	3	2	1

L4	Before tackling a problem or assignment, I first try to work out what is required.	5	4	3	2	1
L5	I try to relate ideas I come across to those in other topics whenever possible	5	4	3	2	1
L6	When I'm working on a new topic, I try to see in my own mind how all the ideas go together.	5	4	3	2	1
L7	Ideas in books make me think of ideas of my own	5	4	3	2	1
L8	I like to play around with ideas of my own even if it is not very useful	5	4	3	2	1
L9	I look at the proof carefully and try to understand what I'm studying	5	4	3	2	1
L10	Often I find myself questioning things I hear in lectures or read in books	5	4	3	2	1
L11	When I read, I examine the details carefully to see how they fit in with what's being said	5	4	3	2	1
L12	It's important for me to be able to follow the argument, and understand the reason behind things	5	4	3	2	1
L13	I find myself relating ideas from lectures when I'm doing other things	5	4	3	2	1
L14	I find that studying academic topics can be quite exciting at times	5	4	3	2	1
L15	Some of the ideas I come across is very interesting	5	4	3	2	1
L16	I sometimes get interested in academic topics and feel like going on studying them	5	4	3	2	1
L17	I go over the work I've done carefully to check for errors	5	4	3	2	1
L18	I think about what I want to achieve to keep my learning focused	5	4	3	2	1
L19	Before starting work on an assignment or exam question, I think first how best to tackle it	5	4	3	2	1
L20	When I have finished a piece of work, I check it through to see if it really meets the requirements	5	4	3	2	1

L21	I manage to find a place to study which allows me to do my work easily	5	4	3	2	1
L22	I think I'm quite systematic and organized when I revise for exams	5	4	3	2	1
L23	I'm good at following up some of the reading suggested by lecturers	5	4	3	2	1
L24	I usually plan out my week's work in advance, either on paper or in my head	5	4	3	2	1
L25	I organize my study time carefully to make the best use of it	5	4	3	2	1
L26	I'm pretty good at doing work whenever I need to	5	4	3	2	1
L27	I work steadily through the term or semester, rather than leave it all until the end	5	4	3	2	1
L28	I generally make good use of my time during the day	5	4	3	2	1
L29	It's important for me to feel that I'm doing my best in my course	5	4	3	2	1
L30	I feel that doing well, and this helps me put more effort into my work	5	4	3	2	1
L31	I put a lot of effort into studying because I'm determined to do well	5	4	3	2	1
L32	I don't find it difficult to motivate myself	5	4	3	2	1
L33	When working on an assignment, I think how best to impress my teacher	5	4	3	2	1
L34	I look carefully at tutors' comments on my work to see how to get higher marks next time	5	4	3	2	1
L35	I keep in mind who is going to correct my assignment and what they're likely to be looking for	5	4	3	2	1
L36	I keep an eye open for what lecturers seem to think is important and concentrate on that	5	4	3	2	1
L37	Often I think whether the work I am doing here is really useful	5	4	3	2	1
L38	There's not much that I find interesting or relevant in my studies	5	4	3	2	1

L39	When I look back, I sometimes think why I ever decided to come here	5	4	3	2	1
L40	I'm not really interested in this course, but I have to take it for other reasons	5	4	3	2	1
L41	I have to learn a lot of portions by heart	5	4	3	2	1
L42	Much of what I'm studying makes little sense: it's like unrelated bits and pieces	5	4	3	2	1
L43	I'm not sure what is important, so I try to leave off all I can	5	4	3	2	1
L44	I often have trouble in making sense of the things I have to remember	5	4	3	2	1
L45	I feel I have the right amount of portions to study	5	4	3	2	1
L46	I often worry about whether I'll ever be able to cope with the work properly	5	4	3	2	1
L47	I often seem to panic if I am late in my work	5	4	3	2	1
L48	Often I keep worrying about work that I think I may not be able to do	5	4	3	2	1
L49	I tend to read very little more than what is actually required to pass	5	4	3	2	1
L50	I concentrate on learning just those bits of information I have to know to pass	5	4	3	2	1
L51	I learn only what is required for exams	5	4	3	2	1
L52	I like to be told exactly what to do in assignments	5	4	3	2	1

**Kindly indicate to what extent the statements given below describe your level of career planning.**

CA1	I am good at adapting to new work settings	5	4	3	2	1
CA2	I can adapt to change in my career plans	5	4	3	2	1
CA3	I can overcome potential barriers that may exist in my career	5	4	3	2	1
CA4	I enjoy trying new work-related tasks	5	4	3	2	1
CA5	I can adapt to change in the world of work	5	4	3	2	1
CA6	I will adjust easily to shifting demands at work	5	4	3	2	1
CA7	Others would say that I am adaptable to change in my career plans	5	4	3	2	1
CA8	My career success will be determined by my efforts	5	4	3	2	1
CA9	I tend to bounce back when my career plans don't work out quite right	5	4	3	2	1
CA10	I am rarely in control of my career	5	4	3	2	1
CA11	I am not in control of my career success	5	4	3	2	1
CO12	I get excited when I think about my career	5	4	3	2	1
CO13	Thinking about my career inspires me	5	4	3	2	1
CO14	It is difficult for me to set career goals	5	4	3	2	1
CO15	It is difficult to relate my abilities to a specific career plan	5	4	3	2	1
CO16	I understand my work-related interests	5	4	3	2	1
CO17	I am eager to pursue my career dreams	5	4	3	2	1
CO18	Thinking about my career frustrates me	5	4	3	2	1
CO19	I am unsure of my future career success	5	4	3	2	1
CO20	It is hard to discover the right career	5	4	3	2	1
CO21	Planning my career is an natural practice	5	4	3	2	1
CO22	I will definitely make the right decisions in my career	5	4	3	2	1
CK23	I am good at understanding job market trends	5	4	3	2	1
CK24	I do not understand job market trends	5	4	3	2	1
CK25	It is easy to see future employment trends	5	4	3	2	1

**Thank You for the time....**

*Publications*

---

# Big Five Personality Traits Among Female Under Graduate Students With Specific Reference To Coimbatore City

Paper ID

IJIFR/V3/ E12/ 003

Page No.

4411-4422

Subject Area

Management Studies

KeyWords

Personality, Age, Residence, Education Stream

1 <sup>st</sup>	Dr. B. Sripirabaa	Associate Professor GRG School of Management Studies PSGR Krishnammal College for Women Peelamedu, Coimbatore
2 <sup>nd</sup>	Y. Benazir	Assistant Professor Department of Business Management PSGR Krishnammal College for Women Peelamedu, Coimbatore

## Abstract

*Personality has been regarded as a practical force in determining the success or failure in life. Personality has been viewed as a source of person's attitude exhibited in the workplace over the years. Personality of an individual starts developing at the early age and is groomed over the education period of individuals. The present education system aims to enable students not just to acquire knowledge but also to become capable, confident and enthusiastic leaders and managers. The aim of the study is to profile the personality of the students across age, education stream and location of residence. The study is descriptive in nature and adopted survey strategy. Data was collected using a questionnaire from the final year under graduate female students in Coimbatore city. The collected data was analyzed using percentage analysis and Analysis of Variance.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Personality plays a vital role in the higher education among the students. Personality is a term frequently used by people. It means different things to different people. Personality refers to a unique mode of response to life situations. The term personality has been derived from Latin word 'persona' which means 'to speak through'. Personality influences others through external appearance. The unique way of responding to day-to-day life situations is

the heart of human behavior. Personality embraces all the unique traits and patterns of adjustment of the individuals in his/her relationship with others and his environment. This implies not only the structure of personality but its dynamic qualities as well. Maddi (1990:P.90) defines “Personality is a set of characteristics and tendencies that determine that commonalities and differences in the behavior of people that have continuity in time and that may not be easily understood as the sole result of the social and biological pressures of the moment”.

Personality has been regarded as a practical force in determining the success or failure in life. Personality has been viewed as a source of person’s attitude exhibited in the workplace over the years. Personality takes the whole man concept because it affects the various psychological processes. Propositions have been made about the different kinds of personality traits having relevance with the nature of job. The prominent feature of personality traits can be successful in aligning with the particular job requirements. Hence, psychologists have tried to identify the types of personality and traits and thousands of personality traits have been identified that differentiates one person from the other. Since ancient times, humans have sought to explain behavior by categorizing personalities into distinct types. There are various theories for personality namely Trait Theory, Psychodynamic Theory, Behavioral Theory, Cognitive Theory, Social learning Theory. Personality assessments have been developed over the past several centuries to describe the aspects of a person that remain stable throughout a lifetime: the individual’s character, pattern of behavior, thoughts, and feelings. Among the personality assessment tools developed by psychologists and social science researchers the big five personality traits proposed by McCrae and Costa, (1990) is popular. Having gained prominence, later recruiters started using personality assessments to sort, classify, and categorize people for the jobs like Managers, Executives, Entrepreneurship, Non- Profit making Professions, Public sector Professions, Scientists, Researchers and Engineers. References to personality assessments have even made their way into books and movies such as Harry Potter, “who was placed into the Gryffindor House at the Hogwarts School by a “sorting hat” that could gauge the temperament of each student”.

Personality of an individual starts developing at the early age and is groomed over the education period of individuals. Schools and colleges conducts program in assessing, shaping and grooming the personality of individuals. The present education system aims to enable students not just to acquire knowledge but also to become capable, confident and enthusiastic leaders and managers. In order to become a skilled, capable leader or manager, a student or an individual should possess an inbuilt personality. Personality brings out the capabilities and strengths of students thus making the student aware of the inner self and thereby becoming more confident to face the outside world. Studies reveal that personality has key influence on individual performance and the job performance. It acts as a major determinant in jobs, where most of the working day is spent interacting with other people what will be done and how it will be done. Each man’s personality reveals itself in the way he works with his superior, his subordinates and other people. Everyone has to adjust to a



whole series of changes in the way work is accomplished when job changes. The strengths of an organization are reflected by the personality of those who hold key jobs. Personality types are strong predictors in choosing the students majors and the impact of this choice lasts far beyond students learning and success in college (Porter & Umbach; 2006). Thousands of students and their parents have expressed that their interests are something that they are not directed towards programs and college majors that do not fit their personality. When the personality type fits the students with the chosen specialization, the students can learn and earn better grades.

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

It discusses the concepts related to the study through reviews of literature which explains the undergraduate students' personality.

- **Mohsen et al (2009)** studies the relation between the Big five personality traits, self-esteem, and life satisfaction in Iran, with 235 university students at the University of Tehran. The data is analysed using the Correlation and Regression analysis. Among the Big Five traits, extraversion and neuroticism is the strongest predictors of life satisfaction. Self-esteem predicts the life satisfaction over and above the Big Five personality traits. Finding reveals that female students scores significantly higher than male students on life satisfaction. The relation between personality traits and life satisfaction are also consistent with those of previous studies (e.g., DeNeve and Cooper 1998). Bivariate correlation analysis shows that four of the Big Five traits (extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness and conscientiousness) significantly correlates with life satisfaction. Openness to new experience is not correlated with life satisfaction. Regression analysis shows that extroversion and neuroticism significantly predicts life satisfaction.
- **Zahra et al (2012)** investigates the relationship between the degree, type of mobile usage and personal traits among the students of public and payame-noor universities of Isfahan Province. The sample selected for the study is 300 students comprising of 150 male and female students of three universities by random cluster sampling method and is assessed with a version of (NEO-FFI) inventory scales and self-constructed mobile usage questionnaire. Data is analyzed by applying Pearson product-moment correlation matrix and linear regression. There is an inverse relationship between mobile usage and neuroticism traits. Considering the relationship between the type of mobile usage and personality traits, none of the five personality traits had meaningful relationship with (internet and Bluetooth) usage. There is a positive relationship between using mobile games and neuroticism and had a negative relationship with listening to music via mobile. Extraversion and openness to experiences shows a positive relationship with listening to music. Agreeableness and conscientiousness didn't seem to have any meaningful relationship with listening to music. Among personality traits, neuroticism is the best predictor of the degree and type of mobile usage. Personality traits can better predict the listening to music in comparison to other mobile usages.

- **Elizabeth et al (2001)** study compares the Computer related stress levels in three business student populations of 239 students comprising of juniors, seniors (MIS majors) and graduate MBA students. Standard analysis of variance shows that MIS students experienced a significantly higher number of stressors than the other two groups and a greater average severity of stress than the pre- majors. Human-computer interaction is suspected to be more stressful for MIS students than other business students because their use of computers is greater and their grades are more heavily weighted towards computer work. This study considers the various personality types/learning styles of the students and investigates how they might be accommodated to minimize anxiety. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) test and a computer assignment preference test are administered. This would seem to be especially important in student populations where computer stress levels are high. While individualized environments and assignment criteria are not always pragmatic, it is possible to provide a variety of assignment choices and to focus on those variables that accommodate the learning style.
- **Clark et al (2007)** examines the relationship between the Big Five Personality Dimensions and Attitudes towards Telecommuting. The basic logic of fit theory is to focus on the fit between an individual's personality and the type of work arrangement. Multi-facet questionnaire is used for measuring the attitude towards telecommuting using a sample of students at a large south eastern University. Factor analysis is used to identify a four factor solution, establishing internal consistency. Additional analysis is made to finalise a 38-item version of the telecommuting attitudes scale with excellent internal consistency ( $H=.91$ ) and four meaningful factors each had good to very good internal consistency ( $H$  ranging from  $.81$  to  $.85$ ). The results show that emotional stability has a significant negative relationship with telecommuting attitudes. Agreeableness is found to have a positive relationship with telecommuting attitudes. Conscientiousness has a positive relationship with telecommuting Work Preferences. Lack of relationship between either extraversion or openness and attitude towards telecommuting. It serves as the dynamics of telecommuting attitude formation and various telecommuting outcomes. It facilitates in developing a comprehensive, multi- dimensional scale with excellent reliability for measuring telecommuting.
- **John W. Lounsbury et al (2009)** enumerates the Personality Characteristics of Business Majors as defined by the Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits, using data from 347 undergraduate business majors and 2,252 non business majors at a large South eastern university and investigates whether the 2 groups differs in Big Five model of personality (B.De Raad, 2000; agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion, openness) and 4 narrow personality traits. Business majors scored higher for conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion, assertiveness, and tough-mindedness, and scored lower on agreeableness and openness. All of the traits except for agreeableness and tough-mindedness correlate significantly and positively with life satisfaction. The study is useful from a practical standpoint in terms of advising college students considering a major in business and business majors planning their careers.

- **Iftikhar Ahmad (2010)** identifies the Performance of Students and Community in Pakistan using 452 undergraduate students in Pakistan. Item-analysis reveals that the response pattern of the students differentiates across the five response choices for 44 of the 60 items. The mean scores of the respondents are close to a theoretical average of 35 for each scale. Girls score significantly higher than boys on Neuroticism and Conscientiousness scales. The alpha index for the Neuroticism and Conscientiousness scales is in the 70s for Extraversion scale in the 50s and for Openness and Agreeableness scales in the 40s. The inventory is thereafter administered to a community sample of 320 (male 139, female, 181) gains 2-3 points in mean scores over the student sample on Neuroticism and Conscientiousness scales. The Big Five (Urdu version) evaluates in the context of Pakistan both on students as well as on community sample, the two populations where it can be potentially used. The scores of boys and girls are the same on this inventory except on conscientiousness and neuroticism scales where girls scores significantly higher than boys. Moreover, conscientiousness is relevant to achievement in the college.
- **Deborah Prentice (1999)** argues that student satisfaction is an important educational outcome. The study concerns with accounting education. The study groups the participants as juniors, seniors, master's students, and new professionals. Undergraduate and master's accounting students and newly hired CPA firm accounting professionals are its subjects. There are three research questions: The levels of program and university satisfaction of the participants; the participants' composite personality profile; and third, the relationship between satisfaction and personality for the participants. Two instruments used are modified College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire for student satisfaction, and the BFI-44, a Big Five trait model instrument, for personality. Mean satisfaction score is compared with class level and by institution. A correlation analysis reveals relationships between satisfaction and personality. Regression analysis discloses that personality subscales contributes most as predictors of satisfaction. The new accounting professionals have higher mean satisfaction scores than all other groups in the study. The personality profile reveals the accounting students as low on Neuroticism, average on Extraversion and Openness, and moderately high on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. With satisfaction as the dependent variable and personality as the independent variable there is an R<sup>2</sup> of .107, indicating 11% of the variance. All groups have basically the same personality profile. The study shows that accounting students are higher on Extraversion, lower on openness; higher on Conscientiousness and reveals their thoroughness in completing their tasks.
- **Jeff Brice (2002)** suggests that entrepreneurial intentions are formed from an integration of personality dimensions (traits), mental ability, general and entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and occupational preference for an entrepreneurial career. A comprehensive theoretical model is developed based on the incorporation of variables from three disparate research perspectives. The sample of 833 university student respondents is taken for the study composed of undergraduate graduating business students, MBA

students, and veterinary students who are in the process of making career-related decisions. The majority of data are collected utilizing an Internet web-based self-report methodology (on-line survey). An empirical investigation is performed on a single path of the theoretical model, which evaluated with Five-factor model of personality. Data is analysed using the factor analysis and multi regression analysis Dimensions and preference for an entrepreneurial career based on the rewards of independence, profit, and a satisfying way of life for the formation of entrepreneurial intentions. Preference for an entrepreneurial career based on the expectation of profits is assessed as a moderator of the relationship between entrepreneurial career preference based on the reward of a satisfying way of life and entrepreneurial intentions. The result indicates that high Openness and low Agreeableness are the only personality dimensions that are directly related to the formation of entrepreneurial intentions. The rewards of independence and profits are affirmed and have a significant direct effect on entrepreneurial intentions. Openness demonstrates a mediated effect on entrepreneurial intentions through preference for the reward of independence while Conscientiousness exhibited a mediated effect on entrepreneurial intentions through both of the intrinsic entrepreneurial career preference constructs independence and a satisfying lifestyle. It suggests that people who are attracted to independence, profit, and challenges are good candidates to form the intentions to start a business. Therefore, any entrepreneurial training that they receive should include in-depth analyses about which rewards may reasonably be attained and in what timeframes for particular types of businesses.

- **Anitsal et al (2010)** analysed the impact of on-line and on-ground course characteristics by Undergraduate Student Personality Traits. Students from 21 courses are approached for collecting the data. The survey is completed with 355 undergraduate students. The data is divided among the students of on-line courses (n= 65), students of on-ground courses (n=37), and students of on-ground courses with online elements. Factor loadings for need for cognition, self-sufficiency, and the five factor model of personality (extraversion, neuroticism, open to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness) indicate that measurement items measures and therefore provide evidence about the existence of validity. Cronbach's alpha values for each measure range between 0.531 and 0.790, indicating sufficient reliability. The mean value for each objective for the total sample are considerably high, (real life problem solving= 4.12, team work= 4.15, creativity=3.85, and critical thinking= 3.96) indicating successful QEP implementation. Students in on-ground courses with on-line elements have a higher mean on teamwork than those in fully on-line courses, though this difference is statistically insignificant. The analysis is to look at correlates of personality traits, types of courses, and four objectives of QEP. Among students of fully on-line courses, agreeableness is the On-Ground Courses with On-Line Elements. With the increasing popularity of distance education, a growing body of research is emerging which investigates personality characteristics, the types of students that are successful online and the differences between on-line students

and traditional students. Understanding these personality traits will help educators fine-tune their course designs and delivery methods based on their students' needs.

- **Hsiang-Yung Feng (2012)** identifies the relationship of Taiwanese university students' personality traits, motivations on overseas internship and their achievements. Taiwan Ministry of Education (MOE) provides university students overseas internships from 2008. The sample of 131 students who have participated overseas internship is collected. There are 29.0% male and 71.0% female. The questionnaire includes 4 parts: personal information, overseas internship sites, personality traits, motivations on overseas internships and achievement of overseas internship. The personality traits have 12 questions, includes five characteristics: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. The motivations on overseas internships have 14 questions, divided into five factors: relaxation, looking for excitement, social expanding, visiting and learning, novelty and self-realization. Achievement of overseas internship covered by intrinsic, extrinsic evaluation. Statistical analysis is conducted using SPSS software. Descriptive statistics are used to understand the distribution of students' demographic data. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is adopted to know the factors of personality traits and motivations of overseas internship. Canonical analysis is to analyse the relationship between personality traits and motivations of overseas internship. Overseas workers' nature of personality traits were extraversion, conscientiousness and agreeableness. They wanted to get to know more about other countries culture, scenery, and customs, etc. Besides, travel youth workers are easy to get along with people. The qualities such as trust and friendliness make them collaborate with other young people more easily. Overseas internships for students can be rewarding experiences that dramatically change the perspectives of globalization and visions. The results shows that students with the trait of motivation looking for excitement also possess the personality traits of agreeableness, openness to experience. While the students with the trait of self-satisfaction own the personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience. Integrated achievement of overseas internship was in relation to personality traits, although intrinsic achievement had relations with motivation.
- **Aslam et al (2001)** investigated the relationship between student's personality traits such as Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness with the academic dishonest behaviours of students. A well-structured questionnaire is used to collect the data from 932 respondents studying at graduate and undergraduate levels in different Pakistani universities. The cross tabulation is used among, Academic Program, Age Group and Major compares with Gender of the respondents. Correlations analysis has been used to investigate the relationship of personality traits with frequency of students' frequency of involvement in academic dishonesty. Mean and standard deviation columns show that overall students have been found high in all personality traits. The need is to have a careful insight by the academicians and policy makers on the ethical and moral values of students at the undergraduate level at a university. This puts stress on the requirement to impact the course of Ethics in the undergraduate curriculum, especially

for non-business students. The results provide a strong implication for academicians to develop the moralities and ethics in students so that institutions may provide ethically cultivated professionals to the business community.

### 3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

To profile the personality of the students across age, education stream and location of residence.

### 4. METHODOLOGY

The research purpose and research questions revealed that this study is descriptive in nature and the study adopted survey strategy. Data was collected using a standard questionnaire. Each response was measured using a three-point Likert scales, ranging from 5- completely agree to 1- completely disagree. The sample size is 151 comprising of Undergraduate students from Arts and Science and Management (BBM and Allied courses) disciplines. Data was collected during the period August 2015 to February 2016. The study used percentage analysis to profile the respondents, ANOVA to identify differences in the levels of personality across respondents of varied demographic profiles. The primary data used by the study were directly obtained from the questionnaire. The Personality questionnaire consists of 20 items, four from each of the five personality variables, developed based on a review of the IPIP five factor personality (Big five Personality) inventory (Buchanan, 2001). They are, namely, conscientiousness, openness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. The average of the items in each factor is computed and is used for analysis.

### 5. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

#### 5.1 Profile of the Respondents

6% of the respondents are in the age group of 23 & 24 years. 45% of the respondents are in the age group of 21 years; 34.4% of the respondents are under graduates in the Arts and Science stream and 27.8% of the respondents are under the Management (BBM) stream. 19.2% of the respondents are under graduates in the Arts and Science stream and 18.5% of the respondents are under the Management (MBA) stream. 31.8% of the respondents are residing in the rural areas, 45% are from urban areas and 23.2% are from semi-urban areas. 50.3% of the respondents scored 81-90% of marks. 6% of the respondents scored 50-60% of marks. This portrays the diverse profile of the respondents which is essential for the study, since the study focuses in enumerating the role of personality among Females graduate students.

#### 5.2 Descriptive Statistics

The Descriptive procedure displays univariate summary statistics for the factors and calculates standardized values (z scores).

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics**

Factors	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGR	151	2.8924	0.63673
EXT	151	3.2649	0.81865

NEU	151	3.2864	0.70321
CON	151	3.1838	0.64659
OPEN	151	3.5762	0.72399

The mean value for the variable openness is higher (3.5762) which implies that the respondents are open to new and non-traditional ideas and are curious about the world around them. The mean value for the variable Neuroticism is (3.2864) which implies that the respondents have typically experiencing negative effects includes sadness, anger, embarrassment and guilt. The standard deviation is high for Extroversion (0.81865) among the three indicating that the person’s sociability, they prefer to be in a large group and are talkative.

**5.3 Analysis of Variance**

Analysis of variance was carried out to find whether respondents of varied demographic profile differed in their perception towards Big Five Personality Inventory.

**Table 2: ANOVA across respondents of varied Age**

		20 yrs	21 yrs	22yrs	23 yrs	24 yrs	25 yrs
<b>Agreeableness</b>	<b>N</b>	12	68	30	9	9	23
	<b>Mean</b>	2.8750	2.7169	3.2167	2.2500	4.0000	2.8152
	<b>F</b>	14.364					
	<b>Sig.</b>	.000					
<b>Extroversion</b>	<b>N</b>	12	68	30	9	9	23
	<b>Mean</b>	3.9375	3.4632	2.8917	2.7500	2.5000	3.3152
	<b>F</b>	7.199					
	<b>Sig.</b>	.000					
<b>Neuroticism</b>	<b>N</b>	12	68	30	9	9	23
	<b>Mean</b>	3.2500	3.4632	3.2333	3.7500	1.5000	3.3696
	<b>F</b>	23.295					
	<b>Sig.</b>	.000					
<b>Conscientiousness</b>	<b>N</b>	12	68	30	9	9	23
	<b>Mean</b>	2.5625	3.1838	3.2500	3.5000	2.7500	3.4674
	<b>F</b>	4.990					
	<b>Sig.</b>	.000					
<b>Openness</b>	<b>N</b>	12	68	30	9	9	23
	<b>Mean</b>	3.1875	3.6544	3.9833	2.5000	4.0000	3.2717
	<b>F</b>	10.827					
	<b>Sig.</b>	.000					

Table 2 reveals that the mean value of students for the variable Agreeableness is higher among 24 yrs category as they are general altruistic tendency, being sympathetic and eager to help others. The mean value for the variable Extroversion is higher among 20yrs category, because the students entering the higher education are sociable, prefer large group,

assertive and talkative. The mean value for the variable Neuroticism is higher among 23yrs category, because the students in the middle of the education typically experiences, negative effects, including sadness, anger, embarrassment, and guilt. The mean value for the variable Conscientiousness is higher among 23yrs category, because the student's ability, or inability, desires, being strong-willed, determined, and high achieving. The mean value for the variable Openness is higher among 24yrs category, because the student's belonging to the Final years are more open to new and non-traditional ideas and are curious about the world around them. There is significant difference in the perception of the Age of the students for the variables Agreeableness ( $F=23.295$ ;  $p<0.000$ ), Extroversion ( $F=7.199$ ;  $p<0.000$ ) and Neuroticism ( $F=23.295$ ;  $p<0.000$ ), Conscientiousness ( $F=4.990$ ;  $p<0.000$ ), Openness ( $F=10.827$ ;  $p<0.000$ ).

**Table 3: ANOVA across respondents of varied under graduate discipline**

		N	Mean	F	Sig.
Agreeableness	Arts and Science	52	3.0144	31.715	.000
	Management	42	2.4464		
Extroversion	Arts and Science	52	3.4038	22.229	.000
	Management	42	2.8274		
Neuroticism	Arts and Science	52	3.4808	9.125	.003
	Management	42	3.1786		
Conscientiousness	Arts and Science	52	3.4038	6.928	.010
	Management	42	3.1071		
Openness	Arts and Science	52	3.8798	36.121	.000
	Management	42	3.1071		

Table 3 reveals that for all the five factors the mean value of students from Arts and Science Discipline is higher students from Management Discipline. This could be because the students from the Arts and Science discipline are more focused towards exploring new things and they are learning the courses practical than the management students. There is significant difference in the perception of the undergraduate students of Arts and Science Discipline and Management Discipline for the variable Agreeableness ( $F=31.715$ ;  $p<0.000$ ), Extroversion ( $F=22.229$ ;  $p<0.000$ ), Neuroticism ( $F=9.125$ ;  $p<0.003$ ), Conscientiousness ( $F=6.928$ ;  $p<0.010$ ), Openness ( $F=36.121$ ;  $p<0.000$ ).

**Table 4: ANOVA across respondents of varied location of residence**

		N	Mean	F	Sig.
Agreeableness	Rural	48	2.8333	31.322	.000
	Urban	68	2.6213		
	Semiurban	35	3.5000		
Extroversion	Rural	48	3.5417	5.844	.004
	Urban	68	3.0368		



	Semiurban	35	3.3286		
Neuroticism	Rural	48	3.6406	10.123	.000
	Urban	68	3.0993		
	Semiurban	35	3.1643		
Conscientiousness	Rural	48	3.5625	22.527	.000
	Urban	68	2.8566		
	Semiurban	35	3.3000		
Openness	Rural	48	3.9167	22.093	.000
	Urban	68	3.1949		
	Semiurban	35	3.8500		

There is significant difference in the perception of respondents of residing in Urban, Rural and Semi-urban areas regarding the variables Agreeableness ( $F=31.322$ ;  $p<0.000$ ), Extroversion ( $F=5.844$ ;  $p<0.004$ ), Neuroticism ( $F=10.123$ ;  $p<0.000$ ), Conscientiousness ( $F=22.527$ ;  $p<0.000$ ), Openness ( $F=22.093$ ;  $p<0.000$ ). Since there is significant difference in the perception post hoc analysis was carried out to find students residing from which locality differed in their perception from the others.

**Table 5: Posthoc analysis for respondents of varied location of residence**

Residence	N	Agreeableness		Extroversion		Neuroticism		Conscientiousness			Openness		
		Subset for alpha = 0.05		Subset for alpha = 0.05		Subset for alpha = 0.05		Subset for alpha = 0.05			Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	
Urban	48	2.6213		3.0368		3.0993		2.8566				3.1949	
Semi-urban	68	2.8333		3.3286	3.3286	3.1643			3.3000				3.8500
Rural	35		3.5000		3.5417		3.6406			3.5625			3.9167

Post hoc analysis reveals that students residing in rural areas have scored a higher mean value for Agreeableness, Extroversion, Neuroticism and Openness fall under one subset, Conscientiousness which have higher score falls under the third subset, whereas students from Urban and Semi-urban area fall in the other subset. The reason for this is due to physical reasons, there are certain limits to them as imparted by society, and the regulations are strongly implemented in rural environment, crushing the desires and aspirations unnecessarily. While sympathy and co-operation is shown in urban families towards their achievements and hopes this smoothens and fulfils the desires. The overall attitude of the family and society makes her guilty feeling and suppressive can't go for self-expression and self-realization.

## 6. CONCLUSION

Personality variable plays an important role among the students. Personality of the students while planning any kind of educational intervention program in colleges and schools is

needed. Service of the psychologists, special educators and social workers must be availed by college authorities to render a professional help to the academic low achievers. The efficacy of the counselling and awareness program in helping the teachers, parents and the students to handle the issue related to low achievement. Various factors influencing the personality includes: Heredity factors, Physical, Social, Family, Cultural and School environment, Psychological Factors. The colleges expect not only to give instruction, but to develop the individual whole personality-developing and nurturing an individual's intellect, and character and value system. Hence, the study reveals that the Imbalance in personality is caused due to suppressed desires and instincts as society has imposed certain restrictions upon her even before she enters adolescence. A teacher should be a blend of both professional commitment and professional competency which will bring a sense of pride, achievement and real joy in teaching in return yielding quality in education consequently to the development of the wholesome personality of the students.

## 7. REFERENCES

- [1] Mohsen Joshanloo, Samaneh Afshari (2009). Big Five Personality Traits and Self-Esteem as Predictors of Life Satisfaction in Iranian Muslim University Students. *J Happiness Stud.*, 12:105–113.
- [2] Zahra Nassiri, Nasrin Hashembeik, Seyed Ali Siadat (2012). The relationship between type and amount use of mobile phone and personality characteristics of students. *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business*, Vol. 4, No. 3.
- [3] Elizabeth R. Towell, Joachim Lauer (2001). Personality Differences and Computer Related Stress in Business Students. *Mid-American Journal of Business*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 69-76, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/19355181200100007>.
- [4] Leigh Anne Clark B.A (2007). Relationships between the big five personality dimensions and attitudes towards telecommuting, UMI Number: 3264816. Dissertation (Ph.D)
- [5] John W. Lounsbury, Knoxville, Ryan M. Smith, Durham, Jacob J. Levy, Knoxville, Frederick T. Leong, Lucy W. Gibson (2009). Personality Characteristics of Business Majors as Defined by the Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits. *Journal of Education for Business*.
- [6] Iftikhar Ahmad (2010). The Big Five Personality Inventory: Performance of Students and Community in Pakistan. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, Vol. 20, Number 2.
- [7] Deborah Prentice (1999). The Relationship Between Personality And University And Program Satisfaction Of Accounting Students. Dissertation (Ph.D)
- [8] Jeff Brice (2002). The Role of Personality Dimensions and Occupational Preferences on the Formation of Entrepreneurial Intentions, UMI Number: 3043141.
- [9] Meral Anitsal, Ismet Anitsal, Bonita Barger, Ismail Fidan, Michael R. Allen (2010). Achieving Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Objectives: Impact of On-Line And On-Ground Course Characteristics By Undergraduate Student Personality Traits, *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, Volume 14, Number 1.
- [10] Hsiang-yungfeng (2012). The Relationship of Taiwanese University Students' Personality Traits, Motivations on Overseas Internship And Their Achievements. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 2, JEL CODES J 24, J 28, J 44.
- [11] Muhammad Shakeel Aslam and Mian Sajid Nazir (2001). The Impact of Personality Traits on Academic Dishonesty among Pakistan Students. *The Journal of Commerce*, Vol. 3, No. 2, ISSN: 2218-8118, 2220-6043.

# Depicting the Post-Graduation Engineering Students Approaches to Learning in the Coimbatore City

Dr. B. Sripirabaa, Ms. Y. Benazir

**Abstract**— Learning is considered one of the most important mental functions of humans, animals and artificial cognitive systems. Learning is considered as the acquisition of new behavior which the people acquire frequently. Students learn in many ways, and teachers differ in instructional methods. Nevertheless, both students and teachers share the same goal to reach optimal learning. Educational programs and courses that are responsive to diverse student populations and their individual differences are essential. The aim of the study is to identify the learning approaches adopted by engineering students. The study is descriptive in nature and adopted survey strategy. Data was collected using a questionnaire from the final year post graduate female engineering students in Coimbatore city. The collected data was analyzed using percentage analysis, descriptive statistics and Correlation analysis

**Index Terms**— Learning approach, Acquisition of new behaviour, optimal learning

## I. INTRODUCTION

Learning is considered one of the most important mental functions of humans, animals and artificial cognitive systems. It relies on the acquisition of different types of knowledge supported by perceived information. It leads to the development of new capacities, skills, values, understanding, and preferences. Learning functions can be performed by different brain learning processes, which depend on the mental capacities to understand the subject, the type of knowledge which has to be acquired, as well as on socio-cognitive and environmental circumstances. Sanford (1986) defines learning as the most acceptable view is relatively enduring change in behavior brought about as a consequence of experience. Learning is considered as the acquisition of new behavior which the people acquire frequently. A simple example is that people learn that ‘fire burns the body’ is learned from others and not necessarily by touching the fire. It seems that most students will learn the forms of knowledge and develop the cognitive abilities that they are asked to demonstrate; that is, students “prepare for what they

expect to be the performance requirements” (Fransson 1977:P. 245).A major concern is the continuing increase in the voluminous that students, are required to learn. This has led to an acceptance that it is important to consider not only what students are required to learn, but how they learn, and the implications of this for continued professional development. At the time of entry, graduates cannot be expected to have the range of knowledge and skills of experienced professionals. To attain and maintain the status of professionals he/she requires continual learning. Graduates will learn how to become successful professionals if they adopt the life-long learning concept, and thereby continually adapt to changes in the business environment. Therefore, education should lay the base on which lifelong learning can be built, in other words graduates should be taught how to learn. Students learn in many ways, and teachers differ in instructional methods. Nevertheless, both students and teachers share the same goal to reach optimal learning. Educational programs and courses that are responsive to diverse student populations and their individual differences are essential. Parents are keen in seeing their children enrolling and graduating from the prestigious educational institutions that are competing with each other to offer their best educational programmes and be at the forefront of academic excellence. In order to prove excellence, there is a tendency to focus only on the people who excel and what make them excel. Studies has been undertaken to understand how various aspects of student attitudes towards learning and their behavior relate to each other with learning outcomes, and also on how these relationships differ according to the disciplines. Research reveals that learning is more likely to be effective where a student plays a practical role in the learning process – for example drawing on strong motivation and clear goals to select an appropriate learning strategy and that process is described as “self-regulated” learning. It is difficult to directly assess the students learning in practice. However, research has also identified some measurable characteristics of students that are associated with the tendency to regulate one’s own learning with better performance. The characteristics identified are confidence in their own learning abilities (self-related beliefs), the motivation and the tendency to adopt certain learning strategies. Approaches to learning are the strategies which learners adopt in order

Manuscript received April 11, 2017

Dr. B. Sripirabaa, Associate Professor, GRG School of Management Studies, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Peelamedu, Coimbatore

Ms. Y. Benazir, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Peelamedu, Coimbatore

to succeed in learning. The term “approach” is used to signify both the learner’s intention and the way in which she/he processes information (Garrison et al., 1995). Cilliers and Sternberg (2001) defines learning approaches as the processes of acquiring knowledge and skills by means of studying, instructing and experience, prior to the learning outcome. Over the last few decades, education researchers utilized qualitative methods to assess students’ experience of learning and their individual approaches to tackle the tasks of their study course (Duff, 2003). How students study, rather than what they study, is an area that is increasingly attracting the attention of education researchers. “It is clear that a learning style as body of knowledge has been accepted into the education literature and professional development agenda since the 1980s. Studies identified three basic approaches to learning that may be adopted by students which contains 52 items and is generally referred to as the Revised ASI or RASI (Richardson, 2005) that is Deep, Surface and Strategic approaches. Surface Approach-The student’s motive to learn is to only carry out the task because of external positive or negative consequences. They memorize what is most important. Because of this focus, they do not see interconnections between the meanings and implications of what is learned. Deep Approach- The deep motive is based on internal motivation or curiosity. In the deep approach, there is a personal commitment to learning, searching for analogies, relating to previous knowledge, and theorizing about what is learned. Achieving Approach-The achieving motive is like the surface approach in that it is focused on the product (getting an “A” or winning an award). The strategy is to maximize the chances of obtaining high marks. If educators find ways for improving educational experiences of their students, they must understand how their students learn and the effects of the learning environment on their learning approaches.

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

It discusses the concepts related to the study through reviews of literature which explains the Approaches to learning among the students.

**Thomas et al (2005)** argues that the concept of deep learning is not new to higher education. The main purpose of this study is to examine the factor structure underlying the items on National Survey of Student Engagement identifies deep approaches to learning. Two different samples are used for the study. The first, from the 2004 administration of NSSE, consists of 110,886 randomly selected first-year and senior students from 450 U.S. four- year colleges and universities. The second, from the 2005 administration of NSSE, consists of 41,966 first-year students and seniors from 519 U.S. four-year colleges and

universities. The 41,966 students randomly selected from the total of 209,834 respondents which is one-fifth of the randomly selected respondents. Using NSSE data that can create deep approaches to learning scale, which is a combination of the three “sub”-scales. Using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, the structure and characteristics of items about student uses of deep approaches to learning is examined. Institutions and researchers can use the resulting scales to assess and investigate deep approaches to learning. It suggests that the deep approaches to learning scale and its sub-scales have adequate consistency with the second-comparison between NSSE deep learning items and other measures of deep learning suggests that there is sufficient substantive overlap.

**Michael et al (2012)** examines the role that students’ discipline-related self concepts with deep and surface approaches to learning, their overall learning outcomes, and continuous engagement in the discipline itself. Fourteen male and 28 female students enrolled in both first and second-semester first-year psychology at the Australian National University voluntarily participated in the study. The average age is 21.26 years. Thirty-six (85.7 %) participants indicate that English is their first language. Using a cross-lagged panel design of first-year university psychology students Semester 1 deep approach to learning positively predicts that their Semester 2 psychology-student social identification; this relationship is mediated by students’ actual Semester 1 learning. Relatively high levels of Semester 2 psychology-student social identification lead to a desire for further engagement in the discipline through an enhanced intent to continue their psychology studies. Discipline-related self- concept is not observed to act as a precursor to learning approaches. It provides a clear evidence not only for the validity of the deep learning approach construct, but for the theoretical claims associating a deep learning approach with an impact on self-concept, and the educational value of encouraging a deep learning approach both for short-term academic performance and for continuing motivation to engage in the discipline. Students’ participation is not anonymous, as it matches with their responses to the measures of social identification, and deep and surface learning approaches, to their course marks. The study shows that a deep learning approach, influences subsequent discipline-related self-concept and that mediates by actual discipline learning.

**Petra et al (2009)** studies the changes in learning approaches that effects the personal values of college students. Uses the study data from different age groups and analyzes the effects of just two or three factors using single level analytical techniques. The study employs multilevel modeling as a more appropriate technique for the analysis of longitudinal data to examine the factors influencing changes in the learning approaches of 153 international undergraduate students

over a period of three years. Learning approaches focuses on gender, discipline area of study, prior performance, personal values and the experiences of students who undertake higher education in another country. Using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) the study identifies the effects of personal values on learning approaches and changes in them over a time. The findings show no changes with students in the deep and surface approaches to learning but a significant decline in the achieving approach, particularly for students whose previous experiences are more of a formal teaching. Students' personal values in terms of security, achievement and hedonism affect the achieving approach while there are no effects on the personal values of tradition, conformity, universalism, self-direction and stimulation the study also observes that there are no significant effects for gender, discipline and ability.

**António M. Duarte (2006)** attempts to characterize Portuguese students' conceptions of learning and approaches to learning. To assess the conceptions of learning and approaches to learning, a sample group of 252 Geography students is chosen as the respondents. (54% female and 46% male). Factorial analysis is used with 12 factors that extracts (after Varimax rotation and according to Kaiser's criterion) with eigen values higher than one and accounting for 61.1% of the variance. Alpha Cronbach calculation for each factor set of items (items with correlations higher than 0.50) and correlation of each item with the total of its group (all higher or equal to 0.17) it is possible to select nine scales with alphas higher or equal to 0.60. Surface approach scale negatively correlates with deep approach scale ( $r = -0.35$ ;  $p \leq 0.001$ ) and in a reduced and non-significant way with achieving approach scale. The study implies a scale that measures concerns with academic assessment is reflecting a "positive stress" towards evaluation situations. The results show a representation of learning as the understanding of knowledge and application in the real world.

**Marlies et al (2010)** outlines the factors that encourages and discourages in adopting deep approach to learning in student-centered learning environments. Teachers play a role; if they are involved and oriented towards students and changing their conceptions, students are inclined to use a deep approach. Concerning the student factors, older students and students whose personality is characterized by openness to experience, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability use a deeper approach. It shows that students in different disciplines differ in the approach to learning they adopt, with students in human sciences in general showing the deepest approach. With regard to perceived contextual factors, findings indicate that students who are satisfied with the course quality (e.g. appropriateness of workload/assessment, teaching, and

clarity of goals) employ a deep approach. If students are intrinsically motivated, feel self-confident and self-efficacy and prefer teaching methods that support learning and understanding, a deep approach will be more frequently adopted. The overview of the research shows the process of stimulating students towards the use of deep approaches to learning in student-centred learning environments. This could serve as a basis for new studies to fill in the gaps in knowledge about approaches to learning.

**Nuray Senemoglu (2011)** identifies students' approaches to learning and study skill as a significant factor affecting the quality of learning. If teacher educators are to find ways for improving educational experiences of their students, they must understand how their students learn and the effects of the learning environment on their learning approaches. The study examines the Turkish and American college of education students' with their major, school year, and gender. The Approaches and Study Skills Inventory for Students (ASSIST) is used to investigate Turkish students' learning approach and study skills. One Way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) is performed on the data obtained from the students of each country separately. Mean scores, standard deviations of approaches to learning and study skills, and number of students from each country is found. The analysis of ANOVA for Turkish and American students reveals statistically significant differences between their approaches to learning— deep, strategic, and surface. Scheffe post-hoc tests reveals that mean scores of Turkish students using deep approach is significantly higher than those of strategic and surface approaches, and strategic approach than those of surface approach. American students preferred deep and strategic approaches significantly higher than surface approach. But there is no significant difference between strategic and deep approaches. To investigate country differences in students' approaches to learning (deep, strategic and surface), a one-way between groups multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is used and it shows that there is statistically significant difference between countries on the combined dependent variables. The mean scores indicates that Turkish students reports slightly higher level of deep approach than American Students. The Turkish students prefer slightly higher level of all three approaches- deep, strategic, and surface- than American students. The results of the study indicate that to enhance quality of learning outcomes of teacher candidates with deep learning approach consistently. The need to evaluate and redesign indicates that pre-service teacher training program, teaching learning environment, and assessment procedures should be evaluated and redesigned.

**Necla Ekinci(2009)** identifies the preferences of learning approaches (deep, surface, strategic) of

undergraduate students and reveals the relationships between their preferences and some variables of teaching-learning processes. This is a descriptive study and the population consists of the students of undergraduate programs of Hacettepe University, Mersin University and Süleyman Demirel University. The sample used is 3428 of first and fourth grade undergraduate students from various programs in the subject fields of health sciences, science, social sciences and fine arts mutually existing in the three universities. The data of the study is collected through the administration of the two inventories, namely Learning Approach Inventory and Teaching-Learning Environment Perception Inventory. The basic finding outlines that although undergraduate students have a higher tendency of applying deep learning approach in handling a learning topic, they also apply surface and strategic learning approaches. Subject fields (health sciences, science, social sciences and fine arts) affect learning approach preferences of the students. While students of fine arts have the highest deep learning scores, students of health sciences have the lowest deep learning scores, There is a significant positive relationship between the academic achievement and scores of deep and strategic learning preferences of the students and a significant negative relationship exists between academic achievement and scores of surface learning preferences, Perceptions of the students on teaching-learning environment as leading students to deep learning are below the average score. The higher the perception of the students on teaching-learning environment, the higher deep and strategic learning preferences. The higher the negative perception of the students on teaching-learning environment, the higher the liability of preferring surface learning approach. Thus, the undergraduate students have a higher tendency of applying deep learning approach in handling a learning topic, but they also apply surface and strategic learning approaches considerably and do not find the quality of teaching learning environment high enough as leading students to apply deep learning approach.

**Karen Scouler (2006)** assessed the influence of assessment method on students' learning approaches, Multiple choice question examination versus assignment essay with the sample of 206 out of which 133 students (69.3%) females, 59 students (30.7%) males second-year The questionnaire requires a simultaneous response for each assessment method to statements focusing on their learning approaches, their perceptions of the levels of intellectual abilities is being assessed, and their preference for either the assignment essay or MCQ examination as an assessment method of the course and the reasons for their choices. The findings is that these second-year students are significantly more likely to employ surface learning approaches (surface strategies and surface motives)

when preparing for their MCQ examination and deep learning approaches (deep strategies and deep motives) when preparing their assignment essays. There are high significant differences in students' perceptions of the levels of intellectual abilities being assessed by the two assessment methods. The MCQ examination is perceived as assessing knowledge-based or lower levels of cognitive processing and the assignment essay is perceived as assessing higher levels of intellectual skills and abilities such as analysis, application and comprehension. A complex and interesting pattern of relationship is found between perception, learning approach and performance outcome. At least in the assignment essay context, students' perceptions of what is being assessed interacted systematically with their selection of learning approaches when preparing their essays these relationships is associated with differential learning outcomes. The variables are analysed in relation to each other and to perform outcome in both assessment tasks. Results indicate that students are more likely to employ surface learning approaches in the MCQ examination context and to perceive MCQ examinations as assessing knowledge-based (lower levels of) intellectual processing. Poorer performance in the MCQ examination is associated with the employment of deep learning strategies. Poorer performance in the assignment essays is associated with the employment of surface strategies. Students are more likely to employ deep learning approaches when preparing their assignment essays which they perceive as assessing higher levels of cognitive processing.

**Hanan et al (2011)** aims to investigate students' perceptions of assessment and the resulting learning styles. Qualitative semi-structured interviews are conducted with 14 students and 8 clinical supervisors from Sydney Medical School, 12 students and 13 clinical supervisors from King Saud bin Abdulaziz University. Both institutions have similar curricula but a different assessment approach. The interviews are transcribed and analyzed using thematic analysis. Interview transcripts are stored and analyzed using ATLAS.ti. Three themes emerged from analyses of the interviews: the function of assessment, learning outcomes and authentic assessment in the clinical environment. Cultural differences and emotions affect students' perceptions of assessment and learning styles. Further a combination of formative and summative assessment based on learning objectives is required. This combination should take into consideration students' cultural background, values and the implemented education system. This balance should be sufficient to motivate students in order to maintain their focus and attention, and reduce the potential negative impacts of a hidden curriculum. The experience of authentic assessment is a powerful motivator for students' approaches to learning.

**Dominic et al (2010)** investigates the weekly online assessment as a teaching and learning method. The sample taken for the study is 140 undergraduate sport science students. The survey is about their attitudes towards learning before and after completing seven summative weekly online assessments. One-way ANOVA with post-hoc paired samples *t*-tests and a Bonferroni corrected alpha level of 0.0023 to indicate statistical significance. The paired samples *t*-test found the 7-week average online assessment scores to be higher than the year coursework average for all other modules indicates the differences between the seven online assessment scores. Spearman rank correlation tests found no relationship between the online assessment week and online assessment score. The students indicate, studying more frequently between lectures and reading more selectively, but no relationship with assessment performance is found. Weekly online assessment is partially supported as a useful method for engaging students in learning activities.

**Lorraine et al (2010)** explores the differences in approaches to learning between undergraduate and postgraduate cohorts with longitudinal data with previous cross-sectional data. Vermunt's Inventory of Learning Styles is used to measure students' approaches to learning. 120-item instrument comprises 4 scales: meaning directed, undirected, and reproduction-directed approaches to learning displays the same pattern. However, application-directed scores increase significantly in the second half of the undergraduate degree program. Descriptive statistics of baseline data regarding degree program, age, and gender are considered. The Shapiro-Wilk test determines that the variables are normally distributed, and Levene's test for homogeneity of variance identifies that there is no heteroscedasticity. Analysis of variance is conducted within learning styles across for both undergraduate and postgraduate students. Greenhouse-Geisser and Huyn-Feldt epsilon above 0.95 is obtained for all variables. Bonferroni corrected pair wise a comparison is conducted where main effects are significant. Commencing postgraduate students' approaches to learning is similar to finishing undergraduate students, and this group is significantly more oriented towards meaning-directed learning compare to undergraduate students. Thus, Pharmacy students' maturation in approach to learning is evident and this bodes well for pharmacists' engaging in life-long learning and capacity to work in increasingly complex health settings.

**Baeten et al (2008)** focuses on the relationships between experiences with portfolio assessment, students' approaches to learning and their assessment preferences by means of a pre- and post-test design in an authentic class setting. The respondents are 138 first-year professional bachelor's degree students in

office management. They are assessed by means of portfolio assessment in a course that combines constructivist design principles and lectures. Approaches to learning and assessment preferences are measured by means of the Revised Two-Factor Study Process Questionnaire and the Assessment Preferences Inventory. During the pre-test, both deep and surface approaches to learning are behind the average of 3. A majority of the students (54.3%) did not have a pronounced approach to learning because they score low on both approaches. Result shows that student preferences for participation in examination and for permanent evaluation decreased significantly. Surface learning increases significantly. The surface approach proved to be a significant negative predictor of the portfolio assessment score.

**Zhi-Hong Chen (2013)** identifies that the Competitive learning is an attracting ever increasing amount of attention in the field of digital game-based learning. Different mechanisms for the promotion of competitive learning, including social-competition and self-competition mechanisms, few addresses student preferences as to the choice between social-competition and self-competition, especially considering students' different levels of capabilities and their perception. Thus, this study investigates how students with different levels of capabilities choose and perceive learning models between social-competition and self-competition. It is carried out using the mixed-model experimental design. Sample consisted of 54 elementary school students assigned into three ability-level groups with all groups experiencing both treatments of social and self competition digital game-based learning environments. The results indicate that low-ability students have lower test anxiety and greater preference for social-competition, whereas medium-ability and high-ability students show higher test anxiety and a similar preference for social-competition and self-competition. Competitive learning design framework should consider enjoyment aspect of social competition for low ability students, and interactive and Performance aspects for self- and social-competition for medium- and high ability students.

### III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

To identify the learning approaches adopted by Engineering students

### IV. METHODOLOGY

The research purpose and research questions revealed that this study is descriptive in nature and the study adopted survey strategy. Data was collected using a standard questionnaire. Each response was measured using a three-point Likert scales, ranging from 3 agree to 1 disagree. The sample size is 150 comprising of Post

graduate students from the Engineering disciplines. Data was collected during the period November and December 2016. The study used percentage analysis to profile the respondents, Correlation analysis is used to identify the association between the learning approach variables. The primary data used by the study were directly obtained from the questionnaire. There are three common approaches to learning which contains 52 items generally referred to as Revised Approaches to Students Inventory (Richardson, 2005). They are, namely, Deep, Strategic and Surface approaches to learning. The average of the items in each factor was computed and was used for analysis.

V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

**Demographic profile of the respondents on the study variables**

To map the demographic profile of the respondents’ descriptive statistics is presented as frequency and percentage. The demographic factors included in the research are age, post graduation and Location of Residence. It is inferred that 3% of the respondents are in the age group of 24 & 25 years. 65% of the respondents are in the age group of 22 years; the respondents taken for the study were the engineering post graduation female students. 31.3% of the respondents are residing in the rural areas, 52.7% are from urban areas and 16% are from semi-urban areas. This portrays the diverse profile of the respondents which is essential for the study, since the study focuses in depicting the approaches to learning among Female Post graduate Engineering students.

**Descriptive Statistics**

The Descriptive procedure displays univariate summary statistics for the factors and calculates standardized values (z scores).

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics**

Factors	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Deep Learning	150	2.9457	0.56829
Strategic Learning	150	3.0842	0.58733
Surface Learning	150	3.0196	0.62370

All the variables are measured on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 – Strongly Disagree to 5 – Strongly Agree) indicating that the respondents adopt strategic and surface approaches to learning.

The mean value for the variable strategic learning is higher (M=3.0842&SD=0.58733). The mean value for the variable surface learning is the second highest value (M=3.0196&SD=0.62370). The mean value for the variable deep learning is the second highest value

(M=2.9457&SD=0.56829). It implies that the respondents have the intention to understand what they were studying and they want to achieve good grades to maximize the chances for academic success.

**Table 2: Correlation analysis- Learning Approaches of Post graduate Engineering Students**

Approaches to Learning		Deep learning	Surface Learning
Strategic Learning	Pearson Correlation	0.758**	0.784**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000
Deep learning	Pearson Correlation	1	0.657**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000

Correlation analysis was carried out to find the association/relationship between the variables. The learning approach dimensions considered in correlation analysis and among the variable surface learning is highly correlated with strategic learning (r=0.784; p<0.000) and the correlation is significant. Strategic learning is highly correlated with deep learning (r=0.758; p<0.000) and the correlation is significant. Deep learning is highly correlated with surface learning (r=0.657; p<0.000) and the correlation is significant. This proposes that the more the students use Surface Approach in their studies, the lower their academic achievement. It is found that high scores on the surface approach that was related to low marks in the final exam. Deep approach to learning did not result in higher grades on the evaluation even though this approach was related to high quality learning outcomes.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the results of this study suggest that both the quality of student learning and students’ pursuit of higher grades are enhanced by the careful selection of an assessment method that encourages students’ development of higher order intellectual skills and the employment of deeper learning approaches; and allows students to demonstrate their development. They further suggest the important role played by students’ perceptions of the abilities and skills being assessed and the relationship between these perceptions and their selection of learning approaches. Students have a higher tendency of applying surface learning approach in handling a learning topic, but they also apply deep and strategic learning approaches considerably and do not find the quality of teaching learning environment high enough as leading students to apply deep learning approach. Students who utilize deep approach in their studies aim to understand the meaning in the materials



they were learning. Teachers need to discourage the use of surface approach and design course that require the students to think critically, seek meaning, to understand their studies material and to be able to relate ideas with prior knowledge or their own experiences. Accordingly, educators must provide a learning environment where students develop a strong personal interest. This is because Warburton (2003) argues that a first step in reaching a deep learning is a high level of student commitment with the learning subject so that students are motivated to understand. Thus, by promoting or inducing deep approach to learning, it is hope that surface approach to learning can be reduced.

#### REFERENCE

1. Measuring Deep Approaches To Learning Using The National Survey Of Student Engagement, Paper Presented At The Annual Meeting Of The Association For Institutional Research, May 14 – May 18, 2005, Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Rick Shoup & George D. Kuh (2005).
2. On The Role Of Discipline-Related Self-Concept In Deep And Surface Approaches To Learning Among University Students- Received: 16 November 2010 / Accepted: 10 April 2012 / Published Online: 22 April 2012\_ Springer Science Business Media B.V. 2012 Instr Sci (2013) 41:271–285 DOI 10.1007/S11251-012-9227-4, Michael J. Platow, Kenneth I. Mavor & Diana M. Grace (2012).
3. The Effects Of College Students' Personal Values On Changes In Learning Approaches, Received: 8 August 2009 / Published Online: 17 September 2009\_ Springer Science Business Media, LLC 2009, Res High Educ (2010) 51:65–87, DOI 10.1007/11162-009-9147-6, Petra Lietz ,Bobbie Matthews (2009).
4. Conceptions Of Learning And Approaches To Learning In Portuguese Students, Received: 27 July 2005 / Accepted: 6 June 2006 / Published Online: 9 July 2006, Springer Science Business Media B.V. 2006, High Educ (2007) 54:781–794, DOI 10.1007/S10734-006-9023-7, ORIGINAL PAPER, Anto' Nio M. Duarte (2006).
5. Using Student-Centred Learning Environments To Stimulate Deep Approaches To Learning: Factors Encouraging Or Discouraging Their Effectiveness, Received 8 February 2010, Received In Revised Form 10 June 2010, Accepted 14 June 2010, Marlies Baeten, Eva Kyndt, Katrien Struyven, Filip Dochy (2010).
6. Education And Science, Vol. 36, No 160, College Of Education Students' Approaches To Learning And Study Skills, Nuray Senemoglu (2011).
7. Learning Approaches Of University Students, , Education And Science, Vol. 34, No 151, Necla EKINCI (2009).
8. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed In The Netherlands. Higher Education 35: 453–472, 1998. 453, The Influence Of Assessment Method On Students' Learning Approaches: Multiple Choice Question Examination Versus Assignment Essay, Learning Assistance Centre, Level 7 Education Bldg A 35, University Of Sydney, Broadway, NSW 2006, Australia. E-Mail: [Kscoull@Extro.Ucc.Su.Oz.Au](mailto:Kscoull@Extro.Ucc.Su.Oz.Au), KAREN SCOLLER (1998).
9. Pharmacy Students' Approaches To Learning In Undergraduate And Graduate Entry Programs, American Journal Of Pharmaceutical Education 2010; 74 (6) Article 106. Lorraine Smith, Phd, Ines Krass, Phd, Erica Sainsbury, Phd, And Grenville Rose, Phd, Submitted December 16, 2009; Accepted February 19, 2010; Published August 10, 2010.
10. International Journal Of Medical Education. 2:44-52, ISSN: 2042-6372, DOI: 10.5116/Ijme.4ddb.Fc11, Students' Perceptions Of The Impact Of Assessment On Approaches To Learning: A Comparison Between Two Medical Schools With Similar Curricula, Hanan M. Al Kadri, Mohamed S. Al-Moamary, Mohi E. Magzoub, Chris Roberts, Cees P.M. Van Der Vleuten (2011).
11. Vol. 9, No. 2. ISSN: 1473-8376, Changes In Approaches To Learning Among Undergraduate Sports Science Students Following A Programme Of Weekly Online Assessments, Dominic (2010).
12. Instr Sci (2008) 36:359–374, DOI 10.1007/S11251-008-9060-Y, Students' Approaches To Learning And Assessment Preferences In A Portfolio-Based Learning Environment, Marlies Baeten, Filip Dochy, Katrien Struyven, Published Online: 15 August 2008, Springer (2008).
13. Facilitating Learning Preferences And Motivation Of Different Ability Students For Social-Competition Or Self-Competition. *Educational Technology & Society*, 17(1), 283–293. Chen, Z.-H. (2014).
14. Learning Preferences And Motivation Of Different Ability Students For Social competition Or Self-Competition, Zhi-Hong Chen, Department Of Information Communication, Yuan Ze University, Taiwan // [Zhchen@Saturn.Yzu.Edu.Tw](mailto:Zhchen@Saturn.Yzu.Edu.Tw), (Submitted February 5, 2013; Revised April 22, 2013; Accepted May 29, 2013)