ORIGINAL ARTICLE

EVALUATION OF PERSONALITY TYPE OF FIRST YEAR MEDICAL STUDENTS

Neha S. Kulkarni[1]

ABSTRACT: Even though research in health professional education has confirmed that non-cognitive factors like personality has importance in selection, training and academic performance of the students. To prepare competent medical doctors, medical schools need to monitor and assess the students at regular intervals. Personality typing is a useful tool for counselling, motivation and guidance of the students and if considered while developing of course will enhance learning and improve the performance of the medical students. So it is necessary a blend of personality characteristics with the cognitive ability of learner during medical education to become a successful medical student. Aim of the present study was to assess the personality type using Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) among the first year medical students of J. N. Medical College Belgaum. **METHODOLOGY:** One hundred and fifty students gave consent and enrolled in this study. Consented students were subjected to MBTI questionnaire to identify their personality type. **RESULTS:** MBTI questionnaire was used to identified personality type of the students, out of 150 students were 80 Extroverts (E), 70 Introverts (I), 90 Perceivers (P), 60 Judgers (J), 76 Filling, 57 sensing, 93 intuitive, 74 thinking type i e E>I, P>J, F>S and N>T. The most common personality type was ENFP (14%) remaining types showed INFP (12%), INTP (9.3%). INFJ, ENFJ, ESFJ, ESFP were of equal percentage (6.7%). **CONCLUSION:** It has been seen that different type of personalities are found in different medical schools and health professionals and poor performance and drop out of the student occur from the course when the course structure, teaching format and personality type do not match. Hence there is a need to assess every individual's personality type which helps in counseling and guidance to learners as a part of remedial measures especially for the low achievers to maximize the learning and students who are prone to drop out from the course in the medical school.
KEYWORDS: Personality, Medical students.

INTRODUCTION: Even though research in health professional education has confirmed that non-cognitive factors like personality has importance in selection, training and academic performance of the students[1,2,3,4,5,6,7] admissions occur in many medical school only on basis of merit or cognitive factor. It is reported that intellectual abilities account for about 35% of the variance in performance, but inclusion of personality information increased the common variance to 75%.[8]

Poor performance and drop out of the students occur from the course when the course structure, teaching format and personality type do not match and they require academic assistance at transition point from undergraduate to graduate training or professional training.[9,10,11] To prepare competent medical doctors, medical schools need to monitor and assess the students at regular intervals.[12] Personality typing is a useful tool for counselling, motivation and guidance of the students[3,4,8,13,14] and if considered while developing of course will enhance learning and improve the performance of the medical students.[3] So it is necessary a blend of personality characteristics with the cognitive ability of learner during medical education to become a successful medical student.[13]

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

There are many kinds of personality measures used with medical students.[15] Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)[16] is one of them widely used valid and reliable instrument used in medical and other professions to measure of personality traits.[14,16,17,18,19] It is developed by Isabel Briggs Myers and Katherine Cooks Briggs and this inventory is based on Carl Jong's theory it identifies four separate dichotomies: Extroversion (E) v/s. Introversion (I), Sensing (S) v/s. Intuition (N), Thinking (T) v/s. Feeling (F) and Judging (J) v/s. Perceiving (P). These types can also be compressed into the following two types based on traits: Sensing-Thinking (ESFP, ESTP, ISTJ, ISFJ, ESTJ, ENTJ, ISTP, INTP) and Intuition- Feeling (ENTP, ENFP, INTJ, INFJ, ESFJ, ENFJ, ISFP, INFP).Considering above mentioned facts the present study was aim to assess the personality type using Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) among the first year medical students of J N Medical College Belgaum.

METHODOLOGY: The present study was conducted for first year medical students of 2013-14 batch of KLE University's JN Medical College, Belgaum in department of Physiology. Ethical clearance was obtained from institutional ethical committee. The study was explained to the students and assured that the data will be used only for research purpose and assured them of strict confidentiality will be maintained. One hundred and fifty students gave consent and enrolled in this study. Consented students were subjected to MBTI questionnaire to identify their personality type.

Statistical Analysis: Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the personality type.

RESULTS: MBTI questionnaire was used to identified personality type of the students, out of 150 students were 80 Extroverts (E), 70 Introverts (I), 90 Perceivers (P), 60 Judgers (J), 76 Filling, 57 sensing, 93 intuitive, 74 thinking type i.e, E>I, P>J, F>S and N>T. The most common personality type was ENFP (14%) remaining types showed INFP (12%), INTP (9.3%). INFJ, ENFJ, ESFJ, ESFP were of equal percentage (6.7%). These personalities represent 61.8%. The findings of MBTI are summarized in table 1a and 1b.

E =80	I = 70	S = 57	N = 93		T = 74	F = 76			J =60	P =90
IJ=26	EJ=34	ST=23	NT=33		SJ=28	NJ=32	TJ=23	FJ=37	IN=46	IS=22
IP=44	EP=46	SF=34	NF=60		SP=29	NP=61	TP=33	FP=57	EN=45	ES=35

Table 1a: Result of MBTI

ISTJ N=3 2%	ISFJ N=7 4.7%	INFJ N=10 6.7%	INTJ N=6 4%
ISTP N=5 3.3%	ISFP N=7 4.7%	INFP N=18 12%	INTP N=14 9.3%
ESTP N=7 4.7%	ESFP N=10 6.7%	ENFP N=22 14%	ENTP N=7 4.7%

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

ESTJ N=8 5.3%	ESFJ N=10 6.7%	ENFJ N=10 6.7%	ENTJ N=6 4%
Table 1b: Result of MBTI			

DISCUSSION: MBTI questionnaire was used to identify personality type. In the present study extroverted type students were more than introverted type students, Extroverted (E) students prefer working with group and having discussions while, Introverted students prefer learning situation where they can primarily work individually. This finding is not consistent with Tharpa[20] in Physiology course who reported more number of introverted students than extroverted. In present study intuitive (N) type students were more than sensing type (S). Students classified as intuitive prefer tasks that call for imagination and quickness of insight and learn about things through contemplation and discussion. On other hand sensing students prefer task that call for going step by step while observing facts and prefer hands on and factual information. Rowe[21] found summer science research students to be more N than S type as represented in this study.

In this study we found that Feeling (F) type were more than thinking type and Perceiving (P) type who like to follow their impulses and work in flexible, informal manner were more than judging students. As it was found in this study that EP type students who represented 46(32%) of the study population were more prone to failure in Physiology[20] and other health professional education,[22,23] "they need to become more organized in their study habits and develop their concentration and reasoning skills".[22] Students preferring Sensing and Judging type of learning that fit in the traditional type of instruction and learning environment[23] represented only 18% of the study population.

In present study NF personality represented 40% of study population. It has been suggested that NF students due to unique nature of personality, require more test-taking techniques to become successful.[24] In addition deliberate practice with appropriate, formative feedback, with just not merely the repetition of an activity, is required to improve performance of the students.[25]

In this study we found that the most frequently occurred learning style was ENTP which was similar with the study conducted by Shuck AA et al[23] in pharmacy students. In contrast Jesee et al[26] found only 7% of this type of students in their study. In our study ENFP, INFP, INTP, ENFJ were the most common four personalities found, where as in the study conducted by Jesee et al[26] ISTJ, ESFJ, ESTJ and ISFJ were the most common four personalities found, but in the study of Huit[27] in Indian medical student ISTJ, ISFJ, ISTP and ESTJ were the most common personalities and among non-Indian students ISTJ, ISFJ, ISTP and ESTJ were the most commonest.

CONCLUSION: It has been seen that different type of personalities are found in different medical schools and health professionals and poor performance and drop out of the student occur from the course when the course structure, teaching format and personality type do not match. Hence there is a need to assess every individual's personality type which helps in counseling and guidance to learners as a part of remedial measures especially for the low achievers to maximize the learning and students who are prone to drop out from the course in the medical school.

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

REFERENCES:
1. Haight S J, Chibnall, J T, Schindler D L. and Slavin S J. Associations of Medical Student Personality and Health/Wellness Characteristics With Their Medical School Performance Across the Curriculum. Academic Medicine. 2012; 87(4): 476-485.
2. Helle L, Nivala M, Kronqvist P, Ericsson KA, Lehtinen E. Do prior knowledge, personality and visual perceptual ability predict student performance in microscopic pathology? Medical Education. 2010; 44(6): 621–629.
3. Lievens F, Coetsier P, Fruyt F D & Maeseneer J D.Medical students' personality characteristics and academic performance: a five-factor model perspective. Medical Education. 2002; 36: 1050–1056.
4. Ciorbea I and Pasarica F, "The Study of the Relationship between Personality and Academic Performance", Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences.2013; 78: 400– 404.
5. Nawabi S. Relationship between personality type and academic achievement. Pakistan oral & dental journal 2014; 34(4) 688-690.
6. Lim JY, Yoo, IY, Oh S.N: Relationship between Personality Type, SAT score and GPA of Student Nurses. J Kor Acd Nurs.2001; 31: 835-845.In Kim M-R.and Han S-J. Relationships between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Personality Profiling, Academic Performance and Student Satisfaction in Nursing Students International Journal of Bio-Science and Bio-Technology 2014; 6(6): 1-12.
7. Kim M-R.and Han S-J. Relationships between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Personality Profiling, Academic Performance and Student Satisfaction in Nursing Students International Journal of Bio-Science and Bio-Technology 2014; .6(6): 1-12.
8. Walton HJ. Personality assessment of future doctors. J R Soc Med. 1987; 80: 27–30.In Personality assessments and outcomes in medical education and the practice of medicine: AMEE Guide No. 79 Hojat M, Erdmann J B. &. Gonnella J S. Medical Teacher. 2013; 35: e1267–e1301.
9. Maize DF, Fuller SH, Hritcko PM, Matsumoto RR, Sotis DA, Taher RR et al. A Review of Remediation Programs in Pharmacy and Other Health Professions. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education. 2010; 74(2): 1-10.
10. Mysorekar V V. Need for mentorship to improve learning in low-performers. The National Medical Journal of India. 2012; 25(5): 291-93.
11. LujanHL and DiCarlo SE. First-year medical students prefer multiple learning styles. Adv Physiol Educ, 2006; 30: 13–16.
12. Hauer K E, Teherani A, Irby D M, Kerr K M & O'Sullivan S P. Approaches to medical student remediation after a comprehensive clinical skills examination. Medical Education 2008; 42: 104-112.
13. Jessee SA, O'Neill PN, Dosch RO. Matching student personality types and learning preferences to teaching methodologies. J Dent Educ. 2006; 70: 644- 651.
14. Royston PJ, Mathieson K, Leafman J, Ojan-Sheehan O. Medical student characteristics predictive of intent for rural practice. Rural and Remote Health. 2012; 1-10.
15. Hojat M, Zuckerman M. Personality and Specialty interest in Medical Students. Medical Teacher 2008; 30: 400-406.
16. Myers IB. MBTI manual: a guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. 3rd ed. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1998.

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

17. Davis KR, Banken JA. Personality type and clinical evaluations in an obstetrics/gynecology medical student clerkship. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2005; 193: 1807-10.
18. Bell MA, Wales PS, Torbeck LJ, Kunzer JM, Thurston VC, Brokaw JJ. Do personality differences between teachers and learners impact students' mevaluations of a surgery clerkship? J Surg Educ 2011; 68: 190-3.
19. Zardouz S, German MA, Wu EC, Djalilian HR. Personality types of otolaryngology resident applicants as described by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2011; 144: 714-8.
20. Tharp GD. Relationship between personality type and achievement in an undergraduate physiology course. Advance in Physiological Education1992; 262: SI: 82-83.
21. Rowe, Budd M. Who chooses science profil. Science Teacher 1978; 45: 25-28. In Ru S, Shou-qin S, Jian-quan T Psychological type and undergraduate student achievement in pharmacy course in Military Medical University. Us –china Education Review.2007; 4(9): 20-24.
22. Ru S, Shou-qin S, Jian-quan T Psychological type and undergraduate student achievement in pharmacy course in Military Medical University. Us –china Education Review.2007; 4(9): 20-24.
23. Shuck A and Phillips Charles R Assessing Pharmacy Students, Learning Styles and Personality Type: A Ten-year Analysis. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education 1999; 63: .27-233.
24. Sefcik DJ, Prerost FJ, Arbet SE. Personality Types and Performance on Aptitude and Achievement Tests: Implications for Osteopathic Medical Education. JAOA.2009; 109(6): 296-301.
25. Ericsson KA, Krampe RT, Tesch-Römer C. The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. Psychol Rev. 1993; 100: 363-406.
26. Jessee S A, O'Neill P N and Dosch R O. Matching student Personality type and Learning Preferences to teaching methodologies. Journal of Dental Education. 2006; 70(6): 644-651.
27. Huitt W Personality Differences between Navjo and Non –Indian College Students: Implications for instruction. Enquiry and excellence. 1988.24(1): 71-74.

AUTHORS:
1. Neha S. Kulkarni

PARTICULARS OF CONTRIBUTORS:
1. Associate Professor, Department of Physiology, J. N. Medical College, Belgaum.

FINANCIAL OR OTHER COMPETING INTERESTS: None

NAME ADDRESS EMAIL ID OF THE CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:
Dr. Neha S. Kulkarni,
126/A, Mrutunjaynagar,
Behind Maharaja Residency,
Angol – 590006, Belgaum.
E-mail: dr.nehaskulkarni@gmail.com