Quarterly

Vol. 51 June 2018 No. 3-4

ISSN-0971-2909

THE ASIAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY & EDUCATION

UGC APPROVED

Reg. (No. 4) (1) (76) NT

Editor In Chief
Prof. Jitendra Mohan

AGRA PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH CELL
Tiwari Kothi, Belanganj, Agra-282 004 (U. P.) India
Phone : 0562-2465964 Mob. : 0-98370-55824
www.aprc.co.in email : vivekaprc@rediffmail.com

sian Journal of Psychology and Education

(Reffered Journal)

ol. 51 Year 2018 No. 3-4

CONTENTS

Asian Journal of Psychology and Education
Vol. 51, No. 3-4, Year 2018, Page 9-16

INFLUENCE OF FORMS OF THINKING STYLES ON SELF-ESTEEM OF STUDENTS

V. V. Chougule* and N. V. Deshamukh**

The purpose of the study was to find out the influence of various forms (Hierarchic, Monarchic, Oligarchic, and Anarchic) of Thinking Styles on self-esteem of Secondary School Students. The sample comprises of 50 male and 50 female students between the age group of 13 to 15 years. They were administered Stemberg, Wagner and Zhang (2007) Thinking styles Inventory Revised II and Coopersmith Self- Esteem Scale. The obtained data was analyzed by calculating M, SD and 't' value to test the significance of the hypotheses of the study. Results revealed that the forms of thinking styles have shown significant difference on self-esteem. And there is no significant gender difference found on self-esteem of students.

Thinking is one of the important factors of human. Thinking styies are cognitive preference which influence on type of behavior and emotions (Zhang and Sternberg 2000). People don't have one special thinking style, but they have a profile of different thinking styles and if the preferred style can be matched in environment, needs and abilities he/she is successful. In the time when styles, abilities and environment demands connect that people could do their task in a way that they could use their preferred style or changing it. In other words, style can change or in special opportunities the style which is more useful is used. Sternberg has been named different styles of people in processing information as thinking style (Zhang and Sternberg 2000).

For thinking styles, Sternberg (1988,1997) proposed his own theory named as the "theory of mental self-government". Sternberg examined the nature of thinking styles and impact of current forms of educational assessment on students with different thinking style profiles. The mental self-government theory establishes a connection with daily activities and management tasks. The flexible use of the mind accounts for the variety of thinking styles in the process of mental self-government. He defines that a style is preferred way of thinking. The mental self-

* Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Jaysingpur College, Jaysingpur. Affiliated to Shivaji University, Kolhapur, Maharashtra.
** Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, M.S.G. College, Malegaon, Affiliated to Savitribai Phule Pune University, Maharashtra.

government theory includes 13 thinking styles that fall along five dimensions. The basic assumption of the theory is that people like societies govern themselves and their mental processes and establish systems separate characteristics and five dimensions namely functions, forms, levels, scopes and leaning that comprise his theory of thinking styles.

Function includes legislative, executive and judicial thinking styles refer to the individual preference of initiating new ideas and practice, setting regulation or evaluating. The second dimension which is Forms refers to how individuals prefer to approach the life events. Monarchic, hierarchic, oligarchic and anarchic styles included in this dimension. Levels identify the individuals focusing on abstract and large issues or the individuals paying attention to concrete issues and details. This dimension includes global and local thinking styles. The fourth dimension is scopes which embrace internal and external styles and refers to preference of individuals to be introverts or extroverts. Leanings, which include liberal and conservative thinking styles, is the fifth dimension defined by Sternberg and associated with the flexibility of individuals about transcending existing rules or adherence to the rules.

According to Sternberg & Wagner (1991) hierarchic style owners tend to do many things at one time. They put their goals in the form of hierarchy depending on their importance and priority. They are realistic, logical and organized in solving problems and decision-making. Monarchic style individuals are characterized by going towards a single goal all the time. They are flexible and able to analyse and think logically low. Anarchic style owners tend to adopt a method of random and non-compliant in a particular order to solve the problems, their performance is better when the tasks and positions that are assigned to them are disorganized, and they are confused. Oligarchic style persons are characterized by being nervous, confused and they have many conflicting goals, all of these goals are equally important for them.

In addition Zhang and Sternberg (2005) grouped 13 thinking styles into 3 types; Type I styles are perceived more positive and adaptive and include legislative, judicial, hierarchical, global, and liberal styles whereas Type II styles are more negative and less adaptive and include executive, local, monarchic, and conservative styles. Finally, Type III styles are neither positive nor negative but adaptable due to the requirements of a situation and include anarchic, oligarchic, internal, and external. Grigorenko and Sternberg (1997) investigated a research related to thinking styles and educational performance. This research shows that correlation is positive between legislative thinking style with creative thinking (0.20) but there is negative correlation between executive style with creative thinking (–0.16). Zhang and Sternberg (2000) studied thinking styles of Hong Kong and Chinese students. Difference between females and males is significant in thinking styles inventory so that male and female students are different in legislative, judicial, global, liberal and internal thinking styles, and in all male scores are higher than female.

Many researchers investigate the importance of thinking styles in academic setting. Also various researches show that thinking style is correlated with problem-solving creativity, decision making, self-esteem, educational and vocational advancement. Self-esteem is a term in psychology to reflect a person's overall evaluation or appraisal of his/her own worth. Self-esteem encompasses beliefs and emotions. It could be positive or negative evaluation of the self and it is how we feel about it. Baumeister (1997) described self -concept as totally perception which people hold about himself / herself. Self-esteem is a personal evaluation of oneself that expresses a self-judgment of approval, disapproval, and personal worth and is shaped by individuals' relationships with others, experiences and accomplishments in life. Self-esteem is one of the most important ingredients of a happy life and healthy life (Twenge & Campbell, 2001). The role of self-esteem in healthy development of children is well documented. Research findings indicate that high self-esteem is associated with better school performance, less susceptibility to peer pressure (Zimmerman *et al.*, 1997), low oral communication apprehension (McCroskey *et al.*, 1977). Pyszczynski, *et al.* (2004) also reported that people with high self-esteem experience more happiness, optimism and motivation than those with low self-esteem, as well as less depression, anxiety, and negative mood (as cited by Neff, 2011). Malik S. and Sadia (2013) studied gender differences in self-esteem and happiness among university students. Result revealed that male students reported significantly higher level of self-esteem as compared to the female university students also insignificant differences in male and female students in level of happiness.

Bhardwaj and Agrawal (2013) examined the gender difference in pre-adolescents self-esteem. They found no significant gender difference in levels for social, academic and parental self-esteem except for general self-esteem. Girls exhibited higher level of general self-esteem as compared to boys. Khatib (2012) investigated the relationship between loneliness, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and gender among United Arab Emirates college students. In research finding, self-esteem emerged as the most significant predictor of loneliness. Results also showed that females reported higher loneliness compared to their males counter mates. Pilafova, *et.al.* (2007) studied the relationship between gender, BMI, self-esteem and body esteem in college students. Results revealed that men had higher on self-esteem as compared to females. Zhang (2001) examined the relationship between thinking styles and self-esteem. Also investigate the relationship of the participants' extracurricular experiences to both thinking styles and self-esteem. It was found that thinking styles and self-esteem are statistically related.

Zhang and Postiglione (2001) studied the nature of thinking styles, self-esteem and socio-economic status of students. They performed a survey among 694 students at the University

of Hong Kong. They reported that when age was controlled, thinking styles and self-esteem overlap. Furthermore, regardless of age, those students who claimed using thinking styles that are creativity-generating and more complex, and those who reported higher self-esteem tend to be students from higher SES families.

So in this study researchers decide to study the influence of thinking styles on self-esteem because it is important aspects of an individual identity.

Objectives :

1. To find out the influence of various Forms (Hierarchic, Monarchic, Oligarchic and Anarchic) of Thinking Styles on Self-esteem of Secondary School Students.
2. To study the gender difference of students with respect to self-esteem.

Hypotheses :

1. There would be significant difference in Self-esteem of Hierarchic and Monarchic thinking styles of students.
2. There would be significant difference in Self-esteem of Hierarchic and Anarchic thinking styles of students.
3. There would be significant difference in Self-esteem of Hierarchic and Oligarchic thinking styles of students.
4. There would be significant difference in Self-esteem of Monarchic and Anarchic thinking styles of students.
5. There would be significant difference in Self-esteem of Monarchic and Oligarchic thinking styles of students.
6. There would be significant difference in Self-esteem of Anarchic and Oligarchic thinking styles of students.
7. There would be significant gender difference in relation to Self-esteem of the students.

METHOD

Sample :

In this study sample comprised 100 Secondary School Students. 50 male students and 50 female students were participated in the research. The age range of entire sample was from 13 to 15 years. Sample was selected by simple random sampling method from different school of Sangli city.

Tools

1. Thinking Styles Inventory Revised II (TSI-RII) :

Sternberg, Wagner & Zhang have developed the inventory in 2007. The TSI- RII assesses the presence of 13 thinking styles, using 65 items divided among 13 subscales. Each subscale contains five items. Participants are directed to indicate how well each item describes them. This is seven-point Likert type scale from not at all well to extremely well. Using the inventory researchers was given only Forms of thinking styles to the participants. There were 20 statements for the Forms of thinking styles. Reliability for the TSI- RII has been reported by Zhang (2000) as follows : Monarchic (.51), Hierarchic (.84), Oligarchic (.66), Anarchic (.54).

2. Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (School Form) :

Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory (School Form) prepared by Stanlay Coopersmith, was used to measure the level of self-esteem of the students. This inventory consists of 58 items, eight of which comprise a lie-scale. The remaining items are scored on dichotomous scale (like me or not like me) to provide a global measure of self-esteem. Higher score indicates higher self-esteem. Internal consistency ratings of the inventory ranges from 0.70 to 0.95. Test-retest reliability is reported to be 0.88. Convergent validity has been established in relation to other self-esteem measures with a correlation of 0.86.

Procedure :

The data for the study was collected by the participants from various schools from Sangli city. Prior permission was obtained from the Heads of the Schools before administering the test. The group of 15-20 students directed at a time. At first the participants were informed about importance and objectives of the study and instructions were given on how to fill the inventory. Before responding the inventory demographic information was collected from the participants. No time limit was specified. Finally they were thanked for their cooperation.

RESULT

In this study thinking styles inventory (only Form subscale) was applied on students. Students were identified who scored high on various Forms of thinking styles. Out of 100 students 48 were high on Hierarchic style, 22 students were high on Monarchic style,16 students were high on Anarchic style and 14 students were high on Oligarchic style as shown in the following table :

Table-1 : Showing no. of Students on Different Forms of Thinking Styles.

Group	Hierarchic style (H)	Monarchic style (M)	Anarchic style (A)	Oligarchic style (O)	Total
Students	48	22	16	14	100

Table-2 : Showing Mean, Standard Deviation of Forms of Thinking Styles o Students on Self-esteem.

Forms of Thinking Styles	Mean	*SD*	*t*-value	Significance
Between (H & M)	MH = 74.21 MM = 65.18	6.56 6.51	5.68	0.01**
Between (H & A)	MH = 74.21 MA = 60.88	6.56 5.34	8.13	0.01**
Between (H & O)	MH = 74.21 MO = 57.86	6.56 5.04	9.91	0.01**
Between (M & A)	MM = 65.18 MA = 60.88	6.51 5.34	2.23	0.05*
Between (M & O)	MM = 65.18 MO = 57.86	6.51 5.04	3.85	0.01**
Between (A & O)	MA = 60.88 MO = 57.86	5.34 5.04	1.59	NS

**Significant at 0.01 level, *Significant at 0.05 level

Table-2 presents the mean, standard deviation and *t*-ratios of hierarchic, monarchi anarchic and oligarchic thinkers for self-esteem. Here, hypotheses no.1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 a accepted, *t*-ratios revealed significant difference in between hierarchic, monarchic, anarch thinkers on self-esteem. No significant difference emerged between anarchic and oligarch thinkers with respect to self-esteem hence hypothesis no. 6 is rejected.

Table-3 : Showing Mean, *SD* and *t*-ratio of Male and Female Students with Respe to Self-esteem.

Group	*N*	Mean	*SD*	*df*	*t*-value	Sig.
Male	50	68.56	8.73	98	0.85	NS
Female	50	67.04	9.18			

From the above table mean, *SD* and *t*-ratio shows that there is no significant difference male and female students on self-esteem. So hypothesis no. 7 is rejected. But the mea score of male students is slightly higher level on self-esteem than female students.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to find out the influence of various forms (hierarchic, monarchic, oligarchic, and anarchic) of thinking styles on self-esteem of secondary school students. Table-2 depicts hierarchic thinking style students scored higher mean as compare to another thinking styles on self-esteem. Monarchic thinking style pupils scored higher mean for self-esteem than anarchic and oligarchic thinking owners but lower mean score than hierarchic thinkers. Anarchic thinking holders displays higher mean for self-esteem than oligarchic thinkers and lower mean score compare to hierarchic and monarchic thinking style owners. Oligarchic thinking style owners shows lower mean of self-esteem as relate to other thinking styles. These finding are in line with previous research findings (Zhang and Postiglione, 2001, Zhang and Sternberg 2006). Finally, hierarchic thinking style owner students have higher on self-esteem as compared to another thinking styles.

Another objective was to study gender difference in self-esteem level of secondary school students. But no significant gender difference is found in scores of self-esteem. These findings support the gender similarities hypothesis which holds that males and females are similar on most, but not all, psychological variables (Hyde, 2005). However, this finding contradict some other research findings reporting that men had higher levels of self-esteem than women because of gender stereotypes favouring males (Pilafova and *et.al,* 2007; Malik S. and Sadia, 2013).

It can be said from these results that at least at this age, girls and boys are not treated differently by either parents or society and therefore, no significant difference is found in their level of self-esteem. This is a good indication of changing attitude of society towards girls. However, this study is not without limitations. One major limitation is that study is conducted on small sample and therefore, result findings cannot be generalized. Further research is needed on larger sample.

CONCLUSION

Hierarchic thinking style students have higher self-esteem than monarchic, anarchic and oligarchic thinking styles students. No significant difference is found in between self-esteem of anarchic and oligarchic thinking styles of students. No significant gender difference is found in the level of self-esteem.

REFERENCES

Bhardwaj A.K. (2013) Gender Difference in Pre-adolescents' Self-esteem. *International Journal of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(8), 114-119.

Coopersmith, S., (1981) Manual for The Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory, Menlo park, CA : Mind Garden, Inc.

Hyde, J.S. (2005) The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist*. 60, 581-592.

Khatib, S.A. (2012) Exploring the Relationship among Lonliness, Self-esteem, Self-efficacy and Gender in United Arab Emirates College Students. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 8(1), 159-181.

McCrosky, J.C., Daly, J.A., Richmond, V.P., Falcione, R.L. (1977) Studies of the Relationship Between Communication Apprehension and Self-esteem. *Human Communication Research*, 3(3), 269-277.

Neff, K.D. (2011) Self-compassion, Self-esteem, and Well-being.*Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(1), 1-12.

Pilafova A., Angelone D.J., Bledsoe K. (2007) *Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research*, Spring 2007.

Sadia Malik & Sadia (2013) Gender differences in self-esteem and happiness among university students. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability* Vol. 2 (1), 445-454.

Sternberg R.J., (1997) *Thinking Styles*, Cambridge University Press, New York, USA.

Sternberg R.J., & Grigorenko E.L., (1997) Styles of thinking, abilities and academic performance. *Exceptional children*.Vol. 63, (3) 295- 312.

Sternberg, Wagner & Zhang (2007) Thinking Styles Inventory Revised II, (TSI- RII), Tufts University.

Twenge, J.M. & Campbell, W.K. (2001) Age and Birth Cohort Differences in Self-esteem : A Cross-Temporal Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(4), 321-344.

Zhang Li-Fang (2001) Thinking styles, Self-esteem and extracurricular experiences. *International Journal of Psychology*, Volume 36 Issue, 2 pp. 100-107.

Zhang L.F. & Postiglione G.A. (2001) Thinking Styles, self- esteem and socio-economic status. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Volume 31 (8), 1333-1346.

Zhang Li-Fang & Sternberg R.J. (2005) A three Model of Intellectual styles. *Educational Psychology Review*, Vol. 17 No.1 March 2005 DOI; 10.1007/s10648-005-1635-4.

Zhang Li-fang & Sternberg R.J. (2006) *The nature of Intellectual styles*. Lawrenee Erlbaum Associates Publishers. Mahwah New Jersey, London.

Zimmerman, M.A., Copeland, L. A., Shope, G.T., & Dielman, T. E. (1997) A Longitudinal Study of Self-esteem: Implications for Adolescent Development. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Vol. 2(2), 117-141.