CHAPTER-6

Result-III

Child rearing Practices and Personality Traits

The very purpose of CRP is to train children to behave in a certain way in the society and thereby develop in them personality traits which are congruent with the societal needs and requirements. In the previous chapters it has been demonstrated as to how CRP differs between school students coming from two different states of India and how the CRP affect the five dimensions of Personality.

In this chapter an attempt has been made to find out if CRP is directly associated with the Personality traits. To ascertain the existing personality traits in student sample of this research, MAP (Multi- Dimensional Assessment of Personality) test for Teenagers was given. As mentioned in the Method Chapter, this test taps 20 personality traits. They are being briefly described below.

Adaptability is the ability to make appropriate responses to changes or changing circumstances, while the second trait, “Academic Achievement” reflects the amount of academic acumen the student has and the degree to which he/she is currently interested and concerned with academics. Boldness is the third trait which refers to individuals who are typically adventurous, bold and energetic with good insight, and the 4th trait ‘Competition’ refers to the student who is self assertive, dominant and aggressive. The 5th trait is ‘Creativity’, which refers to critical thinking, and 6th trait is ‘Enthusiasm’, which refers to happy go lucky, lively and enthusiastic persons. ‘Excitability’, the 7th trait is a combination of immediate temperamental quality, mind-wandering, distractibility, insecurity and irrepressible impulsiveness, and the 8th trait is ‘General Ability’, that refers to mental capacity to learn and handle abstract problems. ‘Guilt-proneness’ is the 9th trait that refers to the feeling of inability to cope with difficult situations and being remorseful. The 10th trait is ‘individualism’ that refers to a person who prefers to do things on his own and is physically and intellectually objective. The 11th trait, ‘Innovation’, refers to the ability of an individual to be divergent in thinking and use his originality to produce something new and different. The 12th trait, ‘Leadership’, is the ability to direct and control the attitude or actions of others, whereas the 13th trait ‘Maturity’ refers to resourcefulness to meet the challenges of the
day. The next trait is ‘Mental Health’, which refers to the high level of adjustment and zest for living in the individual ‘Morality’, the 15th trait refers to the persistence, respect for authority and high level of conformity in an individual, while the 16th trait ‘Self-control’ indicates how strong is an individual’s self-control over his emotional life and behaviour in general. ‘Sensitivity’ is the 17th trait that refers to tender mindedness, dependently, over protectiveness, practical and toughness man individual. ‘Self-sufficiency’ is the 18th trait, which shows whether the individual is a team player or not, and 19th trait is ‘Social Warmth’, that finds out whether the individual is warm hearted and personable. The last trait ‘Tension’, which indicates the stress level of the individuals in a group. These traits are analysed in terms of CRP.

**CRP and Adaptability**

Adaptability trait refers to the ability to make appropriate responses to changed or changing circumstances. The obtained scores of all the students have been computed across schools and CRP wise. An attempt has been made to ascertain if the type of child rearing practices in any way is associated with the adaptability trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the detail.

**Table 6.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;7</th>
<th>Leo &gt;7</th>
<th>BVB &gt;7</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;7</th>
<th>Leo &lt;7</th>
<th>BVB &lt;7</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis was carried out regarding whether the loose, average and rigid CRP are in any way associated with the below average or above scores on adaptability trait,
irrespective of the schools. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total scores of all the schools under the ‘below average’ and ‘above average’ conditions for the three types of CRP. Table below presents the results of the analysis.

**Table: 6.1 A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt;7 on adaptability</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 7 on adaptability</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 12.4 \quad df = 2 \quad P = P<.01 \]

It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do appear to be significantly associated with the ‘adaptability’ trait. In other words, there appears to be a significant association between the personality dimension trait of adaptability and the CRP types, with higher present of Rigid and Average CRP subjects scoring above average sure on adaptability.

A detailed analysis school by school was thus carried out and certain interesting trends were obtained, which are presented below in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.1 which presents the data on adaptability scores school wise in terms of CRP.
BCM & GRD School

*Out of 177 Students of BCM & GRD, 14 were in loose CRP category of which 12 (83%) students reported above average adaptability and 2 (17%) reported below average adaptability.

*61 (34%) students out of 177 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid out of which, 50 (82%) had above average adaptability and 11(18%) had below average adaptability scores.

*104 (54%) students reported rigid CRP type, of which, 92 (88%) reported above average and 12 (12%) reported below average adaptability scores.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average adaptability appears to increase in these schools.

GHPS, Delhi

*Out of 158 students of GHPS, loose CRP was reported by 47 students (28%), out of which 35 (74%) scored more than average adaptability and 12 (26%) below average adaptability scores.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP, that is neither loose nor rigid, of which 43 (86%) had scored above average adaptability and 7 (14%) had scored below average adaptability scores.

*61 (34%) students reported rigid CRP type, and of these, 51 (84%) scored above average adaptability and 10 (16%) reported below average adaptability scores.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average adaptability appears to increase in these schools.

KESS, Delhi

*Out of 199 students of KESS, Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (5%) students of which, 9 (82%) reported more than average adaptability and 2 (18%) reported below average adaptability.
*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 82 (85.4%) had higher adaptability and 14 (14.6%) had poor adaptability.

*92 (46%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of which, 76 (83%) scored higher adaptability scores and 16 (17%) had scored below average adaptability.

There is no specific trend of CRP to adaptability. But it is interesting to note that as one compares loose and rigid CRP, the adaptability of rigid CRP students appears to be higher.

**Leo Christian School**

*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian School, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) students of which 52 (68%) scored above average adaptability and 25 (32%) below average adaptability scores.

*58 (34.46%) students out of 143 reported average CRP that is, neither loose nor rigid, of these 44 (76%) had higher adaptability and 14 (24%) had lower than average adaptability scores.

*8 (6%) students reported rigid CRP type and all 6 (100%) had higher than average adaptability.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average adaptability appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB School, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala state, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students of whom 14 (82%) reported above average adaptability and 3 (18%) students scored lower than average adaptability scores.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 59 reported average CRP that is, neither loose nor rigid, of which 30 (86%) had scored above average adaptability scores and 5 (14%) had lower than average adaptability.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, of which, 5 (71%) reported above average adaptability and 2 (29%) reported below average adaptability scores.
There is no specific trend of CRP to adaptability. But it is interesting to not that as one compares loose and rigid CRP, the adaptability of rigid CRP students appears to be lower in this school.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on adaptability trait. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on adaptability trait as per the Norm, it is seen that in four schools, viz., BCM GRD Punjab, KESS Delhi, and GHPS Delhi have shown larger percentage of students scoring relatively higher adaptability scores under Rigid and Average CRP type of upbringing. On the other hand BVB School in Trivandrum, Kerala State has also shown above average adaptability but under Loose CRP. No typical trend emerges except that Rigid CRP seems to lead to more percent of students across schools having higher scores on adaptability trait as compared to the other two types of CRP. It is interesting to note in Leo Christian School Trivandrum, Kerala only 8 students reported rigid CRP and all these 8 Students have scored above average adaptability scores under Rigid CRP condition.

Though no specific trend emerges, Rigid CRP and to an extent, Average CRP does seem to be appropriate for adaptability trait scores to be high. Rigid CRP seems to be relatively more facilitative of higher adaptability trait in larger number of students across schools followed by Average CRP.

**CRP and Academic Achievement**

The next trait taken up was Academic achievement, which was also analysed in terms of the type of CRP. Academic achievement trait refers to learning skills and academic acumen the student has. An attempt has been made to ascertain if child rearing practices in any way are associated with the academic achievement trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details.
Table 6.2
Schoolwise Academic Achievement, below and above average scores
and type of CRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;7</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &gt;7</th>
<th>BVB &gt;7</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;7</th>
<th>KLD EL &lt;7</th>
<th>Leo &lt;7</th>
<th>BVB &lt;7</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To find out if type of CRP are in anyway associated with Academic Achievement. Chi-Square was computed between the total scores of all the schools under the ‘below average’ and ‘above average’ conditions for the three types of CRP. Table below presents the results of the analysis.

Table: 6.2 A:
CRP and Academic Achievement traits-Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 7 on Aca.Achvt</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 7 on Aca.Achvt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>97 21.41%</td>
<td>57 20.65</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>190 41.94%</td>
<td>110 39.85</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>166 36.64%</td>
<td>109 39.49</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 <1 \text{ df } = 2 \ P = \text{NS}$

It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be associated with the academic achievement trait as measured by MAP being above or below average. In other words, there appears to be no significant association between the type of CRP and the academic achievement trait, when all scores irrespective of the schools were considered.
However a detailed analysis of these two factors (CRP and Academic achievement) school by school reveals certain interesting trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs.

BCM & GRD, Punjab
*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by only 12 (7%) students, of which, 5 (42%) students scored above average and 7 (58%) below average academic achievement.

*61 (33.8%) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of whom 44 (72%) had scored above average academic achievement and 17 (28%) had scored below average academic achievement.

*107 (47.7%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 71 (66%) reported above average academic achievement and 36 (34%) reported below average academic achievement. As one goes from loose to rigid CRP the percent of students scoring below average academic achievement appears to increase in this school.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Academic achievement appears to increase in these schools.

GHPS, Delhi
*Out of 158 students of GHPS, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 27 (57%) student scored above average academic achievement and 20 (43%) below average academic achievement.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 180 reported average CRP that is neither loose nor rigid of these 28 (56%) had above average academic achievement and 22 (44%) had below average academic achievement.

*61 (37%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 39 (64%) reported above average academic achievement and 22 (36%) reported below average academic achievement.

In this school also one finds that as one more from loose to rigid CRP, the percent of students scoring above average on academic achievement increases.
KESS, Delhi
* Out of 199 students of Kerala School Delhi, 11 (6%) reported loose CRP of which 6 (55%) had scored above average academic achievement and 5 (45%) below average academic achievement.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 53 (55%) had above average academic achievement and 43 (45%) had below average academic achievement.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 47 (51%) reported above average academic achievement and 45 (49%) had below average academic achievement.

There appears no significant percent of students on academic achievement in terms of loose to rigid CRP.

Leo Christian School
* Out of 133 students of Leo 67 (50%) students reported loose CRP of which 51 (76%) scored above average academic achievement and 16 (24%) below average academic achievement.

*58 (43.6%) students out of 133 reported average CRP, that is neither loose nor rigid of these 43 (74%) students had above average academic achievement and 15 (26%) had below average academic achievement.

*8 (6 %) students reported somewhat rigid CRP that is neither loose nor rigid of these 5 (63%) had above average academic achievement and 3 (37%) had below average academic achievement. As one move from loose to rigid CRP in this school (Leo Christian School) the percentage of students getting below average academic achievement increases.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Academic achievement appears to decrease in this school.

BVB School, Trivandrum Kerala
* Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala 17 (29%) students reported loose CRP of which 8 (47%) scored above average academic achievement and 9 (53%) scored below average academic achievement.
*35 (22%) students out of 59 reported average CRP that is neither loose nor rigid of these 22 (63%) had above average academic achievement and 13 (37%) had below average academic achievement.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 4 (57%) reported above average academic achievement and 3 (43%) reported below average academic achievement.

There is no specific trend of CRP to academic achievement. But it is interesting to note that as one compares for loose CRP and rigid CRP, the academic achievement of loose CRP Students appear higher.

Concluding Note on this Section

There appears no significant percent of students on academic achievement in terms of loose to rigid CRP. By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on academic achievement trait. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on adaptability as per the Norms, it is seen that in two schools, viz., BCM GRD Punjab, and Leo Christian Kerala having Rigid and Loose CRP respectively have shown larger percentage of students scoring higher academic achievement.

On the other hand GHPS Delhi and Kerala Delhi students having Average CRP have shown low academic achievement. Thus there appears no statistically significant relationship between these factors, that is, CRP and Academic Achievement. (Refer to the detailed table 6.2 which presents the data on academic achievement trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.)

Across Schools Rigid CRP seems to have relatively larger percent of students scoring high on the academic achievement followed by Average CRP. Loose CRP has shown lowest percent of students having good academic achievement. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with academic achievement trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement.
**CRP and Boldness**

The next trait taken up was Boldness. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Boldness trait refers to adventure and good energy with insight. An attempt has been made to ascertain if child rearing practices in any way are associated with the boldness trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details.

**Table 6.3**

**Boldness Average scores and CRP by schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;7</th>
<th>Leo &gt;7</th>
<th>BVB &gt;7</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt; 7</th>
<th>GHPS &lt; 7</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt; 7</th>
<th>Leo &lt;7</th>
<th>BVB &lt;7</th>
<th>Avg score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Rigid</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis of whether the loose, average and rigid CRP are in any way associated with the below average or above average scores on boldness trait as scored by the MAP test. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total scores of all the schools under the below average and above average conditions for the three types of CRP. Table below presents the results of the analysis.

**Table: 6.3 A**

**CRP and Boldness traits- Chi-square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 7 on boldness</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 7 on boldness</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 3.8$ df = 2 P = NS
It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be associated with the boldness trait being above or below average. In other words, there appears to be no significant association between CRP and boldness. However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs. (Refer to the detailed table 6.3 which presents the data on boldness trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.)

**BCM and GRD, Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) of which, 2 (17%) students reported above average boldness and 10 (83%) students reported below average boldness.

*61 (33.8%) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 9 (15%) had above average boldness and 52 (85%) had below average boldness.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 17 (16%) reported above average boldness and 77 (84%) reported below average boldness.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring below average Boldness appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%), of which, 11 (23%) students reported above average boldness and 36 (77%) students scored below average boldness.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 12 (24%) had above average boldness and 38 (76%) had below average boldness.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 7 (4%) reported above average boldness and 54 (96%) reported below average boldness.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring below average Boldness appears to increase in these schools.
KESS, Delhi

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (5.52%) students, of which, 4 (36%) scored above average boldness and 7 (64%) had below average boldness.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 22 (23%) had above average boldness and 74 (77%) had below average boldness.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 20 (22%) reported above average boldness and 72 (78%) reported below average boldness.

There appears no significant percent of students on Boldness in terms of loose to rigid CRP.

Leo Christian, Kerala

* Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) students, of which, 21 (27%) students scored above average Boldness and 56 (73%) below average boldness.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 16 (28%) had above average boldness and 42 (72%) had below average boldness.

*8 (5.5%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 3 (38%) reported above average boldness and 5 (62%) reported below average boldness.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring below average Boldness appears to decrease in this school.

BVB, Kerala

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students of which, 5 (29%) scored above average boldness and 12 (71%) had below average boldness.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 6 (17%) had above average boldness and 29 (83%) had below average boldness.
*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 5 (71%) reported above average boldness and 2 (29%) reported below average boldness.

There appears no significant percent of students on Boldness in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on boldness trait. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on boldness as per the Norms, it is seen that in school, viz., BVB Kerala and Leo Kerala having Loose CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring higher Boldness. On the other hand BCM GRD Punjab with Rigid CRP appears to have larger percent of students (84%) scoring poor on boldness trait. In the Kerala Delhi and GHPS Delhi schools, average CRP seems to be associated with larger percent of students scoring high on boldness trait when compared to BCM Punjab but lower in boldness when compared with students studying in Kerala. In this context also there is no clear trend but it may be mentioned that to have higher boldness, perhaps one must have more of loose and average CRP rather than rigid CRP. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with boldness trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement.

**CRP and Competition**

The next trait taken up was Competition. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Competition trait refers to self assertion, dominant and aggressive. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the competition trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details.
From the above table an analysis was carried out regarding whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on competitiveness trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total scores of all the schools under the ‘below average’ and ‘above average’ conditions for the three types of CRP. Table below presents the results of the analysis.

Table 6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;6</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;6</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;6</th>
<th>Leo &gt;6</th>
<th>BVB &gt;6</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;6</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;6</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;6</th>
<th>ILeo &lt;6</th>
<th>BVB &lt;6</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Rigid</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.8 \text{ df = 2 } P = NS \]
It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be associated with the competitiveness. In other words, there appears to be no significant association between CRP and competitiveness. However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs.

Refer to the detailed table 6.4 which presents the data on competitiveness trait, school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

**BCM and GRD, Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 4 (33%) students scored above average in competition and 8 (67%) scored below average in competition.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 29 (48%) had scored above average in competition and 32 (52%) had scored below average in competition.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 48 (45%) reported above average competition and 59 (55%) reported below average competition.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring below average Competition appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 26 (55%) scored above average competition and 21(45%) below average competition.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 24 (48%) had above average competition and 26 (52%) had below average competition.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 26 (43%) reported above average competition and 35 (57%) reported below average competition.
As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring below average Competition appears to increase in these schools.

**KESS, Delhi**

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (5.52%) students reported somewhat loose CRP of which 7 (64%) scored above average in competition and 4 (36%) scored below average in competition.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 55 (57%) had scored above average in competition and 41 (43%) had scored below average in competition.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 55 (60%) reported above average competition and 37 (40%) reported below average competition.

There appears no significant percent of students on Competition in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**

*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) students, of these, 44 (57%) students scored above average competition and 33 (43%) below average competition.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 38 (66%) had above average competition and 20(34%) had below average competition.

*8 (5.5%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 4 (50%) reported above average competition and 4 (50%) reported below average competition.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Competition appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students of these, 4 (24%) students scored above average competition and 13 (76%) below average competition.
*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 18 (51%) had above average competition and 17 (49%) had below average competition.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 2 (29%) reported above average competition and 5 (71%) reported below average competition.

There appears no significant percent of students on Competition in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on competition trait. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 6 and above 6 scores on competition as per the Norms, it is seen that in two schools, viz., Leo Kerala and Kerala Delhi experiencing Loose and Average CRP respectively have shown larger percentage of students scoring higher competition. On the other hand BVB Kerala and BCM GRD Punjab experiencing Loose and Rigid respectively appear to have smaller percent of students scoring poor on competition. In this context also there is no clear trend.

Across schools it is seen, rigid the CRP higher the competition followed by Loose CRP. Students experiencing Average CRP have shown least competitiveness. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with competition. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement.

**CRP and Creativity**

The next trait taken up was Creativity. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Creativity trait refers to critical thinking and high scholastic and mental abilities. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the creativity trait as scored by MAP test across schools. Table below presents the details.
Table 6.5

Creativity Average scores and CRP by schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;8</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;8</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &gt;8</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;8</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;8</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &lt;8</th>
<th>BVB</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis of whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any are associated with the below average or above average scores on creativity trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on creativity and those who scored high on creativity irrespective of the schools in which the students were. Table below presents the results of the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP and Creativity trait-Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of CRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 8 on Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 8 on Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 4.10  df = 2  P =NS
It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be significantly associated with the creativity trait as measured by MAP test. In other words, there appears to be no significant association between CRP and creativity trait. However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.5 which presents the data on creativity trait, school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

BCM and GRD, Delhi

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 10 (83%) scored above average creativity and 2 (17%) had below average creativity.  
*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 50 (82%) had above average creativity and 11 (18%) had below average creativity.  
*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 88 (82%) reported above average creativity and 19 (18%) reported below average creativity.  

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Creativity appears to increase in these schools.

GHPS, Delhi

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students of which 41 (87%) scored above average creativity and 6 (13%) had below average creativity.  
*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 41 (82%) had above average creativity and 9 (18%) had below average creativity.  
*61 (37%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 44 (72%) reported above average creativity and 17 (28%) reported below average creativity.  

There appears no significant percent of students on Creativity in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.
KESS, Delhi

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (5.52%) students of which 10 (91%) scored above average creativity and 1 (9%) had below average creativity.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 87 (91%) had above average creativity and 9 (9%) had below average creativity.

*92 (58%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 82 (85%) reported above average creativity and 10 (15%) reported below average creativity.

There appears no significant percent of students on Creativity in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

Leo Christian, Kerala

*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) students, of these, 70 (91%) students scored above average creativity and 7 (9%) below average creativity.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 49 (84%) had above average creativity and 9 (16%) had below average creativity.

*8 (5.5%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 6 (75%) reported above average creativity and 2 (25%) reported below average creativity.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Creativity appears to decrease in this school.

BVB, Kerala

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (25%) students of which, 15 (88%) scored above average creativity and 2 (12%) had below average creativity.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of
these 29 (83%) had above average creativity and 6 (17%) had below average creativity.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 6 (86%) reported above average creativity and 1 (14%) reported below average creativity.

There appears no significant percent of students on Creativity in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on creativity trait. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 8 and above 8 scores on competition as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., Kerala Delhi experiencing Average CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high in creativity. On the other hand GHPS Delhi experiencing Average CRP appear to have smaller percent of students scoring poor on creativity. In this context also there is no clear trend.

Across schools it is seen, more Loose the CRP higher the creativity followed by Average CRP. Students experiencing Rigid CRP have shown least creativity. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with creativity trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement.

**CRP and Enthusiasm**

The next trait taken up was Enthusiasm. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Enthusiasm trait refers to liveliness, happy go lucky types and prudence. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the enthusiasm trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details.
From the above table an analysis was carried out as to whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on enthusiasm trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on enthusiasm and those who scored high on enthusiasm irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis.

\[
\chi^2 = 21.9 \quad df = 2 \quad P< .01
\]
It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students appear to be significantly associated with the enthusiasm trait. Average CRP is associated with greater level of enthusiasm as compared to the other two types of CRP. However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.6 above which presents the data on creativity trait, school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

BCM and GRD, Punjab

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 8 (67%) scored above average enthusiasm and 4 (33%) had below enthusiasm.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 41 (67%) had above average enthusiasm and 20 (33%) had below average enthusiasm.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 82 (77%) reported above average enthusiasm and 25 (23%) reported below average enthusiasm.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Enthusiasm appears to increase in these schools.

GHPS, Delhi

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%), of which, 37 (79%) scored above average enthusiasm and 10 (21%) had below average enthusiasm.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 42 (84%) had above average enthusiasm and 8 (16%) had below average enthusiasm.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 44 (72%) reported above average enthusiasm and 17 (28%) reported below average enthusiasm.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Enthusiasm appears to increase in these schools.
KESS, Delhi

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of which, 11 (100%) reported above average enthusiasm.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 83 (86%) had above average enthusiasm and 13 (14%) had below average enthusiasm.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 83 (90%) reported above average enthusiasm and 9 (10%) reported below average enthusiasm.

There appears no significant percent of students on Enthusiasm in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

Leo Christian, Kerala

*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, of which, 69 (89%) students scored above average enthusiasm and 8 (11%) below average enthusiasm.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 48 (83%) had above average enthusiasm and 10 (17%) had below average enthusiasm.

*8 (6%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 6 (75%) reported above average enthusiasm and 2 (25%) reported below average enthusiasm.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Enthusiasm appears to decrease in this school.

BVB, Kerala

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students reported loose CRP, of which, 15 (82%) scored above average enthusiasm and 2 (18%) had below average enthusiasm.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 31 (89%) had above average enthusiasm and 4 (11%) had below average
enthusiasm.

*7 (10.1%) students reported rigid CRP type and all 7 (100%) had above average enthusiasm.

There appears no significant percent of students on Enthusiasm in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on Enthusiasm. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on enthusiasm as per the Norms, it is seen that in three schools, viz., Leo Kerala, BVB Kerala experiencing loose CRP and Kerala Delhi experiencing Average CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high on enthusiasm. On the other hand BCM GRD Punjab experiencing Rigid CRP appear to have smaller percent of students scoring high enthusiasm. Here CRP is highly significant with Enthusiasm.

Across schools it is seen, Loose the CRP higher the enthusiasm followed by Rigid CRP. Students experiencing Average CRP have shown least Enthusiasm. These trends in differences are noteworthy, specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Enthusiasm trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also being significant substantiates this statement

**CRP and Excitability**

The next trait taken up was Excitability. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Excitability trait refers to temperament, insecurity, impulsiveness and insecurity. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the academic achievement trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details.
Table 6.7

Excitability scores and CRP by schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;7</th>
<th>Leo &gt;7</th>
<th>BVB &gt;7</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;7</th>
<th>Leo &lt;7</th>
<th>BVB &lt;7</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out as to whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on excitability trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on excitability and those who scored high on excitability irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis

Table: 6.7 A

CRP and Excitability trait- Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 7 on Excitability</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 7 on Excitability</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 9.14 \) df = 2 P< .05
It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students appear to be significantly associated with the excitability trait. Average and rigid CRP seem to be significantly associated with greater level of excitability as compared to the loose type CRP.

However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.7 which presents the data on excitability trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

**BCM and GRD, Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 11 (83%) scored above average excitability and 2 (17%) had below average excitability.*

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 44 (72%) had above average excitability and 17 (28%) had below average excitability.*

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 79 (74%) reported above average excitability and 28 (26%) reported below average excitability.*

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Excitability appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 39 (83%) scored above average excitability and 18 (17%) reported below average excitability.*

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 29 (58%) had above average excitability and 21 (42%) had below average excitability.*

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 46 (75%) reported above average excitability and 15 (25%) reported below average excitability.*
There appears no significant percent of students on Excitability in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**KESS, Delhi**

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students reported somewhat loose CRP, of these, 8 (73%) reported above average on excitability and 3 (27%) had below average excitability.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 69 (72%) had above average excitability and 27 (18%) had below average excitability.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 72 (78%) reported above average excitability and 20 (22%) reported below average excitability.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Excitability appears to increase in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**

*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian School Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, 59 (77%) students scored above average excitability and 18 (23%) below average excitability.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 43 (74%) had above average excitability and 15 (26%) had below average excitability.

*8 (6%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 5 (62%) reported above average excitability and 3 (38%) reported below average excitability.

There appears no significant percent of students on Excitability in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students reported, of which, 10 (59%) scored above average excitability and 7 (41%) had below
average excitability.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 18 (51%) had above average excitability and 17 (49%) had below average excitability.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, of which, 2 (28%) reported above average excitability and 5 (72%) below average excitability.

There appears no significant percent of students on Excitability in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on Excitability. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on excitability as per the Norms, it is seen that in two schools, viz., Leo Kerala experiencing loose CRP and Kerala Delhi experiencing Average CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high on excitability. On the other hand Leo Kerala appears to have smaller percent of students scoring low on excitability. Here CRP is highly significantly associated with Excitability.

Across schools it is seen that the more Loose the CRP higher the excitability. Students experiencing Average CRP have shown least Excitability. These trends in differences are noteworthy, specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Excitability trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also being significant substantiates this statement.

**CRP and General Ability**

The next trait taken up was General Ability. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. General Ability trait refers to greater mental capacity to learn and intellectually adaptable. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the General Ability trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details.
Table 6.8

General Ability scores and CRP by schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;8</th>
<th>KL DEL &gt;8</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &gt;8</th>
<th>BVB &gt;8</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;8</th>
<th>GH PS &lt;8</th>
<th>KL DEL &lt;8</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &lt;8</th>
<th>BVB &lt;8</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out as to whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on general ability trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on general ability and those who scored high on excitability irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis

Table: 6.8 A

CRP and General Ability trait- Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 8 General Ability</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 8 on General Ability</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = <1 \ P=NS \)
It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be significantly associated with the General Ability trait. However it should be noted that almost all students had scored more than average on general ability and this may be one of the reasons for the general ability and CRP not showing any significant association. Irrespective of CRPO and schools, the General ability of students has shown larger percent of students as compared low general ability level.

However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.8 above which presents the data on creativity trait, school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

**BCM and GRD, Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported 12 (7%) students, of which, 12 (100%) scored above average on general ability.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 60 (98%) had above average general ability and 1 (2%) had below average general ability.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 105 (98%) had reported above average general ability and only 2 (2%) reported below average general ability.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average General Ability appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, all 47 (100%) scored above average on general ability.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these all 50 (100%) had above average general ability.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, all 61 (100%) reported above average general ability.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average General Ability appears to increase in these schools.
KESS, Delhi
*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, all 11 (100%) scored above average on general ability.
*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 93 (97%) had above average general ability and 3 (3%) had below average general ability.
*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of which, 91 (99%) had above average general ability and 1 (1%) had below average general ability.
There appears no significant percent of students on General Ability in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

Leo Christian, Kerala
*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, 74 (96%) students scored above average general ability and 3 (4%) below average general ability.
*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 57 (98%) had above average general ability and 1 (2%) had below average general ability.
*8 (6%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 6 (75%) reported above average general ability and 2 (25%) reported below average general ability.
As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average General Ability appears to decrease in this school.

BVB, Kerala
*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students, of which, 11 (65%) scored above average general ability and 6 (35%) below average general ability.
*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 33 (94%) had above average general ability and 2 (6%) had below average general ability.
*7 (12%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 6 (86%) reported above
average general ability and 1 (24%) below average general ability.

There appears no significant percent of students on General Ability in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on Excitability. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 8 and above 8 scores on excitability as per the Norms, it is seen that in three schools, viz., GHPS Delhi and Kerala Delhi experiencing Average CRP and BCM GRD experiencing Rigid CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high on Excitability. On the other hand BVB Kerala appear to have smaller percent of students scoring high on general ability.

Across schools it is seen, Average CRP higher the general ability followed by Rigid CRP. Students experiencing Loose CRP have shown least general ability. These trends in differences are noteworthy, specific conclusion could not be arrived associating CRP with general ability trait.

**CRP and Guilt Proneness**

The next trait taken up was Guilt Proneness. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Guilt Proneness trait refers to feeling of fatigue in exciting situations and being unable to cope up with difficult situations. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Guilt Proneness as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details.

**Table 6.9**

*Guilt Proneness scores and CRP by schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;7</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &gt;7</th>
<th>BVB &gt;7</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;7</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &lt;7</th>
<th>BVB &lt;7</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on guilt proneness trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on guilt proneness and those who scored high on guilt proneness irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis.

**Table: 6.9 A**

**CRP and Guilt Proneness trait- Chi-square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 7 on Guilt proneness</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 7 on Guilt proneness</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 2.80 \text{ df}=2 \text{ P=NS} \)

It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be significantly associated with the Guilt Proneness trait. However it should be noted that almost all students had scored more than average of 5 sten scores on guilt proneness and this may be one of the reasons for the guilt proneness and CRP not showing any significant association. Irrespective of CRP and schools, the guilt proneness of students has shown larger percent of students as compared low guilt proneness.

However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.9 which presents the data on guilt proneness trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.
BCM and GRD, Punjab

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 9 (75%) scored above average guilt proneness and 3 (25%) had below average guilt proneness.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 46 (75%) had above average guilt proneness and 15 (25%) had below average guilt proneness.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 82 (77%) reported above average guilt proneness and 25 (23%) reported below average guilt proneness.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Guilt Proneness appears to increase in these schools.

GHPS, Delhi

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 of which 37 (79%) scored above average guilt proneness and 10 (21%) had below average guilt proneness.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 41 (82%) had above average guilt proneness and 9 (18%) had below average guilt proneness.

*61 (39%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 51 (84%) reported above average guilt proneness and 10 (16%) reported below average guilt proneness.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Guilt Proneness appears to increase in these schools.

KESS, Delhi

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by11 (6%) students, of these, 10 (91%) reported above average on guilt proneness and 1(9%) had below average guilt proneness.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 76 (79%) had above average guilt proneness and 20 (21%)) had below average guilt proneness.
92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 74 (80%) reported above average guilt proneness and 18 (20%) reported below average guilt proneness.

There appears no significant percent of students on Guilt Proneness in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**

*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, 50 (65%) students scored above average in guilt proneness and 27 (35%) below average guilt proneness.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 39 (67%) had above average guilt proneness and 19 (33%) had below average guilt proneness.

*8 (6%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 6 (75%) reported above average guilt proneness and 2 (25%) reported below average guilt proneness.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Guilt Proneness appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students of which, 13 (76%) scored above average guilt proneness and 4 (24%) had below average guilt proneness.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 29 (83%) had above average guilt proneness and 6 (17%) had below average guilt proneness.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type and all 7 (100%) reported above average guilt proneness.

There appears no significant percent of students on Guilt Proneness in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.
Concluding Note on this Section

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on guilt proneness trait. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on guilt proneness as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., Kerala Delhi and GHPS Delhi experiencing Average CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high in Guilt Proneness. On the other hand Leo Kerala experiencing Loose CRP appears to have smaller percent of students scoring low on Guilt Proneness. In this context also there is no clear trend.

Across schools it is seen, with Loose CRP lower the guilt proneness followed by Average CRP. Students experiencing Rigid CRP have shown high Guilt proneness. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with guilt proneness trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement.

CRP and Individualism

The next trait taken up was Individualism. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Individualism trait refers to one who prefer to do things on his own, is physically and intellectually obstructive and thinks over his mistakes repeatedly and how to avoid it.

An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Individualism trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;7</th>
<th>Leo &gt;7</th>
<th>BVB &gt;7</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;7</th>
<th>Leo &lt;7</th>
<th>BVB &lt;7</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Rigid</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10

Individualism scores and CRP by schools
From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on Individualism trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on Individualism and those who scored high on Individualism, irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis

Table: 6.10 A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP and Individualism trait- Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of CRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 2.67$, df = 2, $P=NS$

It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be significantly associated with the Individualism trait. However it should be noted that almost all students had scored more than average of 5 sten scores on Individualism and this may be one of the reasons for is trait and CRP not showing any significant association. Irrespective of CRP and schools, the trait of individualism being high of students has shown larger percent of students as compared to low individualism level.

However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.10 which presents the data on Individualism trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.
BCM and GRD, Punjab

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 8 (67%) scored above average on individualism and 4 (33%) had below average poor individualism.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 41 (67%) had above average individualism and 20 (33%) had below average individualism.

*107 (59%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 77 (72%) reported above average individualism and 30 (28%) reported below average individualism.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Individualism appears to increase in these schools.

GHPS, Delhi

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 29 (62%) scored above average individualism and 18 (38%) had below average individualism.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 34 (68%) had above average individualism and 16 (32%) had below average individualism.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 43 (70%) reported above average individualism and 18 (30%) reported below average individualism.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Individualism appears to increase in these schools.

KESS, Delhi

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of these, 10 (91%) had above average individualism and 1 (9%) had below average individualism.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 70 (73%) had above average individualism and 26 (27%) had below average individualism.
*92 (46%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 74 (80%) reported above average individualism and 18 (20%) reported below average individualism. As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Individualism appears to increase in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**

*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by only 77 (54%) student, 52 (67%) students scored above average on individualism and 25 (33%) below average individualism.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 39 (67%) had above average individualism and 19 (33%) had below average individualism.

*8 (6%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 4 (50%) reported high individualism and 4 (50%) reported poor individualism.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Individualism appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students out of which 12 (70%) scored above average on individualism and 5 (30%) below average on individualism.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 22 (63%) had above average individualism and 13 (27%) had below average individualism.

*7 (12%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type; 5 (71%) were above average on individualism and 2 (29%) below average on individualism.

There appears no significant percent of students on Individualism in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.
Concluding Note on this Section

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on individualism trait. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on competition as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., Kerala Delhi experiencing Average CRP have shown larger percentage of high individualism. On the other hand BVB & Leo Kerala experiencing Loose CRP along with BCM GRD Punjab appears to have smaller percent of students scoring high on Individualism. In this context also there is no clear trend.

Across schools it is seen, with Rigid CRP higher the Individualism followed by Loose CRP. Students experiencing Rigid CRP have shown low Individualism though the % difference is not much between Loose and Average CRP. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Individualism trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement.

CRP and Innovation

The next trait taken up was Innovation. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Innovation trait refers to being analytical, liberal and divergent thinking. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Innovation trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;8</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;8</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &gt; &gt; 8</th>
<th>BVB &gt;8</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &lt; 8</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt; 8</th>
<th>Avg score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on Innovation trait irrespective of the schools. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on Innovation and those who scored high on Innovation, irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis.

**Table: 6.11 A**

**CRP and Innovation trait- Chi-square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 8 on Innovation</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 8 on Innovation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.40$  df =2  P=NS

It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be significantly associated with the Innovation trait. However it should be noted that almost all students had scored more than average of 5 sten scores on Innovation and this may be one of the reasons for this trait and CRP not showing any significant association. Irrespective of CRP and schools, the trait of high innovation of students has shown larger percent of students as compared low innovation level. However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.11 which presents the data on Innovation trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.
BCM and GRD, Punjab

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 11 (92%) scored above average in innovation and 1 (8%) had below average innovation.

*62 (34 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 58 (95%) had above average innovation and 3 (5%) had below average innovation.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 103 (96%) reported above average innovation and 4 (4%) reported below average innovation.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Innovation appears to increase in these schools.

GHPS, Delhi

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 46 (98%) scored above average innovation and 1 (2%) had below average innovation.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 47 (94%) had above average innovation and 3 (6%) had below average innovation.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 58 (95%) reported above average innovation and 3 (5%) reported below average innovation.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Innovation appears to increase in these schools.

KESS, Delhi

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of these, all 11 (100%) reported above average on innovation.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 93 (97%) had above average innovation and 3 (3%) had below average innovation.
*92 (46%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 89 (97%) reported above average innovation and 3 (3%) reported below average innovation.

There appears no significant percent of students on Innovation in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**

*Out of 143 students of Leo Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, 73 (95%) students scored above average in innovation and 4 (5%) below average in innovation.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 57 (98%) had above average in innovation and 1 (2%) had below average in innovation.

*8 (5.5%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 7 (88%) reported above average in innovation and 1 (12%) reported below average in innovation.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Innovation appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported 17 (29%) students reported loose CRP of which all 17 (100%) scored above average in innovation.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these all 35 (100%) recorded above average innovation.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type; all 7 (100%) reported above average innovation.

There appears no significant percent of students on Innovation in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.
Concluding Note on this Section

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on innovation trait. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 8 and above 8 scores on competition as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., BVB Kerala experiencing Loose CRP have shown 100% students scoring high innovation. On the other hand BCM GRD Punjab experiencing rigid CRP and GHPS Delhi experiencing Average CRP appears to have larger percent of students scoring low on Innovation. In this context also there is no clear trend.

Across schools it is seen, with Average CRP higher the Innovation followed by Loose CRP. Students experiencing Rigid CRP have shown low Innovation though the % difference is not much between Rigid and Loose CRP. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Innovation. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement

CRP and Leadership

The next trait taken up was Leadership. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Leadership trait refers to the ability to direct and control the attitude and actions of others. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Leadership trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

Table 6.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;8</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;8</th>
<th>Leo &gt;8</th>
<th>BVB &gt;8</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt; 8</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;8</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt; 8</th>
<th>I Leo &lt; 8</th>
<th>BVB &lt; 8</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on Leadership trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on Leadership and those who scored high on leadership irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis.

**Table: 6.12 A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 8 on Leadership</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 8 on Leadership</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 11.01  df = 2  P = <.05

There is a significant association between Loos, Average and Rigid CRP and the low or high scores on Leadership. In other words, within the general broadline the Loose CRP has relatively larger percentage of students scoring low on leadership, whereas 40% of Average CRP has 40% of students having high Leadership. There is no difference in regard to Rigid CRP.

Refer to the detailed table 6.8 which presents the data on Leadership trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

**BCM and GRD, Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 9 (75%) scored above average leadership and 3 (25%) had below average leadership.*
*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 33 (54%) had above average leadership and 28 (46%) had below average leadership.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 71 (66%) reported above average leadership and 36 (34%) reported below average leadership.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Leadership appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 33 (70%) scored above average leadership and 14 (30%) scored below average leadership.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 38 (76%) had above average in leadership and 12 (24%) had below average leadership.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 39 (64%) reported above average leadership and 22 (36%) reported below average leadership.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Leadership appears to increase in these schools.

**KESS, Delhi**

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of these, all 11 (100%) scored above average in leadership.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 73 (76%) had above average leadership and 23 had below average leadership.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 76 (83%) reported above average leadership and 26 (17%) reported below average in leadership.

There appears no significant percent of students on Leadership in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.
**Leo Christian, Kerala**

*Out of 143 students of Leo Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, 70 (91%) students scored above average in leadership and 7 (9%) below average in leadership.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 51(88%) had above average leadership and 7 (12%) had below average leadership.

*8 (5.5%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 7 (87%) reported above average leadership and 1 (13%) reported below average in leadership.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Leadership appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students, out of which, 12 (71%) scored above average in leadership and 7 (29%) reported below average in leadership.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 29 (83%) had above average leadership and 6 (17%) scored below average leadership.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, of which, 6 (86%) scored above average in leadership and 1 (14%) scored below average in leadership.

There appears no significant percent of students on Leadership in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on Leadership. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 8 and above 8 scores on Leadership as per the Norms, it is seen that in two schools, viz., Leo Kerala and BVB Kerala experiencing loose have shown larger percentage of students scoring high on Leadership. On the other hand BCB GRD Punjab appears to have
smaller percent of students scoring high on Leadership. Here CRP is highly significant with Leadership.

Across schools it is seen, Loose the CRP higher the Leadership followed by Average CRP. Students experiencing Rigid CRP have shown minimum Leadership. These trends in differences are noteworthy, specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Leadership trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also being significant substantiates this statement.

**CRP and Maturity:**
The next trait taken up was Maturity. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Leadership trait refers to more resources the individual have available to meet the challenges of the day. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Maturity trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;7</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &gt;7</th>
<th>BVB &gt;7</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;7</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &lt;7</th>
<th>BVB &lt;7</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on Maturity trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on Maturity and those who scored high on Maturity, irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis
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Table: 6.13 A

CRP and Maturity trait- Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 7 on Maturity</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 7 on Maturity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.89$  df =2  P=NS

It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be significantly associated with the Maturity trait. However it should be noted that almost all students had scored more than average of 5 sten scores on maturity and this may be one of the reasons for is trait and CRP not showing any significant association. Irrespective of CRP and schools, the trait of Maturity being high of students has shown larger percent of students as compared low maturity level. However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs.Refer to the detailed table 6.13 which presents the data on Maturity trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

BCM and GRD, Punjab

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%), of which, 6 (50%) scored above average in maturity and 6 (50%) had below average maturity.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 29 (48%) had above average maturity and 32 (52%) had below average maturity.

*86 (47.7%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 47 (57%) reported above average maturity and 39 (43%) reported below average maturity.
As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Maturity appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**
*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students of which, 19 (40%) scored above average maturity and 28 (60%) had below average maturity.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 20 (40%) had above average maturity and 30 (60%) had below average maturity.

*61 (39%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 25 (41%) reported above average maturity and 36 (59%) reported below average maturity.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring below average Maturity appears to increase in these schools.

**KESS, Delhi**
*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students of these, 5 (45%) had above average score in maturity and 6 (55%) had below average maturity.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 44 (46%) had above average maturity and 52 (54%) had below average maturity.

*92 (46%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 42 (44%) reported above average maturity and 50 (56%) reported below average maturity.

There appears no significant percent of students on Maturity in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**
*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, 49 (64%) students scored above average in maturity and 28 (46%) scored below average in maturity.
*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 32 (55%) had above average maturity and 26 (45%) had below average maturity.

*8 (6%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 6 (75%) reported above average maturity and 2 (25%) reported below average maturity.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Maturity appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students, of which, 10 (59%) scored above average on maturity and 7 (41%) scored below average in maturity.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 17 (49%) had above average maturity and 18 (51%) had below average maturity.

*7 (12%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, of these, 4 (57%) scored above average in maturity and 3 (43%) scored below average maturity.

There appears no significant percent of students on Maturity in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on Maturity trait. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on competition as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., Leo Kerala experiencing Loose CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high on Maturity. On the other hand GHPS Delhi experiencing Average CRP appears to have smaller percent of students scoring high on Maturity. In this context also there is no clear trend.

Across schools it is seen, with Loose CRP higher the Maturity followed by Rigid and
Average CRP. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with maturity trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement

**CRP and Mental Health**

The next trait taken up was Mental Health. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Mental health trait refers to enduring state in which child is well adjusted and have zest for living. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Mental health trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

**Table 6.14**

**Mental Health scores on the CRP by school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;8</th>
<th>KLDDEL &gt;8</th>
<th>Leo &gt;8</th>
<th>BVB &gt;8</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;8</th>
<th>KLDDEL &lt;8</th>
<th>Leo &lt;8</th>
<th>BVB &lt;8</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on Mental Health trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on Mental Health and those who scored high on Mental health, irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis.
Table: 6.14 A

CRP and Mental Health trait- Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt;8 on Mental Health</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 8 on Mental Health</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = < 1\quad \text{df=}2\quad P=\text{NS} \]

It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be significantly associated with the Mental Health trait. However, it should be noted that most of the students had scored more than average of 5 sten scores and above on Mental Health indicating good mental health, and this may be one of the reasons for this trait and CRP not showing any significant association. Irrespective of CRP and schools, the trait of mental health being high of students has shown larger percent of students as compared to low Mental health level. However, a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs.

Refer to the detailed table 6.14 which presents the data on Mental Health trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

**BCM and GRD, Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 10 (83%) scored above average mental health and 2 (17%) scored below average mental health.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 51 (84%) had above average mental health and 10 (16%) had below average mental health.
*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 86 (80%) reported above average mental health and 21 (20%) reported below average mental health.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Mental Health appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 36 (77%) scored above average mental health and 11 (23%) had below average mental health.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 44 (88%) had above average mental health and 6 (12%) had below average mental health.

*61 (30%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 50 (82%) reported above average mental health and 11 (18%) reported below average mental health.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Mental Health appears to increase in these schools.

**KESS, Delhi**

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, and all 11 (100%) scored above average mental health.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 75 (78%) had above average mental health and 21 (22%) had below average mental health.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 74 (80%) reported above average mental health and 18 (20%) reported below average mental health.

There appears no significant percent of students on Mental Health in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.
Leo Christian, Kerala
*Out of 143 students of Leo Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) students, 65 (84%) students scored above average in mental health and 12 (16%) scored below average mental health.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 52 (90%) had above average mental health and 6 (10%) had below average mental health.

*8 (5.5%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, all 8 (100%) reported above average mental health.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Mental Health appears to decrease in this school.

BVB, Kerala
*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students, of which, 13 (76%) scored high in mental health and 4 (24%) scored poor in mental health.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 30 (86%) had above average mental health and 5 (14%) had below average mental health.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, of which, 6 (86%) reported above average mental health and 1 (14%) reported below average mental health.

There appears no significant percent of students on Mental Health in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

Concluding Note on this Section
By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on Mental Health. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 8 and above 8 scores on competition as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., Leo and BVB Kerala experiencing Loose CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high on Mental health. On the other hand BCM GRD experiencing Rigid CRP
appears to have smaller percent of students scoring high on mental health. In this context also there is no clear trend.

Across schools it is seen, with Loose CRP higher the Mental Health followed by Average CRP. The students with Rigid CRP have lower Mental health. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Mental health trait. Perhaps \( \chi^2 \) value also not being significant substantiates this statement

**CRP and Morality**

The next trait taken up was Morality. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Morality trait refers to being more persistent, more respectful of authority and more conforming to the standard of the group. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Morality trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

**Table 6.15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD ( &gt;8 )</th>
<th>GHPS ( &gt;8 )</th>
<th>KLDEL ( &gt;8 )</th>
<th>Leo ( &gt;8 )</th>
<th>BVB ( &gt;8 )</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD ( &lt;8 )</th>
<th>GHPS ( &lt;8 )</th>
<th>KLDEL ( &lt;8 )</th>
<th>Leo ( &lt;8 )</th>
<th>BVB ( &lt;8 )</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on guilt proneness trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between CRP types and high or low guilt proneness taking the total number of students irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis
Table: 6.15 A

CRP and Morality trait- Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 8 on Morality</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 8 on Morality</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = < 1$  df = 2  P=NS

It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be significantly associated with the Morality trait. However it should be noted that almost all students had scored more than average of 5 sten scores on Morality and this may be one of the reasons for the Morality and CRP not showing any significant association.

However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs.

Refer to the detailed table 6. 15 which present’s the data on morality trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

BCM and GRD, Punjab

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, of which, 11 (92%) scored above average morality and 1 (8%) scored below average morality.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 55 (90%) had above average morality and 6 (10%) had below average morality.
*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 96 (90%) reported above average morality and 11 (10%) reported below average morality.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Morality appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 40 (85%) scored above average on morality and 7 (15%) had below average morality.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 45 (90%) had above average morality and 5 (10%) had below average morality.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 54 (88%) reported above average morality and 7 (12%) reported below average morality.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Morality appears to increase in these schools.

**KESS, Delhi**

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of these, 10 (91%) had above average score in morality and 1 (9%) had below average morality.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 76 (79%) had above average morality and 20 (21%) had below average morality.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 78 (85%) reported above average morality and 14 (15%) reported below average morality.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Morality appears to increase in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**

*Out of 143 students of Leo Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, 62 (80%) students scored above average morality and 15 (20%) scored below average in morality.
*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 55(95%) had above average morality and 3 (5%) had below average morality.

*8 (6%) students reported rigid CRP type, all 8 (100%) reported above average morality.

There appears no significant percent of students on Morality in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by only 17 (29%), of which, 14 (82%) scored above average in morality and 3 (18%) scored below average in morality.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 29 (83%) had above average morality and 6 (17%) had below average morality.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type of which, 4 (57%) scored above average in morality and 3 (43%) scored below average in morality.

There appears no significant percent of students on Morality in terms of loose to rigid CRP in this school.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on morality. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 8 and above 8 scores on morality as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., BCN GRD experiencing Rigid CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high on Morality, followed by GHPS Delhi and Leo Kerala experiencing Average and Loose CRP respectively. On the other hand BVB Kerala experiencing Loose CRP appears to have smaller percent of students scoring high on morality. In this context also there is no clear trend.
Across schools it is seen, with Rigid CRP higher the Morality followed by Average CRP. The students with Loose CRP are found to have lower Morality. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Morality trait. Perhaps \( \chi^2 \) value also not being significant substantiates this statement. There does not appear to be any statistically significant relationship between CRP and Morality.

**CRP and Self-control**

The next trait taken up was Self-control. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Self-control trait refers to strong self-control over emotional life and behavior in general. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Self-control trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

**Table 6.16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;8</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;8</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &gt;8</th>
<th>BVB &gt;8</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;8</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;8</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;8</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &lt;8</th>
<th>BVB &lt;8</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on Self-control trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on guilt proneness and those who scored high on Self-control irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis.
Table: 6.16 A

**CRP and Self-control trait- Chi-square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 8 on Self Control</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 8 on Self Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.60 \quad df = 2 \quad P = \text{NS} \]

The self control had slightly more than 73% of students scoring more than average scores on morality. As such in terms of Loose, Average and Rigid CRP there was no significant association with the self control factor. However detailed analysis school-wise was carried out on the factor of self control and related to the three types of CRP. The results are presented in the following paragraphs.

Refer to the detailed table 6.16 which presents the data on self control trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

**BCM and GRD, Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%), of which, 7 (58%) scored above average in self control and 5 (42%) had below average self control.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 47 (77%) had above average self control and 14 (23%) had below average self control.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 76 (71%) reported above average self control and 31 (29%) reported below average self control.
As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average self-control appears to increase in these schools.

GHPS, Delhi
*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%), of which, 36 (76%) reported above average self control and 11 (24%) reported below average self control.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 37 (74%) had above average self control and 13 (26%) had below average self control.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 44 (72%) reported above average self control and 17 (28%) reported below average self control.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average self control appears to increase in these schools.

KESS, Delhi
*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of these, 9 (82%) had above average self control and 2 (18%) had below average self control.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 59 (61%) had above average self control and 35 (39%) had below average self control.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 72 (78%) reported above average self control and 20 (22%) reported below average self control.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average self control appears to increase in these schools.

Leo Christian, Kerala
*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian School Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, 54 (70%) students scored above average in self control and 23 (30%) scored below average in self control.
*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of
these 48(83%) had above average self control and 10 (17%) had below average self
control.

*8 (6%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, 6 (75%) reported above average
self-control and 2 (25%) had below average self-control.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average
Self-control appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students, of
which, 10 (59%) scored above average self control and 7 (41%) had below average self
control.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of
these 32 (91%) had above average self control and 3 (9%) had below average self-
control.

*7 (12%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type; all 7 (100%) were above average
in self-control.

There appears no significant percent of students on Self-control in terms of loose to
rigid CRP in these schools.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average
on Self control. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 8 and
above 8 scores on Self-control as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., BVB
Kerala experiencing Loose CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high
on Self control, followed Leo Kerala experiencing Loose CRP. On the other hand
Kerala Delhi experiencing Average CRP appears to have smaller percent of students
scoring high on Self control. In this context also there is no clear trend.
Across schools it is seen, with Rigid and Average CRP higher the Self control. The students with Loose CRP are found to have lower self control quiet contrary to what is shown above. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Self control trait. Perhaps \( \chi^2 \) value also not being significant substantiates this statement. There does not appear to be any statistically significant relationship between CRP and Self control.

**CRP and Sensitivity**

The next trait taken up was Sensitivity. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Sensitivity trait refers to overprotected, practical and tough. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Sensitivity as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;7</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &gt;7</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;7</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;7</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;7</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &lt;7</th>
<th>BVB &lt;7</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on sensitivity trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on sensitivity and those who scored high on sensitivity irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis
**Table: 6.17 A**

**CRP and Sensitivity trait - Chi-square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 8 on Sensitivity</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 8 on Sensitivity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = < 1 \quad df=2 \quad P=NS$

It is seen from the above that the types of child rearing practices experienced by the students do not appear to be significantly associated with the Sensitivity trait. However it should be noted that almost all students had scored more than average of 5 sten scores on Sensitivity and this may be one of the reasons for the Sensitivity and CRP not showing any significant association. Irrespective of CRP and schools, the Sensitivity of students has shown larger percent of students as compared low Sensitivity.

However a detailed analysis school by school reveals certain trends which are presented below in the following paragraphs.

Refer to the detailed table 6.17 which presents the data on Sensitivity trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

**BCM and GRD, Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) students, out of which, 8 (67%) scored above average sensitivity and 4 (33%) had below average sensitivity.*
*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 34 (58%) had above average sensitivity and 27 (42%) had below average sensitivity.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 49 (46%) reported above average sensitivity and 58 (54%) reported below average sensitivity.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Sensitivity appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%), of which, 27 (57%) scored above average sensitivity and 20 (43%) had below average sensitivity.  

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 23 (46%) had above average sensitivity and 27 (54%) had below average sensitivity.  

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 31 (51%) reported above average sensitivity and 30 (49%) reported below average sensitivity.

There appears no significant percent of students on Sensitivity in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**KESS, Delhi**

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of these, 5 (45%) had above average sensitivity and 6 (55%) had below average sensitivity.  

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 40 (42%) had above average sensitivity and 56 (58%) had below average sensitivity.  

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 41(45%) reported above average sensitivity and 51 (55%) reported below average sensitivity.
As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Sensitivity appears to increase in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**
*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian School Kerala, loose CRP was reported by only 77 (54%) student, 30 (39%) students scored above average sensitivity and 47 (61%) had below average sensitivity.  
*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 23 (40%) had above average sensitivity and 35 (60%) had below average sensitivity.  
*8 (6%) students reported rigid CRP type, 3 (38%) scored above average sensitivity and 5 (62%) scored below average sensitivity.  
As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Sensitivity appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**  
*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students, of which, 13 (76%) scored above average in sensitivity and 4 (24%) scored below average sensitivity.  
*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 26 (74%) had above average sensitivity and 9 (26%) had below average sensitivity.  
*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, out of which, 6 (86%) scored above average on sensitivity and 1 (14%) scored below average in sensitivity.  
There appears no significant percent of students on Sensitivity in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Concluding Note on this Section**  
By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on Sensitivity. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on sensitivity as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., BVB Kerala
experiencing Loose CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high on Sensitivity. On the other hand Leo Kerala experiencing Loose CRP appears to have smaller percent of students scoring high on Sensitivity. In this context also there is no clear trend.

Across schools it is seen, with Loose CRP higher the Sensitivity followed by Average CRP. The students with Rigid CRP are found to have lowest in Sensitivity. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Sensitivity trait. Perhaps \( \chi^2 \) value also not being significant substantiates this statement. There does not appear to be any statistically significant relationship between CRP and Sensitivity.

**CRP and Self-sufficiency**

The next trait taken up was Self-sufficiency. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Self-sufficiency trait refers to being alone and don’t need support of the group. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Self-sufficiency trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

**Table 6.18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;5</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;5</th>
<th>KLDEL &gt;5</th>
<th>Leo &gt;5</th>
<th>BVB &gt;5</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;5</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;5</th>
<th>KLDEL &lt;5</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &lt;5</th>
<th>BVB &lt;5</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on Self-sufficiency trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low on Self-sufficiency and those who scored...
high on Self-sufficiency irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis

Table: 6.18 A

CRP and Self-sufficiency trait- Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt;5 on Self sufficiency</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 5 on Self sufficiency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = < 1$  df=2  P=NS

In almost 70% of students reported less than average Self-sufficiency. In terms of different CRP’s there was no significant association between the two factors. However a detailed analysis of self sufficiency ion terms of each school and in terms of CRP was carried out and is presented in the following paragraphs:

Refer to the detailed table 6.18 which presents the data on Self sufficiency trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

BCM and GRD, Punjab

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by only 12 (7%) students, of which, 5 (42%) scored above average self sufficiency and 7 (58%) had below average self sufficiency.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 18 (30%) had above average self sufficiency and 43 (70%) had below average self sufficiency.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 27 (25%) reported above
average self sufficiency and 80 (75%) reported below average self sufficiency.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Self-sufficiency appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**
*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 10 (21%) reported above average self sufficiency and 37 (70%) reported below average self sufficiency.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 10 (20%) had above average self sufficiency and 40 (80%) had below average self sufficiency.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 16 (26%) reported above average self sufficiency and 45 (84%) reported below average self sufficiency.

There appears no significant percent of students on Self-sufficiency in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**KESS, Delhi**
*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of these, 3 (27%) were above average in self sufficiency and 8 (73%) had below average self sufficiency.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 30(31%) had above average self sufficiency and 66 (69%) had below average self sufficiency.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 28 (30%) reported above average self sufficiency and 64 (70%) reported below average self sufficiency.

There appears no significant percent of students on Self-sufficiency in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**
*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) student, 21 (27%) students scored above average self sufficiency and 56 (73%) reported below average self- sufficiency.
*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 21(36%) had above average self sufficiency and 37(64%) had below average self sufficiency.

*8 (6%) students reported rigid CRP type, 2 (33%) scored above average self sufficiency and 6 (77%) scored below average on self sufficiency.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring below average Self-sufficiency appears to increase in these schools.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students of which, 8 (47%) scored above average self sufficiency and 9 (53) had below average self sufficiency.

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 14 (40%) had above average self sufficiency and 21(60%) had below average self sufficiency.

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type of these 3 (43%) scored above average self sufficiency and 4 (57%) had below average self sufficiency.

There appears no significant percent of students on Self-sufficiency in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have lower percentage of students scoring more than average on Self sufficiency. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 5 and above 5 scores on morality as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., BVB Kerala experiencing Loose CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high Self sufficiency, followed by GHPS Delhi and Leo Kerala experiencing Average and Loose CRP respectively. On the other hand GHPS Delhi experiencing Average CRP appears to have smaller percent of students scoring high on Self sufficiency. In this context also there is no clear trend.
Across schools it is seen, with Average CRP higher the Self sufficiency, followed equally by Rigid and Loose CRP. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Self sufficiency trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement. There does not appear to be any statistically significant relationship between CRP and Self sufficiency.

**CRP and Social Warmth**

The next trait taken up was Social Warmth. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Social Warmth trait refers to being warm hearted, personable and easy to get along. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Social Warmth trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

**Table 6.19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &gt;9</th>
<th>GHPS &gt;9</th>
<th>KLD &gt;9</th>
<th>Leo &gt;9</th>
<th>BVB &gt;9</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD &lt;9</th>
<th>GHPS &lt;9</th>
<th>KLD &lt;9</th>
<th>Inf &amp; Leo &lt;9</th>
<th>BVB &lt;9</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on Social Warmth. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low Social-Warmth and those who scored high on Social warmth irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis.
Table: 6.19 A

CRP and Social Warmth trait- Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 9 on Social Warmth</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 9 on Social Warmth</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.6 \quad df=2 \quad P=NS \]

There is no significant association between Loose, Average and Rigid CRP and high or low Social Warmth. Infact 85% students reported average to above social warmth.

However a detailed analysis school by school has been carried out indicating how the social warmth factor varies in terms of the three types of CRP. These are presented in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.19 which presents the data on Social Warmth trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

**BCM and GRD Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%), of which, 10 (83%) scored above average in social warmth and 2 (17%) had below average social warmth.

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 49 (80%) had above average social warmth and 12 (20%) had below average social warmth.

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 85 (79%) reported above average social warmth and 21 (21%) reported below average social warmth.
As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Social Warmth appears to increase in these schools.

**GHPS, Delhi**

*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students, of which, 33 (70%) scored above average social warmth and 14 (30%) had below average social warmth.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 40 (80%) had above average social warmth and 10 (20%) had below average social warmth.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 55 (90%) reported above average social warmth and 6 (10%) reported below average social warmth.

There appears no significant percent of students on Social Warmth in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**KESS, Delhi**

*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of these, 10 (91%) had above average social warmth and 1 (9%) had below average social warmth.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 82 (85%) had above average social warmth and 14 (15%) had below average social warmth.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 75 (82%) reported above average social warmth and 17 (18%) reported below average social warmth.

There appears no significant percent of students on Social Warmth in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Leo Christian, Kerala**

*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian School Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%) students, of which, 73 (95%) scored above average social warmth and 4 (5%) had below average social warmth.
*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 53 (91%) had above average social warmth and 5 (9%) had below average social warmth.

*8 (6%) students reported somewhat rigid CRP type, 7 (88%) scored above average on social warmth and 1 (12%) scored below average social warmth.

As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Social Warmth appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students, of which 15 (88%) scored above average social warmth and 2 (12%) scored below average social warmth.*

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 30 (86%) had above average social warmth and 5 had below average social warmth.*

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type of these, 6 (86%) had above average social warmth and 1 (14%) had below average social warmth.*

There appears no significant percent of students on Social Warmth in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on Social Warmth. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 9 and above 9 scores on Social warmth as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., Leo and BVB Kerala experiencing Loose CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring high on Social Warmth, followed by Kerala Delhi experiencing Average CRP. On the other hand BCM GRD Punjab experiencing Rigid CRP and GHPS Delhi experiencing Average CRP appears to have smaller percent of students scoring high on Social Warmth. In this context also there is no clear trend.
Across schools it is seen, with Loose CRP higher the Social Warmth followed by Average CRP. The students with Rigid CRP are found to have lowest Social Warmth. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Social Warmth trait. Perhaps $\chi^2$ value also not being significant substantiates this statement. There does not appear to be any statistically significant relationship between CRP and Social Warmth.

**CRP and Tension**
The next trait taken up was Tension. This was also seen in terms of the CRP type. Tension refers to being short tempered, irritable and anxious. An attempt has been made to ascertain of child rearing practices in any way are associated with the Tension trait as scored by MAP test. Table below presents the details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP Type</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD $&gt;7$</th>
<th>GHPS $&gt;7$</th>
<th>KLDEL $&gt;7$</th>
<th>Leo $&gt;7$</th>
<th>BCM &amp; GRD $&lt;7$</th>
<th>GHPS $&lt;7$</th>
<th>KLDEL $&lt;7$</th>
<th>Leo $&lt;7$</th>
<th>BVB $&lt;7$</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table an analysis was carried out so as to find out whether the loose, average and rigid CRP in any way are associated with the below average or above average scores on Tension trait. For this Chi-Square was computed between the total number of students who scored low or high on tension with the different types of CRP that they had experienced irrespective of the schools. Table below presents the results of the analysis.
Table: 6.20 A

CRP and Tension trait- Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CRP</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &gt; 7 on Tension</th>
<th>No. of subjects scoring &lt; 7 on Tension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1 \text{ df}=2 \text{ P=NS} \]

There is no significant association between Loose, Average and Rigid CRP and high or low tension.

However when detailed analysis school by school was carried out relating these two factors, interesting results emerged which are placed in the following paragraphs. Refer to the detailed table 6.20 which presents the data on Tension trait school wise in terms of the three types of CRP.

**BCM and GRD, Punjab**

*Out of 180 students of BCM & GRD, loose CRP was reported by 12 (7%) and all 12 (100%) scored above average in tension.*

*61 (33.8 %) students out of 180 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 49(80%) had above average tension and 12(20%) had below average tension score.*

*107 (59%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 81 (76%) reported above average tension and 25 (26%) reported below average tension.*

There appears no significant percent of students on Tension in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.
GHPS, Delhi
*Out of 158 students of GHPS Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 47 (30%) students reported loose CRP of which 40 (85%) scored above average in tension and 7 (15%) had below average tension.

*50 (31.6%) students out of 158 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 39 (78%) had above average tension and 11 (22%) had below average tension.

*61 (39%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 47 (87%) reported above average tension and 14 (13%) reported below average tension.

There appears no significant percent of students on Tension in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

KESS, Delhi
*Out of 199 students of Kerala Delhi, loose CRP was reported by 11 (6%) students, of these, 10 (91%) had above average score in tension and 1 (9%) had below average tension.

*96 (48.2%) students out of 199 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 71 (74%) had above average tension and 25 (26%) had below average tension.

*92 (46%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 66 (72%) reported above average tension and 26 (28%) reported below average tension.

There appears no significant percent of students on Tension in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

Leo Christian, Kerala
*Out of 143 students of Leo Christian Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 77 (54%), of which, 44 (57%) scored above average tension and 33 (43%) had below average tension.

*58 (40.5%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 35 (60%) had above average tension and 23 (40%) had below average tension.

*8 (6%) students reported rigid CRP type, of which, all 8 (100%) scored above average in tension.
As one goes from loose to rigid CRP, the percentage of students scoring above average Tension appears to decrease in this school.

**BVB, Kerala**

*Out of 59 students of BVB Kerala, loose CRP was reported by 17 (29%) students reported loose CRP of which 13 (76%) scored above average tension and 4 (24%) had below average tension.*

*35 (59.3%) students out of 143 reported average CRP i.e. neither loose nor rigid of these 25 (71%) had above average tension and 10(29%) had below average tension.*

*7 (12%) students reported rigid CRP type, of these, 4 (57%) students scored above average in tension and other 3 (43%) scored below average in tension.*

There appears no significant percent of students on Tension in terms of loose to rigid CRP in these schools.

**Concluding Note on this Section**

By and large all schools have larger percentage of students scoring more than average on Tension. However, within this trend, if the students are divided into below 7 and above 7 scores on morality as per the Norms, it is seen that school, viz., Leo kerala experiencing Loose CRP have shown larger percentage of students scoring low on Tension, followed by BVB Kerala experiencing Loose CRP. On the other hand BCM GRD Punjab experiencing Rigid CRP appears to have smaller percent of students scoring low on Tension. In this context also there is no clear trend.

Across schools it is seen, equally with Loose and Average CRP lower the Tension. The students with Rigid CRP are found to have more tension. These trends in differences are noteworthy though no specific conclusion could be arrived associating CRP with Tension trait. Perhaps χ2 value also not being significant substantiates this statement. There does not appear to be any statistically significant relationship between CRP and Tension.
Concluding note on this chapter

The CRP being low, average and high was related to 20 different dimensions of personality as per MAP test. It was noted that CRP did associate significantly with Enthusiasm, Excitability and Leadership. CRP however did not show any statistically significant association with Adaptability, Academic Achievement, Boldness, Competition, Creativity, General Ability, Guilt Proneness, Individualism, Innovation, Maturity, Mental Health, Morality, Self-control, Sensitivity, Self-sufficiency, Social Warmth and Tension.

In terms of five different schools the CRP associated with different dimensions differentially indicating that the CRP experienced by the students at home and at school does seem to affect the development of personality in students. While in Boldness, Competition, Maturity, Sensitivity and Self Sufficiency larger percent of students scoring high on these dimensions, there were traits like Academic Achievement, Creativity, Enthusiasm, Excitability, General Ability, Guilt proneness, Individualism, Innovation, Leadership, Mental Health, Morality, Self-control, Social Warmth and Tension dimensions on all of the percentage of students scoring high was very large and this was one of the reasons attributed to the lack of association between the different types of CRP and the personality traits. Interestingly these differed also across the schools when each school was taken and dealt with in detail regarding CRP and Personality trait.

One may conclude from the analysis of the data in the chapter that child rearing practices experienced by the students does seem to have played an important role in their personality development. However, studying in different schools in the different states where the extremes of following the traditions and norms do seem to affect their behaviors as is reflected in some of the traits such as leadership quality, tension, self sufficiency and sensitivity. One may thus conclude the hypothesis set up stating that the different types of CRP will differentially affect the personality traits is partially validated.