CHAPTER - III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The study was designed to investigate the counselling needs of the adolescents and youth as they relate to some psychological and social variables. The nature of the study led to the use of descriptive survey method of research. This method is concerned with the study, description and investigation of what exists today, the conditions and relationships that exist, practices that prevail and beliefs, attitudes and points of view that are held, etc.

This method was employed in the present investigation for the purpose of surveying not the individual, but some generalized characteristics of the population under study. It involved the application of test of independence between the sets of dependent and independent variables using the chi-square and it also used the comparative approach for the study of differences amongst the groups which the total sample included.

SAMPLE

The sample for the study was drawn from the local degree colleges of the Union Territory of Chandigarh comprising Government and Private colleges. A sample of 300 students consisting of 148 boys [Arts 79 (B.A.I-43 and B.A.II-36)]
and 152 girls (Arts 77 (B.A. I-39 and B.A. II-38) Science 75 (B.Sc. I-37 and B.Sc. II-38)) was taken randomly from the colleges included in the sample. The split-up of the sample is given in table 3.1.

The data was collected in the 1989-90 session in which only two classes i.e. B.A./B.Sc. I and II were available and not the final year class. This was due to the change in the education pattern i.e. 10+2+3, in which the students had to pass class 12th followed by three years of T.D.C. Hence the data was gathered from the available classes only.

TOOLS

The following tools were used for data collection for the present study:

I. The Mooney Problem Checklist (College form) (M.P.C.L.) (Mooney, 1950);

II. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16P.F.) (Cattell, 1962);

III. Traditional Family Ideology Scale (T.F.I) (Levinson and Huffman, 1954-55);

IV. Socio-Economic Status Scale (S.E.S) (Deo and Mohan, 1972).

Given below is the description of each of the tools:

Mooney Problem Checklist (College form) (M.P.C.L.) (Mooney and Gordon, 1950)

Designed by Mooney and Gordon, the problem checklist is not a test. Its usefulness lies in its economy for appraising
the major concerns of a group or an individual student, which may be posing problems and which require counselling help.

Of the three forms of Mooney Problem Checklists i.e. College, High School and Junior High School, only the College Form is being used in the present investigation, and hence its description. The checklist (College form as also others) is a list of troublesome problems which are often faced by the students in College. The College Form consists of 330 items, with 30 items in each problem area. The problem areas are:

I. Health and Physical Development (HPD).
II. Finances, Living Conditions, and Employment (FLE).
III. Social and Recreational Activities (SRA).
IV. Social - Psychological Relations (SPR).
V. Personal - Psychological Relations (PPR).
VI. Courtship, Sex and Marriage (CSM).
VII. Home and Family (HF).
VIII. Morals and Religion (MR).
IX. Adjustment to College Work (ACW).
X. The Future; Vocational and Educational (FVE).
XI. Curriculum and Teaching Procedure (CTP).
TABLE No. 3.1

College, Sex and Discipline-wise Distribution of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the College</th>
<th>Sex and Disciplines</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. College, Sector-11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. College for Girls, Sector-11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. College, Sector-46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector-26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector-26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D. College, Sector-32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.A.V. College, Sector-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.C.M.D.A.V. College, Sector-36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When using the problem checklist to understand an individual case, the aim is to analyse the students' problem in relation to his total life situation and to develop some plan of action, wherever necessary, for the guidance of the individual or for the improvement of his situation. The counsellor while using the problem checklist needs to keep in mind the fact that it is not a test. It does not yield scores on traits or permit any direct statement about the adjustment status of the person who makes the responses. Rather, it is a form of simple communication between the counsellee and the counsellor which helps the former to understand the student and his problems. For the counsellee, the checking-in of the problems stated in the checklist is often immediately helpful in understanding himself. This is corroborated by the students' own reports in the summarizing statements wherein they admit having understood their problems through filling out the checklist.

Validity

According to Mooney and Gordon (1950), the checklists are not built as tests. They are used for a variety of purposes, and their usefulness can be evaluated in terms of assumptions on which they are built and the purposes for which they are intended.

The assumptions on which the present checklists were devised are:
1. The great majority of students would be responsive to the items;
2. They would accept the task with a constructive attitude;
3. They would find that the checklists covered, reasonably well, the range of personal problems with which they are concerned;
4. School administrators, teachers and counsellors would find the results usable;
5. Research workers would find the checklists useful in various lines of inquiry.

Reliability

Reliability of M.P.C.L. has been determined in two ways i.e.
1. On the basis of the frequency with which each of the items was marked.
2. On the basis of the rank order of the 11 problem areas arranged by the size of mean number of problems checked in the area on its first and second administrations.

The correlation coefficients of .93 for the former and ranging from .90 to .98 for the latter were obtained.

Scoring

For the scoring of the checklist, the circled items are to be counted first and the number entered in the box. Then the items which are only underlined are to be counted and added to the number circled and the total sum is to be entered in
the 'total' box. Lastly, the total of all the counts for all the areas is to be recorded at the bottom on the front cover and this constitutes the total number of problems checked.

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) (Cattell, 1962)

Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire is an objectively-scorable test devised by basic research in psychology to give the most complete coverage of personality, possible in a brief time. It is planned for the age-group 17 years till maturity, with varying reading levels. Consisting of six forms i.e. A, B, C, D, E and F, only forms A and B are most appropriate for the fully literate person. These forms contain 187 items and include 10 to 13 items for each factor.

The personality factors measured are not just peculiar to the 16PF test. They have been established as unitary, psychologically-meaningful entities in many researches in various life situations. These sixteen dimensions or scales are essentially independent i.e. correlation between one another is usually quite small. Therefore, having a certain position on one does not prevent the person's having any position whatever on any other. Thus, each of the 16 scales brings a new piece of information about the person.

The capsule description of 16 primary personality factors has been given on the following page.
Factor A: Reserved (Sizothymia, previously Schizothymia) Vs Outgoing (Affectothymia, previously Cyclothymia).

'Reserved' has been described as detached, critical and cool, whereas, 'Outgoing' has been described as warm-hearted, easy-going and participating. A person scoring low on Factor A tends to be stiff, cool, skeptical and aloof, liking things rather than people, working alone and avoiding compromises of viewpoints, likes to be precise and "rigid" in his ways of doing things. He may at times be critical, obstructive and hard.

A person scoring high on Factor A is good-natured, easy-going, emotionally expressive, ready to cooperate, attentive to people, soft-hearted, kindly, adaptable, likes occupations dealing with people and socially-impressive situations, readily forms active groups, generous in personal relations, less afraid of criticism, and better able to remember names of people.

Factor B: Less Intelligent (Lower scholastic mental capacity) Vs More Intelligent (higher scholastic mental capacity).

'Less Intelligent' is described as having concrete thinking, and 'More Intelligent' as given to abstract thinking and bright. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be slow to learn and grasp, dull, given to concrete and literal interpretation. His dullness may be a reflection of his low intelligence or poor functioning due to psychopathology.
A person scoring high on this factor tends to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner and intelligent. High scores contraindicate deterioration of mental functions in pathological conditions.

**Factor C:** Affected by feelings (lower ego strength) Vs Emotionally Stable (higher ego strength).

Factor C has been described as indicating emotionally less stable, easily upset Vs facing reality, calm and mature. A person scoring low on this factor is low in frustration, tolerance for unsatisfactory conditions, changeable and plastic, evading necessary reality demands, neurotically fatigued, fretful, emotional and annoyed, active in dissatisfaction, having neurotic symptoms (phobias, sleep disturbances, psychosomatic complaints etc.).

A person scoring high on this factor is emotionally mature, stable, realistic about life, unruffled, possessing ego strength, and better able to maintain solid group morale.

**Factor E:** Humble (submissiveness) Vs Assertive (dominance).

'Humble' is described as being mild, accommodating and conforming, whereas, 'Assertive' is described as independent, aggressive and stubborn. A person scoring low on Factor E tends to give way to others, to be docile, and to conform, is often dependent, confessing and anxious for obsessional correctness.
A person scoring high on Factor E is assertive, self-assured, independent-minded, austere, a law to himself, hostile or extra-punitive, authoritarian (managing others), and disregards authority.

Factor F: Sober (desurgency) Vs Happy-go-lucky (surgency).

This factor has been indicative of being prudent, serious, and taciturn Vs impulsively lively, gay and enthusiastic. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be restrained, reticent, introspective, pessimistic, unduly deliberate; is considered smug, sober and dependable.

A person who scores high on this trait is cheerful, active, talkative, frank, expressive, effervescent, carefree, frequently chosen as an elected leader, impulsive and mercurial.

Factor G: Expedient (weaker superego strength) Vs Conscientious (stronger superego strength).

This personality dimension is described as evading rules, feels few obligations Vs persevering, staid and rule bound. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be unsteady in purpose, is often casual, lacks effort for group undertakings and cultural demands. His freedom from group influence may lead to anti-social acts. But at times makes him more effective, while his refusal to be bound by rules causes him to have less somatic upsets from stress.
A person scoring high on this factor tends to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, persevering, responsible, planful, usually conscientious and moralistic, prefers company of hard-working people than the witty.

Factor H: Shy (threctia) Vs Venturesome (parmia).

'Shy' is described as being restrained, diffident and timid, whereas, 'Venturesome' is described as socially bold, uninhibited and spontaneous. A person scoring low on this factor is shy, withdrawing, cautious, retiring, a "wall flower", usually has inferiority feeling's, is slow, dislikes occupations with personal contacts, prefers one or two close friends to large group, not given to keeping in contact with all that is going around him.

A person scoring high on this factor is sociable, bold, ready to try things, spontaneous, abundant in emotional response. His 'thick-skinnedness' enables him to face wear and tear in dealing with people and grueling emotional situations without fatigue; he is 'pushy' and actively interested in the opposite sex.

Factor I: Tough-minded (harria) Vs Tender-minded (premsia)

i.e. self-reliant, realistic, no-nonsense Vs dependent, over-protected, sensitive.

A person scoring low on Factor I, tends to be practical, realistic, masculine, independent, responsible, but skeptical of
subjective and cultural elaborations, unmoved, hard, cynical and smug. He often keeps a group operating on a practical and realistic "no-nonsense" basis.

A person scoring high on Factor I tends to be tender-minded, day-dreaming, artistic, fastidious, feminine, sometimes demanding help and attention, impatient, impractical, dislikes crude people and rough occupations, slows up group performance, and upsets group morale by unrealistic fussiness.

Factor L: Trusting (alaxia) Vs Suspicious (protension)

i.e. adaptable, free of jealousy; easy to get along-with Vs self-opinionated and hard to fool.

A person scoring low on this factor tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable, cheerful, uncompetitive, concerned about other people, and a good team worker.

A person scoring high on this factor tends to be mistrusting and doubtful, involved in his own ego, self-opinionated, interested in internal and mental life, deliberate in his actions, unconcerned about other people, and, a team member.

Factor M: Practical (praxernia) Vs Imaginative (autia)

'Practical' is described as careful, conventional, regulated by external realities, and proper, whereas, 'Imaginative' is described as wrapped up in inner urgencies,
careless of practical matters, and bohemian. A person scoring low on this factor, is anxious to do the right things, attentive to practical matters, and subject to the dictation of what is obviously possible, concerned about details, able to keep his head in emergencies, but sometimes unimaginative.

A person scoring high on this factor is unconventional, unconcerned over everyday matters, bohemian, self-motivated, imaginatively-creative, concerned with "essentials", and oblivious of particular people, and physical realities. His inner-directed interests sometimes leads to unrealistic situations accompanied by expressive outburst, his individuality causes him to be rejected in group activities.

Factor N: Forthright (artlessness) Vs Shrewd (shrewdness)

'Forthright' is described as natural, artless, and sentimental Vs Calculating, worldly, and penetrating. A person scoring low on this factor is unsophisticated, sentimental, simple, sometimes crude, awkward, easily pleased, content with what comes, is natural and spontaneous.

A person scoring high on this factor tends to be polished, experienced, worldly, shrewd, hardheaded, analytical, intellectual and has unsentimental approach to situations.

Factor O: Placid (untroubled adequacy) Vs Apprehensive (guilt proness).

This factor indicates self-assured, confident, and serene
Vs Worrying, depressive, and troubled personality dimension. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be placid with unshakeable nerve, mature, unanxious, has confidence in himself and his capacity to deal with him, things, resilient, secure, insensitive when a group is not going along with him, which evokes in him antipathies and distrust.

A person scoring high on this factor tends to be depressed, moody, worrier, full of foreboding, brooding, having childlike tendency to anxiety in difficulties, and does not feel accepted in groups or free to participate.

Factor Q₁: Conservative (conservatism) Vs Experimenting (radicalism).

Factor Q₁ relates to respecting established ideas, tolerant of traditional difficulties Vs Critical, liberal, analytical, and given to free-thinking dimension of personality. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be confident, accepts the "tried and true" despite inconsistencies when something else might be better; cautious, compromising regarding new ideas, tends to oppose and postpone change, goes along with tradition, more conservative in religion and politics, not interested in analytical "intellectual" thought.

A person scoring high on Factor Q₁ tends to be interested in intellectual matters and has doubts on fundamental issues. He is skeptical and inquiring regarding ideas either old or new;
is more well informed, less inclined to moralize, more inclined to experiment in life, and more tolerant of inconvenience and change.

Factor Q₂: Group-Dependent (group adherence) Vs Self-Sufficient (self-sufficiency) i.e. A 'Joiner' and sound follower Vs prefers own decisions, and resourceful.

A person scoring low on Factor Q₂ prefers to work, makes decisions with other people, likes and depends on social approval and admiration, goes along with the group, not necessarily gregarious by choice and needs group support.

A person scoring high on Factor Q₂ is temperamentally independent, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions and taking action on his own, discounts public opinion, not dominant in his relations with others does not dislike people but simply does not need their agreement or support.

Factor Q₃: Undisciplined Self-conflict (low integration) Vs Controlled (high self-concept control).

i.e. careless of protocol, follows own urges Vs socially precise and following self-image.

A person scoring low on this factor is not bothered with will-control and regard for social demands, not overly considerate, careful, or pain-staking, and feels maladjusted.
A person scoring high on this factor has strong control of his emotions and general behaviour; is socially aware, careful and self-respecting. However, he tends sometimes to be obstinate.

Factor Q\textsubscript{4}: Relaxed (low ergic tension) Vs Tense (high ergic tension).

'Relaxed' is described as tranquil, torpid and unfrustrated Vs frustrated, driven, and over-wrought. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be sedate, relaxed, composed, satisfied (not frustrated). Sometimes, over-satisfaction can lead to laziness and low performance, as also low motivation which leads to little trial and error.

A person scoring high on this factor tends to be tense, excitable, restless, fretful, impatient, often fatigued, is unable to remain inactive, takes a poor view of the degree of unity, orderliness, leadership, his frustration represents an excess of stimulated but undischarged drive.

Validity

The concept or construct validity of the questionnaire is +.85 which is an acceptable level for the purpose for which it was constructed.

Reliability

Test-retest reliability of this test (after six days) as
reported in the manual, on 146 adults (25-45 years) was found to range from .82-.93, and on 132 students (after a gap of two months) it was found to range from .63-.88.

Scoring

Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire can be scored for 16 primary factors. Besides, it can also be scored for four broad second order factors and some derivations. The second order scores are not derived from raw scores on the primaries, but from the stens into which the former are first converted. Combining of primary stens with weights given in the table in the manual of 16PF, provides stens for the second order factors directly.

Scoring of the test is on the basis of three alternative responses i.e. 'Yes', 'No' and 'Uncertain' or 'In-between', which are provided for each of the questions/statements. Each gets a score of '1' and '2' depending upon the nature of the response except for questions relating to Factor 'B' which are 'Yes' and 'No'. Accordingly, the score for all the correctly returned responses is 1 each.

The total raw score on the sub-scales can be converted into standard scores on a 10 point scale based on the responses of the college students plus other adults. The test can be hand or machine scored. Data are provided for productive use in industry, college and clinic in the form of possible profile
matching and criterion estimation (Cattell, 1969). The handbook of this questionnaire offers a set of 28 occupational profiles.

Traditional Family Ideology Scale (TFI) (Levinson and Huffman, 1954-55)

This scale devised by Levinson and Huffman (1954-55) consists of 40 items relating to various family issues covering five personality variables:

1. Conventionalism

It refers to rigid adherence to the conventional values of a given ethnic class grouping. "True conventionalism involves more than simple adherence to class values. It involves holding them to the exclusion of other values ------------------". The one who transgresses these values is met with a totalitarian, punitive outlook. The conventionalist, according to this viewpoint, "cannot accept value deviations in his own groups nor value diversity in society as a whole". He shows greater concern with "stamping out evil impulses" than with facilitating personal expression and happiness. Finally, Levinson and Huffman (1954-55) believe that "conventionalism is the attribute of a conscience which is poorly internalized and in a sense ego-alien. It makes the person particularly dependent on the immediate external authority to whom he turns for simple, morally proper definitions of what is required in each situation".
2. Authoritarian-submission

This may be defined as "Idealization of and submissiveness towards an in-group moral authority". Concerned with the relations between lower and higher status levels i.e. follower-leader, child-parent, wife-husband etc., obedience herein becomes a cardinal virtue. It is as much the duty of the authority to dominate as the duty of the subordinate to submit in this kind of relationship and the infallibility of the authority must not be questioned by either.

3. Exaggerated Masculinity and Femininity

Rigid dichotomization of male and female sex roles is one of the more universal aspects of authoritarianism. The function of these dichotomous conceptions is to maintain male dominance and female subservience. "The real man", according to this viewpoint, "is master in the home, a good provider, and a firm disciplinarian, one who tolerates no weakness in himself or others. His predominant personal traits are ruggedness, determination, assertiveness, and will power".

The feminine ideal corresponding to the above concept of the male is that of the "sweet", submissive, morally controlled woman who knows and keeps her place 'in the home'. Relative absence of aggressiveness, achievement aspirations and sensuality (woman being more responsible for the maintenance of traditional sexual morality in the conceptual context) are
some of the other characteristics which a woman is expected to possess as an essential part of thought and behaviour.

4. Extreme emphasis on discipline

Parental handling of disciplinary problems forms an important aspect of family ideology. Authority in this scheme of values is a powerful figure for providing standards or rules to which subordinate groups must conform. No rule violation is to be tolerated in the maintenance of strict discipline by the authority. Punishment, physical or otherwise is strongly emphasized here. The rigid prohibitions and demands of authority are arbitrary and they are required to be obeyed largely on faith. In autocratic type of family ideology, discipline assumes a prominent and pervasive role in the child-rearing process. Besides providing a 'proper' conception of parental authority and of himself in relation to authority, it also makes for the induction of impulse control in the child.

As opposed to the above, the general aims of democratic parents are that parental pressures be minimized and the child's use of reason and sense of self-determination by maximized.

5. Moralistic rejection of impulse life

Closely related to the preceding variables, numerous impulses of the child and adolescent are regarded as threatening in the autocratic family ideology. Extreme emphasis on discipline requires the child to excessively inhibit his
impulses and deny their expression. Rigidly dichotomized definition of masculinity and femininity and extreme emphasis on conformity to these roles demand that children of each sex develop heavy defences against wishes regarded as appropriate to the other sex. Aggression and sexual wishes are regarded as extremely undesirable.

In addition to the above, authoritarianism involves a rejection of intense feeling, a denial of the possibility of running counter to moral standards, an alienation of the conscious self from inner fantasy and emotion etc.

The equalitarian approach is not without taboos on aggression, sex and other primary needs. But equalitarian personalities are less threatened by their impulses and they are more prepared to accept in others what they reject or have conflict about in themselves.

Levinson and Huffman devised this scale to measure ways of thinking in the context of family structure and functions. Assessing ideological orientations were placed by the authors along an autocratic-democratic continuum.

The autocratic extreme is represented by viewpoints involving hierarchical concepts of family relations, emphasis on discipline, child-rearing practices and on sex roles etc. The democratic orientation on the contrary decentralizes
authority within the family and seeks greater equality in husband-wife and parent-child relationships.

The various issues of family life under which different items of the scale have been grouped are:

1. Parent-child relationships — child rearing techniques.
2. Husband and wife roles and relations — concepts of masculinity and femininity.
3. General values and aims.

Validity

The internal consistency of the scale was determined by means of the discriminatory power technique, which reflects its ability to differentiate between extreme high scores and extreme low scores (the upper and lower 25 percent) on the total scale. The Discriminatory Power (D.Ps) of all the items were found out by this technique, which reflects its ability to differentiate between extreme high and extreme low scores (the upper and lower 25 percent) on the total scale. The D.Ps average 2.0 and vary from 0.4 to 3.5, all being positive. The D.P. failed to meet the 5 percent level of significance only for 5 of the 40 items.

Reliability

The mean TFI score, when it was conducted early in 1950 to the adult evening Psychology classes at Cleveland College, the downtown branch of Western Reserve University was 33.3.
and S.D. was 7.8. The subjects, 109 in all, included part-time students in various occupational groupings. Their age range was roughly 20-40. The split half reliability (odd-even correlation corrected by the Spearman-Brown Formula) was .84.

Scoring

The psychological concepts and hypotheses used in the designing of the scales were taken from earlier study of Authoritarian Personality by Adorno et al. (1950) and Frenkel-Brunswieck (1950). Of the 40 items included in the scale, 34 are regarded as related to autocratic and 6 to democratic dimensions. The high score on the former indicates strong adherence to 'traditional' or 'autocratic' family ideology, as conceived in the scale, and scores on the democratic items would add to the autocratic score only if the responses are returned in the direction of strong disagreement with the 6 statements considered democratic.

The scoring system of the scale consists in indicating the degree of agreement or disagreement with each item on a scale ranging from +3 (strong disagreement).

The individual's total score is the sum of his item scores. The total number of items being 40, and the maximum score being 7 (1-7, from strong disagreement to strong agreement, the scoring being reversed for the democratic items), the total score can fall between 40-280. Mean score per item can also be
computed by dividing the total score with 40. For comparison of scores from scales differing in length, the average score per item can be multiplied by 10, the possible score per scale item thus can range from 10-70 points.

The Traditional Family Ideology was adapted by Bhatnagar (1971) by administering it to a sample of 250 students of Panjab University.

Because of its having been adapted to the Indian conditions and due to its comprehensiveness as a measure of traditionalism in family ideological orientation with its five related aspects, it was found adequate for use in this study.

Socio-Economic Status Scale (SES) (Deo and Mohan, 1972)

The Socio-Economic Status Scale was developed by Deo and Mohan in 1972. This scale consists of 12 questions. First three questions are related to educational qualifications, occupations and income, and the remaining questions deal with social status. Each question on social status is followed by four to five alternative answers which the respondents are required to check. The choice for this scale was made due to its wide application over Indian population and fairly reliable results as claimed by the authors of this scale. It is in simple language, easy to administer and score. The overall time needed for administration is about 15 to 20 minutes.
Validity

The validity of the scale for the first three items was tested against Kuppuswamy's socio-economic status scale using the method of determining validity on a sample of 145 college as well as school students, the validity co-efficient was found to be .94.

Reliability

The reliability co-efficient of the socio-economic status scale was found to be .91 where test retest method was used on 190 college and school students with a time interval of one and half months.

Scoring

The scoring of the scale is quite elaborate, since it is different for each of the items included in it. The detailed scoring, therefore, given alongwith a copy of the scale is as per Appendix No. IV.

COLLECTION OF DATA

All the tests for the study i.e. Mooney Problem Checklist (MPCL), Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), Traditional Family Ideology Scale (TFI), and Socio-Economic Status Scale (SES) were administered to the students individually.
Before the actual administration of the tests, standardized instructions were read out so that the students fully understood how the responses were to be made. All possible efforts were made to make them feel at ease and respond to the various tests with full concentration.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data gathered on the basis of the administration of the tests, stated as above, was then analysed. Part of the analysis was done manually and the rest of the computations were done at the Panjab University Centre for Computer Science and Applications.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

The statistical techniques employed for the analysis of the data were as follows:

1. Descriptive statistics for studying the nature of different variables.

2. The Chi-square test: the chi-square test was thought to be appropriate for examining whether dependent variables of psychological problems and independent variables of Personality, Academic Achievement, Family Ideology and Socio-Economic Status had any association between them or they were independent of each other. This test was thought to be more suitable for the present analysis,
since the checks made on the criterion variables i.e. psychological problems as per manual for the checklist (MPCL, 1950) are not strictly speaking scores. The data were therefore organised into bi-variate frequency or contingency tables and the statistical test made to determine whether classifications on the two variables were independent of each other.

3. Significance of differences between the percentages was another technique used to determine whether the percentage of the total problems checked in each of the areas were different for the groups under study i.e. boys and girls, and arts and science students. This technique was also preferred over others because of the nature of scores on MPCL.

4. Graphic presentation of results on personality variables was also done in the form of Personality Profiles of high and low problem groups.