Research has been defined as the systematic and objective analysis and recording of controlled observations that may lead to the generalizations, principles, or theories, resulting in prediction and possibly ultimate control of events. In the broadest sense of the word, the definition of research includes any gathering of data information and facts for the advancement of knowledge.

Research designs are invented to enable researchers to answer questions as validly, objectively, accurately and economically as possible. Research plans are deliberately and specifically conceived and executed to bring empirical evidence to the problem in question (Kerlinger, 1986).

Research design refers to the plan and structure of the investigation used to obtain evidence to answer research questions. The design describes the procedure for conducting the study, including when, from whom and under what condition the data will be obtained (McMillan, 1989).

Research methodology is a way to systematically investigate the research problem. It gives various steps in conducting the research in a systematic and logical way. It is essential to define the problem, state objectives and hypothesis clearly. Every piece of research must be planned and designed carefully so that the researcher proceeds ahead without getting confused at the subsequent steps of research.

**Formation of Objectives**

The objectives of the present study have been framed and mentioned in chapter-I.
Sample

The study was conducted in two phases in order to identify the parentally accepted and rejected children and to study their self-concept, need achievement, emotional intelligence and risk taking behaviour. The process of selecting sample is discussed below:

Initial Sample

There are ten (10) districts in Kashmir valley of Jammu & Kashmir. Out of these districts three (03) districts namely Srinagar, Baramulla and Kupwara were randomly selected for selection of initial sample. There are 08, 18 and 13 educational zones in district Srinagar, Baramulla and Kupwara respectively. Out of these educational zones one from each district namely Gulab Bagh zone of Srinagar, Pattan zone of Baramulla and Sogam zone of Kupwara were selected randomly for collection of data. Therefore, the initial sample of the present study comprised of 828 8th class children of (age range: 13-14 years). Following is the educational zone wise distribution of sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name of the Educational Zone</th>
<th>Net Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Gulab Bagh</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Pattan</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Sogam</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td><strong>828</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Sample

Rohner’s Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) Child Form (1978) was administered to all the 828 sample subjects in different sittings after building a rapport with the subjects and the concerned teachers and headmasters of respective schools. The subjects who scored equal to 25th percentile and below on Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) were termed as parentally accepted children and the subjects who scored above 75th on Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) were termed as parentally rejected children. The same technique of extreme scores has been adopted by Rohner (1978), Kithara (1987), Ibrahim (1988), Kanth (1994) and Puju (1997), Ali (2000), Faied (2005), Lila.
Six candidates were not taken into consideration because of absence. Six (06) students were screened out from the final sample of the study as they were continuously absent from the school. The educational zone wise distribution of final sample is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name of the Educational Zone</th>
<th>Parentally Accepted Children</th>
<th>Parentally Rejected Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Gulab Bagh</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Pattan</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Sogam</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collecting the data with Appropriate Tools**

The tools used in the present study are as follows:

1. **Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) Child Form (1978)**
   Parental acceptance rejection questionnaire (PARQ) has been constructed by Rohner (1978). It is a self report questionnaire which is designed to measure the respondent’s assessment regarding the way their parents treated them. In PARQ, parent refers to those adults who have an enduring primary care taking relationship with the child. It consists of four sub scales:

2. **For measurement of Self-concept Sagar Sharma’s Self-concept Inventory (1972)** was administered on the subjects.

3. **Mukherji’s Incomplete Sentence Blank (1968)** was used to measure need achievement of parentally accepted and rejected children.

4. **For measurement of Emotional Intelligence of parentally accepted and rejected children: Emotional Intelligence Scale of Hyde, et al. (2001)** was used.

5. **Self constructed Risk Taking Behaviour Scale** was used for measuring unhealthy risk taking behaviour of parentally accepted and rejected children.

**1. Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) Child Form (1978)**

Parental acceptance rejection questionnaire (PARQ) has been constructed by Rohner (1978). It is a self report questionnaire which is designed to measure the respondent’s assessment regarding the way their parents treated them. In PARQ, parent refers to those adults who have an enduring primary care taking relationship with the child. It consists of four sub scales:
a) Warmth/Affection

The parental warmth/affection scale refers to parent child relationships where the child receives unqualified love—love that is not dependent on how he behaves, love that is not withheld when he is “bad” or awarded only if he is “good”. Warmth/affection may be manifested by showing approval of the child, playing with him, enjoying him, fondling him, comforting or consulting him cuddling him, praising him, kissing him, hugging or demonstrating love in word or other actions. This scale consists of twenty (20) items.

b) Parental Aggression/Hostility

Parental aggression refers to innate destructive drive which is intended to hurt the child physically or verbally. Hostility, on the other hand, is the motive or emotional reaction of anger, enmity or resentment directed towards a child. Parental aggression may be manifested by critical impatience, irritability or antagonism towards the child. Aggressive and hostile parents may hit, kick nag or ridicule their child and they may make disapproving or derogatory remarks to and about the child. They always curse their child, quarrel with them and express their frustration and irritation at the child’s behaviour in other ways. Aggression/hostility has fifteen (15) items.

c) Parental Neglect/Indifference

Indifference refers to an internal state or feeling of the parent - a lack of concern or interest in the child. Neglect is one of the possible outcomes of parental indifference. Neglecting or indifferent parents show a restricted concern for their children’s welfare and development. Such parents are likely to pay as little attention to their child as they can and they are apt to spend a minimum amount of time with him. They ignore child’s requests for help, attention or comfort. Such parents may forget child’s needs. Neglecting or indifferent parents are not necessarily hostile;
however, they simply may be cold, distant or unconcerned about their child. There are fifteen (15) items in parental neglect/indifference scale.

d) Parental Undifferentiated/Rejection

The scale parental rejection/undifferentiated refers to conditions where parents are perceived as withdrawing from the child (i.e. they reject him) but where such rejection does not clearly reflect either aggression/hostility or neglect/indifference per se rejecting parents consider their child as a burden and always find guilt in their child. This scale consists of ten (10) items.

Administration of the Test

PARQ is a self report questionnaire which can be completed from 25 minutes to 30 minutes. There are sixty (60) items in the questionnaire. Four lines are drawn after each sentence:

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely true
4. Almost never true

Before administering the questionnaire, the students were properly motivated. Classrooms were properly organized. After proper rapport building, the test was administered to sample subjects. The copy of the booklet is given in appendix no. I.

Scoring Procedure

There is no right or wrong answers to any statement. There are four responses to one statement- almost always true, sometimes true, rarely true and almost never true. ‘Almost always true’ is assigned a score of 4 points, ‘sometimes true’ a score of 3 points, ‘rarely true’ a score of 2 points and ‘almost never true’ a score of 1 point. After scoring the four areas of PARQ, all items in warmth/affection scale were reverse scored. The rationale for reverse scoring was that a high score will reveal minimum warmth that is maximum rejection. Thus a high score on all the four scales may refer to rejection and low score to acceptance.
Reliability

Cronbach’s co-efficient Alpha was used as the principle measure of reliability. A high Alpha indicates that all items in scale are sampling the same content area. Reliability co-efficient (Alpha) for the four areas is given below:

1. Warmth/Affection \( .90 \)
2. Aggression/Hostility \( .87 \)
3. Neglect/Indifference \( .77 \)
4. Rejection/Undifferentiated \( .72 \)

Validity

Correlations between PARQ scales and validations criterion scales are as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>PARQ Scales</th>
<th>Validation (Criterion) Scales</th>
<th>Co-efficient of correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Warmth/Affection</td>
<td>CRPR, Acceptance</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aggression/Hostility</td>
<td>BPB, Physical Punishment</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neglect/Indifference</td>
<td>CRPBI, Hostile Detachment</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rejection/Undifferentiated</td>
<td>CRPBI, Rejection</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Self-concept Inventory of Sagar and Sharma (1972)

Self-concept inventory has been developed by Sagar and Sharma (1971). Self-concept refers to the sum total of the person’s attitude and knowledge towards himself and evaluation of his achievements. The inventory comprises of two forms. These forms are I am (Real Self) and I would like to Become (Ideal Self). For the present study only one form of the inventory i.e. “Real self” has been taken. This form consists of 67 items 5 point rating scale. Each item is in the form of an adjective, followed by an explanation in very simple language. This has been done in order to overcome the possibility of varied interpretations of the adjectives by the subject who fills his inventory.

Administration of the Test

Self-concept inventory is questionnaire in which subjects are required to give their own individual feelings.
**Scoring Procedure**

Each item in this inventory has been provided with five point rating scale. The weightage given to each positive item is as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 50% of the times</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scoring in case of negative items has been reversed in the following order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 50% of the times</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability**

Reliability of the self-concept inventory has been calculated by the test-retest method and is shown as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test-retest</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal discrepancies</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Validity**

The content validity of self-concept inventory was established and the validity co-efficient of this inventory was found to be 0.68. Convergent validity with Deo’s personality test was also worked out.
3. Mukherji’s Incomplete Sentence Blank (1968)

A sentence completion test or an “Incomplete Sentence Blank” test is a kind of projective test in which the testee is required to complete a number of sentences. A word or a part of a sentence constitutes the test items and testee is required to write whatever comes to his/her mind after reading the given part of sentence meaningfully. The underlying assumption is that the thoughts, ideas and the needs of the testee (subject) are revealed by the type of responses he/she makes in completing the incomplete sentences.

The sentence completion technique is so flexible that it can be readily used to measure different facets of personality. It provides specific information as to what extent the testee knows themselves better than others, the degree of their self-conception, their attitude towards others, their dominant needs; even their defensive behaviour. Mukherjee’s Incomplete Sentence Blank purports to measure only one specific area of motivation, namely the need achievement. The need for achievement (n.ach.) is defined operationally as the behaviour of showing effort to do one’s best or to exceed others. According to Atkinson (1958) it reflects a “desire to move ahead to the ultimate goal”. High achievement motivation is generally associated with striving and effectiveness. The positive aspect of achievement motivation is to have a sense of attainment, self-actualization, or self-fulfillment (Maslow, 1954). The Incomplete Sentence Blank (ISB) developed by Mukherjee has been specifically constructed to assess that aspect of the personality which an individual manifests in connection with their striving in an upward fashion to achieve something very significant, unique and important.

Description of ISB

The ISB consists of 71 items out of which 11 serve as filler items. Item numbering as 9, 16, 28, 36, 37, 44, 52, 57, 59 and 71 are filler items.

Features of ISB

1. The item-stems of ISB are neither too short nor too long. Each incomplete blank is of an optimal length such that a person with high need achievement will tend to complete it in the desired manner consistent with the answer key. The stems neither put excessive restrictions on the part of the testee to respond in a specific way, nor evoke unlimited number of possible answers.
2. The use of filler items and stems in the third person makes the test far less transparent than many standard personality inventories.

3. The ISB is a handy tool to administer in groups for measuring those bi-polar dimensions of personality which together constitute or define the achievement motive; including hope of success vs. fear of failure, high ego ideal vs. low ego ideal, high level of perseverance vs. low level of perseverance, realistic attitude vs. unrealistic attitude and internal control of fate vs. external control of fate.

4. The scoring method employed in ISB is simple, objective and does not call for as much training and sophistication as is necessary for scoring the (TAT) protocols for need achievement following the scoring procedure suggested by McCelland and his associates.

5. The ISB provides a multidimensional measure of need achievement. The study of Mitchell (1961) has shown that Need achievement is not a unitary construct. As such, an appropriate tool for studying need achievement should be one, which traps different facets of the individual’s zeal for upward progression.

Incomplete Sentence Blank- a multidimensional measure of need achievement measures following dimensions of need achievement.

A) **Hope of Success:** with sub areas viz: (i) Optimism, (ii) Identification with a successful authority, (iii) Preference for intrinsic reward when successful.

B) **High Ego Ideal:** with sub areas viz: (i) High level of aspiration, (ii) High Self-confidence, (iii) A sense of striving to achieve a high position, status etc. (iv) Competitiveness, (v) maintenance of Self-respect.

C) **Perseverance:** with sub areas viz: (i) Persistence, Diligence etc. (ii) Preference for difficult and challenging tasks, (iii) Sense of devotion to work, (iv) Satisfaction in completing an assigned task, (v) Long term involvement with future career, (vi) Dislike for Idleness.

D) **Realistic Attitude:** with sub areas viz: (i) Intermediate risks (04 to 08 feet item no.42), (ii) Realistic aspiration, (iii) Advance Planning.

E) **Internal Control of Fate:** with sub areas viz: (i) Reliance on self-efforts, (ii) Denying the role of some superior unknown force in shaping one’s destiny, (iii) Strong Determination.
F) **Evasiveness:** Number of items not responded (included filler items).

G) **Incomplete:** Number of items not completed meaningfully (included filler items).

**Administration of the Test**

The testee is informed that the ISB is not a vocabulary test but a simple tool for measuring how rapidly and frankly he completes the blanks. The testee is asked to read the instructions appearing on the face sheet of the ISB carefully before starting the test. They are also told that there is no time limit for the test. They, however, should fill out each of the blanks as fast as possible.

**Scoring Procedure**

The ISB protocols are scored on the basis of the presence or absence of certain important aspects of achievement motivation i.e. N-ach. Each response is scored as +1 or -1 depending upon what manifest or latent need the complete sentence reflects provided that it indicates any of the above mentioned aspects of need achievement. Whenever the response reflects an opposite of the components mentioned above, it is scored as -1 e.g., sentence reflecting fear of failure, preference for easy tasks, extreme types of risks (or no risk at all), external control of fate, low aspiration level etc. should be credited as -1, scoring of 11 items (9, 16, 28, 36, 37, 44, 52, 57, 59, and 71) is not done as these items are filler items. Responses indicating other areas of manifest needs as affiliation, nurturance, exhibitionism, sex etc. are scored zero. The total score is the algebraic sum of all the positive and negative scores received in the total comprised of 60 items.

**Reliability**

The odd even reliability of the ISB (excluding the 11 filler items) has been found to be 0.65 for a sample of 180 post-graduate students of Nagpur University. The internal consistency reliability, computed by following the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 from the item analysis results based on 100 subjects is 0.61.

**Validity**

The product moment correlation between ISB and a forced choice scale of achievement values called the sentence completion test Mukherjee, (1964) is 0.25 on a sample of 100 Nagpur University Post-graduate students. The ISB is also validated.
with TAT in Kashmir by Shah, (1977) and the correlation co-efficient by product moment is 0.91 which is significant beyond 0.01 level.

4. Emotional Intelligence Scale (2001)

Emotional Intelligence scale of Hyde et al is the widely used scale. The final form of the scale consists of 34 items. The scale comprises of ten factors viz: Self-awareness, Empathy, Self-motivation, Emotional Stability, Managing Relations, Integrity, Self-development, Value-orientation, Commitment and Altruistic Behaviour. The scale devised by Anukool Hyde, Sanjyot Pethe, Upinder Dhar (2001) was selected as a test of measurement of emotional intelligence in the present study. The test comprises of 34 items. The ten factors of emotional intelligence scale are as follows:

A. **Self-awareness:** is being aware of oneself and is measured by items 06, 12, 18, 29. This factor is the strongest and explains 26.8% variance and has a total factor load of 2.77. The correlation of this factor with total score is 0.66.

B. **Empathy:** is feeling and understanding the other person and is measured by items 09, 10, 15, 20 & 25. This factor explains 7.3% variance with a total factor load of 3.11 and the correlation co-efficient of this factor with total score is 0.70.

C. **Self-motivation:** is being motivated internally and is measured by 02, 04, 07, 08, 31 & 34. This factor accounts for 6.3% variance and a total factor load is 3.28. Its correlation co-efficient with total score is 0.77.

D. **Emotional Stability:** is measured by items 14, 19, 26 & 28. This factor explains 6.0% variance with a total factor load of 2.51. The correlation of this factor with total score is 0.75.

E. **Managing Relations:** is measured by items 01, 05, 11 & 17. This factor explains 5.3% variance with a total factor load of 2.38. The correlation of this factor with total score is 0.67.

F. **Integrity:** is measured by items 16, 27 & 32. This factor explains 4.6% variance with a total factor load of 1.88.

G. **Self-development:** is measured by items 30 & 33 and explains 4.1% variance with a total factor load of 1.37.
H. **Value-orientation:** is measured by items 21 & 22 and explains 4.1% variance with a total factor load of 1.29.

I. **Commitment:** is measured by the items 23 & 24. This factor accounts for 3.6% variance with a total factor load of 1.39.

J. **Altruistic Behaviour:** is measured by the items 03 & 13. It explains 3.0% variance with a total factor load of 1.3.

**Reliability of the Scale**

The reliability of the scale was determined by calculating reliability coefficient on a sample of 200 subjects. The co-efficient of correlation was computed through split-half method of reliability and was found to be 0.88.

**Validity of the Scale**

Besides face validity, as all items were related to the variable under focus, the scale has high content validity. It is evident from the assessment of judges/experts that items of the scale are directly related to the concept of emotional intelligence. In order to find out the validity from the co-efficient of reliability (Garrett, 1981), the reliability index was calculated which indicated high validity on account of being 0.93.

**Administration of the Scale**

The scale was administered to the selected sample by hand in number of sittings before distributing emotional intelligence scale. The children were assured that their information would be kept confidential. Later they were asked to go through the instructions given on the face page of the test. Then, they were again asked to tick the choices given against each of 34 statements respectively.

Before administering the scale all subjects were requested to give their sincere cooperation. It was emphasized that there is no right or wrong answer to the statements but the statements are designed to understand the difference in individual reaction to various situations. It is meant to know the difference between individual and not mean to rank them as good or bad. The sample subjects were requested by the investigator to respond to all the statements and no one statement should be left unanswered.
**Scoring Procedure**

There is a five point rating scale for each item. Each item or statement is scored 5 for Strongly Agree, 4 for Agree, 3 for Neutral, 2 for Disagree and 1 for Strongly Disagree.

5. **Risk Taking Behaviour Scale (Self-constructed)**

It was developed by the present investigator to assess the unhealthy risk taking behaviour of the sample subjects. At first fifteen (15) components (areas) were selected by checking different scales of Risk Taking Behaviour and 137 statements were prepared. The scale was modified in the light of views obtained from language experts, research experts, professors and research scholars of various universities on the basis of their suggestions. Some statements were modified, some added and some were removed.

**Face Validity**

The scale was given to experts of different professors of higher education including professors of Lovely Professional University, Punjab and Colleges of Jammu and Kashmir for determining the face validity and the scale was developed by reducing the number of components from 15 to 5 and number of statements from 137 to 110.

**Content Validity**

After determining the face validity the panel of ten (10) judges was selected by the investigator in consultation with supervisor to determine the content validity of the scale. The names and designations of judges are presented in Appendix-VI. The judges were requested to record their agreement or disagreement on any of the items of the scale. They were also requested to suggest the change in the items which they don’t find feasible. Then the items on which there was the consensus of 7 judges and above were retained as such and even they had suggested some change, it was inserted. Thus the present form of scale has 0.7 as the content validity co-efficient. Finally, 80 items were retained after modifying and dropping out some items as per the level of agreement of judges and their suggestions. The 80 statements are covering five (5) dimensions which are described in Table 03 below:
Table 03: Major dimensions of Risk Taking Behaviour Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Academic Risk</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Social Risk</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Future/Goals Risk</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Adventurous Risk</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Security/Peace Risk</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability

The reliability of the Risk Taking Behaviour Scale was estimated through the split-half method of reliability. The scale was administered on 80 individuals of different age groups and both male and female were selected randomly for administration and clarification was given regarding the use of the test. Data were collected and collected tests were divided into two halves (Upper half & Lower Half), then scores on the items were calculated. The correlation of the scale has been found to be 0.65 which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus the final form of the scale was found to be reliable.

Administration of the Scale

The scale is meant for all the literate individuals above the age of 11 years. There is no time limit for completion of the scale. Proper instructions must be given to subjects that there is no right or wrong response. This only tries to measure the unhealthy risk taking behaviour, so please tick within the box which best expresses their level of agreement with the statement.

Scoring Procedure

There are 80 statements in this scale. Each statement has five modes of ratings, Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. The subjects have to put tick mark on any of the option as per their level of agreement. All the items in the scale are positive (favoring unhealthy risk taking), hence the items are scored as 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 for the responses strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree respectively.
**Statistical Design**

After the scoring of the collected data of self-concept, need achievement, emotional intelligence and risk taking behaviour was completed, the data was subjected to statistical analysis by employing following statistical techniques:

1. Mean and S.D.

2. To find out the mean difference between parentally accepted and rejected children on self-concept, need achievement, emotional intelligence and risk taking behaviour ‘t’-test was used.

3. Product moment co-efficient of correlation was computed between the individual criterion and composite criteria with dimensions of self-concept, need achievement, emotional intelligence and risk taking behaviour.

Line graphs and bar graphs were plotted in order to make the results transparent. All the statistical information is presented in next chapter (Chapter-IV).