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CHAPTER-I
INTRODUCTION

According to Psychologists development of personality starts from childhood. In the development of children there are number of factors. These factors influence and shape the personality. Psychologists have divided these factors in to three parts and they call them determinants of personality

1) Biological or Physical determinants
2) Psychological determinants
3) Environmental determinants

Environmental determinants are also called socio-cultural determinants.

Environmental determinants are divided into three types

1) Social determinants
2) Educational determinants
3) Family determinants

The influence of birth order on the development of personality is a controversial issue in psychology. It is widely believed that personality is strongly influenced by birth order, but many psychologists, Personality psychologists largely (though by no means without debate) agree that the Big five personality traits (also known as Five Factor) represent something like a natural taxono of human personality variables. Cross-linguistically the vast majority of adjectives used to describe human personality fit into one of the following five areas that are easily remembered by the acronym OCEAN: Conscientiousness, Extroversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. Birth order is one procedure to gain an understanding of ones place to friends, family members and co-workers. Some researchers believe that how one is placed in the family can have an influence on personality traits. Other factors must also be considered. These include genetics and the environment in which you are raised.
1.2 Size of the family

Family size plays a vital role in personality development directly or indirectly. If the members in the family are increased, interpersonal relationship will increase. One general concept is that if there are large members in the family they have family complex and it affects badly on personality development. The following formula is the best example of Number Inter-relationship.

\[ X - \frac{Y^2 - Y}{2} \]

\[ X = \text{Number of Inter-relationship} \]
\[ Y = \text{Number of family member} \]

Psychologist's defined type of family by family size and it affect on personality development.

1) One child families
2) Small families
3) Medium sized families
4) Large families.

Family immensely influences personality because human being remains till last in the family. Family influences personality directly or indirectly. Personality can be shaped very well by nurturing, nourishing, and communication, besides emotional atmosphere, birth order, family size, family stance, and family organization influence personality development.

Birth order in the family has also been shown to influence proneness to conformity (Schacter, 1959). First-born children tend to change their opinions to conform to false group norms more than do later born children, expect when a large incentive is offered for a correct answer. Then firstborn will tend to be more independent in responding than the later born.
In a family, all the children cannot get equal treatment by the parents, because the needs of children cannot be intensively fulfilled equally from the first child to the last. The approach, enthusiasm, responsibility of parent changes; therefore personality of children differ according to their birth order.

There is also a difference between first and second born child. First-born child is more responsible, less aggressive, and more intellectually curious. He also tends to have stronger consciences than does the second born child. These characteristics, however, are largely dependent upon the sexes of the siblings and the number of years between them. If two siblings are of the same sex and close together (less than two years) in age few differences existed between them; siblings of the opposite sexes and more year apart exhibited marked behavioural differences. (Coe, (1972))

Nearly everyone has some understanding that a child’s position in his family is important for his personality development. The most common stereotype is that of the “only child”-who has been given almost everything he wants and is a spoiled brat. Psychologists have also taken seriously the influence that birth order may have influence upon personality development. In seems obvious, for example, that the conditions of social learning for a firstborn child are different from those of a third born child. The parents may be relatively inexperienced when dealing with their first and may exhibit greater concern about his behavior than when their third child arrives. The firstborn is also an “only child” who must subsequently adjust to losing his status.

The youngest child in the family is likely to receive a great deal of attention and to be treated as “the baby,” which indeed he is. He may, however, continue to be treated this way even after he reaches adulthood. All his attempts to break out of this role may be futile. He is also likely to be taken advantage of
by his older and stronger siblings, especially if they resent his having taken some
of their parents' affection. On the surface, it appears that the ordinal position of a
child does indeed have an important influence on his development. But,
regardless of how tempting it is to simplify matters in this way, the experimental
evidence is not nearly as clear as we, might expect. There appears to be a complex
network of relations among the number of children in family, their sexes, and the
differences in their ages. Birth order by itself is, therefore, an inadequate criterion
for defining special atmosphere for social learning.

1.3 Birth of a sibling

The birth of a sibling results in significant changes in the family
environment. Positive interactions with an older child may diminish, especially if
the birth interval is short and the mother adopts a more controlling parenting
style (Baydar, 1997). Regression, anxiety and aggression have been commonly
observed in the older child (Bischoff & Tingstrom, 1991).

Neuropsychopharmacological studies have attempted to correlate the birth
of a younger brother, described as a particularly traumatic experience for first
born children, aged two to three years, with the status of the older child's
immune system function. Decrease in effectiveness of immune function such as
expression of T3 and T4 lymphocytes and phagocytosis, beginning in the period
preceding the birth of the younger sibling was documented (Rosaschino et al.,
1991-92). Although this was a preliminary investigation with a very small sample
size, these findings may demonstrate a potential physiological repercussion
(Lederman, 1996) of the anxiety a first-born may experience when faced with the
prospect of dethronement.
Sibling rivalry has been well documented and is integral to the possible effects of birth order on personality development. If findings such as these are replicated, it may prompt greater emphasis on promotion of positive parenting styles which have been shown to attenuate a great deal of the potentially detrimental effects of sibling rivalry (Bischoff & Tingstrom, 1991).

Birth order archetypes

Although differences between siblings are determined by factors other than birth order, including external influences and inherent personality differences (Crispell, 1996), there has been great enthusiasm for ascribing certain archetypal characteristic to individuals based on associations with ordinal position of birth. Each archetypical profile, from oldest to youngest, has been assigned with certain characteristics that seem consistent with that place in the family system. Oldest children are seen as more ambitious, given more responsibility and often feel more pressure to succeed (Richardson & Richardson, 1990), yet the experience of dethronement is thought to make firstborns vulnerable to the effects of stress and uncertain in difficult situations (Ernst & Angst, 1983). Middle children are often thought to struggle with finding their place in the family and gaining recognition (Richardson & Richardson, 1990). Youngest children are believed to be accustomed to receiving attention and thought to misbehave if they feel a lack of attention (Nims, 1998). Although these are popularly accepted stereotypes, they are not always borne out in psychological research (Ernst & Angst, 1983). If there is any significant relationship between these characteristics and ordinal position of birth, it is thought that it is easily moderated by many factors that are unique to the individual, the environment or a combination of both (Ernst & Angst, 1983).
1.4 Parental attitudes

Although mothers usually show a high level of consistency in how they raise first and second born child when this child was of the same age, he does not perceive this, or don't have the cognitive or emotional skills to do so (Musun-Miller, 1993). Perception of parental favouritism is common. In a recent study, 62% of subjects reported that they believed one or both parents favoured one child in their family (Zervas, 1994). Birth order was one of the main reasons subjects gave for this occurrence (Zervas, 1994). In 1932, Adler conceded that the favoured child has a developmental advantage, but that the deleterious influence on other children in the family is difficult to estimate (Zervas, 1994).

Zervas (1994) discussed views purporting that children's self esteem is reliant on their perceptions of how their parents and other significant views treat them. Children, who perceive themselves as the non-favoured child may experience feelings of inferiority, anger, depression and incompetence. The favoured child may benefit from the greater security and adoration, but may be troubled by sibling's jealousy, greater obligations to parents (Carson et al., 1992), or guilt and empathy depending on the sibling relationship. Favoured children have been found to exhibit lower social self esteem (Zervas, 1994), which has been attributed to more frequent peer rejections and less opportunity to socialise due to home support and obligations (Zervas, 1994). Expression of favouritism is regarded as detrimental to the functioning of the entire family (Bieber, 1977 in Zervas, 1994). Parent and child relationships are extremely important in the formation of self-esteem, which is considered a crucial contributor to psychological well being. It is still debated whether the component of self-esteem influenced most by parental relationships is restricted to the familial environment or if it is global (Zervas, 1994). It has been suggested that exclusively relying on children's perceptions of favouritism may not be an
accurate reflection of actual occurrences (Zervas, 1994). However the realisation is the perception of the situation that affects individuals' responses and the formation of self-esteem indicate that these subjective assessments of familiar situations may still is instructive (Zervas, 1994).

Parental feedback

The differences between siblings thought to be due to ordinal position of birth are generally believed to arise through differential socialisation by parents (Ernst & Angst, 1983). How this is affected is controversial (Ernst & Angst, 1983). Much research is descriptive, however analysing parental feedback styles may provide insight into how potential birth order characteristics could be formed (Claxton, 1994). Empirical evidence suggests that the amount of process or outcome feedback an individual receives, may be associated with birth order status (Claxton, 1994). This implies that birth order based differences in parental feedback may contribute to personality and behavioural differences that have been linked to ordinal positions of birth (Claxton, 1994). Process feedback involves information concerning how an individual implements a strategy, while outcome feedback concerns judgment of performance (Earley et al., 1990 in Claxton, 1994). Process feedback has a direct effect on the development, quality and use of task and coping strategies. Effective communication to children of task strategies facilitates performance. Communication of outcome feedback increases risk of learning and exhibiting inappropriate behaviour (Earley et al., 1990 in Claxton, 1994). Outcome feedback is regarded as less effective than process feedback for specific adjustment of strategies, especially for dealing with complex stimuli (Claxton, 1994). Process feedback is more time consuming to give than outcome feedback, as it is more detailed and instructive (Claxton, 1994). In an environment where learning is transmitted from parent to child, and parents have fewer demands created by a single child than several children, perhaps firstborns may be exposed to more process feedback (Bohmer & Sitton, 1993).
Greater exposure to process feedback may differentially socialise firstborns to be more skilled at identifying the most effective strategies (Claxton, 1994). This inference does assume that parents are competent at transmitting the most appropriate information. In an investigation of types of feedback received by individuals occupying different birth order positions, last born respondents reported significantly less of both process feedback and outcome feedback from parents. Differences in parental feedback to children are not regarded as conscious, but may result from changes in child-rearing experience, or parental workload. It may be instructive for researchers to differentiate between positive and negative feedback in extending these findings (Claxton, 1994).

**Parental expectations**

Each family member experiences and interprets family dynamics differently. Siblings growing up in the same family may have vastly different childhood experiences. Research has indicated that inter-family experiences may be almost as diverse as between-family experiences (Richardson & Richardson, 1990). Part of the differences in family experiences might be due to parental expectations which vary by birth order. Adults seem to have higher expectations for first borns and tend to describe their first borns more positively than subsequent arrivals (Kalmuss & Davidson, 1992). Differences may also be attributable to the tone that the sibling constellation itself brings to family interaction, determined by sibling spacing, gender and birth order (Dunn & Kendrick, 1982).

Parents rated pre-adolescent children more harshly than their younger children (Musun-Miller, 1993). Perhaps birth order is more of a factor in attributions at one age than another. It could have either an augmenting or offsetting effect on age related attributions and expectations (Musun-Miller, 1993). Clinicians working with troubled families may find it useful to assess the
type of attributions that parents are making about their children's behaviour and whether there is a harsher tone to the attributions made about children occupying various ordinal positions (Musun-Miller, 1993). Attributions made by parents may shape how they respond to their children, or communicate expectations concerning the children's development (Musun-Miller, 1993). Establishing a clearer association between parental attributions and the behaviour they exhibit towards their children, would be instructive in determining how this may affect parent and child's relationship (Musun-Miller, 1993).

**Self esteem**

Social comparison theory states that the level of self esteem is determined through comparison of the self with others. First and only children compare themselves to their parents, whereas laterborns compare themselves to older siblings. The former, an adult to child comparison will yield a greater discrepancy than the latter child to child comparison. This has been hypothesized to result in lower self-esteem for first born and only children (Zimbardo & Formica, 1963 in Falbo, 1984). In empirical attempts at validation of this theory, only borderline significance was obtained in one study, but stronger effects were found for samples of white males from high socio-economic backgrounds (Kaplan, 1970 in Falbo, 1984). Other researchers have theorised that higher self-esteem is more likely for the highest ranked ordinal birth position due to receiving more unconditional positive regard from parents than laterborns receive (Falbo, 1984). Empirical investigation has resulted in conflicting findings; however there seems to be support for this theory in some studies of male children, particularly those from certain minority groups (Rosenberg, 1965 in Falbo, 1984).
Although there are differences in how individuals of different birth orders respond to questionnaires such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). It has not been established if there is a relationship between birth order and neurotic or psychotic symptoms (Altus, 1972).

1.5 Adler’s Individual Psychology

Alfred Adler was a charter member of Freud’s inner circle—the Vienna psychoanalytic society. However, he soon began to develop his own theory of personality, which he christened individual psychology. Adler’s (1917) theory stressed the social context of personality development. For instance, it was Adler who first focused attention on the possible importance of birth order as a factor shaping personality. Adler argued that the foremost human drive is not sexuality, but a striving for superiority. Adler viewed striving for superiority as a universal drive to adapt, improve oneself, and master life’s challenges. He noted that young children understandably feel weak and helpless in comparison to more competent older children and adults. These any inferiority feelings supposedly motivate individuals to acquire new skill and develop new talents.

Alfred Adler (1870-1937) was a pioneer in the study of birth order. His research suggested that the position a child had by the order of birth significantly affected his growth and personality. Research in the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century shows even greater influence, contributing to intelligence, career choice, and to a certain degree, success in adulthood. Adler’s theory stressed the social context of personality development. For instance; it was Adler who first focused attention on the possible importance of birth order as a factor governing personality. He noted that only children, firstborns, second born children and subsequent children enter different home environment that are likely to affect their personality. Thus, he hypothesized that children without siblings are often spoiled by excessive attention form parents, that first born often
are problem children because they become upset when they're dethroned by a second child, and that second born children tend to be competitive because they have to struggle to catch up with an older sibling. Adler's hypotheses stimulated hundreds of studies on the effects of birth order. This research has proven very interesting although birth order effect have turned out to be weaker and less consistent than Adler expected (Schooler 1972).

Another example of Adler's (1927) interest in the social determinates of personality is his theorizing about the child's position in the family. He believed that birth order dictates the way children are treated and how their personalities develop (Leman 1985). Thus, the eldest child is the original center of attention in a family, acquiring a need for power and authority; the second child continually strives to overcome the older rival and the youngest may be spoiled and pampered on the one hand and flexible on the other. Birth order is a social phenomenon, not biological one. Research bears out some of Adler's ideas about birth order (Watking 1992). For instance, firstborn individual are more likely to become famous (Somontion, 1994). Among those who have run for president, firstborns have won more frequently then later borns.

1.6 Psychopathology

An effect of perceived parental attitudes in childhood on the onset of adult psychopathology is a well studied field (Kitamura, Sugawara, Shima & Toda, 1998). Parker identified two aspects of retrospective perceptions of parental child-rearing practices. Care, reflecting the spectrum ranging from warmth to coldness, and overprotection, which reflects the spectrum between degradation/demands and respect for the child's autonomy/self determination (Parker, 1983b in Kitamura et al., 1998) Individuals experiencing depression with a neurotic component have been found to report a lower degree of care and a greater degree
of over protection in childhood (Parker & Hafzi-Pavlović, 1982 in Kitamura et al., 1998), a finding that has had some replication (Parker 1983a in Kitamura et al., 1998). For adult psychopathology with stress as a component of its onset, it may be clinically and theoretically useful to understand how these parental attitudes were formed. This could allow for more effective interventions and prevention. For researchers it may provide insight about the link between perceptions of childhood experiences in different birth order positions and adult experiences of psychopathology (Kitamura et al., 1998).

A relationship between ordinal position of birth and a variety of psychopathologies has been suggested (Ernst & Angst, 1983). The belief that first borns experience more mental illness has been widespread (Skinner, 1997). In a study in which first-born males were found to obtain lower psychological well-being scores than their later born counterparts, no differences were found between females of different birth orders (Fullerton et al., 1989). Yet, first borns have also been found to score lower on measures of depression than second, third, fourth born and youngest children, and exhibit less anxiety and higher self esteem (Gates, Line Berger, Crockett & Hubbard 1988). It may be instructive to analyze these effects at different stages through the lifespan, as it is thought that some of these conflicting results could be effects of change over the lifespan.

The relationship between birth order position and psychopathology is well researched (Altus, 1972), but remains poorly understood due to contradictory findings (Altus, 1972). During childhood, first borns are over represented among problem children (Adler, 1956 in Skinner, 1997). It is thought by some that they have a greater vulnerability to stress (Shulman & Mosak, 1977 in Skinner, 1997), addictive substance abuse and sensitivity to pain in adulthood. First-born female adults have been found to score higher on dimension of hypochondria than later born women. This has been associated with being raised by parents lacking child-
rearing experience. It may be related to an excessively strong or pathological concern about the first child's development. This is thought to be generated by unrealistic assessment of the severity of childhood maladies and excessive sympathetic behaviour during illness. This over concern has been linked to a morbid fixation on their own physical health throughout the lifespan. This effect may be particularly true for female children, since gender role socialization concerning illness behaviour may be involved (Skinner, 1997).

Associations between other birth order positions and mental health problems have also been suggested. Among a sample of adult women identified as chemically dependent, a psychological profile traditionally attributed to a third ordinal birth position was over represented. It was suggested that a contributing factor to the substance abuse was a need to establish a unique place in the family constellation (Utay & Utay, 1996).

1.7 Birth Order and Intelligence

A wide variety of variables are evidently involved in the development of intelligence. Among the more interesting possibilities to come light is the role of family size and birth order. A study by Belmont and Marolla (1973) involving over 350000 men born in Holland between 1944 and 1947 showed that IQ declined as the size of the family increased. Thus, the more children in a family, the lower the IQ scores of the children Furthermore, IQ scores declined with birth order. Older children generally got higher scores than their younger brothers and sisters.

The Belmont and Marolla study led Zajonc and Markus (1975) to design a model that would account for family size and birth order findings. This model is based on the idea that in each family there is intellectual environment
determined by intellectual levels of all members of the family. To quantify this intellectual environment, each parent’s intellectual level was arbitrarily designated as 100. Therefore, the average intellectual level of the husband-wife family is 100 ([100+100] divided by 2=100). With the coming of the first child, these changes are visible. The newborn child’s intellectual level is at or near zero so the family’s intellectual average becomes 67([100+100+0] divided by 3=67). When a second child arrives, the average drops further. If, for example, the first child has attained a level of 40 by the time the second child arrives, the family’s average level will become 60 ([100 + 100 + 40 +0] divided by 4 =60).

According to the pattern in Belmont and Maroll’s findings, one might logically expect only children to have the highest IQ scores of all. They have the smallest families and they are first born. Only children, however, do not conform to the expected pattern. On the average, their scores are more like those of last-born children. Zajonc and Markus attribute the IQ patterns of only children to their lack of opportunity to serve as teachers for younger siblings. They have not had the intellectual stimulation of answering questions and solving problems brought to them by younger brothers or sisters.

The Zajonc- Markus model has merit. It accounts in mathematical terms for the data on family size and birth order. It does not, however, identify the factors that cause the lowering of the family’s so-called intellectual environment. To understand what may be happening, we would have to look more closely into the events that occur within families as family size increases. Do younger children get less intellectual stimulation because some of their stimulation is from immature sources from the other children in the family rather than from adults? Do parents pay less attention to their children as family size increases? Do parents expect less from their younger children? These questions and others need to be considered if we are to understand the family size and birth order data.
Motivation and Birth Order

According to Kagan J., Haremann E. (1968) a sidelight to the achievement and affiliation motives is the fact that both of them tend to be stronger in firstborn children (or only children) than among those born later. The affiliation motive and order of birth study is confined to the affiliation motive, but similar findings have been made in regard to the achievement motive. A possible explanation is that mothers appear to treat a first-born child differently from later children. They devote more time to the first-born, are more physically protective, take a greater part in and interfere more with the child’s activities, and are more extreme with both praise and criticism. The first-born child, it might be said, grows up in an adult world, expected to conform to adult standards. Later children receive less attention and guidance from the mother and are more influenced by their relations with other children. Because first-born tend to be high in achievement motive, many of them become outstandingly successful. Any list of prominent people eminent scholars, people in who’s who, even presidents of the United States – will be found to contain an unusually high proportion of first-born. The first-borns’ higher level of affiliation motive also tends to be reflected in their life styles. They have been found to be more trusting of authority than later-born children. Male first-born, but not females, have also been found to have strong tendencies to conform to social pressures. There seems to be some truth to the cynical observation of the psychoanalyst Alfred Adler, who once described the first-born child as a “power-hungry conservative”.

One specific factor, which emerges in several studies of college students, concerns the relationship between birth order and achievement motivation. At the upper levels of intellectual ability, the first-born child generally has been found to have a higher need for achievement than later-born siblings (Terman, 1925; Altus, 1966). Among intellectually less gifted persons, this difference does not appear. The influence of birth order on the development of personality is a
controversial issue in psychology. It is widely believed that personality is strongly influenced by birth order, but many psychologists have contradictory views. Personality psychologists largely (though by no means without debate) agree that the Big five personality traits (also known as Five Factors) represent something like a natural taxon of human personality variables. Cross-linguistically the vast majority of adjectives used to describe human personality fit into one of the following five areas, easily remembered by the acronym OCEAN: Openness Conscientiousness, Extroversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism.

1.8 Ordinal Position in the Family

The child’s position in a sequence of siblings is the fourth condition, determined at the time of conception, which has a profound influence on later development. Forer has explained the importance of ordinal position in this way (Cicirelli, V. G. 1973). When we are born into a family unit or brought into it through adoption or as a stepchild, we take a certain place in the family hierarchy. We become only child, oldest child, middle child or youngest child. The first and most obvious effect of taking a certain position in the family is the relationship we have with respect to the people already there.... The place in the family establishes for the child a specific role is to be played within the family group. It influences him to develop attitudes towards himself other people and helps him to develop specific patterns of behaviour.

Factors Influencing the Effect of Ordinal Position

Scientific studies of ordinal position have revealed that environmental influences play a more important role than heredity in determining the differences that have been found in children of different ordinal positions in a family. For example, while there appears to be a decline in some abilities,
especially intellectual abilities and achievements, there is evidence that this decline is due more to environmental factors than to heredity (Marcus, R. F. 1975; Tizard, B., & J. Rees 1974; Troll, L. E. 1972). Of the many environmental factors that determine the influence of ordinal position, the five that seem to be most important, from present evidence, are:

First, cultural attitudes toward ordinal position: In cultures where the firstborn is regarded as the heir to authority, power, and wealth, parents brought up in these cultures will be influenced in the treatment of their children.

Second, attitudes of significant people: How family members regard different ordinal positions influence children’s attitudes toward them and, in turn, their behaviour. When younger children look up to firstborns, they use them as models and pacesetters.

Third, role expectations: If firstborns are expected to act as models for younger siblings, and to take care of them, it affects firstborns’ attitudes toward themselves and their behaviour. How some firstborns feel about being expected to be models for younger siblings?

Fourth, early treatment: Regardless of ordinal position, children who are the center of attention during the early months of life often become anxious and resentful when replaced by a younger sibling.

Fifth, stimulation of innate abilities: Parents normally have more time to devote the stimulation of children’s innate abilities in the case of firstborns and last-borns than in those who come between (Ainsworth, M. D., S. M. Bell, & D. J. Stayton 1972).

Long-Term Effects of Ordinal Position

The attitudes, treatment, and roles assigned to children of different ordinal positions in the family are not likely to change; their effects become persistent and influence the personal and social adjustments children of different ordinal
position make as they grow older. Studies of persistent effects of ordinal position have been limited in number. However, those that have been made show those ordinal-position effects are persistent enough to justify the claim that ordinal position is, indeed, one of the most important conditions occurring at the time of conception. For example, even though there is no evidence that firstborns are less healthy than their later-born siblings, they tend to be more health-conscious and concerned and to consult doctors more often than their later-born siblings, even they become adults. They also tend to be more cautious and take fewer risks (Kennell, J. H., R. Jerauld, H. Wolfe, D. Chesler 1974 & Russell, C. S. 1974).

Ordinal position in a childhood family has been found to have an important influence on adult marital adjustments. This is because adults learn to play certain roles in their childhood homes and continue to play those roles after marriage. The best marital adjustments have been reported to occur when husbands were the oldest brothers with younger sisters and when wives were younger sisters with older brothers. When, on the other hand, husbands were person who will fit best into the pattern of life prescribed for the members of the group—the greater the conformity required for social acceptance.

Some specific examples of variations in demand for conformity will show how cultural groups differ. A cultural group that places high value on education as a stepping-stone to upward social mobility expects great conformity to school standards as a means to the desired end. Members of such a group develop this conformity in their children by using more authoritarian child-training methods than are used in families where less emphasis is placed on social mobility. Because of the high value middle-class American families place on social mobility, they expect greater conformity to socially approved standards of behavior on the part of their children than middle-class English families, who are less oriented toward upward mobility. In addition, the indifference to outside
criticism by the English results in less pressure for conformity on the part of children than is found among American families, who, on the whole, are anxious to avoid criticism (Chang, T.S.1974 & Gath, A.1974).

1.9 Family Influences

Relationships with family members, not parents alone, but siblings and grandparents, affect children's attitudes toward outsiders. If, for example, children have frictional relationships with grandparents, it will affect their attitudes toward outsiders who are elderly. However, no one member of the family or one specific aspect of family life is responsible for socializing children. If the overall home environment favors the development of good social attitudes, the chances are that, children will become social persons and vice versa.

Studies of social adjustment have revealed that personal relationships in the home are highly influential: relationships between parents, between children and their siblings, and between them and their parents. The position of the child in the family—whether the oldest, the middle, the youngest, or an only child—is also important. Older children, or those with siblings widely separated in age or of different sexes, tend to be more withdrawn when they are with other children. Children with siblings of the same sex as they are find it difficult to make associations with other children of the opposite sex but easy to make associations with children of the same sex (Beels, C.C.1974, Jones, A.P. & R. G. Demaree 1975).

The size of the family in which children grow up not only affects their early social experiences but also leaves its mark on their social attitudes and patterns of behaviour. Only children, for example, often get more attention than is good for them. As a result, they come to expect similar treatment from outsiders and are resentful when they do not get it. The social behavior and attitudes of children
reflect the treatment they receive in the home. Children who feel that they are rejected by their parents or siblings may assume attitudes of martyrdom outside the home and carry these attitudes into adult life. Such children may turn within themselves and become introverts. By contrast, acceptant, loving parents encourage extroversion in their children (Slater, P. E. 1962). Parental expectations motivate children to put forth effort to learn to behave in a socially acceptable way. As children grow older, for example, they learn that they must overcome aggressiveness and different patterns of unsocial behavior if they want to win parental approval (Schooler, C. 1972).

In the early years of life, the most important influence on children’s social behavior and attitudes is likely to be the child-training method used by their parents. Children who are brought up in democratic homes make the best social adjustments. They are socially active and outgoing. Those who are indulged, on the other hand, tend to become inactive and withdrawn. Children who are subjected to authoritarian child-training methods tend to be quiet and nonresistant, and their curiosity and creativity are restricted by parental pressures (Etaugh, C. 1974 & Korner, A.F. 1971). In summing up the home is the “seat of learning” for social skills. Only when children have satisfactory social relationships with members of their family can they fully enjoy social relationships with people outside the home, develop healthy attitudes toward people, and learn to function successfully in the peer group.

**Outside Influences**

Early social experiences outside the home supplement home experience and are important determinants of children’s social attitudes and behaviour patterns. If their relationships with peers and adults outside the minted. “The person who is strictly literal minded has a limited usefulness to the world and limited capacity for joy” (Rhenigold, H. L. 1973). Just because creativity is
valuable, it does not mean that the more creative people have the greater contributions to the social group and the happier and better adjusted they will be. Too much creativity is very likely to make people into “impractical dreamers”—those who create mentally but never seem to be able to put their dreams into practical forms that will benefit them or the social group. As a result, they will not achieve what they are potentially capable of. This will result in feelings of failure which might damage personal as well as social adjustments.

1.10 Influence of Family Size on Family Relationships

Family size, per se, is not alone responsible for the kinds of relationships that develop among family members. Instead, they depend upon a number of factors, four of which are especially important.

First, the number of interactional systems in a family must be considered. A specific example will serve to show how much more complex the interactional systems become with the arrival of each new family member. At first, there are two family members, husband and wife. There is 1 interactional system. With the arrival of the first baby, there are 3 interactional systems. When a new sibling arrives, there will be 6. Then, if there is another baby, making three children, there will be 10. Should the grandmother come to live with the family, the number of interactional systems will jump to 15.

The larger the family, the greater the number of interactional systems and, normally, the greater the friction in the home. However, friction is often counteracted by the authoritarian discipline of the parents. To avoid the unhealthy home climate that friction gives rise to and to enable each family member to live in harmony with other family members, parents of large families more often use authoritarian child-training methods than do parents of smaller ones.
Second, the composition of the family affects the relationships. When the family is composed of more female than male members, as is likely to be true in elongated families, friction tends to be greater. Females are in the home more than males and, as a result, have closer and more continuous relationships with one another—a condition that tends to lead to traction.

Third, family relationships are affected by parental attitudes toward family size. Parents who want a large family and have such a family will create a favorable emotional climate in the home because they are happy in their parental roles and willing to make the personal and financial sacrifices demanded by a large family. When, on the other hand, parents wanted a small family, but have a large one, their attitudes toward all their children will tend to be unhealthy. They will resent having to make sacrifices in time, effort, and money, and they will often blame each other for the larger than-hoped-for family. Their resentment will lead to poor marital relationships and have unfavorable effects on family relationships.

Fourth, the spacing of the arrival of children affects family relationships; depending on own it coincides with parental desires. Parents may want to have children close together, for example, so that the interruption in the mother’s career will be shortened or so that the children will be companionable. If the arrival of children coincides with these desires, parents’ attitudes will be favourable.

**Influence of Different-sized Families on Family Relationships**

It is customary among sociologists and psychologists to divide families into four general categories: the one-child family, the small family, the medium-sized family, and the large family. In the one-child family, the nuclear family consists of one child in addition to the two parents. This kind of family is more
likely to become elongated by the addition of boarders or relatives living under
the same roof than are families with several children where extra space is less
readily available.

The small family is one in which there are two or three children; the
medium-sized family has three, four, or five children; and the large family has six
or more children. In medium-sized families with three or four children, the
pattern approximates that of the small family; when there are five children, it
more closely approximates the large family in its effects on family relationships.
Small, medium-sized, and large families are more likely to be nuclear than
elongated because of the lack of space and money to take care of outsiders.
(Neugarten, B. L. & K. K. Weinstein 1964) Each family category is, of necessity,
subject to different influences and these will result in indifferent home climates
and different kinds of family relationships. Following lists the major factors that

A careful study of the factors that influence family relationships in each
family category will reveal that each has some conditions that are likely to lead to
good relationships as well as some that are likely to lead to poor relationships.
Therefore, it is not impossible to say which category is the best from the point of
view of the effect it has on family relationships; nor is it possible to rank the
categories in order of merit. However, it is generally agreed by sociologists who
have made extensive studies of the effects of family size that, all things
considered, the medium-sized family especially that with three or four children-
is probably the best from the point of view of healthy family relationships, and
the large family is probably the worst (Scheck, D. C. & R. Emerlck 1976).
1.11 Factors Influencing Family Relationships in Different-Sized Families

One-Child Families

- Often smaller than parental desires
- Close parent-child relationship results in child’s maturity of behavior, which contributes to good peer relationships
- Overprotection by parents
- Democratic or permissive child training
- Minimum family friction due to absence of sibling jealousy and rivalry
- Parental willingness and ability to give child advantages and status symbols
- Parental pressures for academic, athletic, and social achievement
- Child encouraged to play role of own choosing

Small Families

- Usually planned and, therefore consistent with parental desires in size and spacing
- Parents able to devote adequate time and attention to each child
- Commonly employ democratic control of child behavior
- Frequent sibling rivalry and jealousy
- Tendency of parents to compare child’s achievements with those of siblings
- Parental willingness and ability to give each child equal advantages and status symbols
- Role assignment by parents common
Medium-Sized Families

- Usually planned and, therefore, meet parental desires in size and spacing
- Less democratic and more authoritarian control as family size increases
- Role assignments by parents common
- Children often denied outside companionship because they are needed to help at home
- Parental pressures for achievement usually concentrate on firstborn
- Frequent and intense sibling rivalries and jealousies are common
- Limited parental ability to provide advantages and status symbols
- Tendency of parents to compare child’s achievement with those of siblings.

Large Families

- Often unplanned and, therefore, foster parental resentment
- Marital friction due to necessity for personal and financial sacrifices
- Role assignment by parents essential to family harmony and efficiency
- Authoritarian control essential to avoid confusion or anarchy
- Children often denied outside companionship because their help is needed at home or because of lack of money for peer activities
- Sibling rivalry and friction kept to minimum by strict parental control but expressed indirectly in teasing, bullying, and name calling
- Frequent parental inability to give children advantages and status symbols their peers have
- Little parental pressure for achievement except on firstborn
- Little overprotection except for firstborn
Influence of Sibling Relations on Family Relationships

In a child-centered home, sibling relationships have a greater impact on the home climate and on all family members than in an adult-centered home. Because American families today tend to be child-centered, sibling relationships have a greater influence on family relationship than they did in the past. When sibling relationships are favourable, the home climate is pleasant and relatively free from friction. When, on the other hand, sibling relationships are frictional and marked by jealousies, antagonisms, and other forms of disharmony, they play havoc with other family relationships and with the home climate. By so doing, they are hazardous to the personal and social adjustments of all family members, adults as well as children. This is one of the causes of deterioration in family relationships, so common in today's families, which will be discussed later.

Family Lifestyles and Transitions

Families in industrialized nations have become more diverse. Today, there are fewer births per family unit, more adults who want to adopt, more lesbian and gay parents who are open about their sexual orientation, and more never-married parents. In addition, transitions in family life over the past several decades—a dramatic rise in marital breakup, remarried parents, and employed mothers—have reshaped the family system.

In the following sections, we discuss these changes in the family, emphasizing how each affects family relationships and children's development. As you consider this array of family forms, think back to the social systems perspective. Note how children's well-being continues to depend on the quality of family interaction, which is sustained by supportive ties to kin and community and favourable policies in the larger culture.
1.12 From Large to Small Families

In 1960, the average number of children per North American couple was 3.1. Currently, it is 1.8 in the United States and 1.6 in Canada, compared with 1.7 in Australia and Great Britain, 1.6 in Sweden, 1.4 in Japan, and 1.3 Germany (U.S.Census Bureau, 2004b; United Nations, 2004b). A major reason for this decline, in addition to more effective birth control, is that many women are reaping the economic and personal rewards of a career. A family size of one or two children is more compatible with a woman’s decision to divide her energies between family and work. Also, more couples are delaying having children until they are well established professionally and secure economically. Adults who postpone parenthood are likely to have fewer children. Family, marital instability has resulted in smaller families; more couples today get divorced before their childbearing plans are complete.

Managing the work-family conflict

Work and family are organically linked by the people who split their days between home and workplace. Inevitably, there are conflicts between these two worlds, and the way we manage those conflicts determines the health of our society. When faced with a conflict between work and family responsibilities, the majority of Canadian employees put work first, according to Linda Duxbury, business professor at Carleton University. They also strive to meet their family commitments, with the result that the employees themselves can become the victim of burnout and depression. The Globe and Mail series on mental health last week provided vivid personal histories of some of the victims.

Some of the most “toxic” working conditions affect professionals who serve the public – nurses, doctors, teachers, police, military and public service executives - according to Bill Wilkerson, chair of the Global Business and Economic Roundtable on Addiction and Mental Health. And Dr. Duxbury's
study of 6,400 employees working for large employers from business and the
government shows that work-life conflict is affecting more people every year –
rising from 47 per cent of the work force in 1991 to 58 per cent in 2001.

People are working longer hours, they are coping with email messages
into the night and early in the morning, and some are off-shifting so one parent
can be at home while the other works. What gets squeezed out is sleep. The main
indicators of distress are rising absenteeism and increasing costs of disability
leave, with about 40 per cent of disability claims generated by depression. Other
indicators relate to the health of the children and the number of adults who are
limiting family size or deciding not to have children because of the pressures of
work.

Doug Willms, Canada Research Chair at the University of New Brunswick
and author of Vulnerable Children, says that 28.6 per cent of Canadian children
exhibit cognitive or behavioural problems that mean they are not ready to learn
at age 6. Children living in low-income households are more likely to be
vulnerable, but, overall, 60 per cent of vulnerable children are not living in poor
homes, and many live in well-to-do homes.

Why would children in well-to-do families experience these problems?

“What matters most is the kind of family environment a child lives in: the
benefits of good parenting skills, a cohesive family unit and parents with good
mental health far outweigh the negative effects associated with poverty,” Dr.
Willms says. How then, as a society, do we support men and women to be the
best they can be in the world of work and in the home? Barack Obama, in his
instantly famous Father’s Day Speech, started from the proposition that family is
the most important rock on which we build our lives.
We need families to raise our children, Mr. Obama said. Only families can set the standard of excellence, pass along the value of empathy, and give the gift of hope – hope that something better is waiting for us if we’re willing to work hard for it. Much of his speech focused on the personal responsibility of fathers, but, he said, “If fathers (and mothers) are doing their part, then our government should meet them half way.” So, too, should employers. In a recent Health Canada publication – Reducing Work-Life Conflict: What Works? What Doesn’t? – Dr. Duxbury gives two reasons why having family-friendly policies on the books is not enough: the policies are not being applied effectively; and many employees fear repercussions if they ask for help.

There are two concrete things for employers to do to meet employees half way: Give employees a greater sense of control over their hours of work and their work schedule. Clear criteria should be agreed and transparent, the process for changing work hours should be flexible, and there should be mutual accountability. Increase the number of supportive managers within the organization – managers who make work expectations clear, plan the work to be done, and openly discuss decisions that affect the employee’s work.

As for Canadian governments, there are four priorities: Ensure that people who work full time can earn a living wage by consistently adjusting minimum wages to reflect inflation and by expanding the Working Income Tax Benefit introduced in the last budget.

Expand access to affordable early childhood education by offering day-long junior and senior kindergarten, expanding child care spaces for children who are 3 and under, and making access to maternity and parental leave universal. (Only 2 in 3 working women are eligible under current EI rules.) Expand after-school options for recreation, the arts and homework clubs.
Ensure that every neighbourhood has a resource centre to support parents and healthy child development. In acknowledging the organic links between work and family, employers and governments give parents choices about when they work, about giving their children a good start in life, and even about how many children to have. In any aging society, we want every adult to be able to work to their potential, and every one of their children to be ready, willing and able to be a great parent as well as a great worker.

1.13 Family Environment

The family is the oldest and the most important of all the institutions that man has devised to regulate and integrate his behaviour as he strives to satisfy his basic needs. The family is basically a unit in which parents and children live together. Its key position rests on its multiple functions in relation to overall development of its members, their protection, and over all well-being. Therefore, it would emerge that not only the social and physical well-being of the individual is taken care of by the family, but the psychological well-being as well.

The family is the first to affect the individual. It is the family which gives the child his first experience of living. It gets him when he is completely uninformed, unprotected, before any other agency has had a chance to affect him. The influence of the family on the child is, therefore, immense. The influence of other agencies, although indispensable, must build upon the groundwork furnished by the family.

However, to understand the influence of the family on the child, it is important to understand the family and its functions Family has been defined in the Oxford Dictionary as: (1) the body of persons who live in one house or under one head, including parents, children, servants, etc., (2) the ground consisting of parents and their children, whether living together or not; (3) a person’s children
reared collectively; and (4) those descended, or claiming descent from a common ancestry.

Connecting Family Environment

The family environment is influenced by a number of factors like the nature of family constellation; number of children in the family; marital relationships between husband and wife; maternal (paternal) employment; and socio-economic and religious background of the family.

The family environment possesses a certain consistency so that the impact of the same basic values, individuals, material objects etc., is felt over and over. Parental influence may not be felt in a specific situation, but the attitudes and ideas expressed day after day inevitable leave their mark. In certain ways the influence of the family can be negative. All too often, members of the family take out all their frustrations on each other. Moreover, “instead of being a readymade source of friends, the family is too often a readymade source of victims and enemies, the place where the cruelest words are spoken.....”

1. Cohesion: Degree of commitment, help, and support family members provide for one another.

2. Expressiveness: Extent to which family members are encouraged to act openly and express their feelings and thoughts directly.

3. Conflict: Amount of openly expressed aggression and conflict among family members.

4. Acceptance and Caring: Extent to which the members are unconditionally accepted and the degree to which caring is expressed in the family.

5. Independence: Extent to which family members are assertive and independently make their own decisions.
6. **Active-Recreational Orientation**: Extent of participation in social and recreational activities.

7. **Organization**: Degree of importance of clear organization structure in planning family activities and responsibilities.

8. **Control**: Degree of limit setting within a family.

### 1.14 Personality Characteristics

**Neuroticism** –

Neuroticism, or emotional instability, includes such traits as being anxious and unable to control impulses; a tendency to have unrealistic ideas; and generally being emotionally unstable and negative. Neurotic individuals are complainers and defeatists. They complain about different things at different ages, but they are always ready to see the sure side of life and none of its sweetness.

Neuroticism is sometimes called negative affectivity (emotionality) or NA, because of the neurotic person's tendency to feel anger, scorn, revulsion, guilty anxiety sadness and other negative moods (Watson & Clark 1984). People with high NA frequently feel worried and tense, even in the absence of real problems. They complain more about their health and report more physical symptoms than people with low NA do, yet they are not actually in poorer health (Brettet et al; 1900; Watson & Penneabker, 1989).

The Neuroticism dimension places people along a continuum according to their emotional stability and personal adjustment. People who frequently experience emotional distress and wide swings in emotions will score high on measures of Neuroticism. People high in Neuroticism tend to become more upset over daily stressors than those low on this dimension (Gunthert, Cohin, &
Armeli, 1999; Suls, Green, & Hillis, 1998). Although there are many different kinds of negative emotions, sadness, anger, anxiety, guilt—that may have different causes and require different treatments, research consistently shows that people prone to one kind of negative emotional state often experience others (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Individuals low in Neuroticism tend to be calm, well adjusted, and not prone to extreme and maladaptive emotional reactions.

Neuroticism is the name Eysenck gave to a dimension that ranges from normal, fairly calm and collected people to one’s that tend to be quite “nervous.” His research showed that these nervous people tended to suffer more frequently from a variety of “nervous disorders” we call neuroses, hence the name of the dimension. But understand that he was not saying that people who score high on the neuroticism scale are necessarily neurotics—only that they are more susceptible to neurotic problems. Eysenck was convinced that, since everyone in his data-pool fit somewhere on this dimension of normality-to-neuroticism, this was a true temperament, i.e. that this was a genetically-based, physiologically-supported dimension of personality. He therefore went to the physiological research to find possible explanations.

The most obvious place to look was at the sympathetic nervous system. This is a part of the autonomic nervous system that functions separately from the central nervous system and controls much of our emotional responsiveness to emergency situations. For example, when signals from the brain tell it to do so, the sympathetic nervous systems instructs the liver to release sugar for energy, causes the digestive system to slow down, opens up the pupils, raises the hairs on your body (goosebumps), and tells the adrenal glands to release more adrenalin (epinephrine). The adrenalin in turn alters many of the body’s functions and prepares the muscles for action. The traditional way of describing
the function of the sympathetic nervous system is to say that it prepares us for "fight or flight."

Eysenck hypothesized that some people have a more responsive sympathetic nervous system than others. Some people remain very calm during emergencies; some people feel considerable fear or other emotions; and some are terrified by even very minor incidents. He suggested that this latter group had a problem of sympathetic hyperactivity, which made them prime candidates for the various neurotic disorders. Perhaps the most "archetypal" neurotic symptom is the panic attack. Eysenck explained panic attacks as something like the positive feedback you get when you place a microphone too close to a speaker: The small sounds entering the mike get amplified and come out of the speaker, and go into the mike, get amplified again, and come out of the speaker again, and so on, round and round, until you get the famous squeal that we all loved to produce when we were kids. (Lead guitarists like to do this too to make some of their long, wailing sounds.)

Well, the panic attack follows the same pattern: You are mildly frightened by something -- crossing a bridge, for example. This gets your sympathetic nervous system going. That makes you more nervous, and so more susceptible to stimulation, which gets your system even more in an uproar, which makes you more nervous and more susceptible.... You could say that the neuroticistic person is responding more to his or her own panic than to the original object of fear! As someone who has had panic attacks, I can vouch for Eysenck's description -- although his explanation remains only a hypothesis.

Extroversion

Introversion versus extroversion describes the extent to which people are outgoing or shy. It includes such personality traits as being talkative or silent, sociable or reclusive, adventurous or cautious, eager to be in the limelight or
preferring to stay in the shadows. Extroversion is associated with positive emotionality, the inclination to be enthusiastic, lively, and cheerful.

Researchers have identified the second personality dimension as Extraversion, with extreme extraverts at one end and extreme introverts at the other. Extraverts are very sociable people who also tend to be energetic, optimistic, friendly, and assertive. Introverts do not typically express these characteristics, but it would be incorrect to say that they are asocial and without energy. As one team of researchers explained, “Introverts are reserved rather than unfriendly, independent rather than followers, even-paced rather than sluggish” (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 15). As you might imagine, studies find that extraverts have more friends and spend more time in social situations than introverts (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998).

Eysenck hypothesized that extraversion-introversion is a matter of the balance of “inhibition” and “excitation” in the brain itself. These are ideas that Pavlov came up with to explain some of the differences he found in the reactions of his various dogs to stress. **Excitation** is the brain waking itself up, getting into an alert, learning state. **Inhibition** is the brain calming itself down, either in the usual sense of relaxing and going to sleep, or in the sense of protecting itself in the case of overwhelming stimulation.

Someone who is extraverted, he hypothesized, has good, strong inhibition: When confronted by traumatic stimulation -- such as a car crash -- the extravert’s brain inhibits itself, which means that it becomes “numb,” you might say, to the trauma, and therefore will remember very little of what happened. After the car crash, the extravert might feel as if he had “blanked out” during the event, and may ask others to fill them in on what happened. Because they don’t feel the full
mental impact of the crash, they may be ready to go back to driving the very next day.

The introvert, on the other hand, has poor or weak inhibition: When trauma, such as the car crash, hits them, their brains don’t protect them fast enough, don’t in any way shut down. Instead, they are highly alert and learn well, and so remember everything that happened. They might even report that they saw the whole crash “in slow motion!” They are very unlikely to want to drive anytime soon after the crash, and may even stop driving altogether.

Now, how does this lead to shyness or a love of parties? Well, imagine the extravert and the introvert getting drunk, taking off their clothes, and dancing buck naked on a restaurant table. The next morning, the extravert will ask you what happened (and where are his clothes). When you tell him, he’ll laugh and start making arrangements to have another party. The introvert, on the other hand, will remember every mortifying moment of his humiliation, and may never come out of his room again. (I’m very introverted, and again I can vouch to a lot of this experientially! Perhaps some of you extraverts can tell me if he describes your experiences well, too -- assuming, of course, that you can remember you experiences!)

One of the things that Eysenck discovered was that violent criminals tend to be non-neuroticistic extraverts. This makes common sense, if you think about it: It is hard to imagine somebody who is painfully shy and who remembers their experiences and learns from them holding up a Seven-Eleven! It is even harder to imagine someone given to panic attacks doing so. But please understand that there are many kinds of crime besides the violent kind that introverts and neurotics might engage in!
Neuroticism and Extraversion-Introversion

Another thing Eysenck looked into was the interaction of the two dimensions and what that might mean in regard to various psychological problems. He found, for example, that people with phobias and obsessive-compulsive disorder tended to be quite introverted, whereas people with conversion disorders (e.g. hysterical paralysis) or dissociative disorders (e.g. amnesia) tended to be more extraverted. Here’s his explanation: Highly neuroticistic people over-respond to fearful stimuli; if they are introverts, they will learn to avoid the situations that cause panic very quickly and very thoroughly, even to the point of becoming panicky at small symbols of those situations -- they will develop phobias. Other introverts will learn (quickly and thoroughly) particular behaviors that hold off their panic -- such as checking things many times over or washing their hands again and again.

Highly neuroticistic extraverts, on the other hand, are good at ignoring and forgetting the things that overwhelm them. They engage in the classic defense mechanisms, such as denial and repression. They can conveniently forget a painful weekend, for example, or even “forget” their ability to feel and use their legs.

Openness

Openness to experience, which in some personality measures is called intellect or imagination, describes the extent to which people are original, imaginative, questioning, artistic, and capable of divergent (creative) thinking or are conforming, unimaginative, and predictable (Goldberg 1993).

The openness dimension refers to openness to experience rather than openness in an interpersonal sense. The characteristics that make up this dimension include an active imagination, a willingness to consider new ideas, divergent thinking,
and intellectual curiosity. People high in Openness are unconventional and independent thinkers. Those low in openness tend to be more conventional and prefer the familiar rather than something new. Given this description, it is not surprising that innovative scientists and creative artists tend to be high in Openness (Feist, 1998). Some researchers refer to this dimension as Intellect, although it is certainly not the same as intelligence.

**Agreeableness**

Agreeableness describes the extent to which people are good-natured or irritable, gentle or headstrong, cooperative or abrasive, secure or suspicious and jealous. It reflects the capacity for friendly relationships or tendency to have hostile ones.

People who are high on the Agreeableness dimension are helpful, trusting, and sympathetic. Those on the other end tend to be antagonistic and skeptical. Agreeable people prefer cooperation to competition. Those low in Agreeableness like to fight for their interests and beliefs. Researchers find that people high in Agreeableness have more pleasant social interactions and fewer quarrelsome exchanges than those low on this dimension (Berry & Hansen, 2000; Cote & Moskowitz, 1998; Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001).

**Conscientiousness**

It describes the extent to which individuals are responsible or undependable; are persevering or quit easily; are steadfast or fickle; are tidy or careless; are scrupulous or unscrupulous. The conscientiousness dimension refers to how controlled and self-disciplined we are. People on the high end of this dimension are organized, plan oriented, and determined. Those on the low end are apt to be careless, easily distracted from tasks, and undependable. Little wonder that those low in Conscientiousness tend to have more automobile
accidents (Arthur & Graziano, 1996). Because the characteristics that define
Conscientiousness often show up in achievement or work situations, some
researchers have referred to this dimension as Will to achieve or simply Work.

1.15 Statement of the problem

“To Study of Birth Order and Size of the Family on Some Personality
Characteristics and Family Environment”

1.16 Significance of the study:-

- This study may provide quantitative data effect of different birth order
  and size of family on personality characteristics and family environment.
- The study may highlight the importance of the birth order and size of the
  family as a field of inquiry for our understanding of the nature and
  prediction of personality and family environment.
- The study may bring an impetus for future experimental studies regarding
  the effect on prediction of behavior on the basis of birth order and size of
  the family.