

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This research is designed to make a comparative study between drug users and non-users, on their, personality, anomie, motives, and social factors.

SAMPLE

The sample consisted of 290 male adults, belonging to lower, middle and upper socio-economic status, with the lower age limit of 17 years and the upper age limit of 40 years. The mean age of the subjects was found to be 28 years. Out of the 290 subjects, 145 were drug users and 145 non-users of drugs. Random technique of sampling was used in this study and the subjects taken, belonged to Simla, Manali, Hamirpur and Dharamsala. The entire sample was divided into two groups, namely, the control group and the experimental group. The former group consisted of subjects who did not use drugs, while, the latter group consisted of subjects who used drugs. Scales to measure, personality, anomie, motives and social factors, were given to both the groups.

TABLE 3.1

Sample Specification

Initial Sample	-	290 Male Adults
Final Sample	-	100 Male Adults
Age Limit	-	17 years - 40 years
Mean age	-	28 years

TABLE 3.2

Sample Information

Groups	C I T I E S			
	Simla	Hamirpur	Dharamsala	Manali
Drug-Users	41	42	28	34
Non-users of drugs	40	50	20	35

TABLE 3.3Relative State of Subjects for the Different
Drugs Taken Percentage-wise

Variety of Drug	No. of Subjects	Percentage
Alcohol users	23	16%
Tobacco users	27	19%
Marijuana users	30	21%
Heroin users	20	14%
Pathedine users	12	8%
Morphine users	18	12%
Barbiturate users	15	10%

TOOLS USED(1) Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16 PF)

The 16 Personality Factors Questionnaire (Appendix I) was developed by Cattell in 1962. The 16 PF is an objectively - scorable test, devised by basic research in psychology, to give the most complete coverage of personality, possible in a brief time. Planned for the age seventeen through the mature adult age range, its reading level varies for different forms.

Coverage of personality is insured by the sixteen functionally - independent and psychologically meaningful dimensions isolated by over twenty years of factor analytic research on normal and clinical groups. The personality factors measured are not just peculiar to the 16 PF test. They have been established as unitary, psychologically meaningful entities in many researches, in various life situations. These sixteen dimensions or scales are essentially independent; that is to say, the correlation between one group and another is usually quite small. Therefore, having a certain position on one does not prevent the person's having any position whatever on any other. Thus each of the sixteen scales bring an entirely new piece of information about the person, a condition not found in many alleged multi-dimensional scales. The essential point to remember is that their psychological reality enables more knowledgeable predictions to be made from them than from merely statistical scales.

The 16 PF has been found to be a highly reliable scale. The reliabilities, as dependability coefficients, after a six-day lapse, on 146 adults (25 to 45 years), are shown in the Table 3.4.

TABLE 3.4

16 PF Dependability Coefficients : Test-Retest After Six Days (Cattell, 1962).

Factor	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
Forms A+B	.89	*	.87	.88	.90	.88	.93	.89
	L	M	N	O	Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃	Q ₄
	.87	.82	.76	.89	.83	.85	.78	.91
	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
	.81	-	.78	.80	.79	.81	.83	.77
Form A	L	M	N	O	Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃	Q ₄
	.75	.70	.61	.79	.73	.73	.62	.81
	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
	.75	-	.74	.80	.81	.77	.89	.79
Form B	L	M	N	O	Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃	Q ₄
	.77	.70	.60	.81	.70	.75	.62	.87

* Cattell's 16 PF has been found to be reliable on Indian population as well, with a test-retest reliability of 0.78 for adults of 20 to 40 years of age, after a lapse of 10 days (Verma, 1978).

N = 146 Adults (25-45 Years).

Instructions For Administration

Answers were made on a separate answer sheet, and not on the re-usable test booklet. The subjects were asked to enter their names and required biodata, at the top of the answer sheet and were also asked to read the instructions on the first page of the booklet, and then discuss with the investigator, if they had any problem. Once the instructions were clear, the subjects were required to work out the first four examples, in the booklet on the front page. Having done so, the subjects were instructed to move on and complete the entire booklet.

Principles And Mechanics of Scoring

Each answer scores 0, 1 or 2 points except the factor B, (intelligence or crystallized general ability) which scores 0 (incorrect) or 1 (correct). The score of each single item contributes to only one factor total. Tests can be either hand scored, with a stencil key, or machine scored.

Hand scoring with the key is accomplished easily, rapidly, and in a standard manner. The answer appear as pencil marks in the boxes, on the given answer sheet. Two cardboard stencil scoring keys are used; one covers factors (traits) A, C, F, H, I, N, Q₁ and Q₃ and the other, factors B, E, G, I, M, O, Q₂ and Q₄. Stencil 1 is simply fitted over the answer sheet and the marks visible through the holes, are counted for each factor, allowing either 2 or 1, as indicated by the number printed adjacent to the hole. The scores are summed and the

total is entered in the space indicated by the arrow on the stencil for each factor; but, for factor B (intelligence) each correct mark visible in the hole gives a score of 1 only.

Before using the scoring stencils, a quick look at each answer sheet is taken to make sure that there are no odd, unscorable responses, for example, marking two out of three alternatives or entirely omitting any response to an item, in which case the item is given zero score.

(2) Family Environment Scale

The family environment, parents attitudes towards their children, birth order, caste and religion, influence the day-to-day behaviour of a child. To measure the influence of the above mentioned, on drug-use and the non-use of drugs, the family environment scale, developed by Moos and Moos, (1981), (Appendix II) was used. The scale consists of 90 items and it is divided into ten sub-scales, namely, cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual - cultural orientation, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organisation and control.

The Moos and Moos, family environment scale has been found to be highly reliable, showing a test-retest reliability of .86, on 18-28 years old Indian males and females (Nalwa, 1986).

Instructions For Administration

The subjects were told that there are ninety statements in the given booklet and that these statements are about the family. Each subject was to decide, whether, these statements were true or false, with regard to his family. The subject was asked to write a 'T' after each statement, if he felt, it was true or mostly true of his family and write an 'F', if he thought that the statement was false or mostly false of his family. Each subject was asked to remember that we would like to know what his family seems to him and that he should not be influenced by how other members saw his family.

Scoring

The scoring for the family environment scale is simple. Every statement, answered by 'T', is given a score of two marks, and every statement answered by an 'F', is given one mark, a higher score indicates greater consistency with the family environment scale, while, a lower score indicates lesser consistency with the family environment scale.

(3) Anomie Scale

The anomie scale was developed by Sarole, (1966), (Appendix III). He developed this five item scale to assess anomie, representing; the individual's generalized, pervasive sense of "self-to-others belongingness", at one extreme compared with "self-to-others distance", at the other pole. The Sarole,

anomie scale has been found to be highly reliable, showing a test-retest reliability of .84, on 20 to 35 years old males and females (Sarole, 1966). The test-retest reliability of this anomie scale was found to be .81 over a period of 2 weeks, on a population of Indian males and females, between the age 20-40 years (Sankhyan, 1986).

Instructions For Administration

The subjects were told to state their answers to the best of their knowledge by putting a Yes/No, in front of each of the five items in the scale. The subjects were requested not to have any statement unanswered and were also assured that their answers would be kept strictly confidential.

Scoring

Every statement answered as 'Yes', is given a score of 2 marks and every statement answered as 'no' is given a score of one mark. A high anomie would agree with these five items, i.e., a high score will show high anomie and a low score will show low anomie, the maximum score being 10 and the minimum score being 5.

(4) Self-Reported Checklists For Motives

Two self-reported checklists for motives, (Appendix IVA and Appendix IVB), namely, (A) self-reported checklist for motives leading to drug-use, and (B) self-reported checklist for motives helping individuals refrain from drug-use, were developed by, Sankhyan and Sethi, (1986). These checklists were used to identify

which motives lead an individual to or help refrain, from drugs.

Instructions For Administration

Checklist (A) was given to the subjects who take drugs, in order to tap the motives which lead them to drug use, while checklist (B) was given to the subjects who did not take drugs, in order to tap the motives which helped them refrain from drug use. The subjects were asked to read the statements carefully and indicate the motives which applied to them.

Scoring

A careful examination of the checklist, (A) indicates the motives which lead to the use of drugs, while an examination of checklist (B) indicates the motives which help individuals refrain from taking drugs. The two lists contain both psychological and social motives.

(5) Drug Identification Performa

The drug identification performa, (Appendix V) of the World Health Organisation (1974), was used to identify the type of drugs being taken by the subjects.

Instructions For Administration

Each subject was asked to carefully read the list of drugs given in the drug identification performa and tick mark the drug(s) which he used. The subjects were requested not to hesitate in revealing the fact that they use more than one drug

in case they did and were assured that their answers would be kept confidential.

Scoring

The drug identification performa for each subject was carefully examined, and the drug/drugs used by each subject were noted.

(6) Personal Data Sheet

The family environment, parents attitude, caste, religion, age, education, background, marital status and type of the family, influence the behaviour of an individual. A personal data sheet (Appendix VI), developed by Sankhyan and Sethi, (1986), was used to study the social factors in relation to drug-use/non-use. This personal data sheet consisted of questions that are related with age, type of family, marital status, family background, and education.

Instructions for Administration

The subjects were asked to carefully read the questions listed in the personal data sheet, and tick mark the alternative in front of each question, which applied to them. The subjects were requested to be honest in their answers and not to omit any question.

Scoring

The answers on the personal data sheet were carefully examined and the information obtained, was carefully noted for the purpose of statistical analysis, to be applied later.