Since the days of Plato different meanings have been attached to the term 'personality'. The definitions of personality can be grouped under several categories [Allport (2), Hunt (54), Thorpe (104)]. Allport (2) has elaborately discussed the origin of this term and its usage in the literature, theology, law, philosophy, psychology and sociology. Then he has offered his own definition which he claims to represent "a synthesis of contemporary psychological usage". Though formulation of a single definition of personality is very difficult, his definition of personality seems by far the best. According to his view "personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment" [Allport (2, p 4)]. In his definition he combined two opposite aspects into a unified whole. These two aspects are the behaviour aspect and the inner-nature aspect. But it is not an easy job to measure all the different aspects of personality. So the present investigator thought it to be prudent to accept a position of personality that will best serve the purpose of this study. For our present purpose we
have accepted this definition as our guideline. Various theo-
ries on personality have been formulated by the psycholo-
gists, but none of them has been accepted without some reservations
Hall & Lindsey (45). No one theory has been able to explain
all the facts that cover the whole compass of personality. In
fact the elements of personality are complex and factors that
determine personality are varied. So it is very difficult to
formulate a comprehensive theory of personality at least with
the present stock of knowledge.

A few decades ago man was considered to be a pur-
posive creature and behaviour was explained on the basis of
purpose [Adler (1), Allport (2), Murray (73)]. But
Lewin (65), Eysenck (25, 26, 27) did not emphasise much
on purpose as a determinant of behaviour. But there is no
serious contention between the two groups in their emphasis on
purpose.

Another point of distinction among the various
theories of personality lies in the fact that some of them
emphasised on conscious determinants of behaviour [Allport (2),
Lewin (65)] while others put stress on the unconscious
factors [Freud (34), Murray (73), Jung (61)] as an expla-
nation of behaviour. Though at first doubt was expressed
about the existence of unconscious factor, gradually it was
widely accepted by the psychologists. But the emphasis on this
unconscious motivation varied in accordance with the authors'
contention.
Again, some psychologists such as Cattell (16), Freud (33), Murphy (72) laid stress on the factor reward for the explanation of behaviour. They accepted the 'law of effect' as a primary condition of learning. But Allport (2), Lewin (65) did not put so much importance on this theory. Modern concept does not hold that man is motivated consciously to have maximum pleasure and minimum pain [Hall & Lindzey (45)], but it considers reward as the motivator of behaviour, whether the person is conscious about it or not.

The American Psychologists, who view personality as the summation or integration of parts, specially, those elements, which they consider to be common in all persons, do not like to give much emphasis on heredity for the explanation of behaviour. But Freud (33), Eysenck (26), Cattell (16), unlike Allport (2) and Lewin (65) placed greater emphasis on heredity. But the overall analysis of most of the personality theories reveals that the majority accepted the importance of heredity.

Similarity has been found between Freud's theory (which gave emphasis on early experiences for personality development) on the one hand and the theories of Murphy (72), Miller & Dollard (70), Murray (73) & Sullivan (101) on the other [Hall & Lindzey (45)]. The theory put forward by Lewin stressed on contemporaneous events. The idea of Lewin's theory
has been echoed in the theories of Allport (2) & Rogers (32). There is a hot dispute whether past or present can predict future behaviour clearly. Freud (33), Miller & Dollard (70) were in favour of continuity of development. The same viewpoint but in a lesser degree, is held by Adler (1), Murphy (72) & Sullivan (101).

Most of the theories of personality consider an individual as a total functioning unit. Allport (2), Murphy (72), Sheldon (93) are all in favour of studying the behaviour as a connected part of the total person. But Eysenck (25) Miller & Dollard (70) do not hold this viewpoint. The contemporary personality theories [Hall & Lindsey (45)] are in favour of studying behaviour organically instead of isolating small segments of behaviour. Moreover there is a growing tendency among the present-day psychologists to give fuller exposition of the context - how the particular behaviour occurred.

Since Allport (2) stressed on individuality thoroughly, he had to adopt idiographic method for studying behaviour. The same stand was maintained by Adler (1), Lewin (65), Murphy (72). But Eysenck (26) denied individuality completely. It is true that many theories of personality deal with the uniqueness of behaviour but it is not the typical feature of the modern personality theories.
Most of the personality theories have accepted the importance of psychological environment as opposed to physical environment on personality development. The role of experience in the formation of one's personality has been emphasized by Lewin (65), Murray (73). But it did not get equal acceptance in the theories of Cattell (16), Eysenck (26).

Some of the personality theories, which were influenced by sociology, Anthropology, accepted group membership as the determinants of behaviour. Theories put by Murphy (72), Murray (73), Sullivan (101) belong to this category. But Adler (1), Lewin (65) did not emphasize this viewpoint clearly in their theories. No mention of this factor is found in the theories put by Allport, Sheldon (93), Jung (61). On thorough scrutiny of all the contemporary theories of personality it is evident that the socio-cultural background upon which one's behaviour is shaped, is getting much impetus.

Next, the authors of personality theories have tried to explain psychological concepts with those of biological sciences. This is more technically known as interdisciplinary approaches. The personality theorists are more inclined toward biological rather than toward social science. The theories propounded by Allport (2), Cattell (16), Lewin (65) Murphy (72) & Murray (73) emphasized on motivation. According to these authors, behaviour is to be understood from the study of different motivational factors. The psychologists who stressed
on motivation are divided into two groups. One of them is in favour of small number of motivational factors while others consider these factors to be large [Hall & Lindsey (45)].

The viewpoint discussed so far threw light on the concept of personality as formulated by different theorists of personality. The discussion points out at what points different theories coincide as well as differ. According to Sears (87) "any theory is valid only to the extent that is proved useful in predicting or providing for control of behaviour, there is no right or wrong in the matter, but only convenience". The present study has attempted to measure one particular trait of personality. A trait is defined as "a generalized and focalized neurophysic system (peculiar to the individual) with the capacity to render many stimuli functionally equivalent and to initiate and guide consistent (equivalent) forms of adaptive and expressive behaviour." Allport (57). The trait theory holds that for the prediction of one's behaviour we must know his standing on all the traits that are assumed to constitute the personality. But here also difficulty is encountered to measure all the traits constituting one's personality as the number of traits exceeds certain limit. Therefore all psychologists who were motivated by trait-theory confined their endeavour to measure only some of the traits of personality that are relevant to their particular purpose. Moreover in practice it is possible only to measure different traits, but not the integration of different traits.
Like type theory the trait theory does not group people into different types. Rather it classifies people in accordance with the degree to which they possess different traits. According to this theory one's personality is described by his standing on different traits such as introversion extroversion, emotionality, sociability etc. The two sub-varieties of trait-theory are (1) Allport's theory and (2) Cattell's theory [Hilgard (53)].

Though one's personality is a combination of various traits yet it is possible to measure one dimension of personality and the single dimension will reveal only one aspect of one's personality. For example the trait measured by the present researcher indicates only a particular aspect of the personality.

One's personality is determined by various factors. The chief determinants of personality are somatic factors, childhood experiences, social influences, hereditary factors and cultural context. The elaborate discussion of these determinants has been made by Kruch & Crutchfield (62). Among the childhood experiences the relation of the child with his parents is most significant determinant of the latter's personality.