CHAPTER - III

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The main concepts used in the present study are (1) cross-cultural, (2) Personality, (3) Authoritarianism, (4) Rigidity, (5) Tribal and Non-Tribal, and (6) Youth. For the purpose of present study operationally a brief description of these concepts is given below:

CROSS-CULTURAL

There are two major kinds of cross-cultural studies. One kind tries to establish that there are cultural differences involving some particular phenomenon and to indicate what causes these differences. The other kind of study is concerned with establishing generalities. For the purpose of present study, we shall use the term cross-cultural study as proposed in the first category. Cross-cultural research may be conducted for a variety of reasons, to check the generality of psychological laws, to increase the range of our observations on variables of interest, to determine the variations found in subjective culture variables in different settings to take advantage of natural experiments involving combinations of variables that cannot be obtained in the laboratory, to study the manifestation of psychological variables in different cultural contexts, and study cultures for their own sake. Thus, the advantage of the cross-cultural method are two fold. First, it ensures that one’s findings relate to human behaviour in general rather than being bound to a single culture and second, it increases the range of variation of many variables.

PERSONALITY

Everyone is fascinated by the study of personality. The human personality is almost certainly the most complex phenomenon studied by Psychology. Personality has been defined in many ways by different observers. Each definition has something to offer by way of emphasis upon a particular facet of the complicated whole. The Word personality has been derived from the Latin word 'Persona'.
The word 'persona' means make up that an actor puts on while he goes to the stage to play the role of some individual or other character. But personality is more than the outward physical characteristics of a person.

The scientific conception of personality has developed gradually. Allport (1937) was probably the first psychologist who proposed the first genuine and acceptable definition of personality. After analysing a good number of definitions of his predecessors, Allport (1937) proposed his comprehensive definition of personality.

"Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment."

After few years, Allport, G.W. (1961) revised his views as to the concept of personality and modified his earlier definition. Now he proposed that:

"Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought."

Mathematical Approaches to the Concept of Personality:

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (Form E) as prepared by Raymond B. Cattell and Herbert W. Eber is used in the present study for revealing the personality characteristics of tribal and non-tribal youth. In the present research Cattell's Factor analytic approach to the concept of personality has been taken into account to study the personality of tribal and non-tribal boys.

Raymond B. Cattell and Hans Juregn Eysenck are the two personality theorists who have drawn the maximum attention of the contemporary researchers in the field of personality.

Cattell is fascinated with the quantitative aspects of personality measurement. He had used factor analysis as one of his favourite method to discover various traits in personality make-up. According to Cattell, the goal of psychology and personality theory
is to formulate laws which enable us to predict behaviour under many conditions. His definition of personality is not surprising even if, it is based on prediction.

"Personality is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation." (Personality: A Systematic, Theoretical and Factual Study, 1950).

Cattell employed certain intensive key concepts to specify his concept of personality. These major concepts are: Traits, Ergs, Metaergs and self.

According to him a trait is a mental structure, an influence that is made from observed behaviour to account for regularity or consistency in behaviour. In his investigation Cattell found two major kinds of traits: source traits and surface traits. Surface traits are clusters of observable, behavioural events, they are less stable and merely descriptive, and therefore, less important in his viewpoint. Whereas source traits are the underlying influences that help to determine surface traits. Source traits may be divided into constitutional traits and environmental-mould traits.

Cattell advocates a method of analyzing quantitatively the goals or the incentives that motivate the human personality in action in a natural setting. This he calls the 'dynamic calculus'. Attitudes and responses of all kinds are considered to come from dynamic source traits of two kinds. The first is the erg, and the second is the sentiment. An erg is almost like an instinct. An erg is defined as:

"An innate psycho-physical disposition which permits its possessors to acquire reactivity to certain classes of objects more readily than do others, to experience a specific emotion in regard to them, and to start on a course of action which ceases more completely at a specific goal activity than at any other" (Cattell, 1950).

Cattell had identified at least nine of these ergs, including sex, fear, parental protectiveness, assertion, curiosity
etc. A sentiment, on the other hand, is "a motivational source trait which comes out of environmental influences" (Cattell, 1950).

A metaerg is an environmental mould dynamic source trait. Ergs are present at birth but metaergs appear only with development. According to Cattell (1950) 'Self' is

"....the ability to contemplate the physical and social self, whereby the satisfaction of any desire becomes subsided in part to a sentiment for the welfare of the whole self. The sentiment becomes by such contribution the most powerful sentiment in the lattice, controlling all others in some degree".

Cattell has postulated several dynamic cross-roads which represent the events that follow the activation of some ergic pattern of behaviour.

Eysenck's (1960) view of personality is quite consistent with various definitions which have been already examined and appears to be particularly congruent with Allport's definition. Eysenck has defined personality in the following words:

"Personality is the sum total of the actual or potential behaviour - patterns of the organism, as determined by heredity and environment, it originates and develops through the functional interaction of the four main sectors into which these behaviour patterns are organised, the cognitive sector (intelligence), the conative sector (character), the affective sector (temperament), and the somatic sector (constitution)." (Dimensions of Personality, 1947, p. 25).

In regard to the idiographic (individual) vs. the nomothetic (discovering general laws of behaviour), Eysenck emphasises strongly that if personality study is to be a science, it must be by its very nature nomothetic. Central to Eysenck's view of behaviour are, the concepts of trait and types. He defines trait as an "observed constellation of individual reaction - tendencies". A type is defined as an "observed constellation or syndrome of traits". Eysenck has identified three primary dimensions of personality: Introversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism.
Eysenck, like Cattell, makes frequent use of the statistical techniques of factor analysis. Eysenck denies the crucial significance of individuality in favour of a nomothetic approach. He feels self should not be considered as overly important in the study of personality. He also gives heavy emphasis to the role of heredity because of his study of fraternal and identical twins. There are relatively few motivational concepts in Eysenck's theory because he prefers the parsimonious approach.

In the background of Cattell's above mentioned concept of personality the data of this study would be interpreted in the following chapters. Hence personality for the purpose of the present study, we shall mean personality as explained and defined by Cattell. The term "Personality" is a popular concept in the field of psychology and exhaustive literature is already available so it will not be discussed in detail. Therefore, in the present study the term personality and personality factors were used in the reference of Cattell's aforesaid definition to the concept of personality.

**Authoritarianism**

In the recent literature of psychology, there is no personality variable which has figured more prominently in the attempt to interrelate psychological processes than that of authoritarianism. In 1950, a group of psychologists at the University of California published a book entitled 'The Authoritarian Personality'. The appearance of 'The Authoritarian Personality' was a historic event. Adorno et al. (1950) explained authoritarianism as "a personality syndrome characterized by submissiveness to authority, conventionalism, power and toughness, destructiveness and cynicism and an exaggerated concern with sex". Adorno and his associates (1950) have provided evidence that a syndrome of "authoritarian" traits can be identified as a central and enduring part of some people's personality.

Adorno's study suggests that the development of this syndrome comes from severe disciplinary treatment of the child, typically involving excessive stress on rightness of parental rules
and values with insistence on complete obedience of them reinforced by punishment. Often such severe discipline is accompanied by a parental attitude of emotional rejection of the child and by exploitative manipulation of the child.

The fact that authoritarianism was found by Adorno et al. (1950) to be strikingly related to anti-semitic attitudes, ethnocentrism, and political conservatism set the stage for research activity of considerable magnitude. Within the six years following publication of "The Authoritarian Personality", over 200 related studies were published. It is significant to note that the bulk of these studies related authoritarianism to other psychological characteristics. For example, authoritarianism, primarily measured by the California F scale was reported to correlate positively with intolerance of ambiguity (Block & Block, 1951), with perceptual rigidity (Jones, 1955), related to political preferences (Cohn & Carsch, 1954; Milton, 1952), family ideology (Huffman, 1950), teachers' attitudes toward child behaviour (Juul, 1953), distortion in social perception (Scodel & Mussen, 1955) and anxiety (Davids, 1955; Jones, 1953). Newcomb (1961) found that authoritarians to a greater extent than non-authoritarians are likely to over estimate their agreement with preferred associates as opposed to non-preferred peers. Katz et al. (1957) have explored the relationship between authoritarian defensiveness and attitude change which results from self-insight procedures. Lipset (1960) found that although lower-class persons were more authoritarian and intolerant on non-economic issues, they were actually more liberal on economic issues. Weitman (1962) has elaborated the critical views of a unidimensional authoritarian characteristic to study what he feels are three separate orientations toward authority. Brown (1965) has also provided an illuminating synopsis of the liberal authoritarian or authoritarianism of the extreme left. Of course, authoritarianism is only one of a large number of personality dimensions which has been correlated or found to be associated with other psychological factors or processes. Others which have been of special interest to Social Psychologists in this regard are Rokeach's (1960) open-closed minded dimension, self-esteem (Janis & Field, 1959; Janis & Rife, 1959), repression versus sensitization
(Byrne, 1965) and approval motivation (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). However, for many of these personality traits, the exact relationship to prevalent forms of social behaviour has yet to be examined either theoretically or empirically.

Authoritarianism has always been one of the basic problems of human society. According to Sanford & Capaldi (1967), "Authoritarianism: In connection with personality is a personal tendency to crave or demand obedience and subordination; or the complex of traits said to be associated with that tendency." It appears in its most spectacular form in political dictatorships, but it can be found in less dramatic and often more insidious forms in almost every type of interpersonal relationships and social organization. One of its aspects that has especially interested psychologists is the role of personality in authoritarian behaviour.

The term "authoritarian personality" as given by Adorno et al. (1950) is also a substitute for two earlier terms used by the authors i.e., "Fascist Personality" and "Anti-democratic Personality". They concluded that the "authoritarian syndrome" was composed of the following nine clusters of hypothetical variables, each one of which was supposedly expressive of the authoritarian trend.

A) **Conventionalism**: Rigid adherence to conventional middle class values.

B) **Authoritarian Submission**: Submissive, uncritical attitude towards idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.

C) **Authoritarian aggression**: Tendency to be on the look-out for and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.

D) **Anti-intraception**: Opposite to the subjective, the imaginative, the tenderminded.

E) **Superstition and stereotypy**: The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate, the disposition to think in rigid categories.
F) **Power and toughness**: pre-occupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimensions, identification with power figures, over emphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego, and exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.

G) **Destructiveness and cynicism**: generalized hostility and vilification of the human.

H) **Projectivity**: The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.

I) **Sex**: exaggerated concern with the sexual going on.

These variables were thought of as going together to form a single syndrome, a more or less enduring structure in the person that renders him receptive to anti-democratic propaganda. In other words, the authoritarians as identified through their high F-scores are conventional, anti-intraceptive, superstitions, and stereotypy in their thinking. They submit uncritically in face of authority and make their social adjustment by taking pleasure in obedience and subordination. They develop deep compulsive hostility and outward projection of unconscious emotional impulses. Obviously characterization is more on undesirable side. But by and large studies lend empirical support to the assertions made by Berkely researchers. Thus California F-scale as a widely used measure of authoritarianism has stimulated maximum research in the area of social attitudes in the last twenty eight years. In the present study the term authoritarianism will be used as indicated by the scores of Indian adaptation of California F-scale. Hence, we shall use the term authoritarianism for the purpose of present study as it was proposed by Adorno and his associates (1950) in their book "The Authoritarian Personality". Therefore, the term authoritarianism is used so far as the present study is concerned, in the sense as it was explained and defined by Adorno et al. (1950).

**RIGIDITY**

Studies on rigidity, authoritarianism, intolerance of ambiguity, dogmatism and conservatism have been the focus of
attention in contemporary psychological research. According to Wesley (1953):

"Rigidity is a tendency to persist in responses that may previously have been suitable in some situation or other but that no longer appear adequate to achieve current goals or to solve current problems."

Wesley selected ninety items from paper pencil test of personality which were thought to be indicative of rigidity. The original correlation between age and total score on the Wesley scale was 0.27 and between the Matrices and the Wesley scale - 0.29. It is unobvious that these correlations arise from responses to different items on the questionnaire. The results agreed fairly well with the conventional stereotype of rigid manner because they only see certain aspect of the situation, whereas elder persons are unwilling to change long established patterns of behaviour. People of all ages display an orderly detail loving nature. Factor scores of this scale reveal more information about each individual, than the total scores, though it is not unidimensional. For the first time, factor scores of the scale measures the extent to which different type of rigidity operate in an individual. It can not be expected that a given piece of behaviour will always be done from only one of these types of rigidity. It is expected that in a given person atleast these three factors will always be combined in causing rigid behaviour.

Schaie (1955) administered a battery of tests to a group of 216 subjects selected to represent a wide range of age, occupations and education. Factor analysis of that data resulted in the rejection of the hypothesis of a simple rigidity. Behavioural rigidity appeared to be most described by three factors interpreted as: "motor-cognitive - speed", "personality - perceptual - rigidity", and "motor - cognitive - rigidity". The discussion so far lead us to believe that the unitary concept of rigidity must be discarded and that there are different types of personality. In the present study the term "rigidity" is used as defined by Wesley (1950), i.e., "Rigidity is a tendency to persist in responses that may previously have been suitable in some situation or other but that no longer
appear adequate to achieve current goals or to solve current problems.

**TRIBAL AND NON-TRIBAL**

In the present study the term 'TRIBAL' is used for the member of any tribal group, whether scheduled or non-scheduled but comes into the category of tribe as defined by sociologists and anthropologists. Whereas 'NON-TRIBAL' is a member of any group other than tribal group.

The tribe has been defined in as many different ways as there have been writers on the subject. Elwin (1943), Majumdar (1958), Bailey (1960), Ghurye (1963) and Basham (1954) were critical of the term itself. According to Gillian & Gillian (1952), "Any collection of preliterate local groups which occupies a common general territory, speaks a common language and practices common culture as a tribe." In other words, "A tribe is a collection of families bearing a common name, speaking a common dialect, occupying or professing, to occupy a common territory and is not usually endogamous though originally it might have been so" (Imperial Gazetteer of India).

The term tribe has not been defined in constitution. According to article 342, the Scheduled Tribes are 'the tribes or tribal communities or parts of or groups within tribes or tribal communities' which may be notified so by the President. A tribal community possesses the following attributes:

1) It lives in an isolated area as a distinct group culturally and ethically.

2) It originates from one of the oldest ethnological sections of population.

3) Its members are not always within the Hindu fold in the usual sense. Even when they are treated as Hindus, they do not exactly fit in the Hindu caste hierarchy.

4) It is usually backward economically and educationally.
Here we are not interested in reviewing each of the definitions of tribe. Rather we take up their common attributes—of course, with variations depending on their specific studies—and see the level of the conceptual clarity. The defining attributes of the tribe in sum, are: (1) common name; (2) common territory; (3) common language; (4) common ownership or simple economic profession of subsistence level; (5) strong kinship bonds; (6) one political organization; (7) one social rank; (8) low level of technological development; (9) tribal endogamy and distinct taboos; (10) youth dormitories; (11) distinct customs, moral codes, religious beliefs and rituals; and (12) high illiteracy.

The scheduled tribes and other non-scheduled tribal groups of Uttar Pradesh living in scheduled areas in the Himalayan, sub-Himalayan and terai regions as well as in forests and isolated pockets in Bundelkhand, conform to this definition.

**YOUTH**

The term 'YOUTH' shall refer to the boys in the age range of 16-25 years. Therefore, by youth for the purpose of the present study, we shall mean males in the age range of 16-25 years.

**BASIC ASSUMPTIONS**:

Since personality characteristics including authoritarianism and rigidity are influenced by the cultural practices, hence, the tribal and non-tribal youth are likely to differ with each other in regard to their personality characteristics.