CHAPTER-IV
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The present study was carried out to explore the impact of socio-economic status on positive psychological states, such as happiness, hope, and resilience of undergraduates. For this purpose the following methodological steps were used in the present study:

- Design
- Selection and description of sample
- Description about Tools
- Analysis

Design:

A multi group design was used in the present study to find out the impact of socio-economic status (IV) on positive psychological states, such as happiness, hope, and resilience (DVS) of undergraduates.

Sample:

In the present study a sample of 250 youth of both sexes, belonging to different socio-economic status was selected from different colleges of both urban and rural areas of Faridabad, Delhi and Ghaziabad (U.P). The sample was selected on the basis of purposive sampling technique within age range of 18-23 yrs.

Tools:

In the present study the following tools were used:

1. **Socio-economic status scale** (SESS, Dr. Rajbir Singh, Dr. Radhey Shyam and Satish Kumar, 2006) was used. Present SES scale is developed in Hindi and English for both the rural and urban people of having allegiance to both areas. In the present study, Hindi version is used. There are 25 items. One item each for caste and occupation. Two items
for family (type and size), one item for education qualification of self and members. Four items related to monetary matters (i.e. income, saving, income tax and deposits). One item was kept for entertainment expenses per month while four items relate to housing(type and size). Item No. 15 (real estate) has been divided into three parts (A) Agricultural land holding, (B) residential plots and their sizes, (C) shops and their locations. In order to cover life areas nine items relating to social, religious, political and academic participation have been included. Item No. 25 relates to households possessions (material and livestock). Thus the items in the scale are related to caste/ class, occupation, family, education, income, housing, relation network and livestock possessions. Score on items No. 5, 7, 14, 15, and 25 are additive whereas on rest of the items only single score is given. In brackets () the scores are given. Scoring is as for item 1, i.e. general category (score = 3), OBC (2), SCs/ STs (1). For item 2, i.e. Doctor to Labour (5 to 1), For item 3, joint family (2), nuclear family (1). For item 4, more than 10 (4). Item 5, Phd to illiterate (7 to 0). For item 6, more than 50,000 to less than 5,000 (6 to 1). For item 7, Yes (1), No (0). Item 8, More than 50000 to nil (10 to 0). Item No. 9, More than 1000000 to Nil (9 to 0). For item 10, Rs 5000 and above to Nil (7 to 0). Item No. 11, own house to rented house (3 to 1). Item No. 12, big house to very small house (4 to 1). Item No. 13, Metropolitan cities to village (4 to 1). Item No. 14, for Yes (1), No (0). Item No. 15 (a) More than 10 to 0 (3 to 0), (b) More than 5 to 0 (3 to 0), (c) yes (1), No (0). For item No. 16, Yes (2), No (0) for item no. 17, Yes (3), No (0). For item no 18 to 24, 1 for yes and 0 for no. Item no. 25(A) item 1 to 4 (2 X no. of items), item no. 5 (3), item no. 6 to 13 (score 1 x no. of items), 25 (B), item 1-4 (scores 3 X no. of items.), item no. 5-10 and 20 (scores 2 X no. of items), item no. 11-19 and 21-22 (score 1 X no. of items), 25 (C), Diamond (4 X no. of items), Gold (3 X n. of items), Silver (2 X no. of items). Any Other (1 X no.; of items). 25 (D), Buffalo (3 X no. of Buffaloes), Cows, Bullocks, Camel (2 x no. of Cows, Bullocks, Camel). Any Other (1 X no. of animals), Goat (Half X no. of goats), 25(E) For household(1), For commercial, Small Scale (2), Large Scale (3), 25 (F), Small Scale (1), Large Scale (2). The scores of A, B, C, D, E are to be added to get a final
score on item no. 25. However, the total scores are also additive for all items. The reliability coefficient is 0.653 and after a gap of 30 days it is 0.944. The validity is 0.689.

2. **Chinese, Happiness Inventory**: In order to assess the happiness of the participants, Chinese, Happiness Inventory (Lu & Shih, 1997) was used. It consists of 48 items, tapping general subjective experience of happiness for Indian people. It covered three basic elements of happiness concept namely positive affects, absence of the negative affects and overall satisfaction towards life. Moreover it also covers the distinctive sources of happiness of the Indian people. The items have to be responded in 4 points scale ranges from 0-3. The scoring is direct, ranges from 0-3 for each item. The sum of scores of all items gives the overall scores of happiness (0-144). The Cronbach alpha of this inventory is 0.95, the one month test-retest reliability is .66 and validity is evidenced by its correlation of 0.62 with the life satisfaction scale of Diener, Emmons, Larson and Griffin.

3. **Adult hope scale** (Snyder and Harris, 1991) The adult hope scale (AHS) measures Snyder's cognitive model of hope which defines hope as "a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (a) agency (goal-directed energy), and (b) pathways (planning to meet goals)". The adult hope scale contains 12 items. Four items measure pathways thinking, four items measure agency thinking, and four items are fillers. Participants respond to each item using a 8-point scale ranging from definitely false to definitely true and the scale takes only a few minutes to complete. Scoring as Pathways subscale score: Add items 1, 4, 6, and 8. Scores on this subscale can range from 4 to 32, with higher scores indicating higher levels of pathways thinking. Agency subscale score: Add items 2, 9, 10, and 12. Scores on this subscale can range from 4 to 32, with higher scores indicating higher levels of agency thinking. Total hope score: Add the pathways and Agency subscales together. Scores can range from 8 to 64, with higher scores representing higher hope levels. The reliability coefficient (test retest) is .80.
4. The Resilience Scale (Dr. Gail Wagnild and Young, 1993) It is used by counselors, coaches, therapists, researchers, and educators all over the world. It consists of 25 items and is used. This Scale is built on five characteristics. This Resilience Scale is the first tool developed to measure resilience directly, and is used all over the world. Increasingly, organizations are using the Resilience Scale with employee assistance and wellness programs (EAPs). It is a 7-point scale having range, 25-175. As per norms, the total score above 146 indicates stronger high resilience while the range between 25-100 is considered to be very low resilience status. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from .72 to .94 supporting the internal consistency reliability of this scale. Hypothesized relationships between the Resilience Scale and study variables (e.g., forgiveness, stress, anxiety, health-promoting activities) were supported strengthening the evidence for construct validity of this scale. In the studies, the Resilience Scale has been used with a variety of individuals of different ages, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds. The score one is given for circle no. 1 (left) and score 7 is given to circle no. 7 (right) i.e. scoring from left to right in increasing order, from 1-7.

Procedure:

Before giving the various tools to the respondents, the researcher explained the purpose of testing that this information will only be used for research and academic purpose and shall not be used for any other purpose without their consent. Establishment of rapport and suitable general testing condition were prerequisite before starting the testing. The sample was divided into three groups on the basis of SES as measured by socio-economic status scale. After measuring their SES, the happiness, hope, and resilience scale were given to the youth with adequate time gap. However, there is no time limit for completion of test (scale), after finishing the test (scale) performas were taken back and scoring was done as per norms. After collecting the data the scores were subjected to statistical analysis.

Analysis: The analysis of data had been done with the application of one-way ANOVA, t-test and Pearson’s - r and Exploratory data analysis (EDA) techniques by using SPSS 16.0.