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INTRODUCTION:

Measurement is the sine qua non, for every science, be it natural or social. According to Edwards (1957) "In any scientific endeavour, if something is to be studied and investigated, instruments must be developed for observing and measuring the thing of interest". It is the measurement process which permits accurate, objective and communicable descriptions of the subject matter under investigation. According to Guilford (1954) objective measurement is one of the major goals of science.

The science of psychology is young in the sense that, as a systematic body of knowledge about the phenomenon of behaviour, it came to be studied very recently. Those who devoted their time and energies fully, helped to give it a self-contained shape. However, psychological thought as such, can be traced back to the remotest antiquities, scattered in the writings of several ancient thinkers. The references to personality and individual differences date back to Greek thinkers. Plato classified individuals into three categories (i) Intellectuals (ii) Soldiers and (iii) Labourers. Hippocrates and Galen differentiated four temperamental types, (i) Sanguine (ii) choleric (iii) Phlegmatic and (iv) Melancholic. Individual differences were perceived, perhaps as contribution of persons to their own good as well as good of that of the community.
The need for developing tools for measuring personality differences was soon felt. As a result of this, at the end of 19th century, psychological tests were constructed in U.K. and U.S.A. Since then, intensive researches in the field of testing have been carried out and now a large number of psychological tests, both of individual and group types for measuring intelligence, interest, aptitude, attitude, personality etc., are available. All these tools of measurement are being used with great success in predicting and controlling the behaviour of an individual.

There are different types of ability and interests. The abilities and interests play very important role in an individual's life and adjustment, perhaps even more important than this is the personality make-up. Interests can be dependent upon the underlying personality characteristics. Sometimes they are taken as direct manifestations of an individual's personality trait. Therefore, personality is more fundamental to the study and understanding of an individual.

The understanding or the insight gained into the internal structure of the individual can help parents in bringing-up children wisely; teachers, in making their classroom instructions more effective; counsellors, in planning of the educational and vocational careers of their counselling, and in helping them through their various problems; personal,
It is also used in social or emotional, in marriage counselling, and in the selection in schools, colleges or other fields. These are the important areas of application of personality measurement, but in fact, it is applied in much greater variety of situations. Like any other measurement, it is a problem of measurement of personality for the prediction and control of behaviour in future with a view to fostering individual happiness and his social adjustment and worth. If it is possible to discover the strong and weak points of an individual and if his energies and resources can be directed accordingly, perhaps the psychologists might be able to erase the word "Maladjustment" from the dictionary.

DEFINITION OF PERSONALITY:

G. W. Allport (1949) in his classic introduction to this field has enumerated and critically examined some fifty definitions of personality. But H. G. Eysenck (1957) opines that Allport has not done anything more than scratching the surface. It will not help very much to enter into this controversial theoretical issue. However, for the necessary understanding of the term "Personality", a little understanding is necessary.

The word "Personality" is derived from the Greek word "Persona" meaning theatrical mask worn by the Greek actors to characterise their roles on the stage. With the passage of time the term "Persona" came to mean the actor and eventually to individuals in general. In the language of Willian Shakespeare, "All the world's a stage, And all the men and women merely players."
According to Allport, in the writings of Cicero, the term personality is used in four major different senses:

1. Personality is regarded as an assemblage of personal qualities. In this sense, a personality is regarded as the way a person is really like. (2) Personality is regarded as the way person appears to others, not as he really is.

3. Personality is the role which a person plays in life, as a professional, or a social or a political being. (4) Finally "Personality refers to the individual's qualities of distinction and dignity. All these four meanings have their roots in the theatre. In the first interpretation personality pertains to the actor, in the second to the mask he wears, in the third to the role of character he plays and in the fourth to the star performer. In the present sense, a personality in society is a man of distinction or worth. None of these meanings except the fourth one, which has an evaluative connotation can have a place in a scientific setting. However, they are still being used in popular parlance. Guilford (1959) has classified the definitions of personality in five classes.

(1) Personality as Stimulus:

This class of definitions is a sociological interpretation of the term. May (1932) has interpreted personality as men's social stimulus value, "It is the responses made by others to the individual as a stimulus that define his personality".
Very few people studying personality scientifically accept this point of view. In this sense it has an evaluative connotation in its meaning which is identical with reputation. If it is carried to its logical extreme, it loses its sense completely, because, in that event an individual's personality is measured not by studying the individual himself but reactions, judgments and prejudices of others who can pass remarks on him. Perceptions vary according to the individuals, and therefore, an individual in question might be described as different by different judges. But none doubts today that every individual has in him a set of characteristics which truly belong to him, whether perceived by others or not.

(2) Omnibus Definitions:

Two typical examples of omnibus sort of definitions are:

(i) "The sum total of reactions of an individual to all the situations which he encounters is personality", (H. D. Lowrey, 1933)

(ii) "The sum total of all the biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies, appetites acquired by experiences", (M. Prince, 1924).

These and such other definitions are merely defining by enumeration. No attention is paid to the most outstanding characteristic of mental life, namely, the presence of arrangement and organization. According to Allport (1949) "The mere cataloguing of ingredients defines personality no better than the alphabet defines lyric poetry".
(3) **Integrative Definitions**

These definitions stress the organization within personality. Warner and Carmichael (1930) have defined personality as "the entire organization of a human being at any stage of his development". On the other hand McCurdy (1923) defines it as "an integration of patterns (interests) which gives a particular individual trend to the organization of organism".

The organizational aspect is given due importance in such definitions and reference is also made by some authors to its uniqueness. But some are still vague when they use such phrases as "entire organization of human being" or "integration of patterns" etc.

(4) **Holistic Definitions**

William James, McDougall, Bridges, Heider, Blondel, Martin and many others view personality as an integrated whole with more elaborate "Organizational Pattern", a sort of hierarchical one. There are levels or layers of dispositions or characteristics usually with a unifying or integrative principle at the top. If taken literally, such definitions create confusion due to lack of clarity in expression, but if it is taken simply as integrative force with greater stress on organizational pattern, they are useful. Eysenck (1957) has elaborated this concept and given it a very clear form. Explicit in Eysenck's writing is, the conception of personality, "as composed of acts and dispositions that are organized in a hierarchical fashion, in terms of their generality or importance".

Personality as Adjustment

When evolutionary interpretation is applied, personality becomes a way of adjustment, a mode of survival. Biologists and behaviourists are more inclined to attach this meaning to personality. Kempt (1949) while developing this concept observes: "Personality is the integration of these systems of habits that represent an individual's characteristic adjustment to his environment."

There are other definitions such as M. Schoes (1930) "Personality is the Organized System, the functioning whole or unity of habits, dispositions and sentiments that mark off any one member of a group as being different from any other member of the same group." According to R.M. Wheeler (1929) "It is that particular pattern or balance of organized reactions which sets one individual off from another".

Personality is a style of life. According to R.C. Woodworth and D.G. Marquins (1947) "Personality is the total quality of an individual's behaviour, as it is revealed in his habits of thought and expression, his attitudes and interests, his manner of acting, his personal philosophy of life". All these definitions emphasize the uniqueness of individual's adjustment patterns.

Allport (1949) has summarized all these definitions and put forth his own definition, encompassing essential characteristics of all of them. According to him, "Personality is the dynamic organization, within the individual, of those psycho-physical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment". So far, this definition
still remains the most comprehensive expression and clear picture of what is understood by the term personality.

As the objective of the present work is to adapt a personality test of clinical nature Allport's definition emphasising the uniqueness of individual's adjustments will serve our purpose best. Here the concern is mainly with the adjustment of the individual and its measurement for the prediction and control of an individual's behaviour.

MEASUREMENT OF PERSONALITY

Techniques of personality assessment:

Measurement of personality is not restricted to psychological or clinical laboratories alone. Value judgements of personality are frequently heard in every day life. Almost every one says something either about his own personality or about that of someone else. He arrives at such judgement by a variety of methods. He may observe the behaviour of the person he is describing; he may ask others to give opinion about him; or he may ask him some questions (interviews) on the basis of which he may arrive at some conclusions. Such procedures are not new and do not necessarily belong to the province of psychology alone. They have been used for ages and are still being used by all, irrespective of their training in psychology or psychological measurements. Psychology borrowed these commonsense techniques from common man and studied their merits and demerits; how far they served the purpose and how reliable are the judgements based on them and so on. In the process, these techniques have undergone a gradual refinement, leading to the new and/or better ones. Different techniques
were developed in different situations and to-day there exists a wide variety of them. The chief ones are classified in the following categories:

1. Interview
2. Case Study Method
3. Rating Scales
4. Projective Techniques
5. Situational Tests
6. Objective Tests
7. Personality Inventories

These are neither the only categories nor are they exclusive. Some overlapping is inevitable from one technique to another. Yet there are certain distinctive attributes which are characteristic of each one. In this section an attempt is made to introduce these characteristics briefly:

1. Interview:

Interview is a one-to-one relationship between two persons who get together for a variety of purposes. One such purpose is to know about the interviewee or the person interviewed. Interviews are conducted for selection in educational and vocational fields and for guidance and consulting purposes, where it is used to assess the personality characteristics of individual through the observation of his manner and speech, his expressions and ideas. Vernon (1953) is also of the opinion that interview technique is one of the most comprehensive methods of judging a subject's appearance, attitudes, tastes, speech, knowledge etc. Certificates and
testimonials are a further help in judging a person before he actually appears for the interview.

The interview may include the results of some projective material such as TAT, Free Associate Test of Sentence Completion. One of the strongest drawbacks and limitations of the interview technique is, though it uses multifarious data, there is no objective method for combining this data to give one comprehensive judgement and most of the judgements based upon the interview, are more or less of an intuitive nature. Hence, the conclusions of the judgements depend as much on the interviewer as on the data. Two interviewers, interviewing the same interviewee in each others presence, may have the same data yet so that the data is same for both, may arrive at opposite judgements.

In spite of its obvious drawbacks mentioned above, and those to be mentioned in connection with its reliability and validity (below), interview still remains to be the most frequently used technique because of its ease and appeal. The tests have not yet become popular and people are still suspicious of their value.

The Reliability and Validity of the interview Method:

Reliability:

On the whole, this technique is said to have poor reliability. There are various reasons for this. The prejudices of interviewers are one such reason. A notorious instance of this is quoted by Rice (1929). Two interviewers were investigating into the causes of destitution among people who had applied for relief. One of the two interviewers was
a social worker and the other was a prohibitionist. The socialist attributed 39 per cent cases of destitutions to industrial conditions and 12 per cent to alcoholism. The prohibitionist on the other hand attributed 62 per cent cases to alcoholism and only 7 per cent to the industrial conditions.

Vernon and Parry have reviewed several studies in this connection and also the work carried out in the British services during the war. In most of the cases the interjudge correlation was found to be between .50 to .60. Vernon has reported other studies which also point out to the very low reliability between judgements of different interviewers.

**Validity:**

The evidence for the validity of the interview procedure is scarcer than that for its reliability. After reviewing studies about the Armed Forces Vernon and Parry have arrived at the conclusion that the predictions based on the combination of tests and interviews were even worse than those based on the best tests alone. According to McClelland (1962) the primary teacher's judgements about personality qualities of their students have no predictive validity. Stuit (1949) reports that the interviewers did no better than the test of ability. Himmelyait and Summerfield (1951) conducted a research in selection practice in the London Pool of Economy. They found that the result of the interview of candidates by the Board of University Teachers showed zero correlations with their later success in the course. The short entrance test had a small positive validity coefficient and a battery of aptitude tests had larger validity Index for the prediction.
Kelly and Fiske (1951) investigated most thoroughly the predictive validity of interviews, ability and personality tests in case of selection of candidates for the clinical psychology course. Here again, the evidence was unfavourable to the interview method. However, Vernon's (1950) findings in connection with validity of the selection procedure of the civil service Selection Board, presents more favourable evidence of validity of interviews. The investigators have also pointed to the fact that there are large individual differences in the efficiency of the interviewers to make the judgement of potential success of the candidates. This method cannot have wide application because it is difficult to differentiate a good interview from a bad one and also very little is known about the training necessary for good interviewing.

2. Case Study Method:

This method is primarily used in clinical practice. Case Study Method has not been used widely in the assessment of personality even though it is the most comprehensive and thorough of all methods. It is used generally by the clinical psychologist and the psychoanalysts for dealing with cases of abnormal behaviour. When a child or a person encounters some problem which can be solved only by a trained psychologist, the latter is approached for help. He then attempts to understand the psychodynamics of the abnormal behaviour of his client by studying his case thoroughly.
Three kinds of data are included in a case study:

1. Information about developmental history.
2. Information about the present status of the individual.
3. His plans or ideas about the future and his orientation to it.

All this information is gathered from a variety of sources. The subject himself is observed and interviewed. His relatives, acquaintances are interviewed and school records are studied. Various tests including the personality test are administered and analyzed. Case study technique is not a unitary method of personality assessment, rather it employs all other methods, whenever suitable, to get a complete picture of the individual. It is thus an approach rather than an independent technique.

According to Allport (1949) "unskilfully used, it becomes a meaningless chronology of a confusion of facts and fiction, of guess-work and misinterpretation. Properly used it is the most revealing method of all". He further says that the content of any case study is determined by the essential purpose of the writer. The social worker's case is overbalanced by an unduly large data about family budget and health, a probation officer is interested chiefly in the facts pertaining to probationer's whereabouts and his misconduct; the employment manager seeks evidence of ability; clinical psychologist tries to find out more about illness than health; and writers of journalistic case studies for the Sunday papers of popular magazines produce all sorts of entertaining distortions. Taken in its proper form, as a medium of understanding, the case study is a
method that falls primarily within the psychology of personality. Though this method has its limitations, especially in the hands of the untrained workers, it has the potentiality to provide a complete and best possible picture of the individual's characteristics. They become more understandable in the context of the whole life history and the mental make-up of the individual. This presupposes adequate training in the compilation of the case study data and their interpretation. This fact restricts greatly the scope of its application.

3. Rating Scales:

This is the most extensively used method in the assessment of those aspects of the individual which are not amenable to the objective measurement. Standardized tests are fast replacing it in the field of assessment of scholastic and ability factors, but so far as the personality characteristics are concerned its use is still the most popular. The reasons of its extensive use lie mainly in its simplicity of procedure. Even a layman without any kind of training in psychology of measurement uses it in his everyday life. When someone asks your opinion about a third person, or some movie, he is relying on the rating technique. This case and simplicity of its use has made its users blind to the necessary precautions, for obtaining reliable results. This essentially simple technique is, in fact susceptible to a great many errors in the hands of laymen and there has been devastating criticism about its free and unrestricted use. In fact, it has become more notorious for its unrealistic results than for its actual contribution in the field of personality measurement.
Following points need be considered while assessing the reliability of observation and validity of description on which a rater bases his rating of the ratee:

(i) The rater must have the opportunity to observe the ratee over a long period of time and in a variety of situations in which trait or the characteristic on which he is rated is manifested.

(ii) The trait or characteristic in question should be defined and explained clearly in terms of specific behaviour descriptions so that different raters mean the same thing by that trait name.

(iii) The number of raters should be as large as possible. Just as reliability of test increases by the addition of items, the reliability of rating increases by addition of more judges. Of course, all judges must fulfil the above mentioned first condition of sufficient acquaintance with the ratee's behaviour.

(iv) The rating by different judges should be obtained independently of each other. They should not have an opportunity to discuss the rating among themselves, before rating him. In a school where pupils are to be rated by teachers, it is natural that they may discuss the cases and the dominant ones may carry the opinion through. This kind of situation should be particularly avoided.

(v) Stereotypes and popular trait names should be avoided in rating. Persons are often labelled by such popular trait names, and they are likely to be rated on that basis instead of on the basis of actual trait description.
(vi) The halo effect is a tendency of the raters to rate individual consistently high or low on several traits. To avoid this, rating on more than one trait should not be undertaken at a time. They may be asked to classify rates on a five point scale. Thus the area of attention is the trait and not the individual.

(vii) There is a tendency among judges to concentrate rates in some categories or in some part of rating scale, and not to utilise the whole range. This decreases the discriminating potentiality of the scale. In such cases, the judges may be asked to adhere to a distribution akin to normal one, while assigning the individuals to various categories.

Rating scales are of different types and each has its own merits and drawbacks. The important types, according to Guilford (1954) are numerical scales, graphic scales, standard scales, cumulated point scales and forced choice scales. All the types require the rater to assign the ratee one of the ordered categories or a position on an unbroken scale, but all of them are ultimately interpreted in terms of numerical series. The chief advantages of this technique are that they are less time-consuming, simple to use and are applicable to a wide variety of situations. The main point of criticism against ratings is their unreliability, which is due to the working of conceptions of trait names and rater's tendency to rate others in the light of their own prejudices and biases. The ways for overcoming these drawbacks are already discussed. However, in actual practice
very few are careful and systematic enough to avoid these common pitfalls.

4. Projective Techniques:

During the past decades these Techniques have shown a fungus-like growth. The underlying principle is that an individual (i) attributes his own thoughts, attitudes, wishes, emotions or characteristics to objects in his environment or to other persons and (ii) expresses his personality in whatever he does, specially his creative and imaginative activities such as his artistic or literary productions, plays or poems etc. This is based on Freud's concept of projection - a process that goes on within the individual unconsciously. In these tests the subject is presented with relatively unstructured situations to which he has to react freely in his own way. By an unstructured situation is meant a stimulus situation which is vague and does not call for a predetermined response from the subject. Thus, it allows for the individual differences, to the maximum extent and to permit an individual to express his personality fully in his own way while he is structuring the stimulus situation. His real unconscious feelings and thoughts are projected upon this structuring. He does this unconsciously attributing moods and complexes to the characters appearing in the stimulus situation. Thus the projective tests reveal something which is not accessible to the ordinary inventories or structured tests. By these tests, the picture that is obtained is terms of complete processes within the whole person with all the dynamic processes within and without. From the point of view of the Gestaltists this is a very important
merit of these tests, against those that measure personality bit by bit. The chief tests among those which are based on this principle are the Rorschach, the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), the Rosensweig Picture - Frustration Study, the Osgood Test and the various sentence completion and word association tests. Psychodrama and play also are called projective techniques. There are a number of other tests, that have been developed such as CAT for children, Symonds Picture Story Test for adolescents, The Blacky Pictures etc.

**Evaluation of Projective Techniques:**

Inspite of their wide use, the projective techniques are not without criticism. According to Eysenck (1957) projective techniques are a 'Nonsense' in psychology. The techniques as presented by Rorschach, Murray and others looked impressive because of the Freudian theory of projection on which they were based. Though the Freudian theory is very appealing to the popular tests and has an appearance of intuitive validity it later turned out that the interpretations of projective data are dependent upon the training and orientation of the interpreter. This brings the validity of the projective test into question. Another point of criticism levelled against is the claim of projective techniques that though they reveal much more information than is revealed by the test scores, often this extra information is in the form of intuitive judgement of the interpreter, the validity of which is questionable. They further claim that they assess the personality as a whole. The results of the projective test are always interpreted in terms of specific traits just as in case of other techniques. However, the users of other techniques begin with clear concepts of the traits to be measured which
have specific meaning and unambiguous communication value. The users of projective techniques are far less particular in defining the trait concepts used by them and rely on the popular meaning rather than a technical definition. A test is like an experiment, and uniform conditions should be obtained for all individuals in taking the test, as well as administering it. The projective tests being unstructured by nature they do not fulfill this condition satisfactorily and need radical improvement to remedy this drawback. Good-enough (1949) has pointed out the possibility of examiners' projecting their own personality into the interpretation of the subject's data.

Smith, Brunner and White (1956) intensively studied ten cases with the help of various techniques, only to arrive at the conclusion that "Projective techniques, underrate capacities, strengths and stability of the subjects. They fail to reveal creative ways in which the individuals learn to cope with their problems and they fail to show the ways in which attitudes affect the individuals conduct".

According to Guilford (1959) if it is not quite reasonable to predict vocational success on the basis of projective techniques they should at least show some such success in connection with clinical diagnosis. But here again, there is not enough success to justify the apparent faith in the methods. He further says that information provided by them is patchy and needs to be supplemented by other methods. As already indicated, they are not designed to measure specific traits, but they may give suggestions of general traits that may be profitably investigated further in the individual by better methods.
5. Situation Tests

These tests present the subject with a problematic situation to which he has to find an answer. The problem situation may be presented either verbally or in the form of an actual life-like situation. For example, in the tests of social intelligence, a situation is presented in a verbal form as under:

You are the supervisor of an office force of ten people. One member is habitually late. You would:

a) make an example of him by discharging him.
b) Bawl him out in front of the whole group.
c) Call him in and try to find out the reason for the tardiness.
d) Call a meeting of the office force to explain that it every one owes $2 to the company to be in time.
e) Call him privately for a lecture on the importance of being in time.

The subject has to choose one of the alternative courses of the action. For such test usually there is no one correct answer, and the answer the subject chooses reveals his own mind. These types of tests correlate highly with the tests of general intelligence and are criticised on the point that a subject may have the knowledge of appropriate course of action but when the actual situation arises he may not necessarily adopt the same course. According to Woodworth and Harquits (1947) knowledge of rules does not necessarily imply that they will be confirmed to. To overcome this criticism, tests that could sample actual behaviour are more useful than those which sample behaviour in verbally
described situations. The tests, which utilise actual life-like situation for measuring personality were first developed in U.S.A. during World War II for assessing the traits of men and women recruited for the OSS. These include a number of actual behavioural tests in a group situation such as terrain test, crossing a brook, construction, stress interview, improvisation etc. Later it became a common technique used in all the branches of military services and also for the selection of teacher trainees. It was adopted to later on in England as military as well as in civil services. Its use is extended at present to the industries and various other types of services.

In this techniques the setting for testing require elaborate arrangements and a team of trained psychologists, testers or observers. Secondly in the situational tests, the real purpose of the test is hidden and if the subject knows it, he can beat the examiners. Thirdly the evaluations from the situational test are based upon observation within limited period of testing. These ratings are open to the same criticism as was the usual rating procedures.

6. Objective Tests:

Objective tests can be characterised as relatively structured and disguised. These tests present the subject with an artificial task bearing little or no resemblance to the criterion to be predicted. The term objective test has not yet gained unequivocal meaning as a category of personality tests. Again, many of the so-called objective tests are really subjective tests and include the personality inventories, situational tests etc., which are relatively objective
approaches to personality assessment. But this term is being used nowadays in a more restricted sense to denote only those experimental procedures which stand the test of empirical validation. The application of experimental procedure in the field of personality assessment has been very limited. It might be due to the fact that this field is not amenable to treatment by experimental methods or may be that those who worked in this field lacked this bias in their work. Whatever be the reason, those working in this direction have produced some hope that this approach is likely to yield better results than by other methods, all of which are relatively subjective. However, so little work is done in this direction that its real worth still remains to be proved.

Those who have been working with such techniques are Eysenck, Benker, Harrington and Sears. These investigators tried to correlate the underlying psychological attributes of personality with more tangible and measurable characteristics, such as autonomic activity, dark vision, effects of aspiration, perseveration, suggestibility, resolution of conflict, physiological measures of respiration, basal metabolic rate, the effect of success or failure on activity and so on. The usual procedure has been to see if the objectively measurable characteristic is associated with that which is not directly or objectively measurable.

Many of these studies have been inconclusive. This approach has the chief merit, that it is subject to greater control; but at the same time, these techniques are very elaborate, cumbersome, expensive and time consuming. As against these,
the inventories, and rating scales, are easier and less expensive and can be administered to large populations. When there is a need to cater to the needs of large numbers, the latter procedures are more suitable.

7. Personality Inventories:

There is a tremendous amount of growth and use of the personality inventories. This is, despite the fact that they are vehemently criticised by extremists who would like to ban this instrument from the field of psychological testing. Most of the psychologists, however, occupy the intermediate position where they make use of inventories with the full awareness of their limitations. It is, therefore, necessary to see what are the major points of criticism against the use of personality inventories in general.

1. The behaviour of an individual is more changeable in the areas covered by the personality tests than those by ability and aptitude tests. In other words the personality variables are not as stable as the ability variables. But this fact does not disqualify personality inventories in particular. Rather, it is one of the unavoidable obstacles in the field of personality measurement. Whatever be the method used, it, particularly, poses a problem for determining the reliability of the personality tests as such. Then the behaviour itself is subject to change, the inconsistency of responses cannot be solely attributed either to the method of assessment or the behaviour itself. But the need for such assessment is so great that one has to tolerate this fact on the grounds...
that the deeper and more subtle patterns of behaviour are more enduring and once formed, do not change so easily. This makes it possible to measure and predict behaviour with sufficient accuracy.

(i) Sometimes one does not know whether the behaviour itself has undergone change, but the responses are changed. According to Guilford (1959) even though there are some changes, they often act in the opposite directions to neutralize each other and the total effect due to such change is negligible.

(ii) An individual does not behave consistently in all the situations. For example, one who is extrovert and sociable in a classroom may not behave in this manner at home. If the item in an inventory covers some narrow field of behaviour, then, of course, this point of criticism stands. But as a general rule in the item construction, the area of behaviour should be covered as widely and thoroughly as possible. If this is not done it is a drawback of that particular test and not of the personality inventories in general.

(iv) The meanings attached to the trait names by different persons are different in many cases and may widely differ from one attached by the authors originally. This happens almost invariably when the authors do not define clearly the different terms they use in their manuals. There is no standard terminology and different authors name the traits differently and some times in quite novel ways. The users on the other hand go merely by the commonsense usage of
the terms instead of going through the manual for more exact meaning. This can happen in any kind of personality tests and not merely in the self-report inventories.

The

Some critics say that examinee does not know himself well enough to make dependable self-report. Even though it may sound absurd to some, there is still some element of truth in it. So far as the questions asked are simple such as "Do you sleep well?" or "do you keep a diary?". Majority of the items should be of such kind. But sometimes subject comes across an item which does not merely ask to report a fact. It may require him to give his judgement or interpretation of a situation, which might well be beyond his ability. Firstly such cases are rare. Any one can reasonably be expected to think for himself, make judgements and interpret facts. Secondly during item analysis, the items which cannot be understood properly, which are ambiguous, and are beyond the grasp of the group on which test is being standardized or is standardized, are most likely to be eliminated. Even though some such items remain, Guilford (1949) says that whatever the subject reports is significant for him. The thing is, the response should be properly keyed. Even if the subject misrepresents the facts, it can be taken as significant factor indicating his behaviour mechanism.
Though these are various criticisms against the personality inventories, they do not warrant ban on their use. There are explanations and ways out. There are no other tools that can be so easily handled by moderately trained workers in the field of psychological testing. The need for the assessment of personality is so great that the few experts who can profitably use the projective or other methods cannot be solely depended upon. Moreover, the value of other methods is also greatly debated and questioned. In Munnally’s words, "the great need to measure personality characteristics and the paucity of adequate measures should make us cautious about disparaging and well-intentioned efforts."

Some of the well-known personality inventories are Bernreuter Inventory, Mondsly Personality Inventory, Bells Adjustment Inventory, Woodworth Personal Data Sheet, Cattell’s 16 P.F. test and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Out of these M.M.P.I. and Cattell’s 16 P.F. is widely used for their great applicability.

SURVEY OF PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCHES ON CLINICAL PERSONALITY MEASUREMENT IN INDIA

Psychological testing is relatively a new branch of psychology and testing of personality is a special branch thought to be part and parcel of clinical research only. In India, Mental disorders up till now were associated with supernatural powers. As a result of this, clinical testing of personality has not been widely practised and adequately researched on in India. Further, psychological testing has faced indifference as well as antagonism from
Experimentalists. This has been the tendency in western countries too where experimental psychology originated some 30 years prior to the beginning of scientific work on psychological testing.

Experimentalists by and large have adopted a passive and negative attitudes towards applied psychology. Whatever small amount of contribution is made in our country to psychological testing is of very recent origin. First work in the field of testing was started by Dr. Rice on "A Hindustani Binet performance scale" in year 1922. However, since then research in testing has advanced considerably.

A survey of psychological research in India by Joshi (1965) reveals that experimental psychology has been the most popular field of psychology during last fifty years. He has analysed 1365 research papers of which 365 were in the field of experimental psychology covering about 27 per cent of the total work. The field of testing covered by only 5.4 per cent of the work. He concludes the field of testing is not a very popular area with researchers in India.

In 1963 hand-book of "Educational Investigations in Indian Universities" covering the period from year 1939 to 1961 has been published by N C E R T. In this book though 2940 references have been listed in various fields like achievements, interest, learning, language development, motivation, personality etc., there is not a single reference to multidimensional personality tests.

The contribution of Indian psychologists during the period 1950-1960 has been critically reviewed by Krishnan (1961),
He has examined some 342 references, but is silent on the multidimensional personality inventories.

In Gujarat practically identical situation is prevailing. Psychological testing is more or less reduced to theoretical level only. Very few institutions like the B.M. Institute of Psychology are using tests to evaluate the personality of clinical patients. Some government and Municipal Hospitals have full time psychologist on their staff.

The author was prompted by the research in the field of M.M.P.I. conducted by Dr. Beer Singh (1969) for the Hindi speaking population. But since the test was adapted in Hindi language it was not suitable to the Gujarati speaking population. Hence the present work.

The present author has selected the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory on the basis of its utility in the U.S.A. It has been found to be the best clinical instrument which measures so many clinical dimensions simultaneously. Among the personality inventories available in the U.S.A. M.M.P.I. and Cattell's 16 P.F. tests are the most widely used by psychologists. However, since culture plays a very important part in development of personality, tests of personality can not be used cross culturally since they are heavily loaded with the particular culture they are developed and standardized. It is noteworthy that M.M.P.I. is adapted by majority of countries throughout the world. In India there is one solitary attempt at adaptation in Hindi. This work tries to adapt in Gujarati.
The sporadic character of clinical work in India leaves us with no other choice but to depend upon the experience and work of the western psychologists. Most of the private clinics are using chemotherapy and shock therapy. Very few employ tests to understand the structure of the personality of the patient before selecting the therapy. Hence, we have to depend upon and use the pioneer work of the western psychologists and psychitrists.

Translation, development of norms (Standardisation), of a personality inventory which has already established its utility in a different culture was preferred to the other techniques on the grounds of economy, large scale applicability, saving of time and better reliability and validity. Simple paper-pencil tests, which do not involve such complications in the process of administration and interpretation have to be preferred. In such work, restrictions have to be imposed in terms of population, purpose and even aspects to be explored. The present author decided to restrict the applicability of inventory to the college going population.

Statement of problem:
The purpose of present work is "To standardize and adapt some clinical scales of M.M.P.I on Gujarati Speaking Population".

Standardization of entire M.M.P.I. test with nine clinical and four validity scales would be a marathon job for a single researcher. It will need atleast five to seven years of intensive work by a team of researchers. Hence, present author has taken only three clinical scales and
two validity scales. These clinical scales are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Depressin Scale</th>
<th>(D-Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mysteria Scale</td>
<td>(Hy-Scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Schizophrenia Scale</td>
<td>(Sc-Scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lie Score</td>
<td>(L-Score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Validity Score</td>
<td>(V-Score)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>