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In the present attempt, the author has developed the neurotic scale in Gujarati. The scale consists of ten sub-scales of ten items each. Thus, the scale consists of one hundred items.

The items were drawn from various sources such as experts, clinical psychologists, psychiatrists, existing foreign and Indian tests. Thus items collected formed a total item pool of 350 items. They were classified into 13 different areas as per experts' opinion. The items were edited to find out duplication and to determine their relevance to the purpose.

Only 251 items were retained for the final item analysis. These were divided into 13 different areas. Sensitive format of the scale was developed with necessary instructions together with illustration for recording response. It was given to a sample selected from higher secondary schools and arts, science and commerce college.

For scoring the scale, key for neuroticism was developed on the expert's opinion. The items were selected on the basis of discrimination index, percentage
of subjects responding and internal consistency. As a result of the item selection procedure, only one hundred and thirty-six items were retained. Ten areas were formed out of the total thirteen areas. Ten items in each area were classified. The remaining 35 items and other items from the original scale were drawn to form another parallel form.

The various procedures appropriate for this scale for determining reliability were employed such as split half, test re-test, analysis of variance and equivalent forms.

For calculating the reliability of the total scale and subscales, the scale was split into two parts. The two divisions of the scale were obtained by odd and even items. The obtained coefficient of correlations were satisfactory. The other procedures such as 1st and last quarters and 2nd and third quarters and 1st half and the second half for splitting the scale were employed for the total scale, and then reliability coefficients were obtained. Further, Spearman and Brown prophecy formula, Nuder and
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Reid's formula, Llanacon, Miser and Hoyts formula were employed. The various coefficient of correlation were fairly satisfactory.

The test-retest procedure for different time intervals was employed for the total scale and sub-scales. Analysis of variance technique was also used to determine it. Lastly procedures of equivalent form were also used. The coefficient of correlation obtained for the total scale and sub-scale were statistically found significant.

The validity of the present scale was also found, using various methods, for establishing construct validity. It was correlated with other existing tests. Concurrent validity was calculated using contrasted groups- such as prisoners and normals, neurotics and normals, the group awaiting final disposal and normals. Further, it was also correlated with other existing scales such as Eysencks n-scale and extraversion scale, and Mental Health Analysis. The coefficients validity were found to be satisfactory.
For establishing the norms a sample of 1500 male and female was drawn from higher secondary schools, Arts, Science, Commerce, Law Engineering, Education Colleges as well as P.G. Centers in the city of Ahmedabad. For specifying separate norms, the standardization sample was divided into males and females and into adolescents, Post-adolescents and adults. The difference between the averages of several groups were found significant. So the author has given separate norms for entire sample of males and females groups, adolescents, post-adolescents and adult groups in stenine and percentile rank. The table for converting raw scores into normalized T scores was given for each sub-groups. The scale could be total scale and sub-scales for neuroticism.

Limitations of the Scale:

1. This scale being self report, it carries the danger of getting false responses. To overcome the limitation, it is necessary that the test administrator attempts to establish adequate rapport with the individual taking it.
At the time of interpreting the score(s) of individuals, it must be interpreted only with reference to the nature of standardization sample.

The crucial decision may not be taken on the basis of scores obtained on this scale. Before that other evidence may be obtained from other sources.

Attempts have been made to draw the representative sample for norms. The author never claims to have selected strictly random sample. Necessary caution may be taken in this regard at the time of using the results.

Suggestions:

1. An attempt may be made to develop various profiles of different professional groups, successful as well as unsuccessful.

2. Further, a systematic factorial study may be conducted on this scale.

3. The cross-validations studies may be carried out to further the validity of this scale.

4. Lastly, the internal structure of this scale could be assessed on a new carefully selected sample.