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:: METHODOLOGY ::

3.1 INTRODUCTION :

From Natural science to Social and science research is a guide to give guidance to all the researchers in their field for going top on the field and helpful for development in their field. Research means ‘To search again’ for the help of research anyone can get right way or solution to understand their problems.

The nature of social research is scientific. When any researcher is finding anything for their research problem, he uses scientific aspect for it. He always believes to keep scientific aspect, objectivity, honesty, perfectness, pureness and freedom. There are some ethics for the scientific research and which is under:

(1) To compare of variables in relation to research problem.
(2) To know the relation of the variables in relation to research problem.
(3) To find out the effect of variables in relation to research problem.
(4) To keep control on some variables and check the effect of that kind of variables in relation to research problem.

Problem is not born from nothing but it is born form the curiosity of the person. The main objective of pure research is hypotheses, sampling, variables, data collection, reliability and validity of tools, data analysis and statistical analysis etc. to planning of research in advance. For this type of planning is helpful to researcher for getting their goals.

3.2 TITLE :

A comparative study of Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students’ different faculties
3.3 **OBJECTIVES**:

1. To study the difference related to the Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students in relation to their Faculty.
2. To study the difference related to the Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students in relation to their Area.
3. To study the difference related to the Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students in relation to their Gender.
4. To study the difference related to the Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.
5. To study the difference related to the Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.
6. To study the difference related to the Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students in relation to their Area and Gender.
7. To study the difference related to the Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

3.4 **HYPOTHESES**:

1. There is no significant mean difference between the Physical dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty.
2. There is no significant mean difference between the Physical dimensions among students in relation to their Area.
3. There is no significant mean difference between the Physical dimensions among students in relation to their Gender.
(4) There is no significant mean difference between the Physical dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(5) There is no significant mean difference between the Physical dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(6) There is no significant mean difference between the Physical dimensions among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(7) There is no significant mean difference between the Physical dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(8) There is no significant mean difference between the Social dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty.

(9) There is no significant mean difference between the Social dimensions among students in relation to their Area.

(10) There is no significant mean difference between the Social dimensions among students in relation to their Gender.

(11) There is no significant mean difference between the Social dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(12) There is no significant mean difference between the Social dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(13) There is no significant mean difference between the Social dimensions among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(14) There is no significant mean difference between the Social dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.
(15) There is no significant mean difference between the Intellectual dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty.

(16) There is no significant mean difference between the Intellectual dimensions among students in relation to their Area.

(17) There is no significant mean difference between the Intellectual dimensions among students in relation to their Gender.

(18) There is no significant mean difference between the Intellectual dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(19) There is no significant mean difference between the Intellectual dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(20) There is no significant mean difference between the Intellectual dimensions among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(21) There is no significant mean difference between the Intellectual dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(22) There is no significant mean difference between the Moral dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty.

(23) There is no significant mean difference between the Moral dimensions among students in relation to their Area.

(24) There is no significant mean difference between the Moral dimensions among students in relation to their Gender.

(25) There is no significant mean difference between the Moral dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.
(26) There is no significant mean difference between the Moral dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(27) There is no significant mean difference between the Moral dimensions among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(28) There is no significant mean difference between the Moral dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(29) There is no significant mean difference between the Educational dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty.

(30) There is no significant mean difference between the Educational dimensions among students in relation to their Area.

(31) There is no significant mean difference between the Educational dimensions among students in relation to their Gender.

(32) There is no significant mean difference between the Educational dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(33) There is no significant mean difference between the Educational dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(34) There is no significant mean difference between the Educational dimensions among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(35) There is no significant mean difference between the Educational dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.
(36) There is no significant mean difference between the Temperamental dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty.

(37) There is no significant mean difference between the Temperamental dimensions among students in relation to their Area.

(38) There is no significant mean difference between the Temperamental dimensions among students in relation to their Gender.

(39) There is no significant mean difference between the Temperamental dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(40) There is no significant mean difference between the Temperamental dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(41) There is no significant mean difference between the Temperamental dimensions among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(42) There is no significant mean difference between the Temperamental dimensions among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(43) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Family among students in relation to their Faculty.

(44) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Family among students in relation to their Area.

(45) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Family among students in relation to their Gender.
(46) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Family among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(47) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Family among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(48) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Family among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(49) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Family among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(50) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Health among students in relation to their Faculty.

(51) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Health among students in relation to their Area.

(52) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Health among students in relation to their Gender.

(53) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Health among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(54) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Health among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.
(55) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Health among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(56) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Health among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(57) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Social among students in relation to their Faculty.

(58) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Social among students in relation to their Area.

(59) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Social among students in relation to their Gender.

(60) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Social among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(61) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Social among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(62) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Social among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(63) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Social among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(64) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Emotional among students in relation to their Faculty.
(65) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Emotional among students in relation to their Area.

(66) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Emotional among students in relation to their Gender.

(67) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Emotional among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(68) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Emotional among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(69) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Emotional among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(70) There is no significant mean difference between the Adjustment of Emotional among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(71) There is no significant mean difference between the Perceptions of reality among students in relation to their Faculty.

(72) There is no significant mean difference between the Perceptions of reality among students in relation to their Area.

(73) There is no significant mean difference between the Perceptions of reality among students in relation to their Gender.

(74) There is no significant mean difference between the Perceptions of reality among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.
(75) There is no significant mean difference between the Perceptions of reality among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(76) There is no significant mean difference between the Perceptions of reality among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(77) There is no significant mean difference between the Perceptions of reality among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(78) There is no significant mean difference between the Integrated Personality among students in relation to their Faculty.

(79) There is no significant mean difference between the Integrated Personality among students in relation to their Area.

(80) There is no significant mean difference between the Integrated Personality among students in relation to their Gender.

(81) There is no significant mean difference between the Integrated Personality among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(82) There is no significant mean difference between the Integrated Personality among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(83) There is no significant mean difference between the Integrated Personality among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(84) There is no significant mean difference between the Integrated Personality among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.
There is no significant mean difference between the Self-assessment of respondent among students in relation to their Faculty.

There is no significant mean difference between the Self-assessment of respondent among students in relation to their Area.

There is no significant mean difference between the Self-assessment of respondent among students in relation to their Gender.

There is no significant mean difference between the Self-assessment of respondent among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

There is no significant mean difference between the Self-assessment of respondent among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

There is no significant mean difference between the Self-assessment of respondent among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

There is no significant mean difference between the Self-assessment of respondent among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

There is no significant mean difference between the group oriented tendencies among students in relation to their Faculty.

There is no significant mean difference between the group oriented tendencies among students in relation to their Area.

There is no significant mean difference between the group oriented tendencies among students in relation to their Gender.
(95) There is no significant mean difference between the group oriented tendencies among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(96) There is no significant mean difference between the group oriented tendencies among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(97) There is no significant mean difference between the group oriented tendencies among students in relation to their Area and Gender.

(98) There is no significant mean difference between the group oriented tendencies among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

(99) There is no significant mean difference between the controls over environment among students in relation to their Faculty.

(100) There is no significant mean difference between the controls over environment among students in relation to their Area.

(101) There is no significant mean difference between the controls over environment among students in relation to their Gender.

(102) There is no significant mean difference between the controls over environment among students in relation to their Faculty and Area.

(103) There is no significant mean difference between the controls over environment among students in relation to their Faculty and Gender.

(104) There is no significant mean difference between the controls over environment among students in relation to their Area and Gender.
There is no significant mean difference between the controls over environment among students in relation to their Faculty, Area and Gender.

3.5 VARIABLES:

In the present study two level of Faculty (Arts and Science), two level of Area (Urban area & Rural area) and two level of Gender (Boys and Girls) will be taken as an independent variables. The score of Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health will be taken as dependent variables.

In this study the independent & dependent variables has been show in the below table:

**Table-3.5.1 : Detail of Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of Variables</th>
<th>Types of Variables</th>
<th>Grade of Variables</th>
<th>Name of the level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. Urban Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rural Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1. Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Temperamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1. Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1. Perception of the reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Integrated Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Self-assessment of respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Group oriented tendencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Control over environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.1 **INDEPENDENT VARIABLES**:

1. Faculty: (Arts and Science)
2. Area: (Urban Areas and Rural Area)
3. Gender: (Boys and Girls)

3.5.2 **DEPENDENT VARIABLES**:
The score of Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health.

3.5.3 **CONTROLLED VARIABLES**:
1. In the present study selection of samples is only from Ahmedabad District and which were Arts and Science College going students of Ahmedabad District.
2. In this study only College going Students of under Graduate level were taken.
3. Limited samples were taken for this study.

3.6 **SAMPLE**:

3.6.1 **POPULATION**:
In the present study to measure Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students who was studying in Arts and Science Colleges in rural and urban area of Ahmedabad district was randomly selected for the sample.

5.6.2 **SELECTION OF SAMPLE**:
In the present study sample will be selected randomly. We take 120 Boys Students who studying in Arts and Science Colleges in rural and urban area of Ahmedabad district and 120 Girls Students who studying in Arts and Science Colleges in rural and urban area of Ahmedabad district, so total 240 samples will be selected for this study.

Approximately 240 samples will be selected in each category for the research study. After disposing off incomplete and unclear details, a total of 240 samples will be selected as per primary planning.
3.6.3 **EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**:

In the present study we will take total 240 Arts and Science College students of rural and urban area of Ahmedabad district. For breakup of the sample of present study, we can use 2x2x2 experimental design and which is under:

**Table-3.6.3.1 : Experimental Design (2x2x2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th></th>
<th>Science</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Faculty : Arts \(A_1\) and Science \(A_2\)

B = Area : Urban Area \(B_1\) and Rural Area \(B_2\)

C = Gender : Boys \(C_1\) and Girls \(C_2\)

3.7 **TOOLS**:

The main objective of the present study is a study of Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students’ different faculties. In the present study we can use three questionnaires, (1) Self-concept Questionnaire, (2) Bell Adjustment Inventory and Mental Health Inventory.

3.7.1 **DATA SHEET**:

In the data sheet of the present study we can include normally Name, Sex, Qualification, Age, Religion, Area of residency, Type of Family, Socio-Economic Status, Faculty, Category etc. items included in data sheet to measure Self-concept, Adjustment and Mental Health among students.

3.7.2 **SELF-CONCEPT QUESTIONNAIRE**:

For the measurement of self-concept “Self-concept Questionnaire developed by Dr. R.K. Sarashwat (1997), was administered.
Details of measurements: In this inventory following dimensions are measured (i) Physical (ii) Social (iii) Intellectual (iv) Moral (v) Educational (vi) Temperamental.

**Administration of test and its Norms**: This test can be given individually or in a group to the adolescent children aging 12 to 18 years.

**Reliability**: The reliability was found by test retest Method and it was found to be for the total self-concept measure. Reliability Coefficients of its various dimensions ranges from .67 to .91 the following table shows the test retest reliability for each dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code No.</th>
<th>Self-Concept Dimension</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Reliability Co-efficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Temperamental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Self-Concept</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Validity**: Experts opinion were obtained to establish the validity of the inventory, 100 items were given to 25 Psychologists to classify the items to the category to which it belongs. Items of highest agreement and not less than 80% of agreement were selected. Thus the content and construct validity were established.

**Instructions to be given at the time of administering test**: Every child should read the statement carefully and give one of the responses from the following five alternatives: Always, mostly, sometimes, not mostly, Never Thus for every statement the child has to give different response. No statement should be left. The subject has to show ‘3’ sign
against the alternative which is proper for him. The response should be given after selecting one alternative.

- **Scoring:** There are forty-eight statements in this inventory, five alternatives are given against each item. It contains the most acceptable alternatives and the most inacceptable alternatives of self-concept. The items may be positive or negative but the scoring for all items remains the same. The alternatives are arranged in this way 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 if the subject selects the first alternative of any item, this score for the test would be five and for the second alternative, it would be four. In this way scoring would be done according to the choice of alternatives. The sum total of all 48 Statements would be counted as the total score of self-concept of the child. The high score indicates high self-concept and the low score indicates low self-concept. The score range of self-concept questionnaire is from 48-240.

3.7.3 **BELL ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY:**

In order to measure the Adjustment of Among students, we will use "Bell Adjustment Inventory" by Dr. D.J. Bhatt, Reader, Department of Psychology, Saurastra University was used. The details of Bell Adjustment Inventory is under:

- **Details of measurements:** Bell Adjustment Inventory is used to study the children of orphanage, split family and joint family. this inventory evaluates four areas of Adjustment like (1) Family, (2) Health, (3) Social and (4) Emotional and also measures other adjustment in totality.

- **Description of Test:** There are four areas in this inventory. They measures family adjustment, Health adjustment, Social adjustment and Emotional adjustment. There are 35 questions
in each section; two options are given against each question. They are ‘Yes’ and ‘No’. A respondent is required to answer in ‘Yes’ or ‘No’.

- **Reliability and Validity**: The reliability of this inventory is derived after combining spilt-half method, test-retest method and Spearman-Brown’s formula. By using spilt-half method, they found reliability of family adjustment 0.84, health adjustment 0.81, social adjustment 0.87 and emotional adjustment 0.89, which are very high. By using test-retest method validity of family adjustment was 0.91, health adjustment was 0.90, social adjustment was 0.89 and emotional adjustment was 0.92 which is very high. The validity of existing test was found with K. Kumar’s Adjustment inventory in which high rate of validity was found. Validity of family adjustment 0.72, health adjustment 0.79, social adjustment 0.82 and emotional adjustment was 0.81.

- **Method to provide scores**: This inventory method is that of prohibited adjustment inventory. When the person says ‘Yes’ it shows the problem of adjustment and when the person says ‘No’ it indicates the absence of the problem. One mark is given to the respondent who gives the answer ‘Yes’ and no marks are given to the person who says ‘No’. High scores represent maladjustment.

3.7.4 **MENTAL HEALTH INVENTORY**:

In order to measure the mental health of among students, we will use "Mental Health Inventory” by Dr. D.J. Bhatt and Gita Gida was used. We find reliability at 0.94 grades and Validity at 0.71 of
presently discussed test. The detail of Mental Health Inventory is under:

- **Components of Mental Health**: There are five components of this Inventory like (1) Perception of the reality, (2) Integrated Personality, (3) Self-assessment of respondents, (4) Group oriented tendencies and (5) Control over environment.

- **Method of calculation**: There are forty items in currently discussed inventory and each item has eight secondary items. The only thing one has to check is whether respondent agrees to it or not. Whose ever agrees with the items it gets one mark and whose ever disagrees with it gets one marks. This is how we derive two scores.

**Statements**:

- **1, 3, 7, 9, 14, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 33, 35, 37, 38.**

  If a person took mark in disagree box against above numbers then assign one (1) mark and assign Zero (0) mark, if he or she has tick mark in agree box against above numbers.

- **2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 39, 40.**

  If a person took mark in disagree box against above numbers then assign one (1) mark and assign Zero (0) mark, if he or she has tick mark in agree box against above numbers.

Thus, on the basis of scores of obtained from respondents, interpretation is made as per following thongs.

**Two Types of scores**: (1) Total scores and (2) Separate score for each components.

After calculating score of each question, every components is given separate score and that is how the total
score has been arrived at maximum score in 40 and minimum score is 0 (Zero).

- **Reliability**: We get reliability of Mental Health Inventory by following three ways which is (1) Split-half of Spearman Brown, (2) Test-retest method and (3) Intelligent quotient method. The value and reliability of ‘r’ has been presented in following table simultaneously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reliability of the method</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>‘r’ value</th>
<th>Score of reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Split-half of Spearman Brown</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Test-retest method</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intelligent quotient method</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.01 grade accomplishment of value of ‘r’

The duration between half retest was of one month. This table shows that internal reliability is externally satisfactory. In addition to this, for every component, total reliability, reliability of retest has been calculated separately and that has been established by test-retest method. After two tests, there was a gap of one month.

**Table-3.7.4.2 – Test and retest table presenting components of Mental Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>‘r’ value</th>
<th>Score of reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perception of the reality</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integrated Personality</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-assessment of respondent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Group oriented tendencies</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Control over environment</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.01 grade accomplishment of value of ‘r’

- **Validity of Mental Health Inventory**: There are six methods for test of Mental health validity. (1) Validity of face, (2) Validity of Organs, (3) Structural Validity, (4) Creative Validity, (5) Co-relation Validity and (5) Contradictory Validity.
Whatever validity Dr. Bhatt and Ms. Gida have established they have standardized it. That co-relation was valid for which Dr. Bhatt’s components Personality measurement questionnaire was used. The trial of mental health and personality measurement questionnaire was done on 75 professors of different colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of the test</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>‘r’ value</th>
<th>Decision of validity</th>
<th>Level of validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personality questionnaire with 13 sections</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mental health questionnaire</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity is 0.63. From the validity point of view we can say that it is valid enough to measure Mental Health.

3.8 DATA COLLECTION:

For the data collection of the study we can get information about Arts and Science college going students in Ahmedabad District and then we meet to them directly and conversant with an importance of the present study. Than we can give questionnaire to all the Arts and Science College going students who was Studying in Arts and Science College of rural and urban area of Ahmedabad District and data was collected.

3.9 PROCEDURES OF RESEARCH:

In procedures of research first in relation to main objective we can select right questionnaire and after that we can get information about college students of different colleges and we meet to them directly and conversant with an importance of the present study. In order to measure Self-concept “Self-concept Questionnaire”, Adjustment “Bell Adjustment Inventory” and Mental Health, “Mental Health Inventory” was used. We visited many of colleges where students were studying. There were we meeting them directly
and tests were given and data was collected. At last 120 Arts and 120 Science college students of Ahmedabad district were selected finally. All the precautions will be taken during the test administration as manual of each test also. Scoring of each test will be done as per the manual of each test.

3.10 **STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**:  

After scoring of every test which is fill up by students we can get raw scores and then by help of raw scores we can complete data analysis. First we check which option was selected by Students and help of them we can give a score to every sentence and at last we get a raw score. After that all the scores which was getting by scoring we was used “F” test (ANOVA) method for statistical analysis of the present study.

Thus, in relation to main objective of the present study all the data was collected from the Arts and Science college students of Ahmedabad district and then scoring was done for the help of manual of the questionnaire and at last for getting results we can used “F” test (ANOVA) method for statistical analysis of the present study.

In the next chapter-4 in relation to variables of the present study like Faculty, Area and Gender results and interpretation was given.