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CHAPTER - III

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

Scientific research methodology determines the reliability of the research findings. Scientific investigations largely depend upon the representativeness of the sample, the appropriateness in the selection and administration of the instruments used and the methods and procedures followed in collecting data. In view of these requirements, we have critically analyzed and made a scientific appraisal of various components and methodological procedures used to study the "personality correlates of highly accepted children".

3.10 The Sampling Techniques

In the present study, sampling techniques operated under three stages, (i) Identification and selection of sample family units by employing Purposive Sampling Technique, (ii) Screening and identification of children from the sample families so selected by employing statistical criteria of selection of 4 groups and (iii) the sample proper.

3.11 The Sample Families: Criteria of Selection

The present study is an effort to investigate the personality correlates of highly accepted children.
Parental warmth (acceptance–rejection) dimension has been conceptualized as influencing the personality development of the individual. Many personality psychologists (Freud, Adler, Jung, Erikson, Sears, etc.) have emphasized the significance of early childhood experiences on the development and determination of personality. The child's environment is relatively restricted to home in the early childhood, and his experiences are related to the rearing method adopted by the mother. Mother in all cultures is almost uniformly the most significant rearing agent, at least in the early years of child's life. Mother remains the most significant person in the child's life throughout childhood. Thus, for the present study Mothers' expression of acceptance and rejection of the child has been included and fathers interaction with the child has been omitted.

Thus, for the present study the family as a unit of study consisted of parents both alive and at least with 3 children, of which at least one should be from either sex. For the conceptualizations earlier made, the mother and the eldest and the youngest children of each family has been selected. The interaction of the father and the middle child has been ignored.

The sample is collected from 256 families living within Ravishankar University jurisdiction (before the establishment of University at Bilaspur) i.e. mainly from Raipur, Bilaspur and Bastar.
Setting of the sample with regard to source of sample, occupation, family type and ordinal position of the child in the family is clear from Table III.1.

**Table III.1** Territorial Distribution of Sample Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Size of Sample Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raipur</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilaspur</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastar</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.12 **Sample Children: Screening Procedure:**

Two hundred and fifty six families were selected by employing purposive sampling technique from various socio-economic strata of the society. "The basic assumption behind purposive sampling is that with good judgement and an appropriate strategy one can handpick the cases to be included in the sample and thus develop samples that are satisfactory in relation to one's need. A common strategy of purposive sampling is to pick cases that are judged to be typical of the population in which one is interested".
Thus, for the present purpose the highly accepted and highly rejected children were picked up with the help of PARQ(M) & PARQ(C)'s "good judgement. The PARQ(M) & PARQ(C) forms were filled by children of the specified range and mothers of the same children. After obtaining the scores on PARQ(M) and PARQ(C) the high accepted and low accepted (rejected) children were selected to study their personality correlates.

3.13 Sample Children: Sample Proper:

The present study has been conceptualized with a view to study the personality correlates of children who are highly accepted by mothers and perceived highly accepted by children (HAm-HAc), highly rejected by mothers and perceived highly rejected by children (LAm-LAc), highly accepted by mothers, but perceived rejected by children (HAm-LAc), highly rejected by mothers but perceived accepted by children (LAm-HAc).

With a view to select such a sample children and then study their personality correlates the administration of psychological instruments related to procedures underwent primarily under two main stages (i) Screening tests and (ii) Testing proper. The different sub-stages under each have been outlined as under:
(A) **Screening Tests:**

1. **Sampling procedure for screening test:** Selection of family unit for the study of warmth-affection dimension of mother and child and personality correlates of children:

   Selection of family units comprising of mother, and at least three children of either sex the eldest and the youngest between 11-14 years has been done by employing Purposive Sampling technique. Two methods have been followed in this regard.

   (A) **Direct method:**

   In this method, the head of the family was directly contacted and information about the size of family, sex and age range of children in the family was enquired.

   (B) **Indirect method:**

   Under this method, children were contacted in the school through the Principal, with whom a preliminary rapport was established. On the basis of the information gathered from the children, the information was counter-checked by queries from the head of the family. Then, the family found to be suitable as per our specifications mentioned in 3.11 were selected for further studies.

2. After selecting the families to be included in the sample, the families were revisited to establish the rapport and to fix up the time of the actual testing session.
3. In this stage, the responses of mothers were taken on PARQ(Mother) Form. Two approaches were employed with a view to collect data from literate as well as illiterate mothers.

(A) The mothers who could read and understand the written material properly, were given instructions as per PARQ (Mother) Form. They were demonstrated with the statements given in the examples, and when it was found that they have understood it thoroughly, they were handed over the PARQ (Mother) Form to be filled up. If at any stage any help was found to be necessary, they were further instructed. Every such administration of test required 45 to 50 minutes.

(B) For mothers, who were either totally illiterate or were not in a position to read and understand the written material of the test as such, they were explained everything. Then each statement was read out and their responses were recorded on a tape recorder. For this type of test administration, help of the proctor was indispensable. The proctor helped in recording of the responses and was helpful in establishing the rapport also.

Such responses were restudied by replaying the tape and the responses were recorded on the PARQ (Mother) answer blank by the investigator. Every such administration of test required 1 hour to 1 1/2 hours for
recording the responses and 45 to 60 minutes for marking the responses on PARQ (Mother) answer blank.

After having administered two sets of screening instruments, i.e. PARQ (Mother) and PARQ (Child) Forms to the children of 256 families and their mothers, the scores obtained by them were processed; and as per criteria of selection as mentioned latter in this caption, four groups were formed. The children selected under each of the groups were, then, given the personality instruments as the core of the study proper.

During the testing session, it was felt that children below 12 years of age could not follow the PARQ (Children). They had difficulty in grasping the idea involved in it. It was felt that perhaps they are not in a position to give a reliable, objective response pattern. With this practical difficulty, children below the age of 12 years were discarded from the sample. In this way, we had to drop 58 cases of children below 12 years of age; and retained a sample of 256 children.

Thus, the children finally retained for study proper and testing of Hypotheses were 256. In order to find out the highly accepted children by mothers and highly accepted by themselves, the raw scores on $\text{PARQ}(M)$ and $\text{PARQ}(C)$ were converted into standard scores, i.e. $T$ scores with a mean of 50 and S.D. of 10. Since the scores on $\text{PARQ}(M)$ and $\text{PARQ}(C)$ are in terms of rejection, high score on PARQ denotes high rejection and low score
denotes high acceptance. Thus, for selecting the children under \((L_{Ac}-L_{Am})\) category 75 percentile was calculated i.e. all children scoring 55 standard score or above were included in \((L_{Ac}-L_{Am})\) category.

For selecting children for \((H_{Ac}-H_{Am})\) category 25 percentile was calculated, i.e. all children scoring 43 standard score and below were included in \((H_{Ac}-H_{Am})\) category. By applying this procedure we could get 73 children in \((L_{Ac}-L_{Am})\) category and 74 children in \((H_{Ac}-H_{Am})\) category.

For selecting children under \((H_{Ac}-L_{Am})\) and \((L_{Ac}-H_{Am})\) category the same procedure was applied, i.e. children scoring 55 and above on PARQ\((M)\) and scoring 43 and below in PARQ\((C)\) were included \((L_{Am}-H_{Ac})\), whereas children scoring 43 and below on PARQ\((M)\) and scoring 55 and above on PARQ\((C)\) were included in \((H_{Ac}-L_{Am})\) category.

By applying this technique, we could get 8 children in \((L_{Am}-H_{Ac})\) category and 7 children in \((H_{Ac}-L_{Am})\) category. Since the size of the sme in these categories was very small, the hypotheses related to \((H_{Ac}-L_{Am})\) and \((L_{Ac}-H_{Am})\) were dropped.

Table III.2 gives a birds' eye view of the sample.
Table III.2: Size of the Sample children

Actually collected
314 (children)

(A) Size of sample after screening process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dropped because of inability to fillup</th>
<th>Actually retained for study proper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARQ(C)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Size of category of sample groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H_{Ac-H_{Am}}$</th>
<th>$H_{Ac-L_{Am}}$</th>
<th>$L_{Ac-L_{Am}}$</th>
<th>$L_{Ac-H_{Am}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) Occupational sample strata:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctor</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(D) Nature of family structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuclear family</th>
<th>Joint family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(E) Income sample strata:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Income</th>
<th>MidIncome</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F) Size of sample children in accordance with extreme ordinal position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oldest</th>
<th>Youngest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.20 The Instruments

3.21 Instruments used for measuring Rejection-Acceptance Concept:

3.211 Rationale for selection of PARQ for Child and Mother:

The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) is a self-explanatory instrument designed to measure individual's perceptions of parental acceptance and rejection (i.e., the warmth dimension). Parental acceptance-rejection is a bipolar measure of parental behaviour with acceptance (i.e. warmth) defining one end of the continuum and parental rejection defining the other end.

It is relatively a recent test (revised Edition 1979) devised by Rohner & Rohner to measure the parental acceptance-rejection. It is a useful instrument in determining the extent of parental acceptance and rejection. The PARQ was constructed on a theoretical rationale (Goldberg, 1972) in 1971. Several theoretically pertinent factors were taken into account as the test was constructed, i.e. First, the scale must have universal applicability, second, the terms within each scale must have common international referents, and third, the phrasology of the items must be decentered from standard, idiomatic American English.

These conditions were approximately satisfied and keeping the same conditions in mind, a Rohner's
PARQs were adapted by Jaiprakash and Bhargava (1980) in Hindi under Indian conditions, which were rather more useful and dependable to Indian subjects. Further, the analysis of reliability and validity of the PARQ was guided by the standards outlined in the American Psychological Association's standards for Educational and Psychological Tests (1974).

Thus, PARQ was considered to be an effective tool to measure the parental acceptance and rejection.

3.212 Description of PARQ for Mother and Child:

Both the forms of PARQ, i.e. Mother and Child are self explanatory questionnaire where a parent (usually mother) responds to her perceptions about the way she treats her child in terms of (a) warmth/affection, (b) hostility/aggression, (c) indifference/neglect and (d) undifferentiated rejection and where a child responds to his perceptions of the way his mother treated him in terms of the 4 dimensions mentioned above.

All versions of PARQ consist of four scales: (1) perceived parental warmth/affection, (2) perceived parental aggression/hostility, (3) perceived parental neglect/indifference, and (4) perceived parental rejection (undifferentiated). The perceived parental warmth/affection scale refers to parent child relationships where parents are perceived to give love or affection without qualification, but not necessarily with great
demonstration. Accepting parents are generally seen as liking their child, they are seen as approving of his personality and they seem to take an interest in his activities and well-being, warmth and affection may be manifested by showing approval of the child, playing with him, enjoying him, fonding him, comforting or consoling him, cuddling him, or demonstrating love in words or other actions. Routine caretaking and amusing the child as part of a schedule, or as a matter of felt duty do not automatically indicate emotional warmth and affection.

Perceived parental aggression/hostility, perceived neglect/indifference and perceived undifferentiated rejection are all forms of behaviour falling at the "negative" end of the warmth dimension. Perceived parental rejection refers to the perceived absence or significant withdrawal of warmth and affection. Parents who are perceived to be rejecting, seem not to like their child. They seem to disapprove of him or resent him, and they are often seen as comparing their child unfavourably with other children. Parental rejection is expressed in three major forms: as perceived hostility, which is manifested as overt or disguised aggression, as perceived indifference which is often manifested behaviourally as neglect, and perceived undifferentiated rejection.
The scale "perceived undifferentiated rejection" refers to conditions where the child sees his parents as withdrawing warmth from him, but where such rejection does not clearly reflect in either perceived aggression/hostility or perceived neglect/indifference.

Warmth/affection scale in PARQ contains 20 items; aggression/hostility and neglect/indifference each contain 15 items and the fourth scale, undifferentiated reflection contain 10 items, the total being 60 items in all three versions of the questionnaire. All items are arranged in cyclical order.

The test items of PARQ were screened and decentered from idiomatic American English in 1971 with the help of two Turkish anthropologists in collaboration with three American English speakers. Subsequently over the next two years, the child and adult versions of the instrument were piloted on small samples of English-speaking children and adults to detect any further problem with the test instruments, test items, the response format, etc. The troublesome areas in the questionnaire - especially in the child version - were corrected.

Validity and Reliability of the PARQ:

Formal validation procedures were adopted with the Adult PARQ and to the Child PARQ, but only partial validation procedure was applied to Mother PARQ. The
Adult PARQ and Mother PARQ are identical except in tense and pronoun. Preliminary evidence suggests that the reliability and validity of the Mother PARQ are adequate.

Cronbach's coefficient alpha was used as the principal measure of reliability. PARQ reliability coefficients (alphas) for the adult version range from .86 to .95 with a median reliability of .905. For the child version, the range is .72 to .90 with a median reliability of .815. A measure of the concurrent validity of each PARQ scale is given below, which indicates that all four scales of both the adult and child version are significantly (P ≤ .001) related to their respective validation scale.

Table III.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha^a</th>
<th>Alpha^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth/Affection</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression/Hostility</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect/Indifference</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection (undifferentiated)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a - Cronbach's co-efficient Alpha; P ≤ .001 for all correlations.
3.22 Instruments used for measuring personality traits:

2.221 (a) Rationale for selecting HSPQ/ESPQ and F-Scale:

(a) Rationale for selecting ESPQ/HSPQ as Personality Measures:

The ESPQ is a test to measure 13 personality traits of children from 6 to 8 years of age. It has a special advantage that the child does not have to read the questions. The questions are read aloud to the class and the child responds on a non-reading answer sheet. The ESPQ yields scores on thirteen dimensions of personality, including general intelligence with a minimum of testing time. It has been divided into two parts; A₁ & A₂ for convenience of administration and each part requires about 40 to 45 minutes of testing time. Thus, in the present study, highly accepted children of 6 to 14 years of age. For the children between 6 to 8 years of age, ESPQ has been found to be quite a suitable test. It has been adapted under Indian conditions by Lall. It is a most reliable, valid and objective measure of personality traits of children.

Jr.-Sr. High school personality questionnaire (HSPQ) developed and standardized originally by Cattell on his own rationale of personality traits and adapted under Indian conditions by Kapoor and Mehrotra is one of the most reliable, valid and objective measure of types of personality traits for the pupils between 8 to 14 years. On the strength of its sound rationale and
dependable standardization, convenience in administration and meaningfulness in interpretation of scores, it is extensively used by research workers, psychologists, guidance workers and counsellors and practicing teachers.

It covers all the necessary dimensions of personality and describes individual differences meaningfully. It is an individual as well as a group test. It gives maximum information on great number of personality dimensions within the shortest time. Its reliability, validity and objectivity are very high among all the available tests of personality. Freeman (1965) remarked about the HSPQ that "such a complete power is claimed for no other inventory".

(b) Rationale for the selection of F-Scale as a measure of authoritarianism:

Authoritarianism is not a undimensional trait. It is a peculiar combination of contradictory characteristics. Adorno et al. (1950) claimed to measure authoritarianism personally by making use of the F-Scale which measures conventionalism, authoritarian submission, authoritarian-aggression and anti-interception, superstitions, stereotypes, power orientations and toughness, destructive and cynicism, projectivity and ethnocentrism. These variables are thought of as going together to form a single syndrome, a more or less enduring structure in the person that renders him receptive to antidemocratic behavioural dispositions. F-scale, thus,
attempts to measure the potentially antidemocratic personality.

The personality tests used for the present study do not clearly measure the authoritarianism, which has been considered to be an important personality disposition to determine the inter-actional behaviour. F-scale was, therefore, considered to be the most suitable measure of authoritarianism. It is a highly valid, reliable and objective test, which has been used extensively by researchers and social psychologists.

The original F-scale by Adorno et al. (1950) has been adapted under Indian conditions in Hindi by Dr. P. Sarin (1980). This adapted F-scale is rather more suitable to the children under study in view of its cultural consistency and adaptation.

3.222 Description of HSPQ, ESPQ, PARQ & F-Scale:

(a) F-Scale: The F-scale was designed and constructed by Adorno et al. (1950). The original F-scale has 38 items. For every item, there was a hypothesis, sometimes several hypothesis. The major source of these hypothesis was the research already performed. A number of variables were derived and defined, and taken together, they made up the basic content of the F-scale. Each was regarded as a more or less central trend in a person which, in accordance with some dynamic process, expressed itself on the surface in ethnocentrism as well as in diverse
psychologically related opinions and attitudes. The variables included were: conventionalism, authoritarian-submissiveness, authoritarian-aggression, anti-interaction, superstitions and stereotypes, power and toughness, destructive and cynicism, projectivity and ethnocentrism.

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. Therefore, the F-scale attempts to measure the potentially antidemocratic personality. A single item was sometimes used to represent two, and sometimes more different ideas.

The preliminary F-scale made up on 38 items was called Form-78. There were six choices of response for each item: slight, moderate or strong agreement and the same degrees of disagreements, with no middle or neutral category. Each subject indicated the degree of his agreement by making +1, +2, or +3, disagreement by -1, -2 or -3. The mean reliability (0.74) of this scale was found to be low. To improve this, another form of questionnaire was prepared (Form -60). The 19 items from the F-scale (Form -78) that ranked highest in order of goodness were retained, in the same or slightly revised form in the new scale, and 15 new items were prepared. The reliability of this scale was 0.87 as compared with 0.74 of Form - 78. Form - 60 was again revised and new
Form - 45 and 40 were prepared. The revision consisted mainly in discarding 7 items and adding 3 new ones. The final form consisted of 30 items. The average of the reliability coefficient is 0.90. Not only there was a slight improvement in reliability over Form - 60 ($r = 0.87$), but there was also a very marked improvement over the original Form - 78 ($r = 0.74$).

To determine the validity, the test was correlated with ethnocentrism scale (E) and with politico economic conservatism scale (PEC). The correlation with ethnocentrism was 0.75 and with politico economic conservatism scale was 0.57. Form - 45 was selected for use in the present study to assess the authoritarianism of the subjects. The Hindi version was revised by Dr. Promila Sarin (1980) where 3 items were discarded because of unsuitability for Indian population. The remaining 27 items were translated. Adequacy of content and meaning was confirmed and temporal stability of the adapted $F$-scale was computed, the co-efficient of stability was found to be 0.93.

(b) Description of ESPQ:

The Early School Personality Questionnaire consists of thirteen scales. Each scale measures one functionally independent dimension of personality. These thirteen scales relate to psychological variables which have been isolated through factor analysis. Each factor represents a statistically distinct dimension of response
to the test. Each factor consists of a pair of opposite traits (labels). The first level corresponds to the low end of the scale and the second level corresponds to the high end.

Description of the 13 factors:

Factor A:

Reserved detached critical cool -vs- outgoing, warmhearted, easy going, participating.

The high scorer is generally characterized as warm and sociable, the low scorer as more cool and aloof. At the middle childhood level, the difference between the high and low scores is particularly evident in the extent to which the child responds favourably to teachers and to the school situations in general.

Factor B:

Less intelligent, concrete thinking -vs- More intelligent, Abstract thinking, Bright.

The high scorer on this Factor B tends to be "bright" and abstract thinking, while the low-scoring child has more concrete thinking. The intelligence factor of this test is not intended to be a stable estimate of I.Q. It is simply a rapid screening measure to assess general ability.
Factor C:

Affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, easily upset, changeable -vs- Emotionally stable, faces reality, calm.

The child who scores high on this factor appears to be relatively calm, stable and socially mature. He is better prepared to cope effectively with others in comparison to the low scores. Low scorer is relatively lacking in frustration tolerance and more subject to a loss of emotional control.

Factor D:

Phlegmatic, Deliberate, Inactive, Stodgy -vs- Excitable, Impatient, Demanding, Overactive.

The child who scores low on this test might be described as emotionally placid and high scorer exhibits the tendency to exhibit distress on slight provocation or to overact to various kinds of stimuli.

Factor E:

Obedient, Mild, Conforming, Submissive -vs- Assertive, Impatient, Aggressive, Stubborn, Dominant.

The child who scores high on this factor is relatively assertive and aggressive. The low scorer is more docile. At the middle childhood level, aggressive behaviour is a more likely expression of this factor than is successful dominance, since most of the techniques of social manipulation are yet to be learned.
A high E score is frequently accompanied by behaviour problems at this age level. But if the underlying assertiveness is handled in a way conductive to the development of more constructive expression, the later adjustment of the child may be quite successful.

**Factor F:**

Sober, prudent, serious, Taciturn -vs- Happy go lucky, Gay, Enthusiastic, Impulsively lively.

The high scorer is rather enthusiastic, optimistic and self-confident. The low scorer is more serious and self-deprecating. Research evidence indicates that the high F. child is likely to come from a relatively secure and affectionate family milieu, while the desurgent's home life is likely to be characterized by affectional deprivation.

**Factor G:**

Expedient, Evades Rules, Feels few obligations, has weaker superego strength -vs- conscientious, persevering, staid, Rule-bound, Has stronger super-ego strength.

This scale apparently reflects the extent to which the child has incorporated the values of the adult world. Of special importance at the middle-childhood level are values relating to achievement in the school setting.
Factor H:

Shy, Restrained, Diffident, Timid -vs-
Venturesome, Socially bold, Uninhibited, Sprutaneous.

Like Factor A, Factor H constitutes a component of extraversion-introversion in varying degrees of sociability. While the high A individual is sociable in the sense that he shows a positive emotional response to people, however, the high H individual is sociable in the sense that he interacts freely and boldly with people. The low H child is more sensitive and easily threatened and seeks to avoid social threat and over-stimulation through withdrawal.

Factor I:

Tough-minded, Self-reliant, Realistic, No-nonsense -vs- Tender-minded, Dependent, Over-protected, Sensitive.

The personality pattern associated with the high end of this factor is a kind of sensitivity fostered by over-protection. Accordingly, the high scoring child is one who tends to show greater dependence, fearful avoidance of physical threat, and sympathy for the needs of others than the low scorer, who is more independent and "thick-skinned".

Factor J:

Vigorous, Goes readily with group, Zestful,
Given to actions -vs- Doubting, Obstructive, Individualistic, Reflective, Internally restrained, Unwilling to Act.
The high scorer tends to be individualistic, physically restrained, critical of others, and fastidious, while the low scorer is more freely expressive, active and uncritical.

Factor N:

Forthright, Natural, Artless, Sentimental -vs- Shrewd, Calculating, Worldly, Penetrating.

In older groups, the high N individual has been described as socially perceptive and skillful, realistic, and opportunistic, while the low N individual is described as more naive, sentimental and awkward. The specific expression of this factor in middle childhood seems less cleanly defined. The high scorer, however, does seem more "wise" to the ways of adults and peers and, hence, better able to advance his own interests than the low scorer, though he is not likely to appear more mature in other respects.

Factor O:

Placid, Secure, Confident, Untroubled -vs- Apprehensive, Worrying, Depressive, Troubled, Insecure.

This is the factor most directly concerned with manifest subjective distress, and it has been found in older groups to be the factor which best differentiates neurotics from the general population. The distress reaction of the high scorer might be variously characterized as irritability, anxiety, or depression depending on the situation.
Factor Q-4:

Relaxed, Tranquil, Torpid, Unfrustrated -vs- Tense, Driven, Overwrought, Frustrated.

In older groups Factor Q₄ seems to relate to a variety of symptomatic behaviours that might generally be explained in terms of "nervous tension" or undischarged drives. The low relaxed end of the scale seems to reflect a kind of composure that makes for easy sociability.

(c) The Description of High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ):

The Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire has been devised by R.B. Cattell and H. Beloff and Hindi version has been adapted by Mehrottra. This scale has been planned and based on extensive research to make it a reliable and valid measure of personality. It gives the maximum information in the shortest time about the greatest number of dimensions of personality.

The test measures a set of fourteen independent dimensions of personality. These source traits are identified and referred to by letters of the alphabet, keeping to the same designations as have been used in the 16 P.F.

The canons of good test construction have been followed in the design of this test. The reliability coefficients are expressed in three main forms for this test.
1. The stability co-efficient: This is the correlation of the test (Forms A & B) with itself when repeated after a two-week interval.

2. The Homogeniety or Consistency Coefficient: This is a split half co-efficient, but brought to greater stability by taking the mean of three independent splits (The odd-even split and two random splits).

3. The Equivalence Coefficient: This expresses the agreement between Forms A & B on each factor.

Validity: The validity is measured by the extent to which the given scale correlates with the pure factor which it claims to measure. This is called construct or concept validity. The HSPQ was validated against external criterion and possess the concept validity of the items for the actual personality dimensions they are intended to measure.

Factor concept validity can be calculated in two ways: (1) The direct validity, i.e. the correlation of the scales with pure factors and (2) Circumstantial (or indirect) validity. Validities of this scale are found to be thoroughly satisfactory.

The scoring of the test is done with the help of hand scoring stencil key. The raw scores are converted into 'normalized standard stens' with the help of the tables provided, which makes the corrections in the raw scores for age, sex and education.
The psychological meaning of the factors is described below as per the descriptions and meaning given in the handbook. Every factor is presented as a bi-polar continuum. The high scores (sten 10) on the test correspond always to the right hand pole given here.

**Factor A**

Schizothymia A- vs Cyclothymia A+
(Aloof-stiff) vs (Warm, sociable)
Critical, Aggressive vs Good natured, Easygoing
Obstructive, Resists
Adult Direction vs Ready to cooperate
Cool, Aloof vs Attentive to people
Hard, Precise vs Soft hearted, Casual
Suspicious, Jealous vs Trustful
Rigid vs Adaptable, Careless
Cold vs Warm-hearted
Prone to Sulk and Cry vs Readily laughs

In questionnaire responses the A+ students expresses marked preference for occupations dealing with people, enjoys social recognition, can stand "difficult" people more tolerantly and is generally willing to "go along" with expediency; while the A- person is more uncompromising and earnest, prefers things or words to people likes working alone, intellectual companionship and introspection.
**Factor B**

Low General Mental capacity B- (Dull) vs General Intelligence B+ (Bright)

The general mental capacity is always important, so here it is given its proper role alongside the other personality dimensions of about equal predictive value.

**Factor C**

Emotional Instability or Ego weakness C- vs Ego Strength C+ (mature, calm)

Gives emotional when frustrated vs Emotionally mature

Changeable in attitudes vs Stable, constant in interest.

Excitable, overactive vs Calm, phlegmatic

Evasive of Responsibilities, Quiting vs Realistic, Adjusts to Facts.

Worrying vs Placid

Gets into Fights and Accidents vs Does not get into Difficulties

The individual with marked ego weakness may fail in adjustment very badly if moved out of his home environment, or subjected to regimentation and stress e.g. at camp.
Factor D

Phlegmatic Temperament D- vs Excitability D+ (Stodgy, unrestrained)
Placid vs Demanding, Impatient
Self sufficient vs Attention getting, showing off
Deliberate vs Excitable, over active
Not Easily Jealous vs Prone to Jealousy
Self-effacing vs Self-Assertive, Egotistical
Constant vs Distractable, undependable
Not Restless vs Shows many nervous symptoms.

The D+ individual reports that he is a restless sleeper, easily distracted from work by noise or intrinsic difficulties, is hurt and angry if not given important positions or whenever he is restrained or punished. The High D individuals are highly impulsive and a considerable nuisance in restrictive situations, though likeable and affectionate in quieter moods.

Factor E

Submissive E- vs Dominance or Ascendence E+ ("Milk toast", mild, Aggressive, competitive)
Submissive vs Assertive, self-assured
Dependence vs Independent-minded
Kindly, soft-hearted vs Hard, Stern, Hostile
Expressive vs Solemn
Conventional, conforming vs Unconventional, Rebellious
Easily upset vs Tough
Self-sufficient vs Attention-getting
Both extremes on the dimension pose problems for adjustment. High score is very definitely part of the delinquency-behaviour problem pattern in teen-agers but very low score is also "pathological" as it appears in institutionalized Nemotics.

**Factor F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desurgency, F- (Sober, serious)</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>Surgency F+ (Enthusiastic, Happy-go-lucky)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent introspective</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Talkative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed, chastened</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned, Brooding</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Serene, Happy-go-lucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incommunicative, sticks to inner values</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Frank, Expressive, Reflects the Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow, Deliberate</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Quick and Alert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is one of the most important components in extraversion. It is apparently the same dimension as the state of elation vs depression along which psychotics can swing abnormally into manic and depressive melancholic extremes.

**Factor G**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of Acceptance of Group Moral Standards G- (Casual, undependable)</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>Character or Super Ego Strength G+ (Conscientious, Persistent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quitting, Fickle</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Perserving, Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frivolous</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding, Impatient</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Emotionally Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed, Indolent</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Consistently ordered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undependable, Delinquent</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregards obligations to people</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Attentive to people and Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The G+ person views himself as correct in, and a guardian of, manners and morals, persevering, planful, able to concentrate, cautious in thinking before he speaks and preferring efficient people and other companions. Low super ego strength is associated with lying, showing-off, stealing, destruction of property, defiance of law & order, and temper tantrums.

**Factor H**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Therectia H- (Shy, Timid, Threat sensitive)</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>Parmia H+ (Adventurous, &quot;Thick-skinned&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shy, withdrawn</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Adventurous, likes meeting people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiring in Face of opposite sex</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Active, Overt interest in opposite sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloof, Cold, Self-contained</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Responsive, Genial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt to be Eubittered</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrained, conscientious</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Impulsive &amp; Frivolous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Interests</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Emotional and Artistic Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful, considerate Quick to see dangers</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>Carefree, does not see danger signals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The H- individual shows the withdrawn, careful "well believed" syndrome. He reports to be intensely shy, slow and impeded in expressing himself, preferring one or two close friends to crowds, sometimes spiteful and distrustful, but very considerate of others' sensitivities. In group situations H+ persons feel free to
participate, but are reported to be insensitive speakers, and tend to make more social than task oriented remarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harria I- (Tough, Realistic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic, Expects little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reliant, Taking Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard (To point of Cynicism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few Artistic Responses (but not lacking in taste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts on practical, logical evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not Dwell on Physical Disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I+ person shows a fastidious dislike of 'crude' people and rough occupations, recreational taste for travel and new experiences, unstable, unimaginative, esthetic mind, a love of dramatics and a certain impracticability in general affairs. There are indications that artists score high on this factor and also that it is culture pattern differences.

I- represents tough, masculine, practical, mature, group-solidarity, generating and realistic.
Factor J

Zeppia J-  vs  Coastenia J+  
(Liking group action)  (Fastidious, individualism)
Likes to go with the vs  Acts individualistically
group
Likes Attention vs  Self sufficient
Sinks Personality vs  Fastidiously obstructive
into Group Enterprise
Vigorous vs  Neurasthetically Fatigued
Accepts common vs  Evaluates Intellectually
standards

The J+ individual prefers to do things on his own, is physically and intellectually fastidious, thinks over his mistakes and how to avoid them, tends not to forget if he is unfairly treated, has private views differing from group, but prefers to keep in the background and avoid arguments, knows he has fewer friends.

Factor O

Confident, Adequacy 0-  vs  Guilt Proneness 0+  
(confident, self secure)  (Timid, Insecure)
Self confident vs  Worrying, anxious
Cheerful, Resilient vs  Depressed, Cries easily, upset.
Tough, Placid vs  Sensitive, Tender, Easily upset.
Expedient vs  Strong sense of Duty
Does not care vs  Exacting, Fussy
Rudely Vigorous vs  Hypochondriacal
No Fears vs  Phobic symptoms
Given to Simple Action vs  Moody, Lonely, Broading
The O+ person feels overfatigued by exciting situations and inadequate to meet the rough daily demands of life, is unable to sleep through worries, is easily downhearted and especially, remorseful, feels that people are not moral and concerned about things as they should be, is inclined to piety, prefers books and quiets interests to people and noise. Such students over-react to difficulties and need encouragement.

In children definite fears, as well a central feeling of inadequacy and loneliness are prominent for O+ scores.

Factor $Q_2$

Group Dependency $Q_2-$ vs Self sufficiency $Q_2+$
(Sociable, group dependent) (Self sufficient, resourceful)

It is one of the major factors in second-order factor of introversion. The item content reveals a person who is resolute and accustomed to making his own decisions, alone, while $Q_2-$ pole person goes well with group, definitely values social approval more and is conventional and fashionable. Scientists, executives and other individuals who think much on their own, turn out to be above average on this factor. In group dynamics the high $Q_2$ person is significantly more dissatisfied with group integration, makes remarks which are more frequently solutions than questions and tends to be rejected. At school, $Q_2$ children prove commonly
to have been decidedly on the seclusive side. They also seem to have older friends, having mature interests and their general achievement is higher.

**Factor Q₂**

Poor Self-sentiment Formation $Q₂^-$ vs High strength of Self-sentiment $Q₂^+$
(uncontrolled, Lax) (Controlled, Exacting will power)

The child high on $Q₂$ is self-controlled, striving to accept approved ethical standards, ambitious to do well, considerate of others, foresighted, disposed to reduce and control expressions of emotion and conscientious. Its negative pole $Q₂^-$ is essentially an uncontrolled emotionality, excitability, and a rejection of cultural demands, which has some resemblance to Factor D. High $Q₂$ is associated with success in mechanical, mathematical and productive organizational activities. It is high in executives, personnel department workers, and psychiatric technicians, in all of whom objectivity balance and decisiveness are specially demanded.

**Factor Q₄**

Low Ergic Tension $Q₄^-$ vs High Ergic Tension $Q₄^+$
(Relaxed, Composed) (Tense, excitable, Frustrated)

Children and adult scoring high on this scale describe themselves as irrationally worried, tense, irritable and in turmoil. They feel frustrated and are
aware of being criticized by parents for untidiness, phantasy and neglect of good goals.

3.30 The Research Design

On the present study, Acceptance-Rejection by mothers and perceived Acceptance-Rejection by children, nature of family, ordinal position of the child in the family, profession of fathers, interacted as independent variables. The personality attributes consisting of 14 traits measured by the Sr. HSPQ test and authoritarianism measured by F-scale functioned as dependent variables. Keeping in view the hypotheses formulated in Chapter I, the instruments measuring various variables under-study, were administered to the subjects. The administration of the psychological instruments operated in two stages: (1) Screening Tests; and (2) Testing proper.

PARQs for mother and child were used as screening measures whereas HSPQ and F-scale were employed for 'Testing Proper'. The Testing Programmes followed the following time-schedule and sessions.
### Table III.4: Testing Sequence and Sessions Employed in the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session of Testing Session</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Nature of Administration</th>
<th>Time taken for administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session I</td>
<td>PARQ(Mother)</td>
<td>Literate Individual</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Illiterate Individual</td>
<td>1 hr. to 1.15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session II</td>
<td>PARQ(Child)</td>
<td>Group Individual</td>
<td>40-45 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>40-45 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session III</td>
<td>F-scale</td>
<td>Group Individual</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session IV</td>
<td>HSPQ</td>
<td>Group Individual</td>
<td>45-50 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.40 **Methods and Procedure:**

Various measures of psychological constructs employed in the present study were administered in accordance with the general instructions given in the manual of norms of these psychological tests. Identical conditions in different testing sessions for administration of the tests were maintained to the best ability of the investigator. All psychological tests were administered with the help of a proctor invariably by the investigator herself. The data in all testing sessions were collected under identical conditions and were processed objectively. The data collected were scored
by the investigator herself and the scores so obtained were further checked by the proctor with a view to enhance the objectivity in the scoring procedure. The data were scored in accordance with the scoring system given in the manual of norms of various instruments employed in the present study. Before collecting any data, proper rapport with the school authorities, parents and children were established as far as possible.

The testing programmes were organized into two stages:
First: Screening Tests and Second: Testing Proper.
The selected children (256) were grouped into 4 groups thereby ignoring the ungrouped residual children untreated, i.e. \((H_{Ac}-H_{Am})\), \((L_{Ac}-L_{Am})\), \((L_{Ac}-H_{Am})\) and \((H_{Ac}-L_{Am})\), and were given the HSPQ/ESPQ, F-scale with a view to diagnose their nature and kind of personality traits. The schools functioned as a place for the administration of the tests to children in a suitable convenient groups of 4 to 5 children for both, i.e. the testing for screening as well as for proper testing; however, individual testing at home of the child was not barred. The children who were previously screened and selected to be included in the proper were collected in a room in the school with the prior permission of the Principal. The tests were administered as under:
1. Testing Procedure for Screening of Children:

(a) Administration of PARQ (Child):

The children were first administered the PARQ (Child) form. They were instructed as per instructions on the PARQ (Child) form, explained the technique of taking the test and were demonstrated with practice items. Then they were asked to do the two practice examples given in the test form by themselves. On being assured that they have understood the technique of taking the test thoroughly, they were given the signal of 'getting ready' for taking the PARQ (Child). The testing, then, started. The PARQ (Child) required a session of 40-45 minutes.

(b) Administration of PARQ (Mother):

The administration of the PARQ (Mother) was administered to the mothers of 256 children selected from 256 families selected according to the criteria. These mothers were divided into two groups in accordance with their level of educational maturity. Those mothers who could read, write and understand Hindi sufficiently were given the PARQ and responses were directly collected from them whereas those who were illiterate were required to get their responses recorded on the PARQ blank by the investigator herself.
II. Testing Procedure for Study Proper:

HSPQ/ESPQ and F-scale were employed as dependent variables to measure personality traits of the children who were identified to be classified in either of the four groups. These tests were administered to the children of the four groups only. However, data collected on personality traits over 256 children were further analysed and processed in accordance with the bio-data variables with a view to test the hypotheses formulated on Bio-Data variables.

(a) Administration of F-scale:

After having distributed the F-scale booklet, the children were given instructions for taking the test. They were asked to proceed to give their responses in the test booklet itself. They were further checked, if they are filling up the responses as directed. The F-scale required 30 minutes for completing.

(b) Administration of HSPQ/ESPQ:

The children were given the Test Booklets and answer sheet each. They were asked to fill up the details as per blanks on the answer sheet.

The instructions were given to them as per detailed instructions given on the test booklet. They were asked to give responses to questions given for the practice. It was further repeated and checked if they have followed
the instructions properly. They were, then, asked to proceed with the test. In between, it was again checked if they are recording the responses as per instructions. The administration of HSPQ/ESPQ took a session of 45 to 50 minutes.

Invariably, all tests were administered in a group situation with 4-5 children, however, individual testing was also undertaken as and when it was necessary. For subjects who were included in the study on the basis of direct method, the individual testing was adopted either in the child's own house or in the investigator's home. Identical conditions and procedures to the best of the ability of the investigator were maintained in either type of test administration, that took place either at the screening or at the study-proper stage. Similarly, the bio-data collected and responses recorded from the mothers on PARQ(Mother) from literate as well as illiterate mothers also observed identical operations and objective conditions.

3.50 Data collection and data analysis process:
   Rapport and Responses:

(1) Rapport:

The sample schools were contacted well in advance of the testing programme. The Principals and teachers were personally requested to extend their whole-hearted cooperation in the research work. The class teachers were invariably requested to work as a proctor during
the group testing and family details recording programme. Before the tests were administered, the pupils were briefly introduced the purpose and nature of work they have to do. They were also requested to extend their active cooperation in giving true response to their best. The time to be taken for the testing programme was also told to them. Before the answer blanks and test materials were distributed, they were asked whether they have followed 'what they have to do?' and 'how they have to do?'. After having established satisfactory rapport with the subjects, the test administration was started with the final probing questions - "Is there any difficulty?" "Has anybody to ask anything?".

The rapport was established in the same manner with the family head and mothers through common friend. (ii) Responses:

Responses on various tests employed in the study were scored by the investigator herself by making use of the appropriate scoring keys. Thus hand scoring keys were employed for PARQ(Mother) and PARQ(Child) and personality questionnaire (HSPQ). The raw scores obtained on PARQ were converted into Z scores, while raw scores obtained in HSPQ were converted into sten scores as directions given in the manual of norms.
3.60 **Statistical Treatment of Data:**

Statistical methods employed in the present study follow the requirements inherent in the respective hypotheses, purpose of the study and design of the research. The following statistical techniques have been used:

(i) **Standard scores:** The PARQ(Child) and PARQ(Mother) raw scores were converted into standard T score with a mean of 50 and SD of 10 as proposed by McCall.

(ii) **Quartile Deviations:** $Q_1$ and $Q_3$ were computed to categorize the children in High accepted and Low accepted groups.

(iii) **t value:** Mean, SDs and t values were computed which indicated the level of significance in difference between two means. In all hypotheses on "differential studies", t values were applied.

(iv) **F Ratio:** The analysis of variance has been employed to verify hypothesis pertaining to "interactional studies". This statistical treatment has been used with a view to estimate the interactional effects of independent variables on dependent variables.

The results arrived at by employing these statistical methods have been presented in the next chapter.