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5.00 Introduction

Parental interaction with the child in the family is a potential variable that largely determines the dynamics of growth and development and helps in designing the personality dispositions and interpersonal interactions. It is in and through the family that the main components of a child's personality develops. The struggle between feelings of trust and mistrust is first worked out in relation to the parents, and it is by family members, specifically, the parents that the autonomy and initiative characteristic of one's own society are encouraged or denied. The parents and other family members play an important part in relation to later personality components also (Witmer and Kotinsky, 1974, page 174). The family gives him this first objects for identification and provides the situation for the eventual development of an ego identity. Significant motive for the identification process is the desire to possess desirable characteristics of the model (Kagan, 1958, page 296-305).
5.10 **Summary:**

5.11 **Review of Relevant Literature:**

Rich literature is available on parental interaction and personality development. Bronfenbrenner (1961) found that children from achievement-oriented homes excel in planning and performance, but they are also tense, domineering, aggressive and cruel. He further reported that the major changes in parental behaviour over a twenty-five year period indicated a move toward greater permissiveness, freer expression of affection, increased reliance on reasoning, or appeals to guilt in contrast to punishment, a narrowing of the gap between social classes in their patterns of child rearing, and an increasingly important position of the father as a more affectionate and less authoritarian agent of discipline.

Lippit and White (1958) experimentally studied the differential traits of personality observed in two different types of homes where the fathers were respectively displaying authoritarian and democratic leadership style; and recorded significant differences in the acquired personality dispositions among children brought up under these two different social climate. The relation of parental authority to children's behaviour and attitudes has been systematically compiled by Radke (1946).

The findings on studies conducted by Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) on 'patterns of child rearing',
Miller and Swanson (1958) on 'the changing American parent', Becker et al (1959) on 'factors in parental behaviour and personality', Sears, Whiting, Nowlis and Sears (1953) on 'some child rearing antecedents, of aggression and dependency', Radke (1946) on 'relation of parental authority to children's behaviour and attitudes', Sewell, Mussen and Harris (1955) on 'relationship among child training practices', etc. have been systematically presented by Radke-Yarrow and Yarrow (1955) in the Annual Review of Psychology (6, 1-28) on Child Psychology. Parent-child interaction in terms of development of attachment has been studied by Coats, Anderson and Hartup (1972), Maccoby and Feldman (1972), Kotelchuck (1972), Schaeffer and Emercon (1964); Littenberg, Tulkin and Kagan (1971); Ainsworth and Salter (1963); Ainsworth, Salter and Whiting (1967), Ainsworth (1964); Ainsworth and Bell (1969); Caldwell, Wright, Honig and Tannenbaum (1970); Robson and Moss (1970); Marvin (1972); Marvin, Marvin and Abramvitel (1973); Maccoby and Feldman (1972); Rosenthal (1965, 1967a, 1967b); Baumrind (1971). A circumplex model of parental behaviours which shows the relationship of various types of maternal behaviour to love-hospitality and autonomy-control has been presented by Schaeffer (1959) and Becker et al (1959). Rohner’s (1980) acceptance-rejection theory presents a new direction in the study of child development. Jaishree Tiwari (1976) reported significant findings on the development
of personality among the three socio-economic classes of children brought up and reared under Indian conditions.

A review of the available literature on parental authority and personality dispositions leads us to generalize that there exists rich literature on various aspects of parent child interactions and personality development; however, they are limited to methodological shortcomings and sampling defects. Further, these studies fail to explore vertically the mutual interactions between parents and children as both of them perceive each other. No study is available in which the perceived perceptions for acceptance by parents towards their children and of the children towards their parents, so far as mutual acceptance-rejection interactions are concerned, is studied scientifically. The findings based on available literature indicate child's behaviour under conditions of acceptance and rejection by parents; but it fails to point out the limits of acceptance or rejection by parents, which might have caused those typical behavioural outcomes. Further, it does not reveal the amount of parental affiliation that might have borne out those behavioural results. Parental extreme acceptance of the child does not guarantee the reciprocal return of child's extreme acceptance of the parents. Mothering and fathering are further complex variables which have been hardly studied under certain specific social settings.
It is pertinent to point out that family interactions and socialization process in a non-materialistic developing Indian society are conceptually as well as fundamentally different from those interacting in a typical materialistic well developed American society.

The acceptance of a child in a family depends not merely on family interactions and the socialization process, but also on its socio-cultural philosophy and needs, demands and goals of life of the society. By and large, Indian society is a more permissive society where the child gets the love and affection of not only the parents, but also of other members of the joint family.

The present study, therefore, is an attempt to bridge the gap in the existing literature on parental authority and personality development.

5.12 Formulation of Hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1 \((H_1)\):

"Children belonging to High Ac High Am category would display -

A- Cyclothymia, B+ High mental capacity, C+ Ego strength, G+ Super ego strength, H+ Parmia, J- Dynamic simplicity, O- Confident adequacy, Q_3+ High strength of self sentiments and authoritarianism,

whereas on

D Phlegmatic temperament versus Excitability, r Desurgency -versus- Surgency,
I Harria -versus- Premsia,

Q₂ Group Dependency -versus- Self sufficiency,
there would be no tendency to trait direction".

**Hypothesis 2 (H₂):**

"Children belonging to Low Ac Low Am category
would display,

A+ Schizothymia, B- Low mental capacity,
C- Neurotic Emotional Instability, E+ Dominance,
G- Lack of Acceptance of Group Moral standards,
H- Threchia, J+ Neurasthemic self Critical
Tendency, O+ Guilt Proneness, Q₃- Poor self
sentiment formation, and Q₄+ High Ergic Tension

whereas on

F Phlegmatic Temperament -vs- Excitability,
I Harria -vs- Premsia
Q₂ Group Dependency -vs- Self sufficiency,
no tendency to trait direction would be
exhibited".

**Hypothesis 3 (H₃):**

"There exists no significant difference on 15
factors of personality traits between the children of
different professional groups".

**Hypothesis 4 (H₄):**

"Children from nuclear families and joint fami-
lies would display no significant difference in their
personality traits".
Hypothesis 5 (H₅):

"Children coming from Low Income families and children coming from High Income families would not display any significant difference in their personality traits".

Hypothesis 6 (H₆):

"Oldest children of the family would display, A- Schizothymia, C- Neurotic Emotional Excitability, E+ Dominance, G- Lack of acceptance of group moral standards, H- Threctia, J+ Neurasthemic Self Critical Tendency, Q₃- Poor self sentiment formation and Q₄+ High Ergic tension,

whereas on B General Intelligence, D Phlegmatic temperament vs Excitability, F Desurgery vs Surgency, I Harria vs Premsia, O Confident Adequacy vs Guilt proneness and Authoritarianism,

no tendency to trait direction would be exhibited.

The youngest children of the family would display, A+ Cyclothymia, C+ Ego strength, E- Submissiveness, G+ Super Ego strength, H+ Parmia, J- Dynamic Simplicity, Q₃+ High Strength of Self Sentiment, and Q₄+ Low Ergic tension.
5.13 **Sampling Technique:**

Employing purposive sampling technique, 296 families consisting of mother and at least three children of either sex between the age group 11-14 years were selected for the present study. PARQ(C) and PARQ(M) served as two screening instruments for selecting the Highly Accepted and Accepted children. Children scoring above 75 percentile scores on both the screening instruments were said to belong to highly accepted by mothers as well as by the children as perceived by them—(H$_{Ac-HAm}$), whereas those scored below 25th percentile were categorized as children low accepted by their mothers as well as by the children (H$_{Ac-HAm}$) as perceived by them. Employing these criteria, children were categorized into four groups: H$_{Ac-HAm}$; L$_{Ac-LAm}$; H$_{Ac-LAm}$; and L$_{Ac-HAm}$.

After screening, 74 and 73 children were found respectively in H$_{Ac-HAm}$ and L$_{Ac-LAm}$ groups whereas 8 and 7 children were classified in H$_{Ac-LAm}$ and L$_{Ac-HAm}$ respectively. The study proper for evaluating the personality traits of the highly accepted children was conducted on this sample. Since the size of sample of children in H$_{Ac-LAm}$ (N=8) and L$_{Ac-HAm}$ (N=7) was very small; and hence the results obtained there upon may not be dependable, the hypotheses concerning the study of personality traits of H$_{Ac-LAm}$ and L$_{Ac-HAm}$ were deleted and was considered beyond the scope of this study.
However, the study of personality traits in relation to different biographical variables were conducted on the whole sample of children (i.e. N=256).

5.14 Instruments:
(a) Parental acceptance has been measured by PARQ(C) and PARQ(M) designed by Rohner and Rohner and adapted in Hindi under Indian conditions by Jaiprakash and Bhargawa.

(b) For the measurement of personality Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire ("The HSPQ), designed by Cattell and Hella Beloff and adapted by Kapoor and Singh under Indian conditions has been employed.

(c) For Authoritarianism, F-scale designed by Adorno, et al. and adapted by Promila Sarin under Indian conditions has been used.

5.20 Conclusions:
1.a: On Factor 'A' of HSPQ, a difference between $H_{Ac}-H_{Am}$ and $L_{Ac}-L_{Am}$ group has been observed. Hypothesis $H_1$ partially retained to that extent.

b: On Factor 'B' of HSPQ, a moderately significant difference has been observed between $H_{Ac}-H_{Am}$ and $L_{Ac}-L_{Am}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$ partially retained to that extent.
c: On Factor 'C' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been observed between $H_{Ac-HAm}$ and $L_{Ac-LAm}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$ partially retained to that extent.

d: On Factor 'G' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been found between $H_{Ac-HAm}$ and $L_{Ac-LAm}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$ partially retained to that extent.

e: On Factor 'H' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been observed between $H_{Ac-HAm}$ and $L_{Ac-LAm}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$, retained to that extent.

f: On Factor 'J', of HSPQ, a significant difference has been found between $H_{Ac-HAm}$ and $L_{Ac-LAm}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$ retained to that extent.

g: On Factor '0' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been found between $H_{Ac-HAm}$ and $L_{Ac-LAm}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$, retained to that extent.

h: On Factor 'O 3 ' of HSPQ, a significant difference exists between $H_{Ac-HAm}$ and $L_{Ac-LAm}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$, retained to that extent.

i: On Factor 'D' of HSPQ, there exists no significant difference between $H_{Ac-HAm}$ and $L_{Ac-LAm}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$ retained to that extent.

j: On Factor 'F' of HSPQ, no significant difference exists between $H_{Ac-HAm}$ and $L_{Ac-LAm}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$ retained to that extent.
On Factor I of HSPQ, a moderate significant difference has been observed in $H_{Ac-H_{Am}}$ and $L_{Ac-L_{Am}}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$ partially rejected to that extent.

On Factor $Q_2$ of HSPQ, no significant difference exists between $H_{Ac-H_{Am}}$ and $L_{Ac-L_{Am}}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_1$ retained to that extent.

2. (a) On Factor 'A' of HSPQ, a significant difference existed between $H_{Ac-H_{Am}}$ and $L_{Ac-L_{Am}}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ partially retained to that extent.

(b) On Factor 'B' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been found between $H_{Ac-H_{Am}}$ and $L_{Ac-L_{Am}}$. Hypothesis $H_2$ partially retained to that extent.

(c) On Factor 'C' of HSPQ a significant difference has been observed between $H_{Ac-H_{Am}}$ and $L_{Ac-L_{Am}}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ retained to that extent.

(d) On Factor 'E' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been observed between $H_{Ac-H_{Am}}$ and $L_{Ac-L_{Am}}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ retained to that extent.

(e) On Factor 'G' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been found between $H_{Ac-H_{Am}}$ and $L_{Ac-L_{Am}}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ retained to that extent.

(f) On Factor 'H' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been found between $H_{Ac-H_{Am}}$ and $L_{Ac-L_{Am}}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ retained to that extent.
(g) On Factor 'J' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been found between $H_{Ac}^H_{Am}$ and $L_{Ac}^L_{Am}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ retained to that extent.

(h) On Factor 'O' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been found between $H_{Ac}^H_{Am}$ and $L_{Ac}^L_{Am}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ retained to that extent.

(i) On Factor 'O_3' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been observed between $H_{Ac}^H_{Am}$ and $L_{Ac}^L_{Am}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ retained to that extent.

(j) On Factor 'O_4' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been found between $H_{Ac}^H_{Am}$ and $L_{Ac}^L_{Am}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ retained to that extent.

(k) On Factor 'I' of HSPQ, a significant difference has been observed between $H_{Ac}^H_{Am}$ and $L_{Ac}^L_{Am}$ groups. Hypothesis $H_2$ partially rejected to that extent.

(l) On Factors D, F, and Q_2 no significant difference has been observed in $H_{Ac}^H_{Am}$ and $L_{Ac}^L_{Am}$ children. Hypothesis $H_2$ partially retained to that extent.

2. Results of the children belonging to various Professional groups:

(A) Business and Clerk groups:

There existed no difference between children of these two groups on any Factor of HSPQ and F-scale. Thus, hypothesis ($H_3$) is partially accepted to that extent.
B. **Business and Teacher groups:**

On Factor 'A' of HSPQ children of Teacher group have been found significantly higher than children of Business group.

On Factor 'J' and 'Q₄' of HSPQ, children of Business group have been found significantly higher than children of Teacher group.

On other factors of HSPQ and F-scale, no difference existed between children of Business group and children of Teacher group.

C. **Business and Doctor groups:**

There existed no difference between children of Business group and Doctor group on any Factor of HSPQ and F-scale.

D. **Business and Engineer groups:**

On Factor 'Q₃' of HSPQ the children of Engineer group have been found significantly higher than Business group.

On Factor 'Q₄' of HSPQ and 'F', the children of business group have been found significantly higher than Engineer group.

On other factors of HSPQ, no difference existed between Business and Engineer groups.
E. **Clerk and Teacher groups:**

On Factors A, G & O of HSPQ, the children of Teacher group have been found significantly higher than clerk group.

On factors 'I' and 'J' of HSPQ, the children of Clerk group have been found significantly higher than Teacher group.

F. **Clerk and Doctor groups:**

On Factor 'D' of HSPQ children of Clerk group have been found significantly higher than Doctor group.

On Factor 'O' of HSPQ, children of Doctor group have been found significantly higher than Clerk group.

On other factors of HSPQ and F-scale, there existed no difference between Clerk and Doctor groups.

G. **Clerk and Engineer groups:**

On Factor 'G' of HSPQ, the Engineer group has been found significantly higher than clerk group.

On Factor 'I' of HSPQ, Clerk group have been found significantly higher than Engineer group.

On other Factors of HSPQ and 'F' Scale, no difference has been found between these two groups.

H. **Teacher and Doctor groups:**

On Factors 'E', 'F', 'I' and 'Q_4' of HSPQ, Doctor group has been found significantly higher than Teacher group.
On Factor 'G' of HSPQ, Teacher group has been found higher than Doctor group.

On other factors of HSPQ and 'F'-scale, no difference has been found between the two groups.

I. Teacher and Engineer groups:

On Factors 'A' and 'O' of HSPQ, Teacher group has been found to be significantly higher than Engineer group.

On Factors 'J' and 'Q_3' of HSPQ, Engineer group has been found higher than Teacher group.

On other factors of HSPQ and 'F'-scale, no difference existed between the two groups.

J. Engineer and Doctor groups:

On Factors 'E', 'G', 'H' and 'Q_3' of HSPQ, Engineer group has been found significantly higher than Doctor group.

On Factors 'F', 'I', 'O' & 'Q_4' of HSPQ, Doctor group has been found significantly higher than Engineer group.

On other factors of HSPQ and 'F'-scale, no difference existed between these two groups.

Hypothesis H_3 has been partially retained to that extent on Factor 'F' of HSPQ.

3. On Factor 'F' of HSPQ, the children of joint family have been found significantly higher than children
of Nuclear family. On other factors of HSPQ and F-scale, no difference existed between the children of joint and nuclear family. Hypothesis $H_4$ rejected to that extent.

4. On factor 'H' of HSPQ Low income group have been found significantly higher than High Income group. $H_4$ rejected to that extent.

On other factors of HSPQ and 'F'-scale, no difference existed between Low and High Income groups. Hypothesis $H_4$, has been partially retained to that extent.

5. On Factors E, J and Q, of HSPQ oldest children have been found significantly higher than youngest children. Hypothesis $H_6$ retained to that extent.

On Factors 'A', 'C', 'G', 'H' and 'Q_3' of HSPQ, youngest children have been found significantly higher than oldest children. Hypothesis $H_6$ retained to that extent.

On other factors of HSPQ and F-scale, no difference existed between oldest and youngest.

Hypothesis $H_6$ has been fully retained.

5.30 Suggestions for Improvement in the Present Study:

The present study has been conceptualized to evaluate the personality trait of the highly accepted children. Attempts have been made to enhance its scientific nature by controlling and carefully designing various methodological issues and conceptual frame work.
Rohner's (1980) Acceptance-Rejection Theory constituted the very base of the study; and the problem as such, under this context, is quite new one for the Indian children. The investigator has tried her best to employ valid and dependable instruments and sophisticated methodology; however, there, still, remained some limitations which might affect the scientific nature of the present study; and consequently its findings. They are:

1. The study has been conducted on the $H_{\text{Ac}}-H_{\text{Am}}$ as well as $L_{\text{Ac}}-L_{\text{Am}}$ children. The size of the sample is quite dependable; however, its findings could be verified over still a bigger sample drawn from other Indian cultural groups. Such a study would not only enhance the dependability of the results, but also confirm the Acceptance-Rejection theory of Rohner (1980) under Indian socio-cultural settings.

2. In the present study, the investigator failed to have dependable size of children belonging to $H_{\text{Ac}}-L_{\text{Am}}$ and $L_{\text{Ac}}-H_{\text{Am}}$. If a much bigger sample from different family units is covered, then it may be possible to test the hypothesis of personality traits of children belonging to $H_{\text{Ac}}-L_{\text{Am}}$ and $L_{\text{Ac}}-H_{\text{Am}}$ groups.

3. Verification of Rohner's (1980) Acceptance-Rejection Theory on diverse Indian cultures might have enlarged the scope of the present study; but such a problem falls beyond the scope of the present study.
The status of the present study could have been much improved; had these limitations been taken proper care; but they have been considered beyond the scope of the present study.

5.40 Follow-up Studies:

The studies on child development are as vast and as important as the children as the richest resources of the nation are. Numerous research problems could be conceptualized which could improve the quality of human resources in the country as such. Some of the research problems of national significance are:

1. A cross-cultural study of child-rearing practices and personality development.

2. A Developmental Study of Artistic Talents among the Tribal and Non-Tribal Children.


4. A Study of Fathering as a Function of Personality Development.

5. A Study of Parental Protection and Personality Development.


8. Verification of Erikson's Theoretical Framework and its effect on Development of Personality Traits of the Indian Children.


10. Tribal Culture and Personality Development.