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Man lives in a microcosm and not in cosmos. He is a member of many different social groups. As a matter of fact these groups are vitally significant to his individual welfare. All such groups have been classified as psychological and social-organizational. Psychologically people make groups because of mutual interdependence, common ideology or similar attitudinal orientations. Some instances of psychologically formed groups are those of families, friendship circles, educational, religious, neighbourhood and recreational groups. The same groups may become social-organizational when they get functionally related to each other. Works have been reported on primary and secondary groups. In a primary group members possess warm, intimate and personal ties with one another. Such groups are generally small and of face to face type. Their inter-personal behaviour is spontaneous and are devoted to their mutual ends.

It is not to be supposed that the unity of the primary group is one of mere harmony and love, it is always a differentiated and usually a competitive unity, admitting of self assertion and various passions which may be tinged with sympathy. A member of primary group may be ambitious but the chief object of his ambition is likely to be some desired place in the matrix of interpersonal relations.
In the other hand the secondary groups are mostly formal. The relations among the members have been characterized as "Social" and "Contractual". It is not necessary for the member to participate in such groups as whole personalities; they relate themselves with the groups through functions or some special capacities. Social organizations serve the best examples of such groups.

As he grows, man, is more and more influenced by others, if the growing individual is in any way not efficient in entering into the relationship with others, he will find himself in a neutral position in the group, where he is neither able to act upon nor to be contacted by the other members of the group. The individual also learns to respond selectively to the group members. He may learn to approach only those who will respond to him and avoid those whom he feels he can not interest or who may repel him.

The initial efforts to study the interpersonal relationship expressed through choices and mutual attractions were made by Jacob L. Moreno (1923) & Helen Hall Jennings (1944). Moreno devised the sociometric test and Jennings adapted it to study interpersonal attractions in a classroom situation. It was Moreno's genius to devise criterion for uncovering the interpersonal choices of the children for one another. This was certainly a method of measuring group structure which is yet not surpassed by any method in its usefulness for the study of interpersonal choices.
Sociometry as an important technique of understanding the interpersonal attractions was presented by Moreno (1953) in his most stimulating book called "who shall survive." He called this book, "the foundation stone of the sociometric movement." This book appeared in 1934 but the conceptual origin of sociometry had an early history. It was in 1923 when his publication "DAS STANDFADTHABEN" was made public. The book contained the seeds for sociometric thinking. In a way his thinking was reaction to Marxism and psychoanalysis, both of which were opposite to each other but had one thing in common, "They both rejected religion, they both disavowed the idea of a community which is based on spontaneous love, unselfishness and in positive goodness and naive cooperativeness," while asserting the role of sociometry he remarked:

"I want to do through sociometry what religion without science had failed to accomplish in the past and what science without religion has failed to accomplish in Soviet Russia." (4)

How far Moreno succeeded in his claims was only a matter of apprehension. His positive regard for religion and love could be a philosophy underlying his techniques, but he confesses that:

"It is curious... that it is these techniques which made sociometry famous and which have been universally accepted, whereas its underlying philosophy of life has been relegated to the dark corners of library shelves or entirely pushed aside." (5)
In 1912 Moreno had developed two hypotheses, which later on,
became the genesis of sociometry. These were:

1. The spatial proximity hypothesis
2. The temporal proximity hypothesis

According to the first, the nearer two individuals are to
each other in space, the more do they owe to each other
their immediate attention and acceptance. First love by
the norest is meant, "the one who you live next to, whom
you meet first in the street, whom you find working next to
you or who is introduced to you first".

The sequence of proximity in space establishes a
precise order of social bonds and acceptance. The second
hypothesis postulates:

"The sequence of proximity in time
establishes a precise order of
social attention and veneration
according to a temporal imperative, the
here and now demands help first, the
next in time to the here and now back-
ward and forward requires help next." (p.6)

The basic theoretical frame developed and guided by the
practical insights from the fields was finally reported in
1934 with much enthusiasm around. Tlorian Inaniecki (1937)
has remarked:

"The issues raised by new field
(sociometry) were all sociological
problems but that sociometry merits
the credit for enabling the behavioral
scientists to study 'phenomenon' which
for thousands of years have attracted
the social scientists and were rather
evaluated than investigated." (p.7)
The greatest contribution of Moreno is that he could develop the technique which made it possible to investigate the issues which were, merely, evaluated previously.

Sociometry is defined as a technique for

"Revealing and evaluating the social structure of a group through the measurement of the frequency of acceptance or non acceptance among the individuals who constitute the group. It is an approach to the problem of studying interpersonal relations. This technique permits the analysis of each person's position and status within the group, with respect to a particular criterion" (Moreno 1934).

The basic sociometric techniques were generated between 1918 and 1923. By 1932 the American public was made aware of the concepts and research tools. The National Committee on prisons and prison labour published Moreno's "Application of group method to classification, group therapy, interaction diagrams and sociograms.

In order to demonstrate the psychological organization of a community, sociograms were used during the 57th Annual Session of the American Association on Mental Deficiency(1933).

RECENT TRENDS

In its recent past, sociometry has been brought to the point of theorizing about small groups. The researchers are realizing the fact that the interest in small groups has two major functions: (i) that there are miniature societies, where social phenomena can be accurately restructured; and
(ii) small groups are not mere minatures of larger social fabrics rather they are themselves configurations which really exist in societies and the matter most (Lankford, 1974).

Subsequently, the sociometric techniques were devoted to the understanding and analysis of relationships. The question like: what variables are, or are not, related to homogeneity of sociometric choice? This would simply mean whether people of similar intelligence, sex, race, residence and socioeconomic status form the specific sociometric patterns.

Besides primary theoretical considerations, numerous methods of interpretation and analysis have been recently added to the field of sociometry. By now we have a wide range of techniques right from Relational Analysis of Moreno (1942) to Multi-item measures of attraction (Kipnes, 1957) and Multidimensional scaling techniques (Peay, 1974).

Investigators like Shannon (1949), Lumborg (1952), Davitz (1955), Newcomb (1963), Leik and Williams (1977) have made use of these techniques for the purpose of relational analysis.

Scaling devices in sociometry are also of a recent origin. In an attempt to develop a sociometric index that would measure effectiveness of participation for group activity, Sekinski, Siegel, and Vanata (1952) are reported to have used an approximation of the Thurston Method of equal intervals.
The graphic methods introduced by Moreno (1942) have also been improved upon. Attempts to standardize them have been made by Northway (1944) with her "Target-Sociogram," Borgatta (1950) and Ivitta (1961) who recommended the application of direct factor-analysis to the matrix of sociometric choices.

Statistical methods have also been used in the field of sociology. Irons (1944) developed the idea of a chance model for the analysis of sociometric data. The model got currency after some modifications by Crisswell (1947). Another significant statistical approach was introduced by Forsyth and Katz (1946). This was called the Matrix Approach in which the sociometric data is analyzed through the methods of manipulating N x N table summarizing sociometric responses.

An attempt with factor analysis is also not very new to the understanding of sociometric data. In 1948, Cervinka suggested the use of factor analysis and this suggestion was put to use by Rock and Hussain (1950) and Carried further by MacLay, French and Micheal (1966). Recently Yule (1969) has devised an approach to the detection of cliques which is generally called the Algebraic Model to clique understanding. The model represents a new direction in the analysis of clique structure. The greatest advantage of the model is that it is based on powerful theorems about sets and relationships. However, this approach is yet in making.
THE PRESENT STUDY:

Sociometry, personality and culture

Since its inception in 1934, sociometry has been successfully revealing the group structures (Evans, 1952). An interesting era in the field, however, began when several important variables were related to the sociometric data. The purpose was to understand, as to why some people are more socially accepted while others are rejected. Obviously, popularity could not be attributed to any single factor and studies brought out a number of factors related with social acceptability: physical attraction (cooper, 1944; Lee, 1943; Walster, 1974; Miller, 1973; Rudux, 1981), intelligence (Heber, 1956; Wighton, 1948; Beazley, 1948; Mannino, 1976), age (Heber 1956; Cohen, 1977), socio-economic status (Lundberg, 1937; Tagiuri, 1952, Barnett and Zuker, 1977; Burzynski, 1980) etc. were time and again found to be related with sociometric popularity and isolation.

Understandably, personality traits are the most frequently studied correlates of sociometric choices. A number of investigators reported that sociometric popularity is conditioned by personality factors (Seago, 1933; Flaming, 1935; Urdon, 1954; Lendaland, 1973). Nevertheless, little attention has been paid to the question whether the same set
of traits is required to attain popularity in different cultures. It is, therefore, worthwhile to study whether popular as identified in different cultural groups share a set of common traits.

The rationale for expecting cultural variation in the personality traits of the sociometric populars, neglectees or isolates can readily be derived from the theoretical formulations and the empirical findings of anthropologists and social psychologists interested in the study of role of culture in the formation of personality. A number of terms have been used to denote cultural specificity of personality characteristics. We have such terms as Basic personality (Kardiner and Linton, 1936), Model personality (Du Bois, 1944), and National character (Bell, 1968). All these terms share much in meaning, nevertheless, at the same time they are expressions of theoretical orientations and are associated with certain criteria employed for classification of people.

As we are not mainly interested in issues arising from different approaches to the study of culture and personality, it will be out of place to review the studies on the culture as related to personality formation. The rationale of expected cultural variations in the personality of sociometrically identified categories as nominated by their peers sharing same culture, can be brought out by citing the definition of 'Basic personality' as well as the postulates underlying this concept.
According to Kardiner and Linton, the basic personality type for any society is that personality configuration which is shared by the bulk of the society's members as a result of the early experiences which they have in common. The postulates on the basis of which the definition of basic personality is formulated are:

1. That the individual's early experiences exert a lasting effect upon his personality.

2. That similar experiences will tend to produce similar personality configurations in the individuals who are subjected to them.

3. That the techniques which the members of any society in the care and rearing of children are culturally patterned and will tend to be similar.

4. That the culturally patterned techniques for the care and rearing of children differ from one society to another.

Reviewing the work on sociometric choices one wonders that while similarity of race (Wold and Simon 1975), and social class (Dahlke 1953, Langworthy 1959) are considered as determinants of sociometric choice, and attempts have also been made to discern personality patterns associated with different sociometric categories, the significance of cultural variation has been ignored altogether. The realization of cultural differences
in the positive-negative evaluation of features of personality and their behavioral expressions led us to undertake the present study. It is also to be mentioned that since Edwards (1957) pointed out that endorsement of items of a personality inventory is highly correlated with their social desirability scale values, it has been controversial whether endorsement of items of a scale is an expression of the trait which the scale purports to measure or it is a reflection of the tendency to describe oneself in desirable terms. One of the possible reasons of subcultural variations in the personality characteristics of the populars may be that they have better understanding of the norms and socially desirable ideas, attitudes and patterns of behavior. They may, therefore, endorse socially desirable statements even when the content of the statements does not generally reflect their actual personality trait.

Further on the basis of a lot of empirical evidence regarding the role of similarity in interpersonal choices, it is reasonable to deduce that the individual is likely to be attracted by those who are the embodiment of such socially desirable traits, as the individual may or may not have imbibed in himself presently, but are the salient features of his ideal self-image which he will like to realize.

THE SCOPE OF THE PRESENT STUDY:

Three sub cultures viz., Jammu, Kashmiri and Ladakhi within the broader Indian social system are taken for the present investigation. All the three systems though politically
and geographically bound together, are culturally different (Hassan, 1959). When we talk of geographical affinity we mean their nearness to each other, otherwise the factors such as climate, water and mineral resources, soil and forestry etc. are more different than even cultural differences (Drew, 1962). In view of the problem of present study it seems necessary to have a look on their cultural diversity within a politico-geographical affinity.

Kashmir valley, "the terrestrial paradise of India", is at a height of 6000 feet above the sea, with its length and breadth as 84 and 23 miles respectively, it is enveloped by the stupendous mountains on all sides. In latitude a close correspondence is found between Kashmir and the places like Peshawar, Baghdad and Damascus (Asia), Fes, Morocco (Africa) and South Carolina (America) (Drew, 1962). But the elevation the valley is situated at, has granted it more temperate climate than what these countries individually enjoy. About the people of Kashmir Frederick Drew (1971) has observed:

"The Kashmiri people are doubtless physically the finest of all races that inhabit the territories we are dealing with, and I have not much hesitation in saying that in size and in feature they are the finest race on the whole continent of India. Their physique, their character and their language are so marked to produce a nationality different from all around, as distinct from their neighbours as their country is geographically separated." (11)
As for racial background Kashmiris are pure Aryan stock (Campbell, 1866, Bomzai, 1960, Cunningham 1970, Sharma 1972). In their facial expression and other physical features they are largely different from Ladakhis or Jamnuites (Cunningham, 1970). Added to these differences are variations in customs, social mores and other collective practices which put Kashmiris absolutely on different cultural planes as compared with either Jammu or Ladakh.

Jammu on the other hand, is only a tract surrounded by hills extended to the plains of Punjab, with a climate similar to the plains in India. The most inhabited areas of the tract of which the attitude may vary between 1200 to 2000 feet, experience severe heat in May and June. Due to intense heat the rocky surface of the ground causes hot winds to blow.

The Jammu people called 'Negros' are a mixed race (Crew 1971). "They are generally slim with higher shoulders and legs well formed but curiously broad". They are active but not muscledly great. They have a light brown complexion. Their customs, dress, values and language are altogether different from Kashmiris and nearly akin to Punjabis (Bomzai, 1962).

With a strikingly singular climate in the world, Ladakh is highly elevated territory. People living here are placed at a height of 12000 to 16000 feet above the sea level; because of this Ladakh was called 'the roof of the world' (Cunningham..."
It is mostly a desert; a land with almost no forests and pastures. It is inhabited by a peculiar race of people called Mongoloid (Cunningham, 1972). Ladakhis are known as Nates. Their face is broad, flat and square, with high cheekbones, large mouth and narrow forehead. The nose is broad and flat and generally much turned up with wide nostrils having little or no bridge. Their customs and other social celebrations are mostly peculiar and quite unknown to either Kashmiris or Jammuites. Other major differences are those of occupations, religious practices, type and manner of dressing, child rearing practices etc.

Politically, Kashmir has always remained the center of attraction to foreign rulers. The Afghans, the Mughals, the Sikhs and the British have subordinated Kashmir for a pretty long time. During the fifteenth century Ladakh and Jammu were important territories of Kashmir. But during Gulab Singh's rule Jammu assumed a central position (Jamzai, 1960). During that regime Dorawar Singh the ablest lieutenant of Gulab Singh invaded and annexed Ladakh completely to Jammu and Kashmir. The major political closeness between these three territories was, however, brought about by the famous Amritsar treaty (1846) when the British handed over all the hilly areas of northern India including Jammu and Kashmir, the Sikh rulers against a cash price of 3.75 lakhs (Prem Nath Bezaz, 1956).
The statehood thus gained, could not be disturbed even by the Quit Kashmir Movement (1931) initiated by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah (Kazaz, 1956). After the total eradication of the family rule and autocracy in Kashmir, the three regions came more closer than ever. Jammu became the winter capital and Srinagar (Kashmir) the summer capital of the state.

The above survey of geographical social, cultural and political life situations of the three sub-cultural groups leads us to expect that if there are cultural variations in personality traits of the individual having different levels of popularity among the members of their own culture, they should emerge in the study of sub-cultural differences in the personality correlates of sociometric status of the subjects drawn from Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. Thus the objectives of the present study were:

1. To study the differences in the personality traits of the subjects identified in different sociometric classes in the sub-cultures of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh.

2. To make within-culture comparisons of the personality profiles of the sociometrically identified groups. This comparison will not only be in terms of configuration of mean
scores on different traits, but also terms of means of different sociometric categories.

3. To study the differences in the personality traits of the subjects in different sociometric classes from among the subcultures of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. Here again not only the profile of one group will be compared with the profile of other groups, but factor to factor comparisons will also be made.

4. To determine the relationship between social desirability of the personality traits found to be associated with different socio-metric categories.