CHAPTER II

BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE EXPERIMENT:

PRETESTING OF QUESTIONNAIRE:

This questionnaire was tested on 20 students from different cross-sections as indicated earlier. The following shortcomings were found during testing:

* The group factors were confused with their subfactors.
* The meanings of some sub-factors were not clear.
* The factors which were not important were to have been crossed out but a few students did exactly the opposite. There was an ambiguity in our negative approach.
* A few factors which we had not included were highlighted by some. The list of factors were compiled from various research papers. The primary source however was from Ross Stagner (1948)³.

DESIGN OF QUESTIONNAIRE - I:

The feedback from pretesting of the preliminary questionnaire was incorporated in the design of Questionnaire - I. A major change was the shifting of personal biodata to part B and the factors themselves to part A. The major consideration in the shift was that some students may react negatively while filling up the personal biodata where questions on family income, guardians were involved.
The groupings of factors were also eliminated and the 57 factors that came to stay were sorted in the alphabetical order and presented to the respondent with a request to select the 10 more important factors which he or she would use in evaluating the peer for social acceptance into his or her group. In this questionnaire the respondent had the option to add any other factor not listed amongst the 57 factors.

**DESIGN OF QUESTIONNAIRE - II**

The scaling of the importance of the 57 factors on basis of the result of questionnaire - I was turned into a "vote count", counting the frequency with which a particular factor occurred among the 10 factors which the students were asked to select. For example 18 out of the total 48 students from a certain school preferred 'adaptability' to figure in their choice. In this way the frequency of occurrence for each of the factors was found out and the percentage of the students who opted for a particular factor was calculated. In the above example the percentage figure turned out to be 37.5. After having calculated the percentage figure for each of the factors for different schools independently the mean percentage was calculated. This ensured equal representation of each of the school in the importance rating of the factors because initial finding of the percentage figure implied that the student sample drawn from each of the schools was assumed to be hundred (100).

Though a crude method this served the purpose of cutting down the number of factors from fifty seven (57) factors to sixteen (16).
DESIGN OF QUESTIONNAIRE - III

How we selected the 5 factors for this questionnaire?

1. We calculated the mean, the standard deviation coefficient of variance for all the boys and for all the girls separately.

2. We chose the five factors having the least coeff. of variance, for example, out of the 16 factors in questionnaire - II, in the boy's list we found,
   i) Courage
   ii) Disciplined Mind
   iii) Helpful
   iv) Intelligence
   v) Orderly

3. And for the girl's the following 5 factors were chosen:
   i) Cheerfulness
   ii) Courage
   iii) Helpful
   iv) Honesty
   v) Friendliness

4. In the girl's case 4 factors mainly:
   i) Courage
   ii) Determination
   iii) Disciplined mind
   iv) Sincerity
all had coeff. of variance equal to .26. Out of these four we had to choose only one. So we fell back on the factor which had the least Std. Deviation. Thus the chosen factor became 'courage' with Std. Deviation, 1.90. The reason for choosing Std. Deviation is because it measures consistency. The reason for rejecting the mean criteria is because mean is often influenced by extreme values.

In constructing the model we started with the premise that evaluation factors used by boys and girls may be different. It is for this reason that although questionnaire I and II were common (in order to short list the many factors) the Delphi Experiment proceeded separately for boys and girls on two different sets of factors.

**DESIGN OF QUESTIONNAIRE - IV AND V**

The average points given by the class to the five factors in Questionnaire - III was given as feedback in Questionnaire - IV with a request to distribute 100 points among the factors according to their importance.

In addition it was also decided to test how rigid the respondent was in his/her evaluation of importance of the factors, by requesting them to explain any major deviation from the class average.

In questionnaire - V the feedback of the average point given by the class to the various factors was incorporated. Since a fair consensus was achieved by this time it was decided to terminate the Delphi Experiment.
Though a higher consensus could have emerged by extending the number of Delphi rounds, there were a few practical impediments to the continuity of the experiment. At the time the experiment was undertaken the final examinations of the schools were round the corner and the school authorities, however cooperative they were, they did show concern about distracting the students from their last few classes of school.

Nonetheless three rounds of Delphi and two earlier rounds of questionnaires were more than what a researcher may hope to conduct. As such the researcher feels that in order to develop the conceptional model these three Delphi rounds were sufficient for estimation of the parametric weightages.

DESIGN, ADMINISTRATION AND ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE - I :

PILOT DESIGN :

A pilot questionnaire was designed with two sections:

Part A - To collect personal biodata of the respondent

Part B - 20 Groups of factors, each group having many sub-factors.

This was modified version of Cattell's 9 basic table of traits by Ross Stagner.

After the pilot questionnaire was administered on 20 students (12 Vernacular and 8 English) feedback was obtained from the respondents to test out the questionnaire style for ease
of answering and understanding of terms. This initial exercise was very useful because it helped to define the subsequent questionnaires. The following were the problems encountered by the students:

1. They found some of the factors ambiguous.
2. They started ranking some of the cluster headings.
3. Most did not opt for negative factors.

These difficulties were eliminated in all the subsequent questionnaires.

DESIGN AND SAMPLE SELECTION:

QUESTIONNAIRE - I:

Keeping in mind the objectives of the research project the questionnaire was administered on 5 schools. They were different types of schools. Three English medium and two vernacular medium schools were selected. The chosen schools were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>GOVT./PRIVATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DONBOSCO SCHOOL</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FACULTY SCHOOL</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. KAMRUP ACADEMY</td>
<td>VERNACULAR</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ST. MARY'S CONVENT</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. T.C. GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>VERNACULAR</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The students of age group 15 to 16 were taken from Class X.

Of these the first 3 schools were boys' schools, while the fourth and the fifth schools were girls schools. This cross section of schools is representative of any school in an urban area of a developing country. There is also a commonality in the background of the children going to each school.

Usually children from upper middle class and the elite of society go to two of the schools while the children from the poorer section of the local society go to a third school. Students lacking in high scholastic achievements go to the fourth. While there may be exception to the above generalized statements made, the statements are based on various discussions the researcher had with the students and the teachers of the respective schools.

In order to identify the factors used in social acceptance by adolescents it was further decided to choose students from class X because this period in an individual is at once transitory and mercurial in behaviour. Also, the class X was chosen because the head of the institutions desired that the class X students be taken and the researcher could not dictate her choice.

For the Delphi Experiment we need some factors by which the students will be able to evaluate their fellow students. We selected 57 factors for the first questionnaire. Out of 57 factors the students were asked to select the 10 most important factors without assigning any rankings. We then calculated the percentage of students against each factor.
Where the percentage was more than 24% we short listed those factors for the next round.

This is done to reduce the number of factors as working with a large number of factors would be cumbersome not only for analytical work but also for the respondents of the Delphi questionnaires.

Samples of the various questionnaires are given in Appendix A.