CHAPTER TWO
CHAPTER – II
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE
PREDICTORS

In order to know about the various predictors taken in the present study and also to understand the rationale of the relationship of these predictors with the self-concept of the students, the conceptual frameworks of the predictors under consideration are presented here.

2.1 INTELLIGENCE

Researches in the field of education and psychology has led to the belief that intellectual superiority of an individual is the most important determinant factor in the field of academic performance as well as creative talent. The concept of intelligence has been defined in various ways. Earlier definitions were intuitive and asserted that intelligence is the ability to learn or solve problems. Later, more logical and philosophical attempt were made to define this term.

Dictionary of Education by Good (1973) defines intelligence as “the capacity to acquire and apply knowledge”. A number of definitions have been evolved by psychologists according to their own concept of term intelligence”. All the definitions of intelligence have been systematized by Vernon (1950) and Freeman (1962). Vernon (1950) classified all the definitions under three broad categories such as biological, psychological and operational. Freeman (1962), though classified all definitions of intelligence into three categories, but his approach differs from Vernon.
VERNON'S (1950) CLASSIFICATION

1. Biological Approach:

This category of definitions emphasizes the adaptive nature of human beings. According to Vernon (1950), this idea of intelligence is the most fundamental of all. Intelligence, according to this approach, is the capacity to adapt relatively in new situations of life. But if this biological concept of intelligence is critically examined, it is found that many great men to whom one could hardly deny an assessment of exceptional intelligence (e.g. Pascal, Kafka and numerous other academic experts) have been ill-adapted in their social and physical environment. Also the biological concept of intelligence is not of great use from practical point of view in the study of individual differences within a culture.

2. Psychological Approach:

Here definitions advanced by experts contained a clear commitment about the relative effects of heredity and environmental influence in the development of intelligence. Burt (1937), an English psychologist, defined intelligence as innate general cognitive ability. Since scores on existing intelligence have often been shown to be susceptible to environmental influences, a consequence of this definition is that intelligence as defined differs from intelligence as measured by tests. Psychologists have attempted to escape from this dilemma in two ways. Hebb (1949) and Cattell (1971) have distinguished two kinds of intelligence - calling them intelligence 'A' and intelligence 'B' or fluid and crystallized intelligence. The distinctions made by Hebb and Cattell are more or less the same - in each case fluid intelligence or 'A' is thought as genetic potentiality, or the
basic innate qualities of the individual’s nervous system and the crystallized intelligence or ‘B’ is mainly the result of experience learning and environmental factors. Psychologists have specified two types of intelligence, which will in normal circumstances, overlap as much as to be in practice indistinguishable. Further, it is impossible to assess genetic potential uncontaminated by the effects of training and experience and other environmental influences.

The second type of escape from the dilemma is to adopt an operational definition of intelligence.

3. Operational Approach

Operational definitions are important to understand the concept of intelligence in clear and definite terms. Scientific terms are defined not in isolation, as in a dictionary but by stating the observable conditions under which a sentence containing the terms is true or false. Instead of defining the word by itself, it is defined by giving the conditions for the truth of a sentence in which the term occurs. Such definitions are called operations for they frequently state what must be done in order to determine a child’s I.Q. We must first administer a test of specific kind, then observe his performance on the test and finally make certain calculations and decisions. All of these conditions define the meaning of I.Q., as it appears in the sentence – Ramu has an I.Q. of 115.

FREEMAN’S (1962) CLASSIFICATION:

1. Adjustment or Adaptation ability:

The definitions of this category lay emphasis on the adjustment ability of an individual to his environment. The individual is thought
intelligent in proportion, to his ability to adjust to new situations and problems of life. The person who is intelligent has no difficulty in his adjustment. He adjusts in an effective way and can vary his behaviour according to the situation. A person who is less intelligent is rigid and has less response to make in the process of social interaction. The definition given by Stern (1914) comes under this category. He defined intelligence as a general capacity of an individual, consciously to adjust his thinking to new environment.

2. Ability to learn:

The definitions of this category emphasizes the importance of an individual’s ability to learn. Learning ability is an index of one’s intelligence.

3. Ability to carry on abstract thinking:

This category of definitions lays more emphasis on the effective use of concepts and symbols in dealing with situations, especially presenting a problem to be solved through the use of verbal and numerical symbols. Terman (1921) while defining intelligence says, “An individual is intelligent in proportion as he is able to carry on abstract thinking”.

It should be kept in mind that different categories of definitions are not exclusive of each other, but are interdependent. The division has been made for the convenience of understanding. No doubt, on the surface, these categories appear quite different, but when we critically examine the definitions, we find that learning ability is the basic requisite condition for the other two aspects of intelligence.
Being dissatisfied by a number of definitions and interpretations, Boring (1961) defined, “Intelligence is what intelligence tests test”.

Stoddard (1943) presents a comprehensive description of term ‘Intelligence’. According to him, “Intelligence is the ability to undertake activities that are characterized by

(i) Difficulty
(ii) Complexity
(iii) Abstraction
(iv) Economy
(v) Adaptiveness to a goal
(vi) Social value and
(vii) The emergence

and to maintain such activities under conditions that demand a concentration of energy and a resistance to emotional forces”.

But according to Wechsler (1943), “Intelligence is the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally and to deal effectively with his environment”.

THEORIES OF INTELLIGENCE:

To clearly define the nature of intelligence, various philosophers and psychologists have developed various theories.

1. **Monarchic Theory:**

Philosophers developed the monarchical theory of intelligence, who believe that intelligence consists of single factor which equally works in all the situations of life.
2. Faculty Theory:

According to this theory, mind is made up of different faculties like reasoning, memory, discrimination and imagination etc. These faculties are independent of each other and can be developed by vigorous exercise of difficult subject matter. This theory gave rise to a new theory of education called theory of mental discipline.

3. Two-factor Theory:

According to this theory, which was given by Spearman (1927), the intellectual abilities were comprised by two factors – general ability as ‘G’ factor and group of specific abilities known as ‘S’ factor.

‘G’ factor is universal, inborn ability and general mental energy. It differs from person to person and greater the ‘G’ in a person, more he is successful in his life.

‘S’ factor is learned and acquired in the environment and varies from activity to activity in same individual. More the ‘S’ factor, more the person is successful in his vocation.

4. Multifactor Theory:

An American psychologist, Thorndike (1926) developed this theory. He was against the theory of general intelligence and he proposed that there are specific stimuli and specific mental responses and intelligence is just a name for an almost infinite numbers of actual or potential specific connections between these stimuli and responses. This is atomistic theory of intelligence and according to this, there is no general intelligence. He distinguished four attributes of intelligence:
(a) **Level**: This refers to the difficulty of a task that can be solved.
(b) **Range**: It refers to the number of tasks at any given degree of difficulty that we can solve.
(c) **Area**: It means that total number of situations at each level to which the individual is able to respond.
(d) **Speed**: This means the rapidity with which we can respond the test items.

Every intelligence test consists of four attributes. When a person is tested, a certain number of tasks (area) are given which vary in difficulty (attitude) and there are a number of items at each level of difficulty and they are responded in a given time (Speed).

5. **Group Factor Structure of Intelligence**:  
According to this theory, intelligence neither consists of two factors as proposed by Spearman nor multifactors as developed by Thorndike. These primary factors are as follows:

(i) Number factor (N)
(ii) Verbal factor (V)
(iii) Memory (M)
(iv) Reasoning (R)
(v) Word Fluency (W)

6. **Structure of Intellect (SOF) by Guilford (1967)**:  
In 1967 this theory was developed by Guilford and his associated at the Southern California University in the psychological laboratory. The
idea of structure of intellect model was formulated in fifties and successively refined and modified until the present model was finally developed in the year 1967.

He suggested that the mind is composed of at least three dimensions, instead of unidimensional model of intellect. The model is a three way classification of intellectual abilities namely – operations, contents and products.

(i) Operations – The act of thinking
(ii) Contents – The terms in which we think (such as words or symbols).
(iii) Products – The ideas we come up with.

Figure 2.1
Showing Guilford's Model of Intelligence (1967).
7. Vernon's Hierarchy Theory:

According to this theory which was developed by Vernon (1950), intelligence tests measure an overall factor 'G' as well as two main types of mental abilities.

The major group factors are:

(i) Ved: Verbal, numerical and educational.
(ii) KM: Practical, mechanical, spatial and physical

These two major factors can be divided into minor group factors, such as mechanical, manual and these minor factors further can be divided into various specific factors.

There are a number of theories of intelligence but not a single one is complete. So, the discussion on what intelligence is continues.

In the present study, intelligence is defined as “the ability to deal with numbers, analogies, opposites and synonyms to make categories to show inferences. Its measurement (Verbal) is the total scores on Tandon’s Group Test of General Mental Ability (1971).

2.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

The term socio-economic status is a combination of three terms viz. socio, economic and status. In order to understand this term let us first know the meaning of each word separately.

Status

By the term ‘Status’, we mean the recognition given to an individual by his group relations, (Kelly, 1951). In terms of the sense of belonging, (Park and Burgess, 1921) it is the result of the ranking of a role by the
group, (Ogburn and Nimcoff, 1960) that determines for its possessions of a degree of respect, prestige and influence, (Mclver et al, 1937). They are, thus, the ancient powers and privileges of the family bestowing prestige, authority and power (Mussen et al, 1963).

Societies have thus developed two types of distinct statuses – The ascribed and the achieved, (Linion, R., 1936, Ogburn and Nimcoff, 1960).

The 'ascribed status' is the recognition which a society gives to a person because of his position, (Cole et al, 1959). It is assigned to individuals without any reference to their innate differences or abilities, (Linton, R., 1936). Thus it can be predicted and ascertained since birth.

The 'achieved statuses' are as minimum, those requiring special qualities although they are not necessarily limited to those. They are not assigned to an individual since birth but are left open to be filled through competitions, (Linton, R., 1936; Ogburn and Nimcoff, 1960) and individual efforts (Linton R., 1936; Cole et at, 1939).

Social Status

A social person is one who conforms to the three criteria of social development. He should behave in approved manner, play the role which society prescribes for him and possess favourable attitudes towards people and social activities (Hurlock, E.B., 1964).

'Social status', therefore, is an indication of ones position of respect, prestige and influence in the social structure, (Cole & Montgomery, 1959) apart from his personal attributes which may either inhibit or enhance an individual success to success of information and his willingness to deviate from group norms (Everette, 1962) and may even vary with the groups, (Cole & Montegomery, 1959).
Economic Status

The word ‘Economic’ is used generally for the motives involving earning a livelihood, the accumulation of wealth and the like, (Drever, J., 1964). The economic endeavour entails ‘cherishing of things because of their material value’, (Spranger, 1928) and the pursuer, by virtue of this activity, carves for himself a place in society recognized as “Economic status’. Economic status, thus, stratifies modern population according to the amount and source of income which is usually derived from a set of occupational activities, the ownership of property or both.

Socio-Economic Status

The ‘Socio-economic status’ is obviously a blending of the two statuses as enumerated earlier. Though none of the two can exist without each other yet they are distinctively different. ‘Socio-economic status’ appears to be the resultant of the position of an individual in a society by virtue of a complex fusion of both of them, which often do not run parallel to each other in their own areas. This intermingling takes place in an undefined and curious manner eventually to present an indicator to ‘Socio-economic Status’.

‘Socio-Economic Status’ would, therefore, be a ranking of an individual by the society he lives in, in terms of his material belonging and cultural possessions along with the degree of respect, power and influence he wields.

Chamber’s Twentieth Century Dictionary (1970) meaning of Socio-Economic Status is ‘state’, condition, and standing of a person’. Green etc. (1971), the sociologist, defines it, “a position in a social group or grouping in relation to other positions held by other individuals in the
group or grouping”. Thus, socio-economic status refers to social and economic standing. A person who has high standing in the community and good income and who lives in a well furnished house of good quality and have ample opportunities is said to have good socio-economic status.

Good (1973) define socio-economic status as, “The level indicative of both the social and the economic position of an individual or group. In other words a set of potentially influential factors generally associated with home is called the socio-economic status of the child.

It may be defined as socio-economic rank or position of the individual in the group to which he belongs. An individual’s socio-economic status is his group standing or ranking in terms of his social and financial position in relation to others. He may be born to it or he may have acquired it. But in the present study, the subjects are just adolescents, so at this stage, the socio-economic status of one’s parents exercises a decisive influence on one’s fortunes in life. He picks up most of his work values from the family. We find that one’s economic condition tends to determine largely one’s social status, though of course, it is a fact that social status is also determined by some other factors i.e. education, birth and social inheritance. But it is very difficult to disentangle the social status from economic status. For all practical purposes, they represent a singly but complex reality in almost all advanced societies of the world.

This is the social standing of prestige of a person in his group or the group in the community, the position that a person or group holds in public esteem. Status may be vague in some respects but fairly defined in others, depending on the social or other norms. Economic status may be determined by the size or the source of one’s income. Economic status
alone may not ensure social prestige. This may rest partly on wealth but may also be determined by race, nationality, religion, family, lineage or other factors.

Meredith's (1972) study has shown that children of those families which are in general more healthy, developed at a higher social level. Children coming from upper class families are not only superior in health but also in intelligence and achievement. According to Terman and Marrel (1937) the children of the parents in high professional groups have their I.Q. near about 118 while children of clerks with same age group have I.Q. near about 107 and children of labourers have their I.Q. as only 97. It is also essential to note that even though there is relationship between socio-economic status and I.Q., yet it is not high. The correlation is only 0.3 and 0.4. In low socio-economic group, children of high I.Q. are found and in high socio-economic status group there are many children of low I.Q.

It is generally found, moreover, as one of a group of factors in the higher status home that tend to give its children the opportunities of acquisition of various concepts not generally enjoyed by those of lesser status home.

The blended complex of two statuses in terms of 'Socio-Economic Status' as such remains a highly important sociological concept and is usually measured in terms of occupation of father (Warners et al, 1949; Tyler, 1965, Kuppuswami, 1962; Pareek and Trivedi, 1964; Rach, 1970; Kulshrestha, 1972) education of father (Freeman et al, 1928; Warners et al, 1949; Kuppuswami, 1962; Pareek and Trivedi, 1964; Ruch, 1970) house (Freeman et al, 1928, Warners et al, 1949; Pareek and Trivedi, 1964; Tyler, 1965, Shirpurkar, Kulshrestha, 1972) income, (Warner et al,
Variable Sensitivity

'Social' and 'Economic' statuses show intimate relationship to other variables. It has been noted that abnormality in the family is an important correlate of poor performance in 'Social Status'. (Toby and Jakson, 1957), 'Economic Status', promotes leadership, (Lewis, 1954, Singh and Arya, 1966; Sharma, 1975) also affect the level of aspiration in children (Kanta, S., 1962) and religious affiliation, (Allinsmith and Lipset, 1963).

'Socio-Economic Status' influences, the values (Sharma, 1979) differences in home management and table - manner; in husband-wife relationship; in the concept of roles of parents, children and relatives, in the use of money, in child training and attitudes towards family life (McGuire, 1954) in the performance of children in examination (Singh, 1962) in social participation (Pareek and Trivedi, 1964). Children of high 'Socio-Economic Status' talk sooner, talk better than those of lower
'Socio-Economic Status', (Hurlock, 1964). At every age, the articulation of children of the upper 'Socio-economic group' is superior to that of children of lower groups (Landreth, 1958), 'Socio-economic status' promotes more association with their parents, (McCarthy, 1954).

It was also found that 'Socio-economic Status', favour intelligence (Fryer, 1922; Shanthamani, 1970) is curvilinearly correlated and the mid-group remains favourable in bringing about a recognized creative scientist or an engineer (Roe, 1951). It demotes interest agricultural pursuits, (Bharadwaj, 1978), executive and literary pursuits, (Bhardwaj, 1978), commercial, social and household pursuits, (Moolchandani, 1977) but promotes in artistic and executive pursuits, (Bharadwaj, 1978). 'Socio-economic Status' is a curvilinear correlate of scientific interest with oppression on mind, (Bharadwaj, 1978). 'Socio-economic Status' promotes vocational interests when adolescents possess high creativity with low of intelligence, (Bharadwaj, 1978).

Thus, it is clear that 'Socio-economic status' is a very important sociological concept which affects the individual's self-concept in so many ways.

In the present study, socio-economic status of the students is the measure of scores obtained on socio-economic status scale by Kohli (1988).

2.3 ADJUSTMENT

The concept of adjustment is as old as human race on earth. Systematic emergence of this concept starts from Darwin. In those days the concept was purely biological and he used the term adaptation. The adaptability to environmental hazards goes on increasing as we proceed
on the phlogenetic scale from the lower extreme to the higher extreme of life. Man, among the living beings, has the highest capacities to adapt to new situations. Man as a social being not only adapts to physical demands but he also adjusts to social pressures in the society.

The term Adjustment is broadly used for varying conditions of social or interpersonal relations in the society whereby adjustment means reaction to the demands and pressures of social environment imposed upon the individual. The demand may be external or internal to whom the individual has to react. According to Bell (1962), “adjustment refers not only to person’s overt behaviour but also to his own feelings about himself, about other persons and his environment. It is a way of reacting to external stimulus”.

Lazarus and Richard (1961) have interpreted adjustment from two important points of view as an achievement, and as a process. The first point of view emphasizes the quality or efficiency of adjustment and the second lays emphasis on the process by which an individual adjusts in his external environment. Adjustment as an achievement means how efficiently an individual can perform his duties in different circumstances. Four criteria have been evolved to judge the adequacy of adjustment. These are:

(1) **Physical health:**

The individual should be free from physical ailments like headache, ulcers, indigestion and impairment of appetite.
(2) **Psychological comfort:**

One of the most important facts of adjustment is that individual has no psychological diseases as obsession, compulsion, anxiety and depression etc.

(3) **Work Efficiency:**

The person, who makes full use of his occupational or social capacities, may be termed as well adjusted in his social set up.

(4) **Social acceptance:**

Every body wants to be socially accepted by other persons. If a person obeys social norms, beliefs and set of values, we may call him well adjusted but if he satisfies his needs by antisocial means then he is called maladjusted.

Boring (1966) regards adjustment as a process by which a living organism maintains a balance between its needs and the circumstances that influence satisfaction of those needs.

Norman (1968) has studied the adjustive process from different angles. He used the term accommodation and assimilation to represent the alternation of oneself or environment as a means of adjustment. A person, who carries his values and standard of conduct without any change and maintains these in spite of major changes in the social climate, is called assimilator. The man, who takes his standard from social context and changes his beliefs in accordance with the altered values of the society, is called accommodator. For good adjustment one has to resort to both the devices.

For Kundu and Tutoo (1969), the term 'adjustment' refers to a harmonious relationship between the person and environment. The
degree of harmony depends upon certain potentialities within a person and the character of the environment.

Eysenck’s Encyclopedia of Psychology (1972) defines adjustment as a state in which the needs of the individuals on the one hand and the claims of the society on the other hand are fully satisfied.

Adjustment is, therefore, a state of harmony between the needs, activities, responses of a person and his environment. Frequently, adjustment is defined as conformity to group standards. Those who do not conform are considered to be maladjusted.

However, it can be inferred on the basis of survey of various definitions that –

1. Adjustment is a process involving felt need. It’s thwarting leading to varied responses and ultimately terminating in satisfaction of the aroused need.

2. Adjustment is a continuous process involving a series of adjustment. It needs happy and contended life.

3. Adjustment implies equilibrium between the individual and his environment.

4. Adjustment tends to enable the individual to bring desirable changes in the environmental conditions.

As per Freud’s Theory of Adjustment (cited by Chauhan, 1978) there is constant conflict between the instinctive urges and environmental conventional restrictions and social pressure in the mind of the individual. If a person is strong and his consciousness sides with his instinctive desires, he satisfies them irrespective of violation of social norms. Such a person defies the norms of the society for his pleasure.
But most of the persons do not violate the social norms because of their training and education in childhood. They accept the social taboos and inhibitions imposed by the community. They fight with their own wishes, repress and suppress all those that are socially reprehensible. It is this unresolved conflict between inner impulse and taboos of the society that give rise to maladjustment manifested in a wide range of behavioural actions. Neurosis is cause by the constant interaction of three forces

a) The powerful unconscious instinctive impulses
b) The ego and
c) The superego.

The powerful instinctive desire when after emerging from unconsciousness is blocked by ego and superego further causes the conflict. This conflict leads to subterfuges by which the urge seeks satisfaction. The neurosis is the outward manifestation of this conflict and can be understood by interpreting these forces correctly. Adler (cited by Chauhan, 1978) differs from Freud chiefly in the emphasis that Freud attaches to the principle of hedonism and the sex impulse. Advocating quite a different approach to understand human behaviour, he observes that people can sacrifice their sex gratification in order to attain the goal they set for themselves. Adler gives the feeling if inferiority as the primary cause of stress. The child struggles hard to overcome the feeling of inferiority in an attempt to master his environment. The neurotic solution to this feeling of inferiority and helplessness is to strive for personal power or superiority. All persons are striving for attaining superiority in different fields using a variety of approaches. The desire to dominate is the central core of human behaviour in the choice of
profession, vocation, friends etc. Adler concludes that the desire for superiority is the universally acceptable goal of human behaviour and neurosis is a device to dominate in various walks of life.

In the present study adjustment has been operationally defined as person’s overt behaviour, his feelings about himself, about others and environment and the ways he reacts to external stimulus and scores obtained on Mittal’s (1976) Adjustment Inventory is the measure of adjustment which includes home, health, social, emotional and total adjustment.

2.4 ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The primary concern and the most important goal of education is academic achievement of pupils despite many varied statement about the aims of education. Academic achievement is also considered to be the main area of educational research by the researchers. Stephens (1960) states, “Not that other aspects of educational objectives are to be ignored but the fact remains that academic achievement is the unique responsibility of all educational institutions established by the society to promote a wholesome scholastic development of the pupils.

In the words of Crow and Crow (1956), “Achievement means the extent to which a learner is profiting from instruction in a given area of learning. In other words, achievement is reflected by the extent to which skill or knowledge has been acquired by a person from the training imparted to him, it is the outcome of general and specific learning experience. Therefore, the special acknowledgment of a person’s skill, the range and depth of his knowledge or his proficiency in designated area of
learning or behaviour is indicative in designated area of learning or behaviour is indicative of the extent of his achievement.

In view of Good (1959), Biswas and Aggarwal (1971), there seems to be considerable similarities in as much as all of them place emphasis on knowledge attained or skills developed in the academic subjects usually designated by test scores. In other words, academic achievement refers to the degree or level of success or proficiency attained in some specific area concerning school or academic work.

Pressey, Robbinson and Horrock (1959) define achievement as “the status or level of person’s learning and his ability to apply what he has learned”. According to them achievement would not only include acquisition of knowledge and skills but also attitudes and values as aspects of achievement. Achievement as manifested by the application of acquired skills and knowledge is a product of learning attitudes and interests since these factors would implicitly influence the extent of achievement. According to Travers and Robert (1964) the term refers to any desirable learning that occurs. It is obvious that whether a particular learning is referred to as an achievement or not, depends upon whether some body considers it desirable or not. Hence any behaviour that is learned may come within a definition of achievement.

Good (1973) defines academic achievement as “knowledge attained or skill developed in the school subjects usually designated by the test scores or by marks assigned by the teacher or both”.

Two fundamental assumptions of psychology made it necessary to measure academic achievement. First, there are differences within the individual from time to time known as behaviour oscillation i.e. academic achievement of the same individual differs from time to time, from one
class to another and from one educational level to another. Secondly, there are individual differences. Individuals of the same age group, of same grade, usually differ in their potential abilities and academic proficiency whether these are measured by standardized measure of achievement by teacher’s grading or by marks obtained in tests and examinations.

2.5 URBAN-RURAL DIFFERENCES:

The main distinction between urban and rural setting may be that in rural setting we get primary products e.g. sugarcane, wheat etc., whereas in Urban setting we get secondary products i.e. sugar, oil, etc.

Urban denotes a distinct quality of human community, special mode of existence or way of life which is characteristics of the city. Thus, the students who study in urban schools and colleges are considered to be urban students.

A society or community may be classified as rural which has less population, less social differentiation, slower rates of social chance, agriculture as a major occupation. The students who are studying in rural schools and colleges are considered to be belonging to rural group.

The role and urban environment in building the self-concept of students has paramount importance. Difference in environment leads to differences in student’s behaviour, intellectual status, anxiety, popularity, their happiness, satisfaction, beliefs their physical appearance, their own motives assumptions, attitude and feelings.

In the present study urban students have been defined as those students who are living and studying in town or cities,
whereas rural students are those students who have rural background and are also studying in those institutions which are established in rural areas.