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In the previous chapter, a brief review of the research studies related to the present investigation was presented. The purpose of the present study was to examine the effect of social maturity on the personality traits of primary school children, drawn from rural and urban communities. The other factor studied was the sex of the students.

In this chapter, the methodology of the research including operational definitions, selection of the variables, hypotheses, sample for investigation, tools used for data collection and the technique of statistical analysis employed for the analysis of data would be presented.

Operational Definitions of the terms used:

In the present investigation, two concepts need to be explained operationally, namely, personality traits and social maturity.

Personality traits:

Personality is a concept having a comprehensive connotation and it includes many dimensions which are developmental and integrative. Personality is a term
that is extensively used in psychology and social psychology, and refers to a number of psychological components in describing an individual. The term personality is used in many senses, the most satisfactory meaning of the term being "the integrated and dynamic organization of the physical, mental, moral and social qualities of the individual, as that manifests itself to other people in the give and take of social life (Drever, 1935). This would imply on further analysis that it comprises of the natural and acquired impulses, and habits, and interests, and complexes, the sentiments and ideals, the opinions and beliefs, as manifested in his relations within his/her social milieu. Kempf defines personality "as the habitual mode of adjustment which the organism effects between its own egocentric drives and the exigencies of environment".

Guthrie defines personality "as that which consists of those habits and habit systems of social importance that are stable and resistance to change".

Allport defines personality "as the dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physical systems that determine his unique adjustment
to his environment" - personality is both a process and a product. Some general characteristics of personality are:

1. It is continuous
2. It is a product of heredity and environment
3. It is a product of inner aspects and differences
4. It has two functions - overt and covert
5. It is unique
6. It is dynamic
7. It is the end product of learning.

The term "trait" indicates an individual's characteristic mode of behaviour in thought, feeling or act, inherited or acquired. Many psychologists have defined the concept of personality trait differently, as the very term is so flexible to include many shades of meaning. Hence, the term personality trait may be indicative of the actions, thoughts and feelings that are characteristics of an individual.

Trait is a concept, which is descriptive in nature that would characterise the habitual mode of behaviour of an individual manifesting the total personality of an individual which as already been indicated is a process of unique adjustment based on the internal organization of the psycho-physical systems.
A set of personality traits would provide a descriptive characterization of an individual which would typify the pattern of behaviour of a person under different conditions. Personality being unique in its nature the trait manifestation is also unique and it differs from individual to individual. However, as Allport and Odbert (1936) point out that though there are innumerable adjectives describing the individual behaviour, it is possible to arrive at a set of traits, which may more or less describe an individual. Persons like Gordon and others have made an attempt in this direction and in our Indian context Satyamurthy (1964), Sudha (1977) have examined a set of eight traits, on the lines of Gordon's personality profile and inventory (1953), which would be suitable for the study of personality of an individual. The descriptive definitions of these traits are as follows:

1. **Ascendency (Asc):** Those individuals who adopt an active role in group situations, who are self-assured and assertive in relationships with others, and who tend to make independent decisions stand high in the scale. As a contrast, those who play a passive role in the group, who generally lack self-confidence, who prefer to have others take the lead, and who tend to be
dependent on others for advice, stand low in the scale.

(2) **Responsibility (Res):** Individuals who take responsibilities seriously, who are able to stick to any job and get it done, who are persevering, and determined stand high in the scale. On the other hand, however, individuals who are unable to stick to tasks do not interest them, and who tend to escape from them, stand low in the scale.

(3) **Emotional Stability (ES):** Individuals who are well balanced, emotionally stable, and relatively free from anxiety and tension, will be at the upper end of the scale. Persons who demonstrate excessive anxiety, tension, hypersensitivity and nervousness, will be at the lower end of the scale.

(4) **Sociability: (Soc):** Individuals who like to be with other individuals, who are gregarious and sociable, can be placed at the upper end of the scale. Low scores reflect lack of gregariousness, restriction in social contacts, and in the extreme an avoidance of social relationships.

(5) **Vigour (Vig):** Individuals who are energetic, who like to work more rapidly and who are able to accomplish more than the average person, tend to be at the top end
of the scale. Individuals with low vitality or energy, with a tendency to tire easily, who fall below average in terms of work output, tend to be at the lower end of the scale.

(6) Original Thinking (OT): Individuals who tend to be original in their thinking, who like to work with ideas, enjoy solving difficult problems who are reflective, stand at the higher end of the scale. Persons who do not care for intellectual or creative activity, and who lack both an inquiring mind and a general inclination for original thinking, tend to be at the lower end of the scale.

(7) Cautiousness (Caut): Individuals who are highly cautious, who consider matters very carefully before making decisions, and who do not like to take chances or run risks, stand at the top end of the scale. While individuals who are impulsive, who act on the spur of the moment, who make hurried or snap decisions, stand at the lower end of the scale.

(8) Personal Relations (PR): Persons who have great faith and trust in people and are tolerant, patient and understanding tend to be at the higher end of the scale. Low scores reflect a lack of trust or confidence
Social Maturity:

The second concept that needs to be operationally defined is the concept of Social Maturity. Social maturity is a behavioural concept which indicates the extent to which an individual is capable of successfully encounter his/her social environment in such a way that he/she would be capable of operating at the optimum level of efficiency, success and profundity based upon his/her age and other demographic factors. The social maturity provides an index regarding the growth of the person, socially which gets reflected in his/her interaction with persons and situations in the society. It also gives a picture about the optimum level of co-ordination of an individual's psychological and social abilities which renders the individual capable of meeting challenges.

This has been studied in terms of the ten components namely,

1) Social Dependency
2) Isolation
3) Non-communication
4) Non-cooperation
5) Inhibition, which are negative in their nature, a high manifestation of which indicate a social
inmaturity, and

6) Social Autonomy
7) Gregariousness
8) Communication
9) Co-operation
10) Enrichment, which are positive in their nature, a high manifestation of which indicate a high degree of social maturity.

A brief descriptive definition of these are as follows:

1) **Social Dependency:** This is a level of social maturity in which an individual depends more and more on others even in respect of attending to his/her own personal needs and feels lost when he/she is expected to meet any challenge independently. He/she would expect and would feel happy when others control him/her and his/her job remains simply a case of following.

2) **Isolation:** This is an aspect of social maturity in which an individual feels lost in the company of others, does not enjoy social gatherings, feels shy to meet and interact with others, is afraid of big mob and crowd and always feels comfortable and secure while alone.
3) **Non-communication**: This is a dimension of social maturity in which the individual feels incapable of communicating or telling others about his views orally or otherwise. The individual feels tongue-tied, is not able to argue out an issue and he/she cannot articulate effectively and precisely and hence would like to withdraw from any such social encounters.

4) **Non-Co-operation**: This is a dimension of social maturity which is negative in its character wherein the individual's behaviour is loaded with such qualities as selfishness, quarrelsome, non-accommodative, unconcern, impatience, stubbornness, and hence render himself/herself non-cooperative in any social situation.

5) **Inhibition**: This is also a negative dimension of social maturity wherein the behaviour of an individual is characterised as infantile due to such factors as a positive hindrance, obstruction, causing damage, attempts to frighten and bully others, criticize others behaviour negatively and an incessant attempt to dominate others by forcing oneself upon others.

6) **Social Autonomy**: This is a dimension of social maturity which is positive in nature wherein an individual manifests such social behaviour patterns as
self-confidence, self-dependence, absence of peevishness, self-choice and self-determinism. It is also characterised by the level of maturity wherein an individual not only accepts his/her behaviour but also is capable of accounting himself/herself for his actions.

(7) Gregariousness: This is also a positive aspect of social maturity wherein an individual seeks and enjoys the company of others, involves himself/herself in group activities, shares the problems of others with himself/herself, takes up organising social and community activities, is eager to strike, maintain and continue friendship with others and generally exhibits socially an adventurous behaviour.

(8) Communication: This is an aspect of social maturity because of which an individual exhibits a capacity for expressing himself/herself clearly, is very articulate in all his/her verbal dealings, takes active participation in group discussions, is capable of entering into a dialogue or a discussion and is able to answer any questions, as also convince others about his/her views.

(9) Co-operation: Co-operation is a dimension of social maturity wherein an individual is ready to be of some
help to others, goes out of the way to render any assistance to the poor or to the needy, is socially dependable and have a keen sense of social responsiveness and thus generally becomes sociocentric rather than self-centred.

10) **Enrichment:** This is a positive dimension of social maturity in which an individual endeavours to help others, to grow, to mature and learn. By virtue of this, a person is ready to share his/her possessions and knowledge with others, always ready to support others psychologically, is ever so keen to appreciate the good points in others and is an optimistic individual who sees the bright side of others rather than their dark sides.

The first five dimensions are such that a higher score would indicate a lesser degree of maturity, whereas on the second set of five dimensions a higher score would indicate a greater degree of social maturity.

**Discussion of Variables:**

Personality has been the focus of the present investigation. The main interest of the study was to measure the personality of the students V, VI and VII
standards in respect of the eight personality traits studied. The eight traits taken up for the study form a syndrome providing a spectrum of the personality dimensions. This has been concern of the many developmental psychologists who have examined the factors and stages of development of personality (Allport, 1959; Hurlock, 1976; Smith, 1968; Donelson, 1973; Chorpadem, 1977; Mathew, 1971; Skinner, 1964).

It is also true that any educational system should take upon itself the task of personality development and character formation and hence there is a need to study the personality traits of school going children. Hence in this personality trait has been taken as the dependent variable.

Independent Variables:

There are a number of studies which have examined the developmental aspects of personality in relation to a number of factors (Sudha, 1977; Rao and Patil, 1969; Nighwan and Brar, 1966; Jasper Wesley, 1971, Cyrus Ellsworth Criswell, 1969; Adolph Silberman, 1969, Kumar, 1972; Mcelroy-Arahcraft, 1976; Arthur Kassoff, 1966; Rao Nalini, 1978) and also the factors affecting the personality development of an individual. In the present investigation the following variables were considered as independent variables which may affect the personality traits of students.
Personality being a developmental process gets affected by the chronological age and also the scholastic level in respect of the standard or the grade which has a formative influence on the growth. There are a number of studies which have reported the differential effect of age and grade on the personality development.

Therefore the standard in which the students were studying namely V, VI and VII were considered as an independent variables in the study.

Sex: There are a number of studies which have provided the evidence to show the differential effect of personality among boys and girls (Tyag 1960, Jain 1954, Singh 1969, Tapasak, Renee and Roodin 1979, Gupta 1972). Generally it is accepted that girls develop faster than boys even though this is not conclusive. Therefore in this investigation, sex was considered as an independent variable by including both boys and girls in the study.

Community: The pattern of personality development among urban and rural children varies from one another because of many sociocultural factors. Personality itself being sociogenic in nature, it is affected by
various factors which are different from one another in rural and urban communities. There are a number of studies which have shown that the rural children differ from those of urban children in many respects (Mangus 1948, Tiwari 1977, Sudha 1977).

Therefore in the present investigation community was included as an independent variable by drawing sample from rural and urban schools.

Type of Schools: An adolescent spends most of his waking hours in the school environment. There are many studies which have examined the school cultures and they have shown that every school as a social institution has its own unique syntality which has its own impact on the developing personality of the children who come under this influence. The administrative set up, the pattern of time-table, the involvement and many other such factors of educational importance in a private school differs from those of a government school. There are studies which have examined the differential cultural and social atmospheres of these institutions (Orpen Christopher 1971).

Therefore in the present study, children from both private and government schools were drawn to examine the effect of type of schools on the personality traits.
**Social Maturity:** Personality and Maturity are interrelated. They not only mutually depend upon one another, but also influence the growth of each other. In this sense, personality and maturity are cyclic in their interaction. Personality being a psychological dimension is essentially a process of dynamic organisation of many one's own facilities within an individual. The concept of social maturity is essentially behavioural in nature which form the basis for the development of personality. Likewise, the internalisation process within itself would support and consolidate the external matured behaviourable patterns. Therefore the effect of the level of social maturity on the personality formation is obvious. There are a number of studies which have provided insight regarding the formative influence of such psychological and social factors like intelligence, self esteem, self concept, social interaction and so on the personality formation (Lindgren 1956, Adam 1976, Gough Harrison 1966, Shosttani 1976, Jerry 1968, Vora 1981, Thompson 1969).

Therefore in the present study social maturity with its ten dimensions were considered as an independent variable.
Hypotheses:

The following hypotheses were formulated to determine the effect of the independent variables on the personality traits of students.

Major Hypothesis:

1) There is no significant difference in each of the personality traits of rural and urban students.

2) There is no significant difference in each of the personality traits of boys and girls.

3) There is no significant difference in each of the personality traits of students studying in different standards.

4) There is no significant difference in each of the personality traits of students studying in Government and private schools.

5) There is no significant difference in each of the personality traits of students with high and low levels of different dimensions of social maturity.

The above hypothesis was further divided into ten minor hypotheses in terms of ten dimension of social maturity.
Under each of the above major hypotheses, eight sub hypothesis were formulated and tested in terms of the eight personality traits.

**Sampling:**

The method used for drawing the sample was stratified random samplings technique. The population from which the sample in the present study was drawn consisted of all the students studying in V, VI and VII standards of primary schools of Tumkur District and Bangalore city. Ten schools were selected from urban and rural areas. The sample consisted of 150 boys and 150 girls respectively. The total sample being 300 students. The basis of stratification at the school level being community viz. urban and rural and also the type of schools namely government and private institutions and at the student level it was sex and standard.

**Tools of Research:**

The following tools were used for collecting the data in respect of the personality traits and social maturity of students.
Personality Scale:

A personality scale developed by Sudha (1977) on the lines of Guttman was used. This scale measures eight personality traits viz., (1) Ascendancy, (2) Responsibility, (3) Emotional stability, (4) Socialability, (5) Vigour, (6) Original thinking, (7) Cautionousness and (8) Personal Relations. Each trait has six items. The items have been reported to be discriminating as indicated by the obtained t-values for the upper and lower 25% of the sample. The indices of reproducibility showed that the scale is a quasi-scale in the sense used by Guttman measuring uni-dimensional traits. The scale consisted of forty eight items. Among the 48 items prepared, there were negative as well as positive items. The items were provided with three alternative choices to respond. They were 'Yes', 'Cannot say' and 'No'. The scoring procedure for the items were done by giving a score of 'ONE' to 'Yes' response of negative item, a score of 'TWO' for 'Cannot say' response and a score of 'THREE' for 'No' response.

Similarly for a positive statement the response 'Yes' is given a score of 'THREE', 'No' response with a score of 'ONE' and 'Cannot say' response with a score of 'TWO'.
The following table shows the number of items in relation to personality traits.

**TABLE-1**

Number of items in the personality scale corresponding to each personality trait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Personality traits</th>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ascendancy</td>
<td>1, 9, 17, 25, 33, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>2, 10, 18, 26, 34, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>3, 11, 19, 27, 35, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>4, 12, 20, 28, 36, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Vigour</td>
<td>5, 13, 21, 29, 37, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Original Thinking</td>
<td>6, 14, 22, 30, 38, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Continousness</td>
<td>7, 15, 23, 31, 39, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Personal Relations</td>
<td>8, 16, 24, 32, 40, 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see Appendix I A and I B for the Kannada and English version of personality scale)

**Reliability:** The split half co-efficients of reliability for the eight personality traits were found to range from 0.40 to 0.73 (N=1400) and 0.40 to 0.65 (N=190).

**Validity:** It was also validated against the RSSB Personality Inventory and indices obtained ranged from
0.22 to 0.42 (N=200) in respect of eight personality traits and were found to be significant. Hence the tool was deemed to be valid and reliable.

**Social Maturity Scale:**

A social maturity scale developed by Dr. Sudha and Satyanarayana (1983) at the Department of Education, Bangalore University, Bangalore was used to measure the level of social maturity of the students. It provides scores on ten dimensions and social maturity, out of which five are positive, and five are negative. The negative dimensions are social dependency, isolation, non-communication, non-co-operation and inhibition. The positive dimensions are social Autonomy, Gregariousness, Communication, Co-operation, and Enrichment.

There are ten items in each dimension. The items are arranged in such a way that the first five items cover the negative dimensions of social maturity and the sixth to tenth items cover the positive dimensions of social maturity respectively. This arrangement is followed to cover the ten items for each dimension. The scale is a self-reporting one, against each of the statement of which are provided three modes of responses.
namely, "A" for "Always", "S" for "Sometimes" and "N" for "Never". The student has to respond to each of the statement by encircling any one of the modes, which most appropriately describes him/her.

The scoring is done by giving three points to "Always", two points to "Sometimes" and one point for "Never". Thus the scale provides scores/each dimension in such a way that in the case of first five dimensions, higher the score, higher would be the social immaturity or lesser would be the social maturity because a higher score is an indication of a higher degree of social dependency, isolation, non-communication, non-cooperation and inhibition, whereas in the case of other five dimensions, higher the score, higher would be social maturity or lesser would be social immaturity because a higher score is an indication of higher degree of social Autonomy, Gregariousness, Communication, Cooperation and Enrichment.

Validity: The items were scrutinised by experts in sociology, psychology and Education and they were suitably modified before their inclusion into the final format. The items were screened in respect of their content, suitability for their standard for which they are intended and language difficulty and so on. Therefore, the scale is deemed to possess content validity.
Reliability of the tool: The index of reliability for the scale was established by using the technique of test-retest reliability by administering the tool for a group of 25 students with a gap of four weeks. The obtained co-efficients of reliability are presented hereunder.

**TABLE 2**

Coefficients of Reliability for the dimensions of social Maturity Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl No.</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Test-retest reliability coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Social Dependency</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Non-communication</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Non-cooperation</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Inhibition</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Social Autonomy</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Gregariousness</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Co-operation</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the tool was considered to be reliable.

(See Appendix II A for Kannada version and Appendix II B for English version of the social maturity scale).
Administration of the Tools:

The data were collected by the investigator by administering the Kannada version of the instruments used, viz., Dr. Sudha's personality scale and social maturity scale of the same author, to a sample of 300 students of V, VI and VII standard boys and girls of rural and urban schools.

Before administering the tool, the researcher developed good rapport with the students. The students were assured that it was only a psychological test. The students were also assured that the answers would be kept strictly confidential by the researcher. All the directions regarding the method of responding to the scale was given to the pupils.

In order to get the two groups of High and Low on Social Maturity scores obtained by the students of V, VI and VII standards were projected into a frequency distribution separately and the $Q_1$ and $Q_3$ values were computed for each distribution. The following table (Table 3) presents the $Q_1$ and $Q_3$ values which were used as cut off points to get two groups.
TABLE 3

Q₁ and Q₃ values of Social Maturity Scores of V, VI and VII Standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Maturity Components</th>
<th>High Group</th>
<th>Low Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Social Dependency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Isolation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-communication</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Non-cooperation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inhibition</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Autonomy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gregariousness</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Communication</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Co-operation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Enrichment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See Appendices A to J for the computational details of Q₁ and Q₃ values).

Statistical analysis used for analysis of data:

The raw data obtained by administering the scales were further subjected to statistical analysis to test the null hypotheses formulated in the present study. The collected data were tabulated for the purpose of analysis. The t-test was used for testing the hypothesis for significance of mean difference in personality trait
scores of various groups of students, compared by using the formula:
\[
t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{N_2}}}
\]
where \(M_1\) and \(M_2\) are the means of the two groups, \(s_1^2\) and \(s_2^2\) are the variance of the two groups, \(N_1\) and \(N_2\) are the number of pupils in the two groups respectively.

The present chapter dealt with the methodology adopted by the investigator in selecting the variables, formulating the hypotheses, sampling technique adopted, tools selected for testing the data and the statistical measures in analysing the data.

In the next chapter, the analysis and interpretation of the data would be presented.