Chapter – 5: Discussion & Interpretation

This chapter deals with interpretation and discussion of results in accordance with hypotheses. This is regarded as the essential step in the research process. The research has no meaning of its own if the data are not interpreted and discussed properly. Therefore, Interpretations is to be done very carefully, logically and critically by examining the results obtained after analysis. It helps the researcher to arrive at some definite conclusions.

Keeping it in view in this chapter, the results are systematically obtained and presented in the same order as the objectives and hypotheses of the study.

1. PERSONALITY PROFILES

For the measurement of the personality profiles of children of working and non-working mothers, High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) of Cattell (1969) was used and the results shown in tables 4.1-4.14 and figures 1-14 respectively are discussed as under:

Comparison between children of working and non-working mothers (N=400 on each) on Personality.

The perusal of table 4.1 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s Out-going) of personality. The table reveals that there is a significant mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers at 0.05 level. The calculated mean favours children of working mothers which implies that they are warmhearted, outgoing, easygoing and participating as compared to children of non-working mothers who were found as cool, precise, aloof, skeptical and rigid.

The results seems to be justified on the ground that, the children of working mothers get opportunities to be outside with their friends and often do their
assignments independently. They find less interference or dictations from their mothers. They do not bother to show any seriousness towards their different assignments. On the other hand, children of non-working mothers do find their mothers at their homes often inspecting and enquiring about their assignments and hence they become responsible and objective in their dealings. This responsibility and objectivity on their part helps them to be critical and rigid in their approach.

The perusal of table 4.2 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright) of personality. The table reveals that there is no significant mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers. Although there exists a difference of means between the groups, but the difference is so low that no conclusion can be drawn.

The perusal of table 4.3 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable) of personality profiles. The table reveals that there is a significant mean difference on this factor between children of working and non-working mothers at 0.01 level. The results infer that children of working mothers are changeable, easily upset, perturbed and worrying. On the other hand, children of non-working mothers are calm, faces reality, are stable and constant in interests.

Since working mothers do not get ample time to spend with their children to give them love, care and support. Such children face hindrances in making different adjustments in their lives. This lack of adjustment frustrates them and they feel insecure, worrying and perturbed. On the other hand, children of non-working mothers are calm, getting warmth and supportive environment at their homes. These children do not face any type of emotional disturbances while making different adjustments in their lives. They are not easily upset and hence are mature enough to face the realities of different situations objectively.

The perusal of table 4.4 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over-active) of
personality. The table reveals that, the mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level.

The mean score favours the children of working mothers which indicates that they are demanding, over-active and excitable. Since they don’t get dictations from their mothers at their homes, they are often demanding and un-restrained.

On the other hand, children of non-working mothers do not get ample chance of doing things separately. The interference from their mothers makes them inactive, slow and sluggish in their approach.

The table 4.5 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive) of personality. The table reveals that, the mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level.

The mean score favours children of working mothers and it indicates that they are assertive, self-assured and independent minded. Since they do not find any helping hand at their homes, they rely upon their own efforts and initiatives. Hence they are not confined to the conventional approach of solving their different problems they face in their routine lives. On the other hand, children of non-working mothers are submissive and dependent. They do act upon the suggestions and advices given to them by their mothers. Hence they are apt to the conventional approach of solving their routine problems.

The table 4.6 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky) of personality. The table reveals that, the mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level.

The mean score favours the children of working mothers and it indicates that they are happy-go-lucky, carefree, heedless and careless. Since these children do not face any interference from their mothers, they develop the happy-go-lucky attitude in free atmosphere of their homes. Contrary to it children of non-working mothers are serious, introspective and reflective. They do develop such traits in their home environment where their mothers put certain standards to be observed by these children.
The table 4.7 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘G’ (low super ego strength v/s superego strength) of personality. The table reveals that, the mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level. The mean score favours the children of non-working mothers which indicates that they are emotionally disciplined, conscientious and dominated by the sense of duty. They are very much concerned about the moral standards and rules. They often try to abide by the set standards of the society. Contrary to it, children of working mothers are undependable and they disregard the rules and norms of the society. Their obtained low score depicts that they are having less regard for the moral standards.

The perusal of table 4.8 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous) of personality. The table depicts that mean score of children of working mothers (5.53) is greater than the mean score of children of non-working mothers (4.60). The mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level. It can be inferred that children of working mothers get exposed to different problems of their lives and they themselves make efforts to solve them by using their own abilities. By confronting different situations and handling them separately makes them socially bold. On the other hand, children of non-working mothers do not get any exposure to solve their problems by making their own efforts. They often seek help from their mothers who are readily available for them. This dependence on their part makes them shy and they don’t wish to be exposed to different circumstances and situations.

The perusal of table 4.9 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘I’ (tough minded v/s tender minded) of personality. The table depicts that mean score of children of non-working mothers (6.65) is greater than the mean score of children of working mothers (5.00). The mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level.
The mean score favours the children of non-working mothers, which means that they are tender minded often seeking help and sympathy from others. Since they are not practical in their dealings, they often expect attention and favours from their mothers, who are present to provide the same. On the other hand, children of working mothers are tough minded and self-reliant, they take their own responsibilities for the accomplishment of different tasks. They are very much practical in their approach of solving their problems.

The table 4.10 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘J’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) of personality. The table depicts that mean score of children of working mothers (5.88) is greater than the mean score of children of non-working mothers (4.65). The mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level.

It can be inferred that children of working mothers often do things out of their own initiatives and do not rely upon any external care and support. They are very much reflective and evaluative in their approach of solving their own problems. On the other hand, children of non-working mothers are habitual to depend on the help and support of their mothers. They don’t care for doing things out of their own efforts and ‘liking group action’ goes a personality trait with them.

The table 4.11 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) of personality. The table depicts that mean score of children of working mothers (5.79) is greater than the mean score of children of non-working mothers (4.35). The mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level.

The result seems to be justified on the ground that when the child is deprived from healthy family care, his emotional development is hampered. The most important role in family towards children is played by his/her mother. It is the mother who provides the child love, care, affection, acceptance and security. Since children of working mother are deprived of this care and affection, they...
develop a sense of insecurity. On the other hand non-working mothers satisfy the emotional needs of their children by providing them love, care and support. So these children feel a sense of security.

The table 4.12 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) of personality profiles. The table depicts that mean score of children of working mothers (5.57) is greater than the mean score of children of non-working mothers (4.59). The mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level.

The results signify that children of working mothers do get ample chances of solving their problems by their own efforts and take their own initiatives in solving their own problems, i.e. why these children feel a sense of self-sufficiency. On the other hand children of non-working mothers always find a helping hand from their mothers, who take care of their assignments and other issues. They rely more on their mothers. This makes them somehow lethargic and sluggish, and hence they are group dependent.

The table 4.13 shows the comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) of personality. The table depicts that mean score of children of non-working mothers (6.90) is greater than the mean score of children of working mothers (5.67). The mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level.

The analysis seems to be justified on the ground that children of working mothers do not have much interference on the part of their mothers. These children usually do their daily tasks by their own efforts. They try to solve their own problems by making any attempt. The unchecked attempt on the part of their mother makes them uncontrolled, careless of social values and has low self-sentiment. On the other hand children of non-working mothers find their mothers readily available, who checks and prevents them from doing wrong things. Their mother’s interference makes them aware about social norms and
values, i.e. is why these children are controlled, have high strength of self-sentiment, socially precise and compulsive.

The perusal of table 4.14 shows the mean comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense) of personality. The table depicts that mean score of children of working mothers (5.91) is greater than the mean score of children of non-working mothers (4.48). The mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on this factor is significant at 0.01 level.

It can be inferred that children of working mothers feel a sense of isolation, on the basis that they do not find their mothers providing the needed love, care and affection and this negligence on their part disturbs and frustrates them. Non availability of mothers develops in them a sense of loneliness and thus they remain under stress. On the other hand, children of non-working mothers do not feel any such disturbances because, their mothers are there to encourage their efforts and they cooperate in solving their different issues relating to their different adjustments of their lives. This encouraging environment helps them to be relaxed and do not face any kind of frustration.


Miller (1975) reveals that daughters of working mothers were found to be more aggressive and less passive than daughters of non-working mothers. Collins (1975) found that low income families from various racial and ethnic groups showed poorer personality and adjustment among children of part time working mothers than children of non-working or full time working mothers. Burke & Weir (1977) found the daughters of working mothers described more feelings of loneliness and isolation, more resultant stress and slightly poorer personality adjustments than daughters of non-working mothers.
Ribble (1979) has found that children who were not fortunate enough to have the loving, caring and constancy of their mother during their earlier years reacted with negativism, hypertension, stupors sleep and emotional imbalance. Sharma (1986) has revealed that the children of non-working mothers were found to be more tender-hearted, sensitive, dependent and more protective. Mody and Murthy (1988) have revealed that the children of employed mothers were found to be careless and slightly emotionally unstable in the early years compared to the children of non-employed mothers. Vijay (1990) has revealed that significant difference was found in the personality of the male / female children of working & non-working mothers. Vandell & Ramanan (1991) have found that children with latch key experience have more behavior problems. They are emotionally weak. Sroufe et al (1993) have found that insecurely attached infants by contrast, often have later problems: inhibitions and negative emotions in toddler hood, hostility towards other and dependency during the school years.

Koschanska (2001) has found that insecurely attached toddlers show more negative emotions (fear, distress and anger) while securely attached children show more joyfulness, even in the same situation. Ora, Einaya & Ehlas (2006) have that the children of working mothers were having more difficulties and being less adjusted to kindergarten. Their adjustment to day care was also poorer. Singh & Kiran (2014) found that children of working mothers are more affected on personality than children of non-working mothers. Therefore, the hypotheses No.01 which read as:

(1) “Personality profiles of children of working and non-working mothers differ significantly” stands partially accepted.

1. EMOTIONAL MATURITY

For the measurement of emotional maturity of children of working and non-working mothers, Emotional Maturity Scale (EMS), of Singh and Bhargava (1990) was used and results shown in tables 4.15-4.20 and figures 15-20 respectively are discussed as under:
Comparison between children of working and non-working mothers (N=400 on each) on Emotional Maturity.

The perusal of table 4.15 shows the mean comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘A’ (Emotional instability) of Emotional Maturity. The table depicts that there is significant mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity. The mean difference is significant at 0.01 level. The mean favours children of working mothers, indicating there by, that children of working mothers are emotionally unstable while as children of non-working mothers are emotionally stable. As it is clear that employed mothers are subject to role conflict, they have to perform the dual role, as domestic duties as well as occupational duties with the result their home life is full of stress and strain. The uncongenial atmosphere at their home affects their children’s emotional aspect i.e. why children of working mothers are quick changing, feel a sense of irritability, are emotionally unstable and can’t manage as well as control their emotions. On the other hand children of non-working mothers have to play only one role, they have enough time to better their children emotionally and provide congenial atmosphere at their homes i.e. why these children can control their emotions easy and are emotionally stable.

The perusal of table 4.16 shows the mean comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘B’ (Emotional regression) of Emotional Maturity. The table depicts that there is significant mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘B’ (emotional regression) of emotional maturity. The mean difference is significant at 0.01 level. The mean score of children of working mothers is greater than the mean score of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of working mothers are emotionally regressive while as children of non-working mothers are emotionally progressive. The results seem to be justified on the ground, that family is a powerful determinant of child’s
emotional development, because of love, warmth, security, attention, acceptance etc. it provides, which are the basic requirements for the healthy growth of the child. Since the working mothers have less time to spend with their children, these children develop the feeling of hostility, aggressiveness and are emotionally regressive. On the other hand, children of non-working mothers have much time to spend with their children, they satisfy each and every need of their children, as a result these children do not feel a sense of hostility, self-centeredness and they are emotional progressive.

The perusal of table 4.17 makes it clear that the mean score of children of working mothers is greater than the children of non-working mothers on factor ‘C’ (Social maladjustment) of Emotional Maturity. The table depicts that there is a significant mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers at 0.01 level which indicates that children of working mothers are socially maladjusted as compared to children of non-working mothers who are socially adjusted. The analysis seem to be justified on the ground that working mothers do not have ample time to spend with their children, as a result these children usually remain in isolation and it hinders their social adjustment. Loneliness in family leads to social mal-adjustment. On the other hand, non-working mothers provide proper attention to their children which is the basic requirement for socialization. As a result children of non-working mothers develop a strained companionship with their classmates, are found to be friendly, helpful and socially adjusted as compared to children of working mothers.

The table 4.18 shows the mean comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘D’ (Personality disintegration) of Emotional Maturity. The table depicts that there is significant mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers at 0.01 level. The mean favours children of working mothers, indicating there by that children of working mothers have disintegrated personality as compared to children of non-working mothers who have integrated personality. The results seem to be in expected
direction, because personality is developed when there is correct psychological development, which takes place when the child is given the right ambiance to grow up, especially in the initial stage of life. The children who receive approval and encouragement from their parents especially mother are better equipped to deal with challenges and stress inducing situations. Since children of working mothers are usually reared by the servants, they are not in a position to satisfy their each and every need and it affects their personality that is why, they develop the traits like rationalization, pessimism and have disintegrated personality. On the other hand, non-working mothers have close bond with their children, they satisfy each and every need of their children, as a result these children are optimistic, have strong will, bother about the moral code of conduct and have integrated personality.

The table 4.19 shows the mean comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on factor ‘E’ (lack of Independence) of Emotional Maturity. The table depicts that there is significant mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers at 0.0level. The mean favours children of non-working mothers which indicates that, they are dependent as compared to children of working mothers who are found as independent. The results are in expected direction, as working mothers have not ample time to spend with their children, these mothers are busy with their daily occupational duties, as a result these children fulfill their basic needs by their own efforts, that is why they feel a sense of independence and can take decisions at their own regarding different issues. On the other hand children of non-working mothers have interference from their mothers in every task and they relay mostly on their mothers for taking different decisions of life. That is why they feel a sense of dependence and cannot take their decisions on their own.

The table 4.20 shows the mean comparison between children of working and non-working mothers on composite score of Emotional Maturity. The table depicts that there is significant mean difference between children of working and non-working mothers on composite score of emotional maturity at
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0.01 level. The mean score favours children of working mothers which indicates that they are emotionally immature as compared to children of non-working mothers who are emotionally mature. The results seem to be justified on the basis, that managing and understanding emotions are preventive tool which if properly understood will benefit the individual and society at large. The emotional maturity comes with correct psychological development which takes place when the child is given right environment to grow up. The children who receive approval and encouragement from the adults are better equipped to deal with challenges and stress inducing situations. Child rearing is primary responsibility of mother. The child has many psychological needs which must be fulfilled for the proper emotional development. Since children of working mothers spend much time alone at their homes, they feel psychologically insecure and that affects their emotional development that is why due to lack of adult supervision, these children feel a sense of emotional immaturity. In contrary, children of non-working mothers receive approval and encouragement from their mothers. They guide their children in every aspect, prevent their children from doing wrong things, correct their errors and encourage them to set goals, which make them to feel emotionally mature.

The results presented in tables 4.15-4.20 are further substantiated in figures 15-20 respectively, analyzed and discussed above on factor wise and composite score of emotional maturity are in line with these studies: Ribble (1979), Hoffman (1980), Mody and Morthy (1988), Vandell and Ramanan (1991), Sroufe et al (1996), Andrabi (1997), Kochanska (2001), Vijayalaxmi & Bowlby (2007), Ribble (1979) has found that children who were not fortunate enough to have the loving, caring and constancy of their mother during their early years reacted with negativism, hypertension, and emotional imbalance. Hoffman (1980), fulltime employment may result in less effective socialization of sons because their more active behaviour requires greater parental monitoring and intervention than is necessary for girls. Mody and Murthy (1988) have found that children of employed mothers are careless and
emotionally unstable in the early years as compared to the children of non-employed mothers. Vandell and Ramanan (1991) have found that children with latch key experience have more behavioral problems. They are emotionally weak. Sroufe et al., (1996) have found that insecurely attached infants have negative emotions in toddlerhood.

Andrabi (1997) found that the children of working women experience more emotional adjustment problems Koschanska (2001) has found that insecurely attached toddlers show more negative emotions (fear, distress and anger), while securely attached children show more joyfulness, even in the same situation.

Vijayalaxmi & Bowlby (2007) have found that the female children of home makers are having significantly higher emotional maturity compared to the male children of home makers. The children of employed mothers are more socially maladjusted and lacked independence to a very highly significant level compared to the children of home makers.

Therefore, the hypotheses No.02 which read as:

(2) “There is significant difference in emotional maturity of children of working and non-working mothers” stands accepted.

3. PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE/REJECTION

For the measurement of parental acceptance / rejection of children of working and non-working mothers, Parental Acceptance/Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) of Rohner (1978) was used by the investigator and results shown in table 4.21 and figure 21 is discussed as under:

Comparison between children of working and non-working mothers (N=400 on each) on Parental Acceptance/Rejection (PARQ)

The perusal of table 4.21 makes it clear that the mean score of children of working mothers (169.38) is greater than the mean score of children of non-working mothers (132.32) on parental acceptance/rejection. The obtained ‘t’ value is significant at 0.01 level. The mean score favours children of working
mothers which indicates that they are parentally rejected as compared to children of non-working mothers, who are parentally accepted.

The results seem to be justified on the basis that parents and general home environment has been found very important factors which affects children’s development. Parents may be warm and loving or hostile and rejecting. Each pattern of parental behavior affects the personality development of children. Parental warmth is a bipolar dimension, where acceptance stands at one pole and rejection falls on the other. Acceptance and rejection is determined by the child’s perception of parental behavior. Accepting parents perceive their children as having many positive qualities and they enjoy being with their children. Accepting parents are those, who show their love or affection toward children physically and/or verbally, which induces a child to feel loved or accepted. However rejection is determined by two ways, that is parental hostility on the one hand, and parental indifference on the other. Hostility includes feelings of anger, resentment and enmity toward the child, whereas indifference refers to a lack of concern or interest in the child. Hostile parents are likely to be aggressive, either physically or verbally, and indifferent parents are likely to be physically or psychologically remote from their children. Parental care is characterized by love, warmth, affection, acceptance; security etc. if the home environment is not favorable, parental care may take the form of hatred, hostility, aggression, repression and finally rejection of the child. In parental behavior the role of mother is very important, as child usually spends maximum time with his/her mother. It is, therefore, the mother who leaves a strong and a long lasting impact on the child and lays the foundation for its future development. The early warmth and affection of a mother is associated with calm, happy and cooperative behaviour of the child. The mother acts as a model and the way in which she is perceived by the child determines many of the behavioural choices of the child that may determine his/her later stages of development. A mother has more opportunities than the father to influence the
child’s growth, behaviour and development. When the working mother comes to her home after completing the occupational duties, she feels exhausted. She has less time available to spend with their children as a result of which, their children feel a sense of rejection and develop the qualities of hostility, aggression and emotional instability.

On the other hand, non-working mother enjoy being with her children and show her love for her children physically as well as verbally. Non-working mothers usually spends much time with their children, which leaves a strong and a long lasting impact on the child and lays the foundation for its future development. The early warmth and affection of a mother is associated with calm, happy and cooperative behaviour of the child. As a result these children find themselves as accepted children, as they receive praise, complement, kiss, hug etc. from their mothers.

The result presented in table 4.21 and substantiated through figure 21 interpreted and discussed above are in line with: Radke(1946), Sears (1961), Cole and Hall(1970), Ojha (1973), Rohner (1977) and Maqbool (1988)

Radke(1946) found that homes in which autocratic discipline prevailed were rated by their teachers as more unpopular with associates, more quarrelsome, more unstable emotionally, more daring and uninhibited, more sensitive to praise and blame than children from democratic homes. Sears (1961) found that accepted children appear friendly, creative and lacking in hostility and rejection may lead to shyness and social withdrawal. Cole and Hall (1970) found that the child who has been actively rejected by his parents is passive towards authority, docile, outwardly decorous, hostile, withdrawn, frustrated, insecure, stubborn and passively resistant. Ojha (1973) found that mother’s love, father’s permissiveness and love were positively related with achievement, whereas mother’s rejection and protection, parental restriction, rejection and protection were negatively related. Rohner (1977) found that parentally rejected children have impaired feeling of self-esteem and self-adequacy and have a negative
world view in comparison to parentally rejected children. Maqbool (1988) found significant differences in the personality dispositions of parentally accepted and rejected children and reveals that parentally accepted children are high on self-adequacy, self-esteem and hold positive world view while as parentally rejected children are low on self-adequacy and self-esteem, they possesses hostility, impaired self-concept and negative world view. In the light of above findings and with the support of above studies, the hypotheses No.03 which read as:

(3) “There is significant difference in parental acceptance/rejection of children of working and non-working mothers” stands accepted.

Coefficient of correlation between Personality and emotional Maturity of Children of Working Mothers (N=400) on composite score and factor wise

It is clear from the results of the table 4.22 that the co-efficient of correlation between emotional maturity (composite score) and factors of personality viz; factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’(low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self- sufficiency), factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) is: 0.61, -0.07, -0.47, 0.59, 0.53, 0.57, -0.49, 0.18, -0.55, 0.44, 0.115, 0.36, -0.50 and 0.13 respectively of children of working mothers. The result makes it clear that positive significant relationship at 0.01level has been found between composite score of emotional maturity and various factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’(Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’(undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained), factor
‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) and factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense) which implies children of working mothers with high emotional immaturity are outgoing, overactive, assertiveness, heedless, carefree, reflective, self-sufficient and are tense. Negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between composite score of emotional maturity and various factors of personality viz: factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) of personality of children of working mothers which implies that children of working mothers with high emotional immaturity are emotionally less stable, have low super ego strength, are tough minded and are uncontrolled. The results also make it clear that positive significant relationship at 0.05 level has been found between emotional maturity (composite score) with the factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) of personality of children of working mothers, which indicates that children who are high on emotional immaturity are insecure. Negative but not significant relationship has been found between composite score of emotional maturity and with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), of personality of children of working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn.

The perusal of the table 4.22 makes it obvious that the coefficient of correlation between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers and the factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained), factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense) is: 0.51, -0.04, -0.42, 0.50,0.43,
0.47, -0.48, 0.27, -0.45, 0.41, 0.099, 0.34, -0.46, and 0.17 respectively. The results make it clear that positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity and various factors of personality of children of working mothers viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘J’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained), factor ‘Q$_2$’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) and factor ‘Q$_4$’ (relaxed v/s tense), which indicates that children of working mothers with high emotional instability are outgoing, over-active, assertive, heedless, adventurous, internally restrained, self-sufficient and are tense. Positive significant relationship at 0.05 level has been found between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity and with factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) of personality of children of working mothers which indicates that children with high emotional instability are insecure. The table also depict that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity with various factors of personality of children of working mothers viz: factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable) factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q$_3$’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) which indicates that children with high emotional instability are emotionally less stable, have low super-ego strength, are tough minded and are uncontrolled. The table also depicts that negative but not significant relationship between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright) of personality of children of working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn.

The perusal of table 4.22 makes it obvious that the coefficient of correlation between factor B (emotional regression) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers with various factors of personality of children of working
mothers viz factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained), factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q_2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q_3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q_4’ (relaxed v/s tense) is: 0.58, -0.03, -0.44, 0.57, 0.50, 0.52, -0.48, 0.12, -0.47, 0.40, 0.113, 0.25, -0.46 and 0.13 respectively. The table reveals that positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor B (emotional regression) of emotional maturity with various factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained), factor ‘Q_2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) and factor ‘Q_4’ (relaxed v/s tense) which indicates that children of working mothers with high emotional regression are outgoing, over-active, assertive, heedless, adventurous, internally restrained, self-sufficient and are tense. With factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) the relationship has been found positive significant at 0.05 level, which indicates that children of working mothers with high emotional regression are insecure. The analysis also makes it clear that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘B’ (emotional regression) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers with various factors of personality viz: factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q_3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) which indicates that children of working mothers with high emotional regression are emotionally less stable,
have low super-ego strength, are tough minded and are uncontrolled. Negative but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘B’ (emotional regression) of emotional maturity with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright) of personality of children of working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn. The perusal of table 4.22 makes it obvious that the coefficient of correlation between factor ‘C’ (social maladjustment) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers viz factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undenominative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego -strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense) is : 0.55, -0.05, -0.44, 0.53, 0.46, 0.50, -0.51, 0.103, -0.47, 0.47, 0.110, 0.26, -0.47 and 0.14 respectively. The table reveals that positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘C’ (social maladjustment) of emotional maturity with various factors of personality viz; ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undenominative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained), factor ‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) and factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense) which indicates that children of working mothers with high social maladjustment are outgoing, over-active, assertive, heedless, internally restrained, self-sufficient and are tense. The table also depict that, positive significant relationship at 0.05 level has been found between factor ‘C’ (social maladjustment) of emotional maturity with factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous) and with factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) of personality of children of working mothers, indicating
there by children of working mothers with high social maladjustment are adventurous and insecure. The results also make it clear that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘C’ (social maladjustment) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers with various factors of personality profiles of children of working mothers viz: factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable) factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) which indicates that children of working mothers with high social maladjustment are emotionally less stable, have low super-ego strength, are tough minded and are uncontrolled. Negative but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘C’ (social maladjustment) of emotional maturity with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright) of personality of children of working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn.

The perusal of table 4.22 makes it obvious that the coefficient of correlation between factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers with factors of personality of children of working mothers viz factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing) is 0.52, with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright) is -0.03, with factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable) is -0.38, factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active) is 0.50, factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive) is 0.41, factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky) is 0.47, factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength) is -0.42, factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous) is 0.14, factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) is -0.46, factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) is 0.39 factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) is 0.114, factor ‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) is 0.29, factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) is -0.41 and with factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense) is 0.06. The table reveals that positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘D’ (Personality disintegration) of emotional maturity with various factors of
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personality viz: ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) and factor ‘Q’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), which indicates that children of working mothers with high personality disintegration are outgoing, over-active, assertive, heedless, adventurous, internally restrained and are self-sufficient. Positive significant relationship at 0.05 level has been found between factor ‘D’ (Personality disintegration) of emotional maturity with factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) of personality of children of working mothers, which indicates that children of working mothers with high personality disintegration are insecure. With factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense) of personality of children of working mothers, the relationship is positive but not significant; hence no conclusion can be drawn. The results also make it clear that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers with various factors of personality of children of working mothers viz; factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable) factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender-minded) and with factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) which indicates that children with high personality disintegration are emotionally less stable, have low super-ego strength, tough-minded and are uncontrolled. Negative but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of emotional maturity with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright) of personality of children of working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn.

The perusal of table 4.22 makes it obvious that the coefficient of correlation between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers with various factors of personality of children of working mothers viz factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright),
factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender-minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained), factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense) is -0.24, 0.06, 0.06, -0.21, -0.24, -0.27, 0.07, -0.29, 0.06, -0.07, -0.23, 0.29 and 0.07 respectively. The table reveals that positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity with the factor of personality viz: factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), which indicates that children of working mothers with high independence are uncontrolled. The table also depict that positive but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender-minded), and factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense), hence no conclusion can be drawn. Negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity with various factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), and factor ‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), which indicates that children of working mothers with high independence are outgoing, overactive, assertive, heedless, adventurous and are self-sufficient. The results also makes it clear that negative but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers with the factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) and factor ‘O’ (secure
v/s insecure) of personality of children of working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn.

Since children of working mothers experience indifference, less care and negligence from their mothers which probably affects their level of emotional maturity and which in turn affects their personality profiles. As working mothers have to perform dual roles – domestic as well as occupational duties, their home life is full of stress. They have less time to spend with their children and to satisfy their basic needs. This negligence on the part of their mothers affects their emotional development as well as personality that is why, these children are outgoing, instable, over-active, assertive and heedless. Since these children do not get the needed love, care and support from their mothers, they are expedient, adventurous, tough minded and are internally restrained. Since they do not get dictations from their mothers at their homes, they are often demanding and un-restrained. Absence of mother for a longer period of time makes them to feel insecure and remain in tense. These children are self-sufficient, as they have to perform their daily tasks by their own efforts. They try to solve their own problems by making every attempt. The un-checked attempt on the part of their mother makes them uncontrolled, careless of social values and to feel a sense of independence. These children usually remain in isolation, which hinders their social adjustment. Loneliness in family leads to social maladjustment.

**Coefficient of correlation between Personality and emotional Maturity of Children of Non-working Mothers (N=400) on composite score and factor wise**

It is clear from the results of the table 4.23 that the co-efficient of correlation between emotional maturity (composite score) and factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-
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go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q$_2$’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q$_3$’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q$_4$’ (relaxed v/s tense) is 0.114, 0.06, -0.21, 0.114, 0.114, 0.115, -0.066, 0.04, -0.23, 0.07, 0.113, 0.07, -0.27 and 0.084 respectively of children of non-working mothers. Positive significant relationship at 0.05 level has been found between composite score of emotional maturity with factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active) factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky) and factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) , which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high emotional maturity are reserved, undemonstrative, submissive, sober and are secure. Positive but not significant relationship has been found between composite score of emotional maturity with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘Q$_2$’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) and factor ‘Q$_4$’ (relaxed v/s tense) of personality of children of non-working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn. The results also make it clear that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between emotional maturity (composite score) and factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q$_3$’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) of personality of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high emotional maturity are emotionally stable, are tender-minded and are controlled. However with factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength) of personality of children of non-working mothers, the relationship has been found negative but not significant, hence no conclusion can be drawn.
The perusal of table 4.23 makes it clear that the co-efficient of correlation between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego -strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense) is 0.19, 0.02, -0.22, 0.21, 0.099, 0.13, -0.23, 0.06, -0.26, 0.171, 0.24, 0.05, -0.21 and 0.21 respectively of children of non-working mothers. Positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), and factor ‘Q4’ (relaxed v/s tense), which indicates that children with high emotional stability are reserved, undemonstrative, sober, zestful, secure and are relaxed. Positive significant relationship at 0.05 level has been found between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity with factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive) of personality of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high emotional stability are submissive. However, Positive but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity and with the factors of personality of children of non-working mothers viz: factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous) and factor ‘Q2’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), hence no conclusion can be drawn.
The result also makes it clear that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) of emotional maturity with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high emotional stability are calm, have superego-strength, are tender minded, and are controlled.

The perusal of table 4.23 makes it clear that the co-efficient of correlation between factor ‘B’ (emotional regression) of emotional maturity with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s overactive), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘0’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) is 0.23, 0.03, -0.25, 0.22, 0.07, 0.07,-0.004, 0.04, -0.24, 0.06, 0.34, 0.04, -0.24 and 0.115 respectively of children of non-working mothers.

Positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘B’ (emotional regression) of emotional maturity with the factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s overactive) and factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) of personality of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high emotional progression are reserved, undemonstrative and are secure. With factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) of personality of children of non-working mothers, the relationship has been found positive significant at 0.05 level, indicating thereby, children of non-working mothers with high emotional progression are relaxed.
The table also depicts that positive but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘B’ (emotional regression) of emotional maturity with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) and factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) of personality of children of non-working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn. The analysis also makes it clear that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘B’ (emotional regression) of emotional maturity with the factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) of personality of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high emotional progression are emotionally stable, are tender-minded and are controlled. However with factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength) the relationship has been found negative but not significant, hence no conclusion can be drawn.

The perusal of table 4.23 makes it clear that the co-efficient of correlation between factor ‘C’ (Social maladjustment) of emotional maturity with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (affected by feelings v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) is 0.113, 0.02, -0.28, 0.111, 0.112, 0.114, -0.21, 0.05, -0.21, 0.114, 0.114, 0.112, -0.23, and 0.25 respectively of children of non-working mothers. The analysis makes it clear that Positive significant relationship at 0.01 level
has been found between factor ‘C’ (Social maladjustment) of emotional maturity with the factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) and with other factors at 0.05 level viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) and factor ‘Q₃’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) of personality of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high social adjustment are relaxed, reserved, undemonstrative, submissive, sober, zestful, secure and are group dependent. Positive but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘C’ (Social maladjustment) of emotional maturity with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), and factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous) of personality of children of non-working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn. The table also depicts negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘C’ (Social maladjustment) of emotional maturity with the factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) of personality of children of non-working mothers indicating thereby, children of non-working mothers with high social adjustment are emotionally stable, have superego-strength, are tender minded and are controlled.

The perusal of table 4.23 makes it clear that the co-efficient of correlation between factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of emotional maturity with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained)
factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) is 0.17, 0.07, -0.20, 0.07, 0.06, 0.05, -0.05, 0.03, -0.06, 0.05, 0.05, 0.06, -0.04 and 0.19 respectively of children of non-working mothers. Positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of emotional maturity with the factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing) and factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) of personality of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high level of personality integration are reserved and relaxed. Positive but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of emotional maturity with the factors of personality viz: factor B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) and factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) of personality of children of non-working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn.

The results also make it clear that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of emotional maturity with the factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable) of personality of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high level of personality integration are emotionally stable. The table also makes it clear that negative but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of emotional maturity and with the factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) of personality of children of non-working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn.
The perusal of table 4.23 makes it clear that the co-efficient of correlation between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) is -0.24, 0.007, 0.16, -0.05, -0.07, -0.03, 0.01, -0.04, 0.02, -0.24, -0.04, -0.32, 0.26, and -0.06 respectively of children of non-working mothers. Positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity with factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable) and factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) of personality of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with high dependence are emotionally stable and controlled. The table also depicts positive but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength) and factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) of personality of children of non-working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn. The table also depicts negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity with factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) and factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) of personality of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with lack of independence are reserved, like group actions and are group dependent. The analysis also make it clear that
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A negative but not significant relationship has been found between factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity with factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), and factor ‘Q’ (relaxed v/s tense) of personality of children of non-working mothers, hence no conclusion can be drawn.

Children of non-working mothers enjoy love, care, warmth, affection, security and acceptance from their mothers. This favorable attitude of their mothers makes them emotionally mature, emotionally stable, emotionally progressive, socially adjusted, and have integrated personality. As children of non-working mothers have interference from their mothers in every task, it makes them dependent on their mothers for taking different decisions of life. Children of non-working mothers found always a helping hand with them they feel a sense of reserved-ness, in-activeness and group dependency. Children of non-working mothers find their mothers readily available, who check and prevent them from doing wrong things. Their mother’s interference make them aware about social norms and values, that is why these children are controlled, socially precise, have high strength of self-sentiment and are compulsive. Since non-working mothers always encourage the efforts of their children and also cooperate in solving their different issues relating to their different adjustments of life, this encouraging environment helps them to feel a sense of relaxedness and security. Non-working mother provide suggestions and advices to their children which makes them to feel a sense of submissiveness and seriousness. These children bother about the moral code of conduct, as they always find their mother’s intervention on different issues of their daily life, which helps them to be disciplined.

Children of non-working mothers do not get any type of exposure to solve their own problems by making their own efforts, their mothers are readily available to give them every support. This dependence on their part makes them to feel a
sense of shyness and tender-mindedness that is why they often seek help and sympathy from others.


Hoffman (1963) found that the children of working mothers appeared to be less assertive and less affective in their peer interaction. Moore’s (1975) indicate that the children who had been left by their mothers from early infancy showed the symptoms of insecurity such as nail biting and bad dreams. Miller (1975) reveals that daughters of working mothers were found to be more aggressive and less passive than daughters of non-working mothers. Ribble (1979) has found that children who were not fortunate enough to have the loving, caring and constancy of their mother during their earlier years reacted with negativism, hypertension, stupors sleep, diarrhea and emotional imbalance.

Hoffman (1980) found that fulltime employment may result in less effective socialization of sons because their more active behaviour requires greater parental monitoring and intervention than is necessary for girls. Bronfenbrenner, Henderson (1984) and Alvarez (1985) have found that highly educated full time employed mothers described their three year old sons in especially negative terms. Their boys seemed demanding and non-compliant.

Sharma (1986) has revealed that the children of non-working mothers were found to be more tender-hearted, sensitive, dependent and more protective. Mody and Murthy (1988) have revealed that the children of employed mothers were found to be careless and slightly emotionally unstable in the early years compared to the children of non-employed mothers. Vandell & Ramanan
(1991) have found that children with latch key experience have more behavior problems. They are emotionally weak. Sroufe et al (1993) have found that insecurely attached infants by contrast, often have later problems: inhibitions and negative emotions in toddler hood, hostility towards other and dependency during the school years. Andrabi (1997) found that the children of working women experience more emotional adjustment problems. Hill and others (2001) found that when a child’s mother works in the first year of life it can have a negative effect on the child’s later development. Koschanska (2001) has found that insecurely attached toddlers show more negative emotions (fear, distress and anger) while securely attached children show more joyfulness, even in the same situation. Aizer (2004) has found that the children without adult supervision are more likely to engage in anti-social or risky potentially dangerous behaviour. Ora, Einaya &, Ehlas (2006) found that the children of working mothers were having more difficulties and being less adjusted to kindergarten. Their adjustment to day care was also poorer. Vijayalaxmi & Bowlby (2007) have found that the female children of home makers are having significantly higher emotional maturity compared to the male children of home makers. The children of employed mothers are more socially maladjusted and lacked independence to a very highly significant level compared to the children of home makers.

In the light of above findings and with the support of above studies, the hypotheses no.4 and 5 which read as:

(4) “There is significant relationship between personality profiles and emotional maturity of children of working mothers” and

(5) “There is significant relationship between personality profiles and emotional maturity of children of non-working mothers” are partially accepted.
Coefficient of correlation between Personality and Parental Acceptance/Rejection of Children of Working Mothers (N=400)

The perusal of table 4.24 makes it clear that the co-efficient of correlation between parental acceptance/rejection with the factors of personality of children of working mothers viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (affected by feelings v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency), factor ‘Q₃’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) is 0.69, 0.05, -0.67, 0.71, 0.60, 0.80, -0.49, 0.36, -0.55, 0.50, 0.23, 0.28, -0.63 and 0.22 respectively. The table reveals that positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between parental acceptance/rejection of children of working mothers with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q₂’ (group dependency v/s self-sufficiency) and factor ‘Q₄’ (relaxed v/s tense) which indicates that children of working mothers with high score on PARQ, are outgoing, overactive, assertive, heedless, adventurous, internally restrained, insecure, self-sufficient and are tense. However with factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright) of personality of children of working mothers, the relationship has been found positive but not significant, hence no conclusion can be drawn. The table also reveals that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between parental acceptance/rejection with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-
minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) of personality of children of working mothers, which indicates that children of working mothers with high score on PARQ, are emotionally less stable, have low superego-strength, are tough minded and are uncontrolled.

Since, children of working mothers score high on parental acceptance rejection questionnaire (PARQ). They receive less love, care and support from their parents and which intern affects their personality profiles. Due to negligence on the part of their parents especially mother makes them out going, emotionally instable, over-active, stubborn, demanding and assertive. These children find less interference or dictation from their mothers that is why they do not show any seriousness towards their different assignments and feel happy-go-lucky, carefree, heedless and careless attitudes. Since working mothers do not get ample time to spend with their children to give them love, care and support, such children face hindrances in making different adjustments of life. This lack of adjustment frustrates them and they feel insecure, worrying and perturbed. These children are bold and tough minded as they have to perform their tasks by their own efforts, and develop a sense of individualism. These children try to avoid social gatherings, as they remain in isolation in their homes that is why they have weaker super-ego strength. Rejection on the part of their mother makes them to feel careless and remain tense.

Coefficient of correlation between Personality and Parental Acceptance/Rejection of Children of Non-working Mothers (N=400)

The perusal of table 4.25 makes it clear that the co-efficient of correlation between parental acceptance/rejection with the factors of personality of children of non-working mothers viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright), factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally
restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure), factor ‘Q_2’ (group dependency v/s self- sufficiency), factor ‘Q_3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled), and factor ‘Q_4’ (relaxed v/s tense) is 0.46, 0.06, -0.23, 0.44, 0.23, 0.15,-0.17, 0.114, -0.56, 0.25, 0.160, 0.113, -0.21 and 0.160 respectively. The table reveals that positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between parental acceptance/rejection with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘A’ (Reserved v/s outgoing), factor ‘D’ (undemonstrative v/s over active), factor ‘E’ (submissive v/s assertive), factor ‘F’ (serious v/s happy-go-lucky), factor ‘j’ (liking group actions v/s internally restrained) factor ‘O’ (secure v/s insecure) and factor ‘Q_4’ (relaxed v/s tense), which indicates that children of non-working mothers with low score on PARQ, are reserved, undemonstrative, submissive, sober, zestful, secure and are relaxed. However with factor ‘H’ (shy v/s adventurous), and factor ‘Q_2’ (group dependency v/s self- sufficiency) of personality of children of non-working mothers, the relationship has been found significant at 0.05 level, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with low score on PARQ are shy and group dependent. With factor ‘B’ (Dull v/s bright) of personality of children of non-working mothers, the relation has been found positive but not significant, hence no conclusion can be drawn. The table also reveals that negative significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between parental acceptance/rejection with the factors of personality viz: factor ‘C’ (emotionally less stable v/s emotionally stable), factor ‘G’ (low superego-strength v/s superego-strength), factor ‘I’ (tough-minded v/s tender minded) and factor ‘Q_3’ (uncontrolled v/s controlled) of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with low score on PARQ are emotionally stable, have high superego-strength, are tender minded and are controlled. The results reveal that children of non-working mothers score less on parental acceptance rejection questionnaire (PARQ). These children receive love, care, support and acceptance from their parents especially mothers. This caring and loving attitude affects their personality. Acceptance on the part of their parents
makes these children as reserved, emotionally stable, submissive and sober. Their parents especially their mothers provide every support to these children and interferes in their daily tasks, that is why these children feel a sense of security, tender-mindedness and are dependent. The regular and proper check of their parents especially their mothers makes them obedient, sound follower, controlled and relaxed. The interference from their mothers in every task make them, in-active, slow and sluggish in their approach. Since non-working mothers have ample time to spend with their children to give them love, care and support. Such children do not face any hindrances in making different adjustments of life.


Symonds (1939) states that parentally rejected children found to be emotionally unstable, restless, over-active, given to trouble making, resentful of authority more inclined to steel and quarrel some while as parentally accepted children showed personality traits like cooperativeness, friendliness, loyalty, honesty, emotional stability, calmness, enthusiasm and cheerfulness respectively. Dhoundlyal (1984) found that home environment is closely associated with the emotional development of adolescents. Rohner and Khaleque (2002) study revealed that family accepted children have stable positive self-concept, emotional stability and least aggressive behavior as compared to rejected parental children. Takeuchi, H. et. al. (2011) findings depict that personality attributes such as temperaments sentiments emotions etc. are highly stable among accepted children. Whereas rejected/ overprotected children have emotional instability, and quickly losses the temper in different several situations. Seham R.K. (2012) found that Parentally Accepted have stable personality Profile characterized by positive self-concept, high level of self-esteem and also perform well in academic side. On the other hand rejected
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secondary students have low academic performance and negative self-concept about themselves. Sidora (2014) found that acceptance level of parenting resulted high scholastic achievements and strong cognitive powers characterized by giftedness, creativeness of children. Whereas rejected children usually suffer from high level of anxiety stress which also become hurdle in their scholastic achievement.

Therefore, in the light of above findings and with the support of above studies the hypotheses no. 6 and 7 which read as:

(6) “There is significant relationship between personality profiles and parental acceptance/rejection of children of working mothers” and

(7). “There is significant relationship between personality profiles and parental acceptance/rejection of children of non-working mothers” are partially accepted.

Coefficient of correlation between Emotional Maturity and Parental Acceptance/Rejection of Children of Working Mothers (N=400)

The analysis of the table 4.26 makes it obvious that the coefficient of correlation between parental acceptance/rejection (PARQ) and emotional maturity (composite score) of children of working mothers is 0.73 which is positive and significant at 0.01 level. The results make it clear that, children of working mothers with high score on PARQ are emotionally immature.

The analysis of table 4.26 also makes it clear that the coefficient of correlation between parental acceptance/rejection(PARQ) with various factors of emotional maturity of children of working mothers viz, factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) is 0.68, with factor ‘B’ (emotional regression) is 0.76, with factor ‘C’ (social maladjustment) is 0.70, with factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) is 0.63 and with factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) is -0.26. The table makes it clear that positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found between Parental acceptance rejection and with the factor ‘A’ (emotional instability), with factor ‘B’ (emotional regression), with factor ‘C’ (social maladjustment) and with factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of emotional maturity of
children of working mothers, which indicates that children of working mothers with high score on PARQ are emotionally instable, emotionally regressive, socially maladjusted and have dis-integrated personality. However with factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity of children of working mothers, the relationship has been found negative significant at 0.01 level, indicating thereby, that children of working mothers with high score on PARQ are independent.

It is revealed from the above results that children of working mothers score high on emotional maturity scale (composite score) and high on parental acceptance rejection questionnaire (PARQ). These children do not get the needed love, care and support from their parents especially mothers, which in turn affect their emotional development as well as personality, that is why these children are emotionally immature, emotionally instable, emotionally regressive, socially maladjusted and have dis-integrated personality. As these children have less interference on the part of their mothers and have to perform their daily task by their own efforts that is, why they feel a sense of independence.

**Coefficient of correlation between Emotional Maturity and Parental Acceptance/Rejection of Children of Non-working Mothers (N=400)**

The analysis of the table 4.27 makes it obvious that the coefficient of correlation between parental acceptance/rejection (PARQ) and emotional maturity (composite score) of children of non-working mothers is 0.27, which is positive and significant at 0.01 level indicating thereby, that children of non-working mothers with low score on PARQ are emotionally mature.

The perusal of table 4.27 makes it clear the coefficient of correlation between parental acceptance/rejection (PARQ) with various factors of emotional maturity of children of non-working mothers viz factor ‘A’ (emotional instability) is 0.34, with factor ‘B’ (emotional regression) is 0.15, with factor ‘C’ (social maladjustment) is 0.14, with factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) is 0.35 and with factor ‘E’ (independence) is -0.21. The analysis of the table makes it clear that positive significant relationship at 0.01 level has been found
between PARQ and with factor ‘A’ (emotional instability), factor ‘B’ (emotional regression), factor ‘C’ (social maladjustment) and with factor ‘D’ (personality disintegration) of children of non-working mothers, which indicates that children of non-working mothers with low score on PARQ are emotionally stable, emotionally progressive, socially adjusted and have integrated personality. However with factor ‘E’ (lack of independence) of emotional maturity of children of non-working mothers, the relationship has been found negative but significant at 0.01 level which indicates that children of non-working mothers with low score on PARQ are dependent.

The results discussed above reveals that children of non-working mothers score low on emotional maturity scale (composite score) and also low on parental acceptance rejection questionnaire (PARQ). Accepting parents provide love, care, support and affection to their children, which make them emotionally mature, emotionally stable, emotionally progressive and socially adjusted. Since, children of non-working mothers have interference of their mothers in every task that is, why these children feel a sense of dependence. Since, non-working mothers have ample time to spend with their children to give them love, care and support. Such children do not face any hindrances in making different adjustments of life. Due to loving and caring attitude of their mothers, these children have integrated personality.


Symonds (1939) states that parentally rejected children found to be emotionally unstable, restless, over-active, given to trouble making, resentful of authority, more inclined to steel and quarrel some while as parentally accepted children showed personality traits like cooperativeness, friendliness, loyalty, honesty, emotional stability, calmness, enthusiasm and cheerfulness respectively. Goldfarb (1945) found that children who were deprived of love in infancy often demand love in adolescence. They remain maladjusted and often suffer from
emotional disturbances. Rohner (1977) mentions that rejected children are more likely hostile, aggressive, emotionally unresponsive and emotionally unstable than the accepted children. Dhoundlyal (1984) found that home environment is closely associated with the emotional development of adolescents. Kitahara (1987) found that parentally accepted children showed more dependence than parentally rejected children. Maqbool (1988) found significant difference between emotional stability of parentally accepted and rejected children. Anshu (1988) found significant difference between emotional adjustments of children who enjoy favourable home climate than those, who do not have favourable climate at home. Kanth (1994) found that parentally accepted children possess stability in emotions in comparison to parentally rejected children. El-Sayed (2000) showed that children who perceived their parents as more accepted also tend to exhibit higher levels of emotional stability and social adjustment, together with lower levels of anxiety. Hulya (2011) has found significant effect of parental acceptance-rejection on pro social behaviour like emotional stability. Alegre (2011) found that the parental responsiveness, parental emotion-related coaching, and parental positive demanding are related to children’s higher emotional intelligence, while parental negative demandingness is related to children’s lower emotional intelligence. Therefore, in the light of above findings and with the support of above studies the hypotheses no.8 and 9 which read as:

(8) “There is significant relationship between emotional maturity and parental acceptance/rejection of children of working mothers” and
(9). “There is significant relationship between emotional maturity and parental acceptance/rejection of children of non-working mothers” stands accepted.