METHOD

Sample
A total of 785 adolescent subjects (boys & girls in the age range of 14-16 years) were taken from various schools of secondary and senior secondary level from Patiala district and Chandigarh city. Prior consent of the concerned school principals and participant students was taken. Out of the total sample (N=785), 250 Participants high on normative and diffuse identity style (Faulty Identity Orientation) were screened in with help of Identity Style Inventory-R (ISI-R; Berzonsky, 1992). Out of the total sample of 250 subjects, 175 were given psycho-educational intervention (experimental group) and 75 subjects served in the control group (no intervention).

Research Design
A pre-post experimental-control group design was used to assess the efficacy of psycho-educational intervention program on the faulty orientation styles of ego-identity formation (i.e. diffuse identity style & normative identity style), along with other important measures such as cognitive autonomy, emotional literacy and problem solving ability. Repeated measure design was used to compare the pre-post intervention scores of experimental and control group using repeated measure analysis of variance. One way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was applied to analyze the significance of difference between experimental & control group on identity style/orientation, cognitive autonomy, emotional literacy and problem solving. The data was also subjected to one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and correlation.

Tools

1) Identity Styles Inventory-R (ISI-R) by Berzonsky (1992)
The socio-cognitive perspective of Berzonsky (2004) postulates stylistic differences in how individuals process and deal with identity relevant information and issues. Berzonsky (1992) developed the identity style inventory (ISI)-R to assess the extent to which the individuals use the three stylistic orientations viz. a viz. Information style, normative style & diffuse style. The ISI-R also includes the subscale designed to assess strength of identity commitment (Bersonsky, 1992). The items are also
designed to tap the processing of identity relevant information in general (e.g., values, goals, standards, beliefs, and personal problems) and independent of a specific identity domain. In the present research a revised version of Identity Style Inventory (ISI-R) has been used. ISI-R consists of 40-items in total. There are 11 items measuring the *Informational style* (e.g., “I’ve spent a lot of time and talked to a lot of people trying to develop a set of values that make sense to me”), 9 items for the *normative style* (e.g., “I’ve more-or-less always operated according to the values with which I was brought up”); and 10 items containing the *Diffuse/Avoidant style* (e.g., “It doesn’t pay to worry about values in advance; I decide things as they happen”) and 10 items to assess the identity commitment scale (e.g., “I know what I want to do with my future”). Respondents indicate the degree to which each item is characteristic of himself or herself using a 5-point likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all like me*) to 5 (*very much like me*). After reverse scoring of negatively worded items, total scores are based on summed responses for items composing each subscale. The ISI-R has good reliability and both convergent and divergent validity (Berzonsky, 1992). Cronbach’s alphas were .68 for the informational style, .66 for the normative style, .68 for the diffuse style, and .75 for identity Commitment.

2) **Cognitive Autonomy and Self Evaluation Inventory (CASE) by Beckert (2007):**

Cognitive autonomy is a sense of independence, a conviction that one has control over one’s life. It also comprises of personal feelings of being able to make decisions without seeking justification from others (Spear & Kulbok, 2004). The CASE inventory is a 27-item instrument used to measure independent thought, or cognitive autonomy. Using a 5-point likert scale (ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”) this inventory assesses five autonomous areas of cognition including evaluative thinking (8 items; e.g. I think about the consequences of my decisions, I think about how much actions will affect me in the long run etc.), voicing opinions (5 items; e.g. When I disagree with others I share my views, I stand up for what I think is right regardless of the situation etc.), decision-making (6 items; e.g. I consider alternatives or solution options before making decisions, There are consequences to my decisions etc.), self-assessment (3 items; e.g. I am the best judge of my talents, I am good at identifying my own strengths etc.), and comparative validation (5 items;
e.g. I need family members to approve my decisions, I care about what others think of me etc.). The items in the comparative validation subscale are coded in reverse order.

In context to the issues related to reliability, Cronbach alpha coefficients were used to assess the internal consistency of the CASE subscales. The alpha coefficients for the evaluative thinking subscale were (.74), (.79), and (.84), voicing opinions (.56), (.55), and (.65), decision-making (.65), (.47), and (.69), self assessment (.82), (.49), and (.49), and comparative validation (.46), (.61), and (.67). The CASE inventory also demonstrated construct validity through convergent relations. High correlations were found between the subscales for CASE (evaluative thinking, voicing opinions, decision-making, self-assessment, and comparative validations). A positive correlation was found between evaluative thinking (one’s ability to evaluate thought and make logical inferences) and decision-making. This reflected that self-assessment (or self reflection) gives way to decision-making. If one has done a self-evaluation or assessment, they may more readily make decisions for themselves (Brandley, 2008). The CASE inventory is an appropriate measure for this research because it appears to measure the ability to think for oneself. Independent thought is one of the variables being assessed in this research. The CASE inventory made it possible to examine differences in cognitive autonomy between individuals receiving the intervention (GEAR UP) and those who do not. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of .80 was reported from one field sample of 161 high school students (Beckert, 2007), indicating an adequate level of internal consistency. As a general rule, a coefficient of .70 or greater is considered a relatively high correlation indicative of adequate inter-item reliability (Leary, 2004). Eighty percent represents true score variance leaving just 20% as measurement error. In another study, the reliability scores of the 27 items were considered again. The overall alpha coefficient for the scores from this sample was .85 (Beckert, 2007). Another study demonstrated construct validation, scores from adolescents at different ages were assessed and scores on CASE inventory were found to differ across grade level for each subscale. On two of the subscales, decision-making and evaluative thinking, college students scored significantly higher than the high school and middle school students. Scores for high school juniors were significantly higher than the seventh-grade participants (Beckert, 2007).
3) **Emotional Literacy Checklist (ELC) by Faupel (2003)**

Emotional literacy checklist is the practical tool used to measure the strengths and weaknesses of the adolescents in the area of emotional literacy. The emotional literacy checklist comprises of three checklists for: adults in the school (teachers, learning support assistants, etc.); parents or caregivers at home; and students themselves. The present study is concerned with using only the third checklist designed for students within the age range of 11-16 years.

This scale fairly adapts the Goleman’s (1996) broad classification of the knowledge, skills and competencies that contribute to emotional literacy and social progress of children and young people. In the pioneering work, Goleman (1996) distinguished between personal competence (Which is about how to manage ourselves) & social competence (which concerns how to manage relationships with others). Based on the Goleman’s classification of components of emotional literacy, using four point likert type scale ranging from “very true” to “not at all true”, this inventory assesses five dimensions of emotional literacy including Self-Awareness (sample items e.g. I am aware of my own strengths & weaknesses); Self-Regulation (e.g. I often lose my temper); Motivation (e.g. I carry on trying even if I find the work difficult); Empathy(e.g. I try to listen to the other people’s views even when I think they are wrong); and Social Skills(I can make friends even after having a fight). Each scale comprises of 5 items respectively.

The reliability analysis of the standardization data was addressed by using Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient for each of the sub scale for the three checklists. For the student’s checklist, reliability- Cronbach Alpha for sub scale of Self-Awareness was 0.47, for Self-Regulation, it came out to be 0.58, for Motivation 0.68, for Empathy 0.56 and for Social Skills subscale, was 0.58. However the overall Emotional Literacy as a concept acknowledged by this scale has the alpha coefficient of 0.78. The analysis of the standardization data concerned with the validity of the checklists focused on exploring the extent to which the five dimensions of emotional literacy proposed by Goleman (1996) were evident of the data. The analysis on the validity quotient showed that the majority of items in the subscales were highly correlated with other items on the same subscale. This pattern of results provided evidence that items in the subscale were measuring the same underlying concepts. The items were also found to highly correlate with overall emotional literacy scores. These results indicate that each
of the items within the subscale was also measuring some aspect of emotional literacy as one overall construct rather than just separate concepts of social skills or self-awareness (Faupel, 2003).

In context to gender differences, girls’ ratings on the student checklist were on average slightly higher than for boys, but the differences were small and not statistically significant. In the student checklist-sex differences show that mean score for males on overall emotional literacy was 72.4 & SD was 9.0; for females, mean score was 72.7 & SD came out to be 8.2; and mean score for total sample (both males & females) came out to be 72.6 and SD was 8.6 respectively. The mean sex difference for student checklist was 0.3, which was non-significant.

4) Problem Solving Inventory (PSI) by Conrad & Hedin (1981)

This instrument is intended to assess the problem solving ability. This instrument is designed as proximate measure of person’s inclination and the ability to perform four tasks (i.e. ability to generate alternatives, accept responsibility, consider consequences and comprehend complexity of the problem), which are central to the process of solving problem (Conrad & Hedin, 1981). The respondent’s task is to read the stories and respond to the questions asked i.e. is to generate protocols, which can be scored according to the degree the respondent: 1) can generate alternative solution to the problem; 2) actively seek to resolution to the problem and accept responsibility for its resolution; 3) consider the merits of its alternative solutions in terms of their consequences; 4) comprehend the complexity of the problem and is oriented to the growth of both self and others. The respondent receives four separate scores based on the elements in the problem solving. Each respondent is scored on four indices i.e. generation of alternative index, Action-Responsibility index, Consequences index and Empathy-Cognitive Complexity index. The scoring procedure for first three indices is relatively straightforward. The fourth is somewhat more complex, incorporating the elements of several interrelated developmental perspectives including ego-development, moral development, cognitive complexity, & level of need etc.

The pilot case for the validity of this tool as a reasonable measure of problem solving is based on a logical analysis of its content and scoring procedures. Dimensions of the protocol are directly based on the steps in problem solving delineated by John Dewey. Thus part of the research procedure was to correlate a sample of student scores on this
index with their moral reasoning scores from Rest’s Defining Issues Test. This was done using the Pearson Product-Moment test and the scores correlated at a level of .43 (N=60). This finding suggests that the two tests do acknowledge and measure some common, but not identical dimensions of thought and development with just 20% (0.19) variance common in both. This finding is consistent with the theoretical base for the test which includes moral reasoning (one of five developmental/psychological dimensions incorporated in the scale). A sample (N=20) was tested pre and post on both the Problem Solving and DIT tests. Change scores on the two tests were found to correlate highly and significantly at r = .78, an even stronger indication that they measure at least some common developmental elements. One further indication of concurrent validity is the similarity of the Complexity/Empathy Scale to the scale of Prosocial Reasoning developed by Eisenberg (1976). A nine-staged index was developed by Eisenberg (1976) to score the protocols/responses of the students on several prosocial dilemmas. This scoring index closely parallels the one developed for testing cognitive complexity and empathetic reasoning index in this scale. A critical validity check conducted on the Complexity/Empathy Scale. The directors of three programs were taught the content and the scoring system of the Scale. They were then asked to rate a random selection of their students on the Complexity/Empathy Scale based on their own observations of and interactions with them. Their assessments were compared with their students’ scores on the post test. Their assessments coincided exactly with student scores in 73% of the cases with a Pearson Product-Moment correlation of (r = .84, N = 45) (Conrad & Hedin, 1981).

Inter-rater reliabilities of the four scorers on this scale were calculated and high inter-rater correlations were found between the four raters on all the four dimensions. But due to the lack of range in the scoring of all the four indexes, even further precision was desired because of the newness of the instrument (Conrad & Hedin, 1981).

Administration of Tests and Psycho-Educational Intervention

The present study was carried out in three phases (Phase-I, Phase-II and Phase-III). Prior consent of all participants was taken before starting the investigation. In the Phase-I, adolescents within the age-range of 14-16 years from various schools were identified on the basis for availability as well as their willingness to participate in the study. Rapport was established with the participants. All the 785 participants were
administered to Identity Style Inventory (ISI)-R. Out of these, 250 subjects who scored high on diffuse identity style and normative identity style on Identity Style Inventory were selected for further investigation.

In **Phase-II**, all the participants were randomly assigned to Experimental (N=175) and Control group (N=75). They were administered Cognitive Autonomy & Self Evaluation Inventory, Emotional Literacy Checklist and Problem Solving Inventory. Administration of tools was done in group setting as all the tests were paper pencil measures. Each group comprised of 10-12 students. A gap of 5-10 minutes was given between administration of two tests. Then participants in the experimental group were given Psycho-Educational Intervention Program for a period of five weeks (approx). Participants in the control group were not given Psycho-Educational Intervention, but keeping in view ethical considerations, the investigator during the second phase of the study had general discussion on issues like daily life activities, school curriculum and extracurricular activities with the participants in the control group.

The intervention program was carried out for experimental group. Before starting with the intervention program rapport was built with the participants of the experimental group and they were made comfortable, relaxed and were assured of their confidentiality. Participants in the group were randomly allocated to 10-12 subgroups with each subgroup having 10-12 participants. Appropriate physical setting for intervention program was created. All the modules were conducted in a separate classroom of each school in which chairs were arranged in semi-circular manner so that every participant can easily face each other as well as the investigator, standing in the centre. This seating arrangement also facilitated the conduction of activities in the middle space easily. The intervention program was completed in the duration of five weeks (approx) during which 5 modules of approximately ninety minutes duration were carried out.

The **Phase-III** was the post testing phase. In this phase the post intervention scores of all the participants in both the groups (experimental as well as control group) were obtained on Identity Style Inventory, Cognitive Autonomy & Self-Evaluation Inventory, Emotional Literacy Checklist and Problem Solving Inventory. Then the data collected was scored and appropriate statistical measures were applied to analyze the data and to interpret the results.
A PSYCHO-EDUCATIONAL INTERVENTION

A psycho-educational model is an approach to changing and altering behavior patterns, values, interpretation of events and life-outlook of individuals who are not adjusting well with their environment(s) (e.g. home, school, or workplace). Inappropriate or deficient behavior is viewed as person’s maladaptive attempt to cope with the demands of the environment. Appropriate behaviors are developed by helping the individuals to recognize and realize the need for change and then helping the person to display more appropriate behavioral choices. Psycho-educational investigators are concerned with individual’s mind, perception of reality and appropriate and intelligent mapping of one’s feelings. According to these investigators, behavioral change comes not just from the manipulation of the environmental variables but from the development of a better understanding of oneself & others and by practicing new ways of reacting.

For the present research a psycho-educational intervention program was designed in the form of a set of 5 modules. The application of these modules focus on enhancing learning, discussion, self-reflection and participation/interaction. It is intended to enhance self-awareness, self-reflection and ultimately self concept of the adolescents, where adolescents’ should acknowledge their personal strengths & weaknesses, and should be able to overcome their weaknesses & use their strengths in solving problems & making appropriate decisions about various life choices and identity related issues. This self-learning based model provides an adolescent with a context, where he/she develops the tools and competencies essential for finding and redefining identity related issues. The intervention program comprised of the battery of activities based on three dimensions viz. a viz. cognitive, affective and socio-cognitive. The focus of this intervention program is to provide the adolescents an opportunity to find direction by creating such relevant contexts in which they can discover their competence and amend aspects of their self for healthy development. Investigator would aid them with a context to creatively explore their identities viz. a viz. their life choice dilemmas and goal settings. Subsequently, the participants would acquire greater self-understanding which would help them make appropriate vocational and life choices and realize their unique inner potential and make better life adjustments.
The detailed module wise curriculum of intervention is presented as follows:

**Rapport formation & Introducing the Intervention Program**

Before starting with the module based activities, the rapport building session was conducted, where the investigator introduced her to the group and a round of general introduction of all the participants in the group was carried out. This was an icebreaking as well as a rapport building session which further proceeded with general introduction of the purpose, procedures & benefits of the intervention program. The participants were made positively oriented towards the intervention as follows:

“You all will be associated with me for few days and we will be performing certain fun games and interactive activities that you will enjoy a lot. It is an interactive program where everybody is going to participate and remain involved. There will be no teaching, no evaluation, no marks or grades, but pure enjoyment and loads of learning through observing others as well as oneself. You just need to be honest and participative in these activities”.

“Do not hesitate to share any query, we can discuss and clarify it now”.

Termination of this introductory session was concluded with the general discussion where every participant was given a chance to speak about him/her.

**Module-I**

**Module-I** i.e. named as “Vocational Workbook” comprised of five activities, targeted on accelerating the brainstorming among students in relation to their vocational decisions; the basis for gathering vocation related information; the way they gather vocation related information; the way they reason for various options they chose; and the way they decided fairly to go with certain option in near future. The purpose of this game was to foster self-awareness and self-reflection among the adolescents. This module targeted on making the adolescents’ acknowledge their own strengths and weaknesses, so that they could work upon them, use them in making decisions and solving problems related to various identity issues especially career orientation. Another major interest of this module was to instigate the process of exploration among the adolescents. Goal setting & goal attainment were also focused in this very module.
**Tools needed:** The investigator would need: The copies of vocational workbook, Projector, chalk board, chalks, and pens/pencils to write. Students would need colors, cardboard, crayons and other resources to make certain creative presentations.

**Activity1: Name Game**

The first activity in the vocational workbook was the activity named as “Name Game”. In this activity the adolescents were asked to write certain positive or negative characteristics/strengths & weaknesses they think they have in themselves, starting from the alphabets of their own name. Once they were finished with that they were asked to encircle one or two characteristics they feel are the best and are worst in them.

**Instructions:**

“Your task is to enlist the alphabets of your name and then write some positive features that relate to yourself and some negative features or characteristics about yourself” (E.g. an adolescent with a name: RAGHAV, is writing R-Responsible, A-Attractive etc., as his strengths and R-Rude & A-Arrogant etc., as his weaknesses). After that please encircle strength (only one) and weakness (only one) of yours, which you think is the best and worst in you respectively”

**Activity 2: Face Game**

The second activity in the vocational workbook consists of pictures of two big faces i.e. a smiling face and a sad face. The individuals were asked to write on/under those faces about 5 things (atleast), that they enjoy doing in the smiling face and 5 things that they dislike doing on/under the sad face. Once they were finished with that, they were asked to encircle one activity which they liked the most and one activity which they disliked most.

**Instructions:**

“Your task is to write, on/under the happy simile 5 things (atleast), which you enjoy doing with a smiling face i.e. you love to perform those activities and write 5 things (atleast) which you dislike doing, on/under the sad simile”. After that please encircle an activity (only one) that you find as most interesting and an activity (only one) that you find as least interesting”.
Note: Activity 3, 4 and 5 were the homework activities given to the adolescents. The description of the same is given below.

Activity 3: Aim Game

This activity was designed as a homework activity for the students. Where they were asked to jot down as many career options as they know, or could search for, through different sources like internet, books, newspapers etc.; gather information about them; try to stream line certain options of their own choice. To make this interesting they were asked to craft something creative, such as making a collage or power point presentation etc. Before instructing about this activity an informal career/vocational guidance session was also conducted where student’s queries related to vocational decision making/problem solving were catered. The process of career decision making highlighted below was also discussed during the session.

**PROCESS OF CAREER DECISION MAKING**

Instructions:

“Now you know much about your positive & negative characteristics and also about things you like and dislike doing. Today your task will be to enlist the career options which are available to you. Then highlight those career options which you would like to follow or which you think suits you the best according to your personality. Make use of internet, books, newspapers or other sources to explore more about these options. You can also make a collage using pictures of various career options or can use any other way of presentation. You can use colors in your presentation and try to be creative. Highlight your favorite career option(s) in the presentation”.
**Activity 4: Question Yourself Game**

This activity ascertained the task of reasoning and giving logical and rational grounds for selecting one or two career options (highlighting favorite career option(s) in activity 3) to pursue in near future. The students had to ponder upon the reasons that why they want to opt for a particular option? Why they weigh this option more appropriate for themselves as compared to other options? This gives them a chance to redefine their goals if needed.

**Instructions:**

“Your task is to enlist the reasons for choosing the career options that you had interest in i.e. question yourself and write why do you want to be in that career? What fascinates you in that career? What are your passions and interests? You can use different colors for writing about different careers choices you made”.

**Activity 5: Game to Goal**

In this activity the students were asked to demarcate the steps to reach their goal (career option(s) selected in the previous activities). There task was to doodle out certain milestones to achieve, in order to reach a goal and certain hurdles which they think that might prop up and hinder their goal achievement process.

**Instructions:**

“Now as you have selected the career options, which you think you have interest in, so today your task is to select 2 or 3 options (career goals) and now write the ways to reach these goals. Enlist the steps to reach each goal and the problems or hurdles, which you might face to reach those goals. Do this separately for each goal”.

**Note:** Activity 3, 4, and 5 were the home work activities. Which were to be performed by the students at their respective places and a group discussion related to these three activities was conducted in the termination session.

**Module-II**

**Module-II** comprised of an activity named as **“Do I agree or Disagree”** which focused on deliberating and conveying various ideas about different issues concerning social and emotional life of adolescents. This module comprised of a session focused on discussing, debating and learning about various psycho-socio-emotional contexts and related issues. The purpose of this module was to discuss various issues that
might lead to strong difference in opinions among the group members, can further result into arguments pertaining to various issues related to parenting styles, peer pressure, role of parents and peers in career choice & making decisions related to important life concerns. This module impinged upon stimulating the perspective taking skills, coping with huge parental and peer influence that hinders one’s own independent thinking patterns; value orientations and enhancing self-dependent autonomous behavior and decision making. It kindled the ability to voice one’s opinions and regulate oneself socially.

*Tools needed:* chalk board, chalks, mike, and projector.

In this activity the students were verbalized three statements in verbatim one by one (after every statement a detailed discussion and debate was followed for around 30 minutes). After which they were asked to take stand in favour and in disfavour of each statement and make two groups to debate and discuss upon the issue verbalized by the investigator in the form of statement. The group division was followed by a debate session. The investigator acted as facilitator for both the groups and helped in gearing and heating up the discussion in a healthy and informative manner.

**Instructions:**

“Close your eyes and listen carefully to the statement verbalized. After listening to the statement and analyzing its meaning, the ones’ who are in the favour of that statement should stand up and the ones’ who are not in favour of that statement should remain seated”.

The three statements to be verbalized in this module were:

1. Peers/Friends are always right.
2. What we are is equal to what others think about us.
3. Parents do not understand children’s feelings.

**Module-III**

*Module-III* is named as “*what to do*”, which is a problem oriented module. In this module five problem situations were posed in front of the students one by one, for each situation 10-12 minutes were given to the group members to think upon and find valuable alternative solutions to the problem and then select a single best solution option after synthesizing the pros and cons (positive & negative points) of each
solution suggested. The students were asked to write the protocols for each problem on a piece of paper provided by the investigator. The purpose of this activity was to cultivate and promote problem solving ability, creativity in solving problems, autonomy and problem focused coping among the students. Before starting with the activity the students were explained and made acquaint to the problem solving process.
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**PROCESS OF PROBLEM SOLVING**

*Tools needed:* The investigator would need: A Projector, chalk board, chalks, and pens/pencils to write and blank sheets.

The five problem situations that were posed in front of the students were as follows:

1. “Your parents want you to choose a career stream of their choice but you don’t like that field, you are interested in something else. What would you do?”
2. “You find out that your best friend has started dating someone. You know that person whom he/she is dating and you find out that he/she is not good enough for him/her. Your friend has also started ignoring his/her studies and is lying to you and his/her parents about it. You are highly concerned for him/her. What would you do?”
3. “One day you came back to your place and find that your main door is open, your parents are out of town and you didn’t find any neighbour around, you are suspicious of thieves inside your house. What will you do?”
4. “Your friends are choosing a particular career stream and they want you to join them. When you told them that you have other interests, they started teasing and taunting you. What would you do?”
5. “You lost your favorite pen which had distinct engraving on it and one day you found the same pen with your classmate. You told him/her that this is your pen but he/she does not agree to you. What would you do?”

Note: The purpose of choosing such problem areas were general and not specific. The need was to inculcate problem solving skills and behavior in relation to various personal, social and intellectual contexts. The problems can be changed according to the need of the situation or sample of the study.

Module-IV

The Module IV named as “Expressing ‘you’rself” was designed to provide students a chance to focus on themselves and expressing their strengths & weaknesses, motivations, career choices, likes & dislikes, their religion and value orientation. On the whole, they were made to think, analyze and then reflect what they are in total as a human existence. The purpose was to make them contemplate about “who they are” and what they think “they want to be” in future. Self-awareness, reflection and clarity about “who one is” were the major issues addressed in this module.

Tools needed: The investigator would need: A Projector, chalk board, chalks, pens/pencils, blank sheets to write. Students would need colors, cardboards, crayons and other resources to make certain creative presentations.

This module comprises of one major activity detailed as follows:

Activity - “It’s me”

Instructions:
“Your task for the day is to express your unique self. Think and express about the following issues. To make this activity interesting, you can use any form of art i.e. drawing, singing, poem writing, dancing, story writing, paragraph writing, painting etc. to describe the below mentioned issues”:

1. What kind of person you are and what kind of person you want to be?
2. What are your strengths and weaknesses?
3. What/Who motivates you a lot?
4. What are your dreams?
5. What qualities do you value in your relationships?
6. Is your religion important to you? If yes, in what ways?
Module-V

The Module-V of this intervention program is named as “I am proud of ‘ME’ because”. The name of the module itself suggested the theme and purpose of this module. The students were made to perform certain writing based activities, where they were asked to assess & articulate themselves and the way they were been articulated by others. And then write their expressions on a piece of paper provided by the investigator. This activity provided students with a platform where they can introspect and see within themselves and retrieve thoughts & things (behaviors especially) that they think positive about themselves. The second part of the activity performed in this module purposed to highlight comparative evaluation and validation of one’s esteem by others.

After performing this activity they will be easily able to reflect comparison between what they think about themselves and what they think others’ think about them. The purpose of this activity was to endorse good levels of self-esteem; shooting efficacious thoughts about one’s abilities and inculcating the sense of self worth and self pride. These are most important ingredients of one’s sense of self or identity.

Tools needed: The investigator would need: A Projector, chalk board, chalks, and pens/pencils and blank sheets to write.

Instructions:

“Your task is to evaluate yourself and write about how proud you feel about yourself i.e. how positively you see yourself and how positively others see you in relation to the following areas:

1. My looks
2. My body
3. My relationships
4. My intelligence
5. My personality

Your first task is to write about your own positive perceptions about yourselves in the areas mentioned above. 30-minutes will be given to complete this task. After that your task is to write about others perceptions about yourself (i.e. what you think about how
others perceive you) in relation to above mentioned areas. For this task also time duration of 30 minutes will be given to you. Try not to consult other group members for any of the activities and try to be honest with yourself while writing”

After the completion of the task a twenty five to thirty minutes discussion oriented session was conducted where the students were asked to share their writings in open. The students got a chance to confirm or redefine their protocols for the second part of the activity conducted.

**Termination of Intervention Program**

Before moving onto the post testing phase of the research design, a termination session of about sixty-sixty five minutes was conducted. In this session students were involved in an open discussion about their experience of intervention. A group discussion was carried out about career decision making where Activity 3, 4, and 5 of the vocational workbook were discussed and students were asked to share their views, decisions, reasons, steps and hurdles (they might face) to achieve their decided career options. Students also presented their creations (for Activity-3) in front of the group during this session.

After a generous gap of 3-4 days, a post testing session was conducted, where students were re-administered on the Identity Style Inventory, Cognitive Autonomy & Self-Evaluation Inventory, Emotional Literacy Checklist and Problem Solving Inventory.

After two weeks of the intervention program one general interactive session was conducted with the participants. This session was named as feedback session and the purpose of this session was to get feedback from the participants. They were told to give open views about the intervention program. Participants reported clarity in decision making about their career choices. They also reported to be more cognitively organized and emotionally balanced than before. Few students stated that now they were able to think independently and were able to regulate their emotions effectively. Some others mentioned that their parents and significant others noticed a change in them (though the students were not able to describe the change). Participants also wanted to have more such fun sessions in future. They reported that they really enjoyed doing such activities. Participants also suggested long term intervention program. The feedback given by the participants was satisfactory and the investigator
thanked all the participants for their consent and cooperation in the intervention program.

**Procedure**

Identity Style Inventory (ISI)-R by Berzonsky (1992) was administered to a large sample (N = 785) taken from secondary and senior secondary level schools. On the basis of scoring the answer sheets of all the respondents. Subjects who were high on normative and diffuse identity style were screened to be used as sample for conducting the present investigation. This sample (N = 250) could be termed as purposive sample which included boys as well as girls. Out of this sample 175 subjects were assigned to experimental group and 75 subjects were taken in control group.

Psycho-educational intervention was applied to experimental group only. During the same time period subjects in control group were kept busy in neutral kind of activities like discussion about school curriculum, daily life activities, daily routine, school curriculum, current issues picked up from newspaper and extracurricular activities.

In the pre-testing session four psychological tests namely, Identity Styles Inventory (ISI)-R, Cognitive Autonomy and Self Evaluation Inventory (CASE), Emotional Literacy Checklist (ELC) and Problem Solving Inventory (PSI) were administered to all the subjects (both in experimental and control group) in the sequence in two sessions. 5-10 minutes gap was given in between the administration of two tests. Tests were administered in group setting; each group comprised of 10-12 students. Scoring of all the answer response sheets were done strictly according to instructions given in the manual.

The psycho-educational intervention was given to subjects in experimental group. This too was given in group setting, each group comprised of 10-12 students. Each session lasted for approximately 40-45 minutes and each group received the intervention for 5 to 6 weeks with 2-3 sessions per week for each group. During this period neutral interaction was maintained with the subjects in the control group. At the end of intervention with all the subjects post testing was done by administering all the tests which were used during the pretesting session. The obtained data was statistically analyzed using Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), one way repeated measure analysis of variance, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and correlational analysis. Detailed results are presented in the following chapter.