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This chapter presents a brief theoretical and historical background of research on human development enabling to understand how human development has been viewed by researchers.

Models of Human Development:

Research on human development is said to have passed through three developmental phases, one extending from 1870 to 1930, another from 1930 to 1950 and the third one from 1950 onwards (Mussen, 1983). The first study not designed properly was conducted in 1870 by Schwabe and Bartholomai in which the hypothesis “that conditions of various parts of the city exercise different influences upon the knowledge of pupils” was tested. During the first period from 1870 to 1930 research in the field of human development was in its infancy. Only two models of research, the Social Address Model and Nature-Nurture Models dominated the field. The social address model covered comparisons of individuals living at different social addresses. This model characterizes many researches being conducted even today in India. Galton was, perhaps, the first to introduce family structure as a key environmental context affecting the course of human development, first researcher to have investigated the possible effect of parents on the development of their children through the medium of personal interaction (Mussen, p. 362). Some of the defining properties of research paradigms of this period were (i) social structure model which consisted of discrete variables that were treated solely as main effects, (ii) interaction effects of variables influencing the development were not taken into account, (iii) absence of any theoretical ideas about the processes through which the environment influenced the course of development.
A major shift in the conception of man's relation to his environment took place as a result of the work and ideas of Lorenz (1965) and Hebb (1949). It was, now, realized that "Instead of being merely the object of external forces, the individual was seen and studied as an active organism seeking stimulation, providing responses, altering and even creating its own surrounding" (Mussen, p. 380).

Several researchers, after 1930, transformed these highly general and strange theoretical ideas into researchable problems and operational definitions. David Levy was the first person who implemented Freudian theory in research on parent-child relationship in the context of child development which was followed by Symonds who provided more rigorous a research design. Another psychologist who put Freudian theory into practice of research was Bowlby (1951) who gave sufficient theoretical concreteness to Freud's concept of maternal attachment with the result that Ainsworth (1969) and her colleagues were able to develop the widely used "strange situation" experiment as a method for assessing the quality and consequence of stability versus disruption in the mother-child bond. The implementation of Freud's theory of identification was, afterwards, operationalized in the concept of modeling as developed and applied by Bandura (1969) and Bandura and his colleagues (1961). Similar roles in relation to Piaget's theory of social influences in development were played by Berenda (1950) and Kohlberg (1964). In the same way Lippit and White applied Lewin's field theory to the study of children's groups (Mussen, p. 371). A few years after this Barker (1968) translated Lewin's concept of "Life Space" into concrete naturalistic "behaviour settings", thereby, establishing a new research domain of ecological psychology.
A second major wave of investigation following upon parent child relationship paradigm was the study of child's socialization in the context of social structure. It was a sort of grafting of the new paradigm on the old one i.e. the social address model. Now, under the new emphases the same model was extended to comparing parents living at different places. The initial contrasts included socio-economic status. A series of surveys was conducted in 1932 by Anderson (1936) in which data were reported on social class differences in parent practices including onset and duration of breast-feeding, toilet-training, permissiveness, mode of punishment and training for independence. Such studies continued to dominate the scene over a quarter of a century to come. Bronfenbrenner (1958) analyzed the accumulated results and identified a trend over a 25 year period toward a greater permissiveness, especially on the part of middle class parents. There have been no follow-up studies of these trends from 1950 to the present day.

Research on human development after 1950 assumed a more complex form. New environmental domains were added and more complex structures were formulated. This was an outcome of the fusion of the social address model of 1870s and later process paradigms of 1939. It was emphasized during the period after 1950 that not only location and the processes but something more influenced the human development. For example, it was held that difference in parental treatment of children found to be differentially affecting the child's development were also due to different environments in which parent's were living. The following models (Mussen, p. 376) seem to have emerged during this period.

1. A Person-Process Context Model
2. Microsystems Model
3. Meso-systems Model
4. Ecosystem Model.
The person-process model of human development research envisages possibility of differences by social class not only in child rearing practices and outcomes, but also in the processes that inter-connect them. Developmental processes under this model are assumed to vary as a joint function of biological and environmental factors. Child-rearing attitudes and belief systems are treated as important mediators of child rearing behaviour. This model recognizes that not only does the environment influence the development of the child, but the child also influences the environment. It assumes that developmental effects can be cumulative over time. This model is so designed that it takes into account the characteristics of each of these elements and interaction among them. Such designs have come to be applied to child development research only very recently.

Simultaneously with the Person-Process context Model described above other developments were taking place in this field. They were reflected in the research designs involving more complex and differentiated conception of the immediate settings in which children lived. Initially, stimulated by theoretical paradigms they soon took an implicit momentum of their own. The environment in which the child lived was, then, considered as a micro-system providing the setting in which the child has to think, feel and act. This was the beginning of the evolution of setting as Microsystems. Barker, Wright and their colleagues provided impressive evidence in support of their thesis that most of the variance in the behaviour of children is accounted for by settings in which they are located. It is widely accepted that the “child’s experience in a particular setting has an effect on his subsequent development” (Mussen, p. 378). Setting as the physical environment and setting as the structural environment both have been studied in relation to child’s development. A setting is a place where people can readily engage in
face-to-face interaction. Their activities, roles, interpersonal relations, time and material characteristics etc. constitute the elements or building blocks of the setting which may be considered as a system (Mussen, p. 380). The system has its own dynamics. The patterns of interaction as they persist and evolve through time constitute the vehicle of behavioural changes and individual child development. A microsystem is a kind of environmental setting, an organized complex of a number of critical elements. Bronfenbrenner (1979) and Brim (1975) define this as a “pattern of activities, roles and interpersonal relations experienced over time by the developing person in a given setting with particular physical and material characteristics”. Implicit in this microsystem model is the emergence of a more dynamic and differentiated concept of child’s immediate environment. The differentiation in structure and functions is further manifested in the expansion of focus from dyads and triads to higher order structures as the proximal contents of the socialization process. Bronfenbrenner calls these higher order structures as N+2 systems i.e. system within system. More complex systems can become units of analysis in their own right.

The mesosystem model of research in the field of human development was also evolved during the 1960s. It emphasized that the “behavioural development is a function, processes occurring in two or more settings of the relations between these settings” (Mussen, p. 382). Multisetting influences on child development, first, received recognition in Hartshorne and May’s experiment (1928) on deceit, in which the authors reported on the relative impact of parents’ versus peers’ values on the child’s attitudes about right and wrong. Later on studies in this direction were conducted in the 1950s by Neiman (1954), Harris-and-Tseng (1957) and by Sowaid and his associates in 1987.
Hess and Goldblatt (1957), Stukat (1958), Coleman (1961) compared the experience of pupils from big and small schools and found that children in big schools participated in a far greater variety of roles as compared to children from smaller schools. Philips (1972) however, demonstrated that “Indian Children’s Confusion” and “inappropriate” behaviour appeared to be the result of the cultural incongruity between the worlds of home and school”.

Family’s external context as a factor of human development in the family was also incorporated in the research approaches to the study of human development during this period. This was called exosystem model of research. Studies of this kind were conducted by Hoffman (1980). In these studies the influence of mother’s employment on child’s development was studied by him.

Studies on effects of father’s employment on child’s development continued to be in vague in the 1950s and the 1960s till 1980s. Miller and Swanson (1958), Candill and Weinsten (1969), Kohn and Schooler (1973), Slomezynski, Miller and Kohn (1981) all found in their studies that the parents’ employment, nature of employment and sex of parents employed had significant influence on the development of the child’s attitudes, values and academic achievement. Parents’ social world, another part of the exosystem has also been studied in relation to child’s development. Giovannani and Billingsley (1970), Garbarino (1976) etc. have studied the effect of external context, particularly of parents’ social life, their interaction with relatives, friends and neighbors in the community on child’s development and have demonstrated that they affect child’s development significantly and in several different ways.
Thus, various research models right from the year 1870, the year of the origin of research in human development till the present day guided research efforts in the field of human development. Three major sets of forces contributed to the evolution of these research models. The first included the theoretical paradigms developed by the scientists themselves, sometimes from other disciplines and cultural backgrounds including both the theory translators and the domain theorists (i.e. those who called attention to previously uncharted domains and provided tools for their systematic mapping). The second set of forces emanated from a source outside the pale of science itself i.e. from the developmental researchers who focused on social change taking place in the society. The “Life Course” perspective of Elder was one example of this. The third set of sources emerged from the individual efforts of the researchers on gradually elaborating latent structures underlying the research designs employed by earlier investigators in the field.

Various forms of settings as systems have, thus, been studied in relation to human development such as setting as physical environment (e.g. the effect of television, etc.) and setting as structural environment and triadic and “second order effect” meaning, thereby, “the mediation of a dyadic process through the influence of a third party”, e.g., impact of father and mother’s treatment of the child. Examples of such studies are the studies made by Parke (1978) and Pedesen (1981).

A mother is the first school for a child. She is a dynamic force in the life of her child influencing his physical, emotional, social and ethical development. A child is subjected to continuous care of one person usually the mother working or non-working. It is the duty of well-educated young
women to build happy homes for themselves and serve as a good example for others. They should strengthen human society by giving it the most able children.

The child feels secure in the household where the mother cares well of her child. The mother, typically, is the source of several primary rewards such as food, tactile contact, and alleviation of pain and warmth. It is essential for mental health of a child that the infant and young child should experience a warm, intimate, and continuous relationship with his mother. The child must feel that he is an object of pleasure and pride to his mother and the mother needs to feel an expansion of her own personality in the personality of her child. Each needs to feel closely identified with the other.

In the recent two decades the values of our society have changed and so have changed the roles of parents in the family. As we are becoming more and more materialistic, it is the economic values which prevail over all other matters in our society. As a result, both the mother and the father have to get employment. Due to this trend of mother's employment the family culture and structure have much changed from traditional ones. This change certainly affects the behaviour of parents and their child rearing practices. The traditional belief was that women must stay at home with their children in order to promote their children's proper and allround development. Psychologists argue that a child not reared primarily by its mother during the first three to five years of its life, will suffer from various kinds of negative consequences due to this maternal deprivation, ranging from emotional damages and lowered intellectual potential to inadequate physical development. It also has a negative effect on personality growth of the child.
It is a well-known fact that adolescence is a state of mind rather than a period in life. It is in fact a phase of development beginning normally about the age of eleven or twelve and going on sometime into the early twenties. If the child has been brought up in a secure and happy atmosphere regardless of the mother's employment he will have the best possible chance of growing up into a healthy adult, free to live his own life at the same time and able to love and respect the parents to whom he owes so much.

Now the question arises 'is child's personality affected by the employment of mother or not'. It is generally argued that the children of working women are more achievement-oriented. On the contrary some people argue that the mother should be completely devoted to her children for their development. But till now it remains only a matter of discussion whether the personality characteristics of the children of working or non-working mothers differ or "to what extent mother's employment affects the traits of her child". The proposed study is an attempt at finding out some evidence in the context of these questions. It is stated as follows:

**Statement of the Problem:**

The study is titled as "A differential study of Developmental Characteristics (hyperactivity, Anxiety and self concepts) of working and non-working mother's children".

**Definition of the Problem:**

The problem studied involves one independent and three dependent variables. The dependent variables include three developmental characteristics such as hyperactivity, anxiety and self-concepts. The independent variable is the state of mother's being employed which constitutes a component of home environment. It was presumed that
employed mother's children should be developmentally different in the context of stated developmental characteristics from those who are unemployed mother's children.

**Related Research:**

A brief review of researches related to the present study is presented in this section.

Ramchandran (1981) found in his study that the employment of mothers had neither a positive nor a negative effect on the socio-emotional and educational development of the child. Working mothers of girls have higher level of anxiety for children as compared to non-working mothers of girls. Children of mothers who had a low level of anxiety for children and interacted more with their children, were found to have higher level of social maturity, a more positive self concept, a low level of manifest anxiety and higher achievement in language and arithmetic than children of mothers who had a high level of anxiety but whose interaction with their children was low. Sharma R (1986) found in his study that the self concept level of children of working mother was more positive than that of children of non-working mothers. The children of working mother were found to be better in concentration and confidence. Significant difference was found on adjustment level in the children of both the groups. In case of non-working mothers children were found to be more excited, anxious tender-hearted, sensitive, dependent and more protected. Sudha Trivedi (1988) found that there is no significant difference between the achievement scores of the children of working and non-working mothers. Vijai (1990) found that there is significant difference in the personality of the male/female children of working mothers and non working mothers. Vijayran (1992) found that non-
working mothers spent more time than working mothers in feeding and clothing their children. The educated mothers punish their children less. Mothers did not show any difference in shouting at their children due to their difference in education, employment and income. Pandya Pratap T. (1996) in his study found that social adjustment of non-working mothers daughter was higher than those of working mothers. School adjustment of ninth class children of working women, was better than that of non-working mothers. Nanda and Meera (1999) found out that the children of employed mothers had better comprehension ability than of children of employed mothers. Children of employed mothers faced more loneliness that the children of unemployed mothers, specially boys. Minakshi Goswami (2000) found in her study that working mothers children were more achievement-oriented than all other groups while anxiety of the girls of working mother was found to be highest. Ven T.M. Vander, F.T. Cullen, M.A. Carrozz and J.P. Wright (2001) after testing the effect of working hours and occupational conditions on delinquency found out that the characteristics of maternal employment had relatively little or no influence on delinquency.

It may be concluded from these researches that there is multidimensional impact of the mothers employment on the personality characteristics of their children. Employed mother’s children have, perhaps, better comprehension ability and are more achievement-oriented. It is also seen that mother’s employment affects children’s effective development. The researchers had found that self-concept of the children of working mother was better. Children of working mothers were assertive and independent, children of non-working mother were more sensitive, protected and tender. Level of aspiration of children of working mother was higher. Need achievement of
children of working mothers was higher. Children of non-working mothers were more anxious.

**Rationale of the Study:**

As children grow some behavioural differences may become so distinct that the parents find difficult to manage. These are personality traits of the child. When mothers have to remain out of door for employment, the children are likely to suffer for want of proper care of mother because she is not able to devote full attention towards her children so as to allow them to grown in right direction. So the children of working mothers may develop many psychological problems as fear, frustration, anxiety hyperactivity etc. Children may suffer from loss of parental affection, nearness and identification which may drive them to learn to be aggressive, frustrated, shaky etc. Not getting from employed mothers what they need mothers being employed and finding little time to care may cause developmental problems in their children. NIPCCD (1978) found that children of the mothers in upper occupational level were more socially developed and their mothers felt less dependent upon schools for their children’s social development. Effect of mother’s being employed on children’s development was clearly brough out in this study. However, this was the positive aspect of development resulting from mother’s being in employment.

Sharma, A (1981) found that the fact of mothers being employed was linked with acceptance-rejection, encouragement-discouragement, democratic-autocratic, trust-distrust and tolerance-hostility dimensions of children’s development. Working mother with a moderate family size used punishment to maintain discipline. The undue pampering and over protection by working mothers of high socio-economic status significantly contributed to several problems of their children who predominantly showed feelings of hatred, autocratic attitude and also
distrust. P.S. Kala (1986) found that the two groups of working and non-working mothers did not differ in perceived parent-child relationship. Yet, he found that children of working mothers were better adjusted at home than those who come from the non-working mothers' homes. These few studies demonstrate that evidence in this regard is not conclusive. Rather, the findings with regard to the effect of this fact of working and non-working women on children's development is found to be complicating. Moreover, the link between the developmental characteristics such as children's hyperactivity, anxiety, and self-concepts and the fact of mother's being employed has not been explored so far. Hence, there seems to be a pressing need to make such a study. The proposed study is designed with this object in view.

**Need and Significance of the Study:**

We all know very well that mothers play a vital role in the life of a child. When a mother is working out of home, the influence of the absence of the mother on child's development is a point of major concern of many of psychologists, educationists, and sociologists. The effect of the maternal deprivation upon the development of children is considered to be significant by several psychologists. Not only the care of the child is the primary responsibility of the mother, but the mother's physical proximity with the child and her constant availability to respond to his needs is also an essential condition for adequate healthy development of the child. Psychologists have unanimously emphasized this fact and researchers have extensively demonstrated the importance of parent-child relationship. In case of working mothers, however, quality of this relationship seems to be tremendously affected as is experienced by many of us. High rate of employment of mothers outside the home, may introduce certain factors that give the child a feeling of insecurity and helplessness. The youngest child, according to a
study by Roumann, in the family of a working mother tends to substitute fantasy for real life achievement and suffers from a lack of a cordial relationship with people. It was also found that in homes where there is a working mother the child is likely to lack a sense of motivation or standards and feeling of personal worth. Adjustment to others is another difficult task for most children. The oldest child can be expected to lack a sense of personal freedom and experience emotional tensions. It may also be expected that children from working women homes may suffer from being more hyperactivity, anxiety and poor self-concept. If this a found to be so intervention programme for such children and proper guidance may be suggested in which case it may be possible to save them from being broken down. Children are the future builders of nation. Therefore it becomes essential to provide them an appropriate soothing environment so that their abilities, capabilities and personality can be developed effectively according to the need of self and society. Since, there is no conclusive research in this direction, the study may provide tentatively, the truth about the fact. May be what is presumed in the forgoing lines is not found to be a fact. That also may be meaningful and may add a new dimension to psychological beliefs in this direction. That is why it is necessary to investigate the effect of mother’s employment on the children’s traits such as hyperactivity, level of anxiety and self-concepts because a mother plays an important role in the life of a child. Since the moment the child is born mother’s care, affection, standards and ideals are, universally, believed to shape her child. A mother is said to be the first school for her child. Hence, it seems desirable to study how some of the developmental traits of the child are affected by the mother’s being in employment. The problem, therefore, seems of great value to the parents, educationists, psychologists and sociologists. That is why the
investigator intends to compare the hyperactivity level, anxiety and kinds of self-concept of the children of working and non-working mothers.

**Objectives of the Study:**
Following are the objectives formulated to be achieved through this study:

1. To find out if working mothers factor affects developmental characteristics of their children.
2. To find out if children of working mothers suffer from more hyperactivity than those coming from non-working mothers' houses.
3. To find out if children of working mothers are more anxiety-ridden than those coming from non-working mothers' homes.
4. To find out if there are significant differences between the self-concepts of children of working and non-working mothers.
5. To describe developmental characteristics of children coming from working mothers' homes.
6. To study separately differential characteristics (self-concepts, hyperactivity and anxiety) of male and female children of working and non-working mothers.

**Hypotheses of the Study:**
In order to achieve the foregoing objectives following hypotheses were formulated:

1. That, the fact of working mothers significantly affects the developmental characteristics of their children.
2. That, the children of working mothers are significantly more hyperactive as compared to children of non-working mothers.
3. That, children of working mothers are more anxiety-ridden as compared to children of non-working mothers.
4. That, there are significant differences between self-concepts of children of working and non-working mothers.

5. That, the development syndrome of children of working mothers may be specifically described in terms of hyperactivity, anxiety and self-concepts. Hypotheses 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 come as part of the foregoing umbrella hypothesis.

6. That, the there is a significant difference between the self-concepts of the boys of the working and non-working mothers.

7. That, the boys of working mothers are more hyperactive as compared to the boys of non-working mothers.

8. That, the boys of working mothers are more anxiety-ridden as compared to the boys of non-working mothers.

9. That, there is no significant difference between the girls of the working and non-working mothers and self-concepts.

10. That, the girls of working mothers are more hyperactive as compared to the girls of non-working mothers.

11. That, the girls of working mothers are more anxiety-ridden as compared to the girls of non-working mothers.

Data Collection:
Data were collected on all the variables by the researcher herself with the help of the class teachers and a few friends. The scores thus obtained are presented in the mastersheet, appendix, C-2.
Data-Analysis and Results:

The mastersheet formed the basis of analysis and drawing conclusions. The two groups of children were, then, compared on these variables and conclusions were drawn on the basis of significance of difference between them. The foregoing research hypotheses were converted into null-hypotheses which were tested by applying either the t-test.

Delimitations:

The study was confined to children of class IX and X only of Sitapur and Lucknow districts.
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