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The personality study as one of the scientific studies is relatively a new branch of knowledge. It is the most complex and fascinating phenomenon studied in behavioural sciences especially in psychology. In spite of enormous difficulties, it has made great strides (68, 96).

Within the discipline of psychology, it is a field of study rather than a distinct aspect of individual. Indeed it overlaps neighbouring areas extensively. It is at the cross-roads of most of the areas of psychology; it is the point of convergence between the study of human development and change, of abnormality and deviance as well as of compliance and fulfillment, of emotions and thought, of learning and of social relations.

The study of "total individual" or the "whole person" may be a worthy goal, but it is a practical impossibility. Traditionally, personality study has been devoted to generating theories about human nature and individuality and about the causes and meanings of important psychological differences among individuals. Psychologists have tried to find the most enduring and permanent human characteristics. Attention has also been directed to measuring complex characteristics as objectively as possible and to evolve useful methods for studying individuals (68, 96).

DEFINITIONS OF PERSONALITY

There are several meanings given to the word "Personality", perhaps the commonest of these may be reduced to the formula "personality is individual's effect upon other people, around him." Another popular
meaning is to identify personality with the characteristic of aggressiveness. Further, personality in colloquial sense, implies personal attractiveness, the ability to withstand crisis in life etc.(96).

In this context Super (99) has rightly pointed out that the field of personality is one of the most popular, challenging, important, and confused in contemporary psychology. Every psychologist has attempted to define it according to his own theoretical bias and thereby emphasised certain aspect ignoring the other. The problem of defining personality is a difficult one, and a very wide variety of definitions have been suggested over the years.

Even when the matter of defining personality is approached from a purely psychological viewpoint, the diversity is great. Hall and Lindsey (44) have reported that "no substantive definition of personality can be applied with any generality." The historical and theoretical reasons for this diversity of thought and lack of agreement among psychologists are complex and lengthy (61).

Vernon (107) has emphasised unique qualities and characteristics of an individual intellectual as well as non-intellectual: Cattell (35) equated personality with individual aspects of behaviour and viewed that it should have predictive power. Lewin (63), Murphy (70) and Murray (71) while defining personality gave explicit attention to the field within which behaviour occurs. Murphy (70) stated that there is organization within the organism and organization within the environment, but it is the cross organization of the two that is investigated in personality research. Murray's (71) views have been deeply influenced by psychoanalytic theory. According to him personality is not a series of biographical facts but something more general and enduring that is inferred from the facts.
Kemp (96) defined personality in terms of habitual mode of adjustment. Morton Prince (90) while defining personality emphasized inner aspects of personality. Watson (110) has called attention to the fact that character is a part of personality. Symonds (101) has defined it as the portrait or landscape of the organism working together in all its phases, while May (87) speaks of it in terms of the social stimulus of the individual. According to Eysenck (39) personality is more or less stable and enduring organization of a person's character, temperament, intellect and physique which determines his unique adjustment to the environment. His views appear to be particularly congruent with Allport's definition. Allport (2) made an extensive survey of literature, extracted about fifty different definitions, classified them into broad categories - omnibus definitions, integrative and configurational definitions, hierarchical definitions, definitions in terms of adjustment, and definitions in terms of distinctiveness, and gave a more comprehensive and widely cited definition. According to him personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment. Further he has recently made a change in the foregoing definition of personality which reads "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determined his characteristics behaviour and thought(3). Leftout of this newer definition is the idea of uniqueness, perhaps because Allport was concerned that such an emphasis might seem to exclude personality from scientific study. Added is the term "characteristic", presumably to emphasize the idea of stability.
PERSONALITY VIEWPOINTS

Various personality theories have been put forward from time to time by several scholars emphasizing their own standpoint. They have been broadly classified into four major different types of viewpoints: biological, experimental, social and psychometric.

The Biological Viewpoint

According to this viewpoint, all the personality events are studied in terms of interactions among the early experience, genetic endowment and evolutionary background of the organism. The reciprocal interaction of behaviour with its biological bases is the primary focus of this viewpoint. This evolutionary perspective emphasizes both phylogeny, the development of behaviour within the human species, and the ontogenetic development of each particular man. Therefore, the adaptive significance of a behavioural response in man's natural environment is emphasized more than the precision with which that response can be defined or measured in laboratory. Selective pressures that give rise to human behaviour and the contemporary pressures working to modify it are of central concern (111).

The Experimental Viewpoint

This viewpoint construes the events of personality study in terms of uniform learning, perceptual, and higher processes. It proceeds on the assumption that uniform processes underlie human behaviour. Although the content of the personality of different individuals highly distinctive and unique, people share uniformity in the ways in which that content is acquired. The understanding of human behaviour and the possibility for control over human behaviour rest in understanding the processes whereby
specific content is acquired. Further, the natural units of personality and the possibilities for prediction, control, and understanding of human behaviour lie in the mechanisms and processes whereby the unique content of each person is acquired (111).

The Social Viewpoint

This viewpoint stresses the events of personality study in terms of social context in which the individual lives and develops. It was asserted that man is a social animal, that important personality characteristics are both socially defined and determined. A full understanding of the social context requires a study of the contribution of models of cultural roles, and of culture themselves (104).

The Psychometric Trait Viewpoint

This viewpoint emphasized the events of personality study in terms of attributes which reflect underlying trait organizations. According to this the behaviour of individual is best understood in terms of attributes which reflect underlying trait organization. Personality trait measurement is emphasized in the separate realms of behaviour observation, self-report, and the indirect assessment of underlying traits.

A trait may be thought of as any distinguishable, relatively enduring, way in which an individual differs from others (111).

In the present problem the psychometric trait viewpoint is adopted throughout.
The concept of adjustment originated in biology. In biology the term usually employed is adaptation, a concept which was a cornerstone in Darwin's (62) theory of evolution (62). This biological concept of adaptation has been borrowed by the psychologist and renamed 'adjustment'. They represent a functional perspective for viewing and understanding human and animal behaviour. That is, behaviour is seen as having the function of dealing with or mastering demands that are made upon the individual by his environment.

The psychologist is more concerned with what might fancifully be called "psychological survival" or adjustment, rather than physiological survival or adaptation. Parallel with the biological concept of adaptation, in psychology behaviour is interpreted as adjustments to demands and/or pressures. These demands may be external to an individual or may be internal to an individual. To live successfully requires coming to terms with external pressures as well as satisfying internal ones (62).

In brief, adjustment consists of psychological processes by means of which the individual manages or copes with various demands or pressures (62).

ASSESSMENT OF PERSONALITY

The term "assessment" is relatively new in the field of psychology. Its first use by psychologists occurred during world war II to indicate the procedures for selection of military personnel. Following the world war II, the use of the term "assessment" begin to appear in teaching and research publications (59).
To psychologists, assessment means any procedure for making meaningful evaluation or differentiations among human beings with respect of any characteristic or attribute. Subsequently the term included a variety of methods of assessment and an even greater range of attributes or characteristics by which a person may be assessed.

The field of personality is perhaps the most challenging and difficult of any of the area in behavioral sciences (57), the personality is not something which is perceived directly and measured. It is always inferred from the behavior.

In ability testing, the individual seeks to produce an optimal score so that he may be favourably considered or selected for some position. Here the tester and the testee usually agree implicitly about the purposes of the testing. While in personality assessment, the testee may be told that there are no right or wrong answers, that he should respond truthfully, so on and so forth, but for various reasons he may be consciously or unconsciously motivated to respond on the basis of other considerations. He may attempt to cover up undesirable characteristics in the interest of presenting himself in a favourable light or he may be oriented toward over emphasizing his complaints or faults to win necessary sympathy. In brief, in personality assessment it is dangerous to assume that the testee is fully motivated to provide a truthful and accurate answers. In most cases, even if testee was so motivated, he would probably lack the ability to describe himself accurately. Like many of us, he undoubtedly falls back upon mechanisms of self-deception that heighten his accomplishments and diminish his faults in his own eyes. Thus, frankness of response and accuracy of self-description do not necessarily go hand in hand (57).
In spite of these enormous difficulties, personality assessment has made great stride. It has become one of the fascinating fields of psychology and has attracted large number of investigators.

In an attempt to assess personality, assessor seeks to make statements about person that can be shown empirically to be accurate and useful. These statements are made on the basis of many different types of data. These various data may be obtained through several methods. They have been broadly classified into self-report inventories, projective tests and non-test instruments (87).

Self Report Inventories

Large number of self-report inventories are available for assessing personality. These inventories could be readily administered to a large number of individuals, scoring is rapid and objective, and vigorous statistical procedures could be used in establishing norms, internal consistency, the relation between test scores and other behavioural measures, factor structure, and other aspect of the instruments (42, 61). This approach to personality assessment emphasized the measurement of discrete traits or aspects. Woodworth's personal Data Sheet (111), Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (54), Bell Adjustment Inventory (14), Strong Vocational Interest Blank (98), etc., are some of the well known tests used for personality assessment.

Projective Tests

Projective test involves the presentation of a stimulus situation that elicits the private idiosyncratic meaning and organization of the individual's private world that he has brought to the testing situation.
and which is called into play in responding to the test demands. This approach in personality assessment emphasizes the global assessment of single individual (4), Rorschash Ink Blot (85), Thematic Apperception Test (70), Blacky Pictures Test (39). House Tree and Person Test (33), Sentence Completion Test (86), are some of the well known tests used by majority of the clinics (4, 59).

Other Miscellaneous Procedures

Other miscellaneous procedures include observation, interviews, ratings, biographical data sheet, sample behaviour technique, etc. These procedures for personality assessment are used to serve specific purposes (4, 61, 104).

Foregoing discussions revealed that there are several procedures for personality measurements. Each procedure has its own advantages and disadvantages. The selection of the methods depend upon the several factors - purposes of assessment, subject to be assessed, resources available etc.. Generally, psychologists are in favour of employing more than one method for assessing personality of an individual (44, 61, 75).

HISTORY OF PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

Man's interest in personality assessment is longstanding, probably stemming back to prehistoric times. In addition to the intuitive methods, many systematic procedures - astrology, palmistry and phrenology - have survived from Biblical times (61).

Astrology attempts to forecast events on earth through observation of the fixed stars and other heavenly bodies. According to this the
personality of each individual, and the cause of events in his life, could be assessed and predicted from his horoscope.

Palmistry, attempts to assess an individual personality and to predict future course of events in the life of an individual on the basis of various irregularities and folds of the skin of the hand. Palmistry emphasizes the lines of the hand, as well as to the swellings or monticuli between these lines.

These two procedures - astrology and palmistry - have been rejected for two reasons (44). First, the assumptions on which these techniques are based are contrary to our current scientific understanding, and second, the predictions that emerge from these procedures have not been shown to be accurate.

Phrenology tries to assess the personality of an individual on the basis of the measurement of the external shape of the human skull. Phrenology was given its major impetus late in the eighteenth century by Franz Joseph Gall, a German physician and anatomist. This system of personality measurement deserves careful scrutiny for several reasons (61) : 1) there were careful theoretical assumptions underlying the system, 2) the system was completely empirical in basis, and thus open to scientific inquiry, and 3) the history of phrenology is recent enough to have provided fairly complete documentation.

The basic assumptions concerning the specificity of cerebral functioning and formation of the skull, as understood by phrenologist, have been clearly disproven, and thus the theory upon which phrenology rests is discredited (61).
Astrology, palmistry and phrenology have not survived to day because the modern personality assessment procedures typically are based on assumptions that are congruent with modern science and rely on the empirical demonstration of the usefulness of their prediction (44, 61).

Influence of Psychological Measurement

Scientific personality assessment has its roots in the study of individual differences through psychological measurement. The study of individual differences was given considerable impetus by Darwin's work on evolution. According to him, in order to study the effects of human genetics, it would be necessary to identify clearly individual differences in those behaviours that had adaptability and survival value for mankind. Sir Francis Galton, a famous British scholar of the nineteenth century became interested in the inheritance of these differences (4). He himself was also the initiator of the measurement of the non-intellectual faculties - character and temperament.

The study of individual differences in the united states was pioneered by James McKeen Cattell (31), who had his doctorate in Leipzig. He also worked with Galton in England. Although his interests were mainly in the areas of psychophysics, perception, and reaction time, he had a strong influence upon the development of other psychological measurement devices, including personality tests (31, 44).

At about the same time, in France Alfred Binet, used a standard series of experimental tasks, including observation on body types, head measurements and handwriting. Some of these interests appeared to reflect the then-current influence of phrenology and other prescientific notions.
But he discarded all these later, and began a series of investigations into mental functioning which included personality. He employed variety of tasks, in measuring intellectual functioning which included telling stories about pictures and identifying inkblots, which were antecedents of what are now known as the projective test of personality (44, 61).

Thus, research on the measurement of personality was preceded by work on the measurement of skill or abilities, and grew out of the early academic interest in the measurement of individual human differences. Here the work of Karl Pearson and Charles Spearman, Galton's followers, in statistical procedures provided powerful tools for later work in assessment (41). Web's study attempted to summarize the important aspects of character through the intensive study of large number of subjects. His systematic studies can be regarded as forerunners of the present day "biographical data blank" approach to personality assessment.

The earliest attempts at personality assessment with pathological cases involved word association procedures (4). The use of word association as a method for the identification of unconscious personality conflicts was initially proposed by Carl Jung. Jung developed a standardized list of words for the same. Kent and Rosanoff also developed formal approach to the use of word association technique and developed norms of common responses based on 1,000 normal persons. Thus, the word association test can be regarded as the first practical psychometric device for identifying emotionally disturbed persons (4).

Further, Heymans and Wiersma developed a list of symptoms indicative psychopathology. Hoch and Amsden revised it. These lists were influential
in generating the self-report personality inventory. The first such inventory was Woodworth's Personal Data Sheet (114), which was developed during World War I to use with military personnel.

A noteworthy development occurred in personality assessment for clinical purposes. Hermann Rorschach (85), a Swiss psychiatrist came out with ink-blots for making differential psychiatric diagnosis. His major work was published in German in 1921, but did not appear officially in English until 1942. His work has been seminal both in stimulating research with his inkblots and in the development of other minimally structured stimulus situations for the purpose of personality assessment.

Thus two divergent origins of personality assessment emerged - one from clinical assessment of psychopathology and second from academic study of individual differences.

The first trend in personality assessment is exemplified by projective techniques. The second trend in personality measurement, that stemming from the interest of academic psychologists in individual differences is exemplified by the work on paper and pencil personality inventories.

The projective methods were conceptualized as those which present the subject with a situation for which there are few clearly defined cultural patterns of response, so that he must "project" upon the ambiguous way of seeing life his meanings, significant patterns, and especially his feelings. These are indirect methods of personality assessment. They tap the pattern of internal organization and structure of personality without disintegrating or modifying the pattern as it exists (61). Several projective
techniques - Rorschach's Ink Blot, (85), Thematic Apperception Test (72), Four Picture Test (106) Children's Apperception Test (15), Draw-a-Man Test (79), etc. are used by different clinics. This approach emphasizes the global assessment of personality of a single individual.

The non-projective methods include self-report inventories. This approach emphasized the measurement of discrete traits or aspects rather than a global assessment of the whole personality (4). The items included in these instruments were often concerned with the more superficial and obvious aspects of overt behaviour, and their susceptibility to deliberate faking posed many problems in interpreting scores.

Goldberg (45) while discussing the current proliferation of personality inventories, made a distinction between two kinds of inventories, based on the reasons for their development. The first group of inventories was developed in response to pressures from society to deal with specific applied problems. This category included the inventories dealing with the problem of personal adjustment etc. The second group of inventories was based more upon conceptions of the structure of individual differences than upon any social or real life considerations and was viewed as stemming from theoretical concepts about the nature of personality. This group included the inventory measures of introversion-extroversion etc. (61). Recently both types of inventories are in use. Over and above these methods, other two formal approaches to personality assessment - Biographical data sheet and behaviour sample techniques - are in use (61).

The biographical data sheet is widely used in industrial and business settings. It was also used for many years in the development of
'base expectancy tables' to predict whether or not a prisoner is likely
to violate parole if it is granted to him. Professional mental health
workers also emphasised its use. The behaviour sample technique, though
it has an illustrious beginning in Galton's laboratories, has only limited
use in routine personality assessment. Recently it has found a place in
behaviour therapy research.

The procedures are developed for the comprehensive personality
assessment of an individual by a group or panel of professionally trained
assessors. The individual to be evaluated is brought for several days of
study at an "assessment center". The purposes of this procedure is to
understand better individuals of this type, such as creative architects
or clinical psychologists or to select candidates for some difficult high
level position such as astronauts or undercover agents (64, 61).

Here many different kinds of data, such as biographical data,
intellectual evaluations, response to self-report inventories, and projec-
tive techniques, the proceedings of several inventories and variety of other
behaviour samples of record of situational tests may be made available to
the panel of assessors regarding the individual (s). There are several
inherent problems underlying this approach. The first programme of this
nature was developed by Henry Murray and his associates at Harvard in 1938.
More recently, this approach has been successfully used by one of the major
American industrial companies. American Telephone and Telegraph Company —
for evaluating middle level managers. This is one of the more promising
approaches to the personality assessment (32).