CHAPTER 1

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

1.1 Definitions of personality

1.2 Early Attempts to measure Personality

1.3 Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS)
   1.3.1 Introduction
   1.3.2 The Development of the EPPS
   1.3.3 Personality Variables of EPPS
   1.3.4 The Norms, Reliability and Validity of EPPS

1.4 Draw-Backs of the EPPS

1.5 Significance of this study
1.1 Definitions of Personality:

The definition of any term is an arbitrary matter. There cannot be one and only one correct definition and all other established ones being wrong. However, the understanding of a selected definition is more adequate if it is compared with other definitions.

It is natural that such a wide word as "Personality" should have a variety of definitions. After a survey of definitions of personality, Allport\(^1\) concludes that there are at least fifty different meanings of the term personality. He reports that "Personality came from the Latin word - 'Persona' originally denoted the theatrical mask first used in Greek drama and adopted about a hundred years before Christ by Roman players." A Greek player commonly held a mask before his face. The mast was called a 'Persona' because he talked through it. Thus, personality was thought of as precisely what the mask of the actor implied - a cover for the 'real' person behind it. In time, the term 'Persona' came to apply to the actor and eventually to individuals in genera; perhaps with the recognition with Shakespeare, that 'All the world's a stage and all the men and women merely players.'

Allport\(^2\) also reports that Persona is used in at least four distinct senses in the writings of Cicero. It is worthwhile to note these meanings, because they embrace most modern conceptions. All of them have their roots in the
theatre. Firstly, a person is regarded as an assemblage of personal qualities; in this sense, it represents what the person is really like. In this interpretation, personality pertains to the actor. Secondly, a persona is regarded as the way a person appears to others, not as he really is. In this sense, personality pertains to the mask. Thirdly, persona is the role a person plays in his life, a professional, social or political role, for example. A role is a character in a drama. Finally, persona refers to qualities of distinction and dignity. In this sense, it pertains to the star-performance. Because of the evaluative connotation of this meaning of the term, one does not find such a definition in the scientific setting. In popular usage, a personality in a community is a man of distinction or worth.

Psychologically speaking, personality is all that a person is. It is the totality of one's behaviour towards oneself and others as well. It includes everything about the person—his physical, emotional, social, mental and spiritual make-up.

In this way, the term personality signifies something deeper than mere appearance or outward behaviour. How should it be given a proper meaning or definition is a difficult problem. Everyone, it seems, knows what personality is, but no one can precisely describe it fully. Thus, the word 'personality' is a very complex term and can be defined in different ways. The investigator, here, would satisfy himself just by quoting some definitions:
(1) According to G.W. Allport:

"Personality is the dynamic organization with the individual of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment."

(2) According to Shoens:

"Personality is the organized system, the functioning whole or unity of habits, dispositions and sentiments that mark off any one member of a group as being different from any other member of the same group."

(3) According to Morton Prince:

"Personality is the sum total of all the biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies, appetites and instincts of the individual and the acquired dispositions and tendencies acquired by experience."

(4) According to Kemph:

"Personality is the integration of these system of habits that represent one individual's characteristic adjustments to his environment."

(5) According to Gordon:

"Personality is a more comprehensive term and it includes character which is a special aspect of a developed personality."
(6) According to Watson:

"Personality is the sum of activities that can be discovered by actual observations over a long enough period of time to give reliable information."

(7) According to Eysenck:

"Personality is the more or less stable and enduring organisation of a person's character, temperament, intellect and physique, which determine his unique adjustment to the environment."

(8) According to Cattell:

"Personality is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation."

With all that have been mentioned above, the present investigator would like to conclude the following things about personality.

- The main characteristic of personality is self-consciousness.
- Personality includes every thing about a person. It is all that a person has about him. It includes all the behaviour patterns.
- It is not static; it is dynamic and is ever in a process of change and modification.
- It is both mental and physical.
Indeed, this short and concise explanation of the term 'personality', as given above, has a wide meaning. It draws a beautiful portrait of an individual's totality. It may be understood to mean as the sum total of one's way of behaving towards oneself and others as well. It also predicts one's nature of behaviour as how one would behave in a particular situation and one's pattern of adjustment to the ever changing forces of environment.

1.2 Early Attempts to measure Personality:

It would be in the fitness of things to have bird's eye view of the history of the measurement of personality before going through the details about Edwards' Personal preference Schedule. This provides a historical background of personality testing as a whole.

In old days, men gave their opinions for other men by evaluating character-trait. But their evaluations were not reliable. After a long time, metaphysicians and philosophers had thought about the character-trait or quality of a man and as a result, palmistry and face-reading were developed. But they were not directly related with the measurement of personality.

Galton was the first person to conceive and try to measure the character-trait. He found that character-trait and behaviour of every person were stable. So it could be measured. Afterwards, due to the varied need of educational
and vocational guidance people took interest in the measurement of character-trait and behaviour. In 1922, Fernald prepared a test for measuring character-trait. Hart-Shone, May and their associates published a character education inquiry during the period of 1924 to 1929. This was an important attempt in the measurement of character-trait.

When measurement of personality had just passed its infancy, Ellis raised a caution against the thoughtless use of personality measures:

"Perhaps there is no other aspect of mental measurement about which such wide discrepancies between theory and practice are found, or it may be that there is no other area in which so much over activity is accompanied by so little thought."

Upto the mid-years of the present century, many attempts were made to prepare different personality questionnaires, but they had not much structural concept about constructing different items. Such psychologists as Burt, Eysenck, Flanagan, French, Gibb, Guilford, Mosier, Ryeburn, Thurstone, Vernon, Cattell and his colleagues did try to have structural concepts while framing different items to measure the personality.

In 1945, when Cattell surveyed the field of personality for his book of 1946, on the subject, the popular questionnaires available were: Woodsowrth’s Personal Data
Sheet (1938), Maslow's 'Dominance' Test (1940), C.R. Rogers' Child Adjustment Items (1939), Strong's Interest Test (1943), Bernreuter's 'Social Behaviour Patterns' (1935-1938), Bell's Adjustment Inventory (1934-1939), Allport's Ascendence - Submission Scale (1928), and many others - none of which claimed to be, or could be considered, a factored test.

In the following ten years, however, several important questionnaires on an extensive factor-analytic basis appeared: the Guilford - Zimmerman Questionnaire, the Cattell 16 PF, and the Thurstone Temperament Schedule, as well as Remmers and Schimberg's SRA Junior Inventory.

In this creative midcentury moment, the well-known MMPI also appeared, which, although not factored, had a definite objective, statistical rationale intended to obtain maximum separation of clinical groups. Other questionnaires appeared, many based on purely clinical insights such as Mooney's problem Check List and Gough's well-known California Personality Inventory.

Between that decade and the present, several important factored instruments appeared, notably, the Comrey Scales, the Edwards Personal preference Schedule, Dielman Coan, and Cattell's Early School Personality Questionnaire, Eysenck's EPI (formerly MPI Scales) D.N. Jackson's PRI Scales, Porter, Cattell and Schue's child Personality Questionnaire, Sells and Cattell's Clinical Analysis Questionnaire, Rotter's International and External Control Scales, and so on-in all,
probably over two hundred printed 'Scales'.

In measurement of Personality, different techniques were used, which are listed here.

(1) Questionnaire  (2) Observation
(3) Rating Scale  (4) Interview Method
(5) Sociometric Technique (6) Situational Tests
(7) Projective Technique.

It would be a note-worthy approach in a right direction to take the stock about personality testing movement in India and particularly in Gujarat. Of course, the detailed information about these tests has been discussed in Chapter-2, "Review of Related Literature".

In 1959, M.S.L. Saxena (Banaras Hindu University, Uttar Pradesh) prepared a Personality Inventory. In 1961, R. Kundu constructed and standardised a New Personality Test for his Ph.D. degree from Calcutta University. In 1965, D.B. Tarechand (Bombay University) developed a Personality Test in Guidance. In 1967, R.P. Singh prepared a test for personality Adjustment of college students in Patna University of Bihar State. In 1971, R.R. Tripathi, (Patna University, Bihar State) awarded Ph.D. on, "Construction of a Personality Test with the Social desirability variable controlled." The study was based on Edwards Personal preference schedule. Edward himself, "While developing his EPPS used a scaling method which resulted in a psychological continuum of
Social desirability, on which the statements could be located unknown to the students, the statements in the inventory had been previously scaled for degree of social desirability by the method of successive intervals. Statements with low social desirability scale values on this continuum represent traits which are judged to be socially undesirable and statements with high social desirability scale values represent traits which are judged to be socially desirable. In 1971, M.T. Ramji prepared the rating scale for assessing personality traits of primary school pupils. In 1979, U.G.C. financed study was carried out by R. Jay-Gopal on, "Personality Profile of the under and High Achievers of some of the schools in the city of Madras."

The above mentioned all the researches were conducted in different states of India. In Gujarat also, the researches on personality, were conducted by different investigators.

In 1965, M.N.Palsane (M.S.University, Baroda) prepared a Personality Inventory. In 1974, S.P.Gosai also prepared a Personality Inventory for his Ph.D. degree from Gujarat University. J.Jotwani and S.L.Vaya adapted Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) for Gujarati population respectively in 1980 and 1985 on different samples. In 1986, R.S.Patel adapted Cattell's Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ) for Gujarati pupils. In 1986, S.J.Emmanuel adapted Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 P F Q) in
Gujarati version. In 1988, B.G. Dave adapted Cattell's Early School Personality Questionnaire (ESPQ) for Gujarati children of ages 6 through 8. R.N. Thakur adapted High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) for Gujarati School pupils. J.H. Shah developed Problem check List for Secondary and Higher Secondary School Pupils, separately. He also constructed and standardised self-concept inventory for pupils of grades IX and X, it being a rating scale having 80 adjectives (1976). But no one from Gujarat undertook any study on EPPS so far. It is present investigator's humble attempt to adapt and standardise EPPS for Gujarati students.

1.3.1 Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

In this section 1.3, "Edwards Personal Preference Schedule - Manual" published by the test-maker, Allen L. Edwards has been amply referred to as only hard facts about the schedule were to be presented.

1.3.1 Introduction: The information regarding EPPS has been given here in detail, as the investigator based his study more or less upon it.

EPPS was constructed and standardised by Allen L. Edwards (University of Washington). It was designed primarily as an instrument for research and counselling purposes, to provide quick and convenient measures of a number of relatively independent normal personality variables that these
statements purported to measure have their origin in a list of manifest needs presented by H.A. Murray and his associates at the Harvard Psychological Clinic. The names that have been assigned to the variables were those used by Murray.

1.3.2 The Development of the EPPE: The usual personality inventory consists of a set of statements relating to personality traits that are to be answered in such a way that a "yes" response indicates that the subject believes that the statement is characteristic of himself and a "No" response that it is not. A printed inventory of this kind was given to a sample of 140 college students. One of the statements in the inventory was:

"I like to be loyal to my friends." Another statement was:

"I like to avoid responsibilities and obligations."

It was found that 98 per cent of the students answered "Yes" to the first statement and only 6 per cent to the second.

Unknown to these students the statements in the inventory had been previously scaled for degree of social desirability by the method of successive intervals. This scaling method resulted in a psychological continuum of social desirability on which the statements could be located. Statements with low social desirability scale values on this
continuum represent traits which were judged to be socially desirable. The two statements mentioned above were widely separated on the social desirability continuum. The scale value for the statement concerning "loyalty to friends," that was endorsed by 98 per cent of the students, was 4.14. The scale value for the statement concerning "avoidance of responsibilities and obligations" that was endorsed by only 6 percent of the students, was 0.68. This relationship between the per cent of "yes" responses obtained for the personality statements and the social desirability scale values of the statements is quite general.

For the complete set of statements, it was found that the per cent of "yes" responses increased with the social desirability scale values. The relationship was linear and the strength of the relationship as measured by the product-moment correlation coefficient was 0.87.

Without recourse to other sources of information (and such sources are exceedingly difficult to obtain), there was no way of knowing how many of the 98 per cent who stated that they "like to be loyal to their friends" were not, in fact, characterized by this statement, but stated that they were because this was the socially desirable thing to be. And, similarly, one did not know how many of the 94 per cent who failed to state that they "like to avoid responsibilities and obligations," did so, not because this statement did not
characterize them, but because acknowledging that it would be regarded as socially undesirable. However, in the EPPS, an attempt was made to minimize the influence of social desirability in responses to the statements.

The EPPS differs from many inventories in another respect. A number of personality inventories purport to measure such traits as emotional stability, anxiety, adjustment, or neuroticism. Still other inventories purport to measure such clinical and psychiatric syndromes as schizophrenia, paranoia, or hysteria. High and/or low scores on these inventories have associated maladjustive or clinical connotations. For research and counselling purposes, where it is often desirable to report back scores to subjects, such inventories present definite problems. These connotations are less likely to be attached to the variables in the EPPS.

1.3.3 Personality Variables of EPPS: The EPPs provides measures of 15 personality variables. The names and descriptions of the 15 variables are given below:

(1) ARCHIEVEMENT (Ach):

To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.
(2) DEFERENCE (def) :

To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.

(3) ORDER (ord) :

To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

(4) EXHIBITION (Exh) :

To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the centre of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.
(5) AUTONOMY (aut) :

To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free, to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

(6) Affiliation (aff) :

To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

(7) INTRACEPTION (int) :

To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the behaviour of others, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

(8) SUCCORANCE (suc) :

To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal -
problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favours cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

(9) DOMINANCE (dom):

To arrange for one's point of view, to be leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed Chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others, to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the actions of others, to tell others how to do their jobs.

(10) ABASEMENT (aba):

To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

(11) NURTURANCE (nur):

To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and
sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others,
to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who
are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward
others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

(12) CHANGE (chg) :

To do new and different things, to travel, to meet
new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine,
to experiment and try new things, to eat in new and different
places, to try new and different jobs, to move about the
country and live in different places, to participate in new
fads and fashions.

(13) ENDURANCE (end) :

To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any
job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle
or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before
taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a
job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction,
to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no
progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at
work.

(14) HETEROSEXUALITY (het) :

To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage
in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with
someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite
sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the
opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

(15) AGGRESSION (agg) :

To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.

1.3.4 The Norms, Reliability and Validity of EPFS :

1.3.4.1 NORMS : In determining whether a particular score, within the range of scores from 0 to 28, for a given variable is high or low, reference may be made to norms. Percentile norms were established for men and women on each of the personality variables. These percentile norms were based on 760 men and 749 women tested in 29 colleges scattered over the country.

The raw scores distributions for men and women on each variable were also converted into standard score distributions (T scores) with a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10.
The interpretation table for norms is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentiles</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>T Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97 and above</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>70 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 - 96</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>60 - 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 84</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>41 - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 16</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and below</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>30 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.4.2 RELIABILITY: Split-half reliability coefficients or coefficients of internal consistency were determined for the 15 personality variables. These coefficients were obtained by correlating the raw and column scores for each variable over the 1509 subjects in the college normative group. The internal consistency coefficients, corrected by the spearman-Brown formula ranged from 0.60 to 0.87.

Test-retest reliability coefficients or stability coefficients ranged from 0.74 to 0.88. These coefficients were based upon the records of a group of 89 students at the University of Washington who took the EPPS twice with a one-week interval.

1.3.4.3 VALIDITY: (a) Although the validity data reported in the EPPS manual were meagre, a large number of independent validation studies have been published. Various studies have been made comparing ratings and scores on the variables of the EPPS. In one study, subjects were asked to rank themselves on the fifteen personality variables without the knowledge of
their corresponding scores on the EPPS. The self-rankings of some subjects agreed perfectly with their rankings based upon the EPPS.

In another study, the statements appearing in the EPPS were printed on individual cards and the subjects were asked to do Q sorts of themselves following Stephenson's instructions. These self ratings were correlated with scores on the EPPS for each subject. As a result, some subjects showed a high degree of agreement and others a little or no agreement between their self-ratings and scores. There was a definite tendency on the part of some subjects doing the Q sorts to regard the statements with higher social desirability of themselves and those with low social desirability scale values as being least characteristic. For these subjects, the correlations between self-ratings and EPPS scores were quite low.

(b) CORRELATION WITH OTHER SCALES: The another approach involves the investigation of the relationship between the variables of the inventory and other variables which should, in theory, be related to the inventory variables in specified ways.

Some evidence along these lines was available from a study involving 106 students at the University of Washington who were given the EPPS and then some weeks later were given the Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory and the Taylor-Manifest Anxiety Scale.
The Guilford - Martin Personnel Inventory provides measures on three variables named after the favourable (for socially desirable) end of the scales: Cooperativeness, Agreeableness, and Objectivity. Cooperativeness is defined as "opposed to fault-finding or overcriticalness of people and things." Agreeableness is defined as "opposed to belligerence or a dominating disposition and an overreadiness to fight over trifles." Objectivity is defined as "opposed to personal reference or a tendency to take things personally". High scores on all three variables were supposed to indicate the presence of the traits named and low scores their opposites.

High scores on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale were supposedly indicative of the presence of anxiety and low scores, the absence of anxiety. An examination of the items in this scale would result in general agreement that high scores are to be regarded as socially undesirable.

The product-moment correlations of the three scales of the Guilford - Martin Personnel Inventory and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale with the EPPS variables were significant at the 0.05 level. These correlations are, in general, in the expected directions, although it is possible that at least a partial explanation for the correlations of the Guilford-Martin and Taylor Scales with Succorance and Endurance can be found in a common factor of social desirability.
The two highest correlations of a Social Desirability scale with the EPPS variables are 0.32 with Endurance and -0.32 with Succorance. The Taylor Scale has a high negative correlation with the Social Desirability Scale and the three Guilford-Martin Scales all have high positive correlations with the Social Desirability Scale.

1.4 Draw-Backs of the EPPS:

Victor Serebrovskoff quotes in "A Guide to intelligence and Personality Testing" (in Buros, 1978) that

No reasons are given in Edwards manual to show that the EPPS does measure the manifest needs proposed by Murray. Even face validity is suspect! Four items presume heterosexuality. What about those for whom boots evoke sexual arousal! Edwards purports to measure normal personality variables, but this is no excuse for presuming normality of responses or equating sexuality with heterosexuality. Aggression, too, is mainly refined, bitchy and verbal, not overtly physical.

Anne Anastasi remarked in 1988,

Although the EPPS introduced several noteworthy features, it is in need of: (a) revision to eliminate certain technical weaknesses, particularly with regard to item form and score interpretation; and (b) properly conducted validation studies utilizing techniques of score pattern analysis appropriate to ipsative scores.
1.5 **Significance of this Study:**

(1) EPPS is an inventory measuring 15 personality variables at a time.

(2) This inventory can be used for individuals as well as a group.

(3) The procedure of conducting the EPPS is easy to operate.

(4) It is also useful in giving guidance and counselling in various fields of human behaviour.

Taking into consideration the above mentioned special characteristics and uses of EPPS, the adaptation and standardisation of this schedule in Gujarati version will fill in the gap that had remained in the field of Personality Testing in Gujarat State. Most of the tests available in Gujarati are either useful in clinics or to measure Cattell's personality factors. There are some inventories in Gujarati which look into problems faced by specific groups, pupils of different grades, etc. as well as the degree of level of adjustment of different types - personal, social, marital, etc. But EPPS is totally based on Manifest needs of the person and 15 variables that these statements purport to measure have their origin in H.A. Murray and others' list of manifest needs. Hence, the adapted Gujarati Schedule will be quite useful in guidance and counselling on which some stress has been placed in the supplementary revised edition of 1992 of "National Policy on Education 1986."
REFERENCES


2. Ibid. P. 26


4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.


13 Ibid., pp. 5-22.
