C H A P T E R V

CASE STUDIES OF HIGHLY AND LOWLY AGGRESSIVE ADOLESCENTS

CHAPTER-V

CASE STUDIES OF HIGHLY AND LOWLY AGGRESSIVE ADOLESCENTS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Tha plan of the study included the detailed study of some cases on both extremes of the aggression scale . Case studies give an insight into the nature of the problem under study as well as its development in an inter relation of environmental forces taken in their chronological order. They recognise that each individual is different from another and is therefore a separate entity. In the present study each subject has some definite causes and antecedents lying both within himself and his enviroment for high or low aggression. It has a developmental history behind it. So the case studies were an attempt to explore the causes, manifestations and effects of aggression in the subjects for the study undertaken.

Case study method is a comprehensive method including a number of methods of measurement. It is an attempt to synthesize and interpret the material thus

gathered for the purpose of making an inclusive picture of the individual and of the background factor affecting his life. Case study should thus include a description of the present status, an account of the past influence and successive stages of development and an indication of future trends.

5.2 SAMPLE

The sample for the case studies were drawn from among the subjects on whom the aggression scale was administered for the first part of the study. Aggression scores were coded in frequency distribution table and the subjects lying one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the means of aggression scores obtained by Allahabad and Baroda samples were taken as the subjects on extreme ends. The means and standard deviations are given in the tables 5.1 and 5.2 .

TABLE-5.1

Mean and S.D. of Aggression scores in Allahabad Sample.

c.i.	f		
53-62	2	M =	23.35
43-52	7	σ =	9.52
33-42	42	M+1σ=	32.87
23-32	93	M-1σ=	13.83
13-22	129		
3-12	81		
	N = 354		

TABLE-5.2

Mean and S.D. of aggression scrores in Baroda Sample.

c.i	f	
53-62	2	
43-52	5	
33-42	22	M = 23.2
23.32	72	σ = 11.69
13-22	90	M+1σ = 34.89
3-12	19	M-1σ = 11.51
	N = 210	

Thus the subjects who scrored 33 and above on aggression scale in Allahabad were taken as the populat-

- ion of High Aggression subjects (HAS_A). In the same way the subjects scoring 35 and above in Baroda were taken as the population of HAS_B.

Similarly the subjects who scored 13 and below on aggression scale formed the pupulation for Allahabad for case studies of Low Aggression subjects (LAS_A) and the subjects scoring 11 and below formed the population for Baroda for case studies of LAS_B.

Out of the above stated population for the second part of the study ten cases each on both the extremes on aggression scale were selected randomly from Allahabad. The same was repeated in Baroda. Thus the total number of cases to be studied became forty. Out of these forty cases ten each (five each from HAS and LAS) in both the cities were to be studied.

The researcher first met the subjects individually in the school and tried to seek their co-operation. She

told them that they were selected on the basis of their behaviour on the tests administered on them and that none of them was abnormal or deviant character. She then visited the subjects' houses one by one and tried to see how far other members of the family of each subject were ready to cooperate.

Out of the those ten cases each on both the ends on aggression scale five each on both ends were selected for final study on the basis of their behaviour, availability cooperation and also the cooperation of the teachers, family members etc.

Thus the sampling was multistaged. In the first stage it was random and in the second stage it was purposive sampling.

The procedure was repeated in Baroda. Thus five on both extremes in both cases/the cities were selected for case studies making the total number of case studies twenty.

5.3 PROCEDURE FOR DATA COLLECTION

The researcher used a few visits to the houses of

each subject under study one by one to build up the rapport with their family members. She conversed casually with each available member of the family of the subject. This was repeated with each subject.

She then told them the purpose of her study and told them that their ward was not abnormal or had some socially undesirable characteristics, rather he/she displayed some special characteristics on the tests administered on him/her. She had to be cautions in using the word aggressive as it is held in negative connotation. Instead she used the explanation and definition of the term to tell them about her study. She told them that the study would help them also in a way that they would know about the child in a better way and the child too would be able to accept himself in a healtheir way.

The researcher met the class mates/peer/siblings the class/subject-teacher, their (subjects') parents, apart from the subjects themselves. The first few meetings included casual talks and the general information about the

subject. This helped the creation of the atmosphere in which interviews could be held. The researcher then started with unstructured interview schedules which became more and more structured and pin pointed on subsequent meetings, still the flexibility was kept.

The interview schedule prepared was based on an interview schedule for authoritarian personality developed by the psychology department of Allahabad University. Allahabad. The questions asked were classified in the infancy, early childhood, childhood and adolescence (Appendix). As the situations demanded the questions were restructured . The procedure was repeated with each case. Some of the subjects were hesitant in front of their family members. In such cases the better atmosphere was provided to them where they could be free. Some subjects preferred writing to speaking out certain things. These writings were used as written interviews checklists were prepared to help the subjects finding out some traits in them. These checklists are appended in the end.

5.4 ANALYSIS

Content analysis was used to analys the data. The manner in which the interviews proceeded is given in the appendix. The informations thus gathered from all the respondents were then pooled together and were then recorded in the tabulated form. One example of such a table is appended in the end. The contents were then analysed and frequencies were noted down in content table. In aanalysing the contents of the cases studied in detail, the emphasis was given in getting some insight in the causes of high or low aggression and its effect on subjects and its manifestations by them. For the purpose of analysis the manifestation and effects were taken together, because in some cases the high or low aggression was manifestated in some of the traits in the subjects as perceived by the four categories of respondents viz. the parents of the subject, the teachers of the subject, the peer/s of the subject and the subject himself, peer included class mate, friend, same age sibling etc. Since the

present day school system does not give much opportunity for teacher-pupil contact, the teachers could not contribute much on locating the causes of high or low aggression. Again the peer were not much available for interviews by the researcher and they too could not contribute much on this aspect. So the main respondents taken for causes were parents and the subjects themselves.

5.4.1 Causes:

The causes that have emerged for presence of high and low aggression in subjects are given below in the Table 5.3 and their χ^2 values are given against each cause. In one case of HASs the subject is a son and second in birth order. But he is also taken in the category of eldest because both he and his family members referred him to be the eldest one. He has one elder sister but she too considers herself as a younger one and junior to the subject as held by the society.

TABLE-5.3

Cause of aggression as reported by HASs and LASs and their X^2 values.

S.No.	Cause	HAS	X^2	p	LAS	X^2	p
1.	Birth order						
	i) Eldest	1			3		
	ii) Middle	2	6.461	.05	4	.400	n.s.
	iii) Youngest	1			3		
2.	Sibling size						
	i) Small (2 or less)	1			0		
	ii) Average(3 or 4)	6	4.036	N.S.	9	14.945	.01
	iii) Large(5 or more)	3			1		
3.	Communication with parents						
	i) Good	2			2		
	ii) O.K.	2	3.430	N.S.	3	1.612	n.s.
	iii) Poor.	6			5		
4.	Responsibilities						
	i) Subject has responsibilities towards the family	8	5.556	.02	2	3.7	n.s.
	ii) Subject does not have responsi-	1			8		

-bilities towards
the family.

5. Family Education						
i) Well Educated	6	0.5	n.s	8	3.7	n.s.
ii) Not well Educated	4			2		
6. Childhood						
i) Physical Problems	4	.83	n.s.	1	4.625	.05
ii) Comfortable	2			7		
7. Financial Situation						
i) Constraints	5	1.143	n.s.	4	0.5	n.s.
ii) Comfortable	2			6		
8. Goal in life						
i) Goal oriented	7	2.889	n.s.	1	6.5	.02
ii) No goal	2			9		
9. Feelings for siblings						
i) Attached	8	5.579	.02	1	4.625	.05
ii) Not attached	1			7		
10. Separated from parents inchildhood/earlychild-hood						
i) Yes	3	2.70	n.s	0	10.1	.01
ii) No.	7			10		

11. Physical condition

i) Weak	3	2.70	n.s.	-		
ii) Not weak	7					

12. Parental expectation from the subject:

i) High	6	6.489	.02	2	10.703	.01
ii) Average	1			8		
iii) Low	1			0		

13. Father's temperament

i) Short tempered	4	0.5	n.s.	1	6.5	.02
ii) Balanced	6			9		

14. Frustration

i) Present due to failure in getting good marks/ position/parental love respect in family.	10	10.1	.01	2	3.7	n.s.
ii) Absent	0			8		

15. Sibling of same sex

i) Present	10	10.1	.01	8	3.7	n.s.
ii) Absent	0			2		

Looking into the above table it is evident the there were certain causes that emerged significant in

in case of HAS_S and not in LAS_S and some other causes emerged as significant in LAS_S and not in HAS_S. Similarly some causes were not significant in any of HAS_S or LAS_S while one cause emerged as significant in both HAS_S and LAS_S.

The first cause that emerged for the development of high aggression was the birth order. From the table 5.3 it is seen that 70% of HASs were eldest in the family, 20% HASs were middle ones and only 10% HASs were the youngest in the family. The χ^2 value for this is 6.461 with df = 2 From the table E(Garrett 1967) it can be seen that the calculated value is more than the table value for .05 level (5.991 with df=2) hence it can be said that the birth order did play a significant role in the development of high aggression and that the eldest ones tend to be more aggressive. But the χ^2 value for LASs calculated for the data is 0.400 with df=2 which is far below to be significant. From the table 5.3 also it is seen that the percentage does not differ much. 30% LASs were first child 40% were middle ones and 30% were the youngest ones. Thus it could be

said that birth order is importeant where HASs are concerned but it not of significante for the development of low aggression in the subjects.

Second cause in the list was the sibling size. Only 10% HASs and belonged to small size and 60% of HASs were from middle size and 30% of HASs were from the middle size. Here the calculated χ^2 value for HASs is 4.036 with df= 2 which is below than 5.991 with df = 2 the value required to be significant at .05 level. This difference in sibling size is not large enough to be called as the real difference. Thus sibling size had no effect on development of high aggression. In case of LASs the table 5.3 shows that none of LASs belonged to the small family size while 90% LASs came from the family having 3 or 4 children and only 10% of LASs had a large (5 or more) number of siblings. The χ^2 value for this difference was found to be 14.945 with df=2 which is higher than the tabled value of table E (9.210 with df=2) at .01 level. Thus

it can be said that the number of siblings did play the significant role in the development of low aggression. The large family size was the cause of low aggression. Another cause reporeted by the respondents was the communication the subject with the parent, especially father, 20% of HASs each were having good, and workable communication with parents. The rest of 60% HASs were having poor communication with parents. But the difference did not cause high aggression as χ^2 value is 3.430 which is not significant (5.991 at .05 level with df=2) The same is the case with LAS where χ^2 value is 1.612 again far below the significant value. Though here 20% of subjects were having good 30% having workable (O.K) and rest 50% were having poor communication. But in both HASs and LASs it is not significant.

Another cause that had emerged as a cause for high or aggression was responsibilities given by the family members. While 80% of HASSs were found to feel responsibilities for family people, 10% of HASs did not

the rest 10% HASs did not feel the responsibilities, (for the purpose of analysis non respondents were left and told number of the subjects in HASs was taken as 9). The differeene was found to be the true difference as the χ^2 value 5.556 with df = 1, is more than the value 5.412 required to be significant at .02 level with df=1. In other words responnsibilities for family people did play a significant role in development of high aggression. In case of LASs only 20% of subjects felt responsibilities for family and 80% of them did not feel any responsibility for family members. But the χ^2 value is 3.7 which is a little less than the value to be significant at .05 level with df = 1 (table value 3.841) Though the value is less but is very near to the table (significant) value. Further study in this area may explore some interesting findings.

Family education was given as one of the causes in development of high or low aggression by the respondents. Family education meant the education

of the parent/s or the guardian/s in case the parent/s was / were no more, well educated, meant here, were graduates and not well educated meant non-graduates. None of the parents was uneducated or illiterate. 50% of HASs belonged to families well educated and 40% of HASs were from families not well educated . But the difference is not significant to attribute to the development of aggression in HASs. The χ^2 value is 0.500 with df = 1 which is below the χ^2 value 3.841 to be significant at .05 level with df = 1 . While 80% of LASs belonged to well educated families. Only 20% LASs were from families not well educated ($\chi^2 = 3.7$ n.s)

Childhood was assumed to be another cause when the aggression might have developed in HASs. 40% of HASs had physical problems in childhood and 20% of the HASs had no major problem in childhood. The remaining subjects of their parents did not report anything specific about the physical problem in the childhood of the subjects. The difference here also is not true to have any bearing on the different levels of aggression in subjects. The obtained χ^2 value of

0.83 with df = 1 is far below the value 3.841 with df = 1 required to be significant at .05 level with df = 1. The same is not the case with LASs. 10% LASs were reported to have major physical problems in the childhood and 70% of them did not have any such problem and had comfortable childhood. 20% the subjects were non respondents as nothing was said on this issue either by them or by their parents. Among the respondents the difference in the childhood of the LASs was found to be significant as the calculated χ^2 value was 4.625 which is more than 3.841 the value to be significant at .05 level. Hence the subjects having very comfortable childhood developed low aggression.

Seventh cause as reported by respondents was the financial situation of the subject's family. Of HASs 50% subjects had financial constraints and 20% had no constraints and rest 30% did not say anything about it. Of LASs 40% reported to have financial constraints and 60% reported to have comfortable financial situation. It is evident from the table 5.3 that this cause also was not significant in the development of high or low

aggression . The χ^2 value for HASs was 1.143 and for LASs it was 0.5 . Both the values are far below the value 3.841 to be significant at .05 level with df=2.

Interestingly the goal in life emerged as a significant role in the development of low aggression. 90% of LASs did not have any goal in life and only 10% LASs reported definte goal in life. Thus most of LASs left themselves on fate and had no goal of their own in their life. In other words we can say that absence of any goal in life caused the development of low aggression in LASs. In case of HASs, 70% reported to have definite goal in life. They were concerned about their future/career life. They were assertive in maintaining what they want and would become in future. Only 20% HASs reported that they did not have any goal in life and 10% did not say anything about it. But the χ^2 value for HASs was 2.889 which was non-significant. Further studies may give some more insight in this area. Absence of goal might caused low aggression.

Another interesting feature, that is visible from the table 5.3, is that 80% of HAS were attached

to their siblings and only 10% HASs were not attached to them. 10% HASs were not attached to them 10% subjects in this group did not respond on this aspect and the χ^2 value (5.579) was significant at .02 level with df = 1 (table value is 5.412). Inverse was the case with LASs. 70% of LASs were not attached to their siblings and 10% LASs were attached to them, 20% did not respond on this aspect. Among the respondents the χ^2 value for LASs was calculated and found to be 4.625 which is greater than the table value 3.841 at .05 level for df = 1 and thus significant. In other words it can be said that attachement for siblings caused the development of high aggression and non attachment for siblings caused the development of low aggression. This is very interesting emotional phenomenon to be explored in further studies.

30% of HASs reportedly were separated from their parents in early childhood or till childhood and 70% lived throughout with their parents. But the difference was not a true difference as the χ^2 value

failed to reach any level of significance .It was found to be 2.7 which is below the table value 3.841 at .05 level with df = 1 . None of LAS, reported to have been separated from parents and it caused them develop low aggression the χ^2 value was 10.1 which is greater than the table value 6.625 at .01 level with df = 1.

Physical condition was reported to be another cause for the development of high aggression.30% of HASs were physically weak and 70% were not weak. But this difference also failed to attribute to the cause of development of high aggression as the χ^2 value was 2.7 which was below 3.841, the table value at .05 level at df = 1. None of LASs reported anything regarding the physical conditions of themselves.

Another cause that emerged from the data was the expectation of parents from the subject. Parents of 60% HASs had high expectation from the subjects and parents of 10% HASs had average expectation from

their wards and 10% HASs were held low in expectation by their parents. This difference was the real one as the χ^2 value was found to be 6.489 which is greater than the table value at .02 level for df = 1. Thus high expectation from parents became one cause for the development of High aggression. In the same way 20% LASs were held high and 80% were held average in expectation. No LAS was expected to achieve low by his parents. Here also the differential level of parental expectation did play the role in the development of low aggression. The calculated χ^2 value was 10.703 which is much higher than the value 6.635 to be significant at .01 level with 1 degree of freedom.

Father's temperament also emerged as one of the causes for the development of high or low aggression. 40% HASs had short tempered father and 60% HASs had father with balanced temperament. This included the father who was no more. But the difference was not significant as the χ^2 value was 0.5 which is lower

than the value 3.841 to be significant at .05 level with df = 1 . In case of LASs, only 10% of them had short tempered father and rest of 90% LASs had father with balanced temperament. This played an important role in the development of Low aggression because the calculated χ^2 value 6.5 was greater than 5.412 which is required to be significant at .02 level with df = 1.

The presence of frustration played a very significant role in the development of high aggression. The χ^2 value for the difference in presence and absence of frustration calculated to be was 10.1 with one dgree of freedom. This is higher than 6.635 at .01 level with df = 1 and hence is significant. In fact none of the HASs reported the absence of frustration through the antecedents of frustrations varied from failure in getting good position, good marks, parental love and respect in family. The presence of frustration in all the highly aggressive subjects is in accordance with the theory propounded by Dollard et. al. (1944). In case of LASs, only 20% of the subjects had frustration

and the rest of 80% LASs did not report the presence of frustration. They were contended in whatever they got. This difference is not significant as the calculated value 3.7 is less than 3.841 at .05 level with df = 1, though the difference is very little. Further light may be thrown on this aspect by studying it in deep in further studies.

Presence or absance of same sex sibling was also reported to be the cause of the development of high or low aggression. All the HASs have the same sex siblings and the χ^2 for the difference was found to be 10.1 which is greater than 6.635 at .01 level with df = 1 and hence is significant. It can thus be said that the presence of same sex sibling played important role in developing high aggression. In case of LASs the difference is not significant and χ^2 value is a little less than 3.841. The value obtained is 3.7 which is not significant at .05 level with df = 1.

Some other minor causes were also reported either by HASs or by LASs or by both. These were tabulated reportedly in a frequency table. These are given

below in the Table 5.4.

TABLE-5.4

Other Causes

S.No.	Cause	HAS	LAS
1.	Small house.	6	2
2.	Present life comfortable (needs are fulfilled before being asked for).	-	5
3.	Neighbourhood not congenial .	4	-

The table shows that 60% HASs were living in small houses while only 20% LASs were living in small houses. 50% LASs reported that they never ask for any need as they were fulfilled before being asked for. 40% HASs reported that they were living in the neighbourhood which was not conigenial.

5.4.2 Manifestations and Effects:

In contents the effects and manifestations were taken together. The Table 5.6 shows the different effects and manifestation in terms of personalityes traits as perceived by the four categories of respondents viz. the parent/s of the subjects, the teacher/s of the subjects, the peer/s of the subjects and the subjects themselves. All the four categories were considered here and are shown in Table 5.5 in terms of frequencies of the respondents perceiving that trait in the subjects they were opening.

TABLE-5.5

Frequencies of different respondents on different traits

Respondents / Traits.	HASs				LASs			
	Par-ent	Tea cher	Peer	Self	Par-ent	Tea-cher	Peer	Self
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. a) Obedient	2	-	-	1	5	2	-	1
b) Disobedient.	5	3	3	-	1	0	2	-
2. a) Docile	5	6	2	-	4	2	2	3
b) Dominant	6	3	-	4	-	-	-	-

TABLE-5.6 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. a) Studieous	6	3	-	5	3	2	3	3
b) Not studieous	3	3	3	5	3	-	-	-
4. a) Stubborn/ bold/Consistent/ Confident.	7	4	3	4	1	1	1	1
b) Not stubborn/ compromising/ confused.	2	2	1	1	6	4	6	1
5. a) Irritable	7	6	5	5	1	1	-	1
b) Peace loving	2	-	-	1	6	5	4	1
6. a) Active	4	6	2	1	1	2	-	1
b) Passive	-	3	-	-	3	4	1	2
7. a) Dependent	1	-	-	1	3	-	-	2
b) Independent	3	-	-	3	2	-	-	-
8. a) Responsibe	3	2	-	3	2	2	-	1
b) Irresponsible	2	2	1	-	2	-	-	-
9. a) Extrovert/ Mixing/ Cooperative/ Open.	2	3	1	2	5	3	4	6
b) Introvert/ not mixing/ non-cooprative/shy/ reserve.	7	4	6	6	3	4	-	1
10. a) Possessive	4	2	5	4	-	-	-	-
b) Not possive	1	-	-	-	4	1	1	5

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. a) Quiet	4	3	2	4	2	3	2	3
b) Shows off	4	2	2	-	4	4	2	-
12. a) Regular	4	4	4	4	1	-	-	1
b) Irregular	-	3	-	2	2	2	2	-
13. a) Thiest	7	-	3	7	10	-	-	6
b) Athiest	3	-	2	2	-	-	-	2
14. a) Neat/tidy	7	2	4	7	5	5	4	5
b) Careless/ untidy.	3	-	-	3	1	2	2	2
15. a) Intelligent	6	6	4	3	4	2	2	2
b) Not intelligent.	1	4	3	-	-	4	-	3
16. Appreciates others.	2	3	-	3	-	-	-	1
17. Playful/jovial/ fun loving.	3	-	3	2	5	-	5	5
18. Sensitive	8	6	6	8	2	-	-	1
19. Deceitful	3	3	3	1	-	-	-	-
20. Suspecious	4	-	1	3	1	-	-	1
21. Interested in cocurricular activities/ good in physical Activities/ Artistic.	3	4	2	5	2	3	2	1
22. Lacks concentration.	1	3	-	2	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
23. Preference for same religion friends.	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
24. Preference for meritorious students as friends.	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	1

Table 15 showing the frequencies of different respondents on different traits being present in the subjects. (The total frequencies may be more than 10 in each HASs and LASs categories as the same subjects were rated by different respondents.

The table shows that there are a number of cells which have no frequency. This clearly indicates that the respondents did not speak about those traits in the subjects they were talking about.

In order to know whether HASs and LASs were held differentially in the opinion of their parents, teachers, peers and themselves χ^2 tests of independence in 2 x 2 fold contingency tables were applied. One example of

how the χ^2s were calculated is given below:-

TABLE 5.6

	Parent		
	HAS	LAS	
Obe.	2 (A)	5 (B)	7 (A+B)
Disob.	5 (C)	1 (D)	6 (C+D)
	(A+C)	(B+D)	N
	7	6	13

$$\chi^2 = \frac{N(AD-BC/-N/2)^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(B+D)} \qquad \frac{13(/2 - 25/- \frac{13}{2})^2}{7X6X7X6} = 2006$$

(χ^2 for 2 x 2 fold Table corrected for continuity *)

The vertical lines /AD-BC/means that the difference is to be taken as positive.

The χ^2 values are shown in table 5.7 for each category of respondents on their opinions for HASs and LASs.

TABLE 5.7

Table showing chisquare (χ^2) values related to comprative opinions of parents, teacher, peer and subject himself regarding HASs and LASs.

cont....

* Garrett,H.E.,(1967)(4th Indian Edition) Statistics in Psychology and Education. Vakils Effer and Simons Private Ltd., Bombey (Page 265).

(χ^2 values for the openions of respondents for HAS, and LAS,

Traites/Respondents	Parent	Teacher	Peer	Self
1. Obed.x disobedient	2.006	1.700	0	0
2. DocilexDominant	3.75	2.009	0.312	3.512
3. Studieous x Not Studieous	0.11	0.178	2.25	0.783
4. Stubborn x Not Stubborn	4.063*	1.132	1.856	0.600
5. Irritable x peace loving.	5.625**	5.486**	5.40*	0
6. Active x passive	2.133	0.547	0.187	0
7. Dependent x Independent	0.141	0	0	0.750
8. Responsible x irresponsible.	0.141	0	0	0
9. Extrovert/Mixing x Introvert/reserve.	0.512	0.292	4.482*	4.000*
10. Possessive x Not possessive.	2.976	0.187	0.960	5.406*
11. Quiet x shows off	0	0	0.500	0
12. Regular X Irregular	0.365	0.394	2.344	0.262
13. Theist x Athiest.	1.569	0	0	0.070
14. Neat & Tidy x careless.	0	0.381	0.234	0.228
15. Intelligent x Not intelligent	0	0.267	0.080	0.889

1	2	3	4	5
16. Appreciates others.	0.500	1.333	0	0.250
17. Playful/Jovial	0.125	0	0.125	0.571
18. Senstive	2.5	4.1666* or 4.167	4.167*	4.000*
19. Deceitful	1.334	1.334	1.334	0
20. Suspecious	0.8	0	0	0.250
21. Interested in co-curricular activities.	0.	0	0.500	1.500
22. Lacks concentration	0	1.335	0	0.500
23. Preference for same region friends.	1.334	0	0	1.334
24. Preference for meritorious students as friends.	0.500	0	0	0.250

* Sig. at .05

** Sig. at .02.

The table shows that in most of the cases the parents of HASs and LASs did not differ in their perception of their children. This held true in case of other respondents also viz. teachers, peers and

and the subjects themselves.

In case of two traits only the parents had different opinion of their children, one of them was stubbomm Vs. Non stubborn. The chi square value is 4.063 here which is higher than the value 3.841 required to be significant at .15 level with df= 1. Since more HASs were held stubborn in the opinion of their parents it could be said that more HASs were stubborn than LASs according to their parents.

In case of the trait Irritable Vs. Peave loving the chisquare value is more than what is required to be significant at .02 level with df = 1. The obtained value is 5.625 while the table value is 5.412 since more HASs were perceived irritable by their parents than those of LASs and similarly more LASs were peace loving than HASSs according to the Parent.

In case of the traits on which the HASs and LASs were perceived differentially by their teachers, the traits were not the same. One of the trait was the same

i.e. irritable x peace loving. Here the obtained χ^2 value 5.486 is higher than what is required to be significant at .02 level (5.412). Thus the null hypothesis would not be accepted here and it could be said that HASs and LASs were perceived differently by their teachers on the trait irritable Vs. Peace loving. Since more HASs were in the category of being irritable it could be safely said that more HASs were irritable than LASs, and more LASs were peace loving than HASs considering the opinion of their teachers.

Similarly the obtained chi square value for the trait senstive is 4.167 which is higher than the value required to be senstive at .05 level with df = 1 and more HASs were senstive than LASs taking into consideration of their teacher's opinion.

The table shows that on three traits only the peer's opinion differred regarding HASs and LASs. First trait was Irritable Vs. peace loving where the obtained chi square value is higher than what is required to be significant at .05 level (value obtained 5.40, value required 3.841 at .05 level with df = 1). More peers

of HASs perceived them to be more irritable than those of LASs and more peers of LASs perceived them to be peace loving than HASs.

The peer's opinion differed on the second trait of extrovert vs. Introvert (chi square ontained 4.482 with df = 1 while value required is 3.841 at .05 level). Thus it could be stated that more HASs were introvert than LASs as perceived by their peers (Table 5.5).

In the same way on the trait sensitive also the opinion of the peers differed significantly. (χ^2 obtained 4.167 χ^2 requiired 3.841 at .05 level with df = 1). Table 5.5 shows that more HASs were senstive than LASs according to their respective peers.

On the trait of extrovert Vs. Introvert the chi square value of the subjects opinion about himself is 4.00 which is higher than what is required at .05 level (3.841 with df= 1). Thus it could be said according to table 5.5 that more HASs feel themselves to be introvert than LASs and more HASs were extrovert according

themselves .

On the trait possessive Vs. non possessive the HASs and LASs had different opinion about themselves (χ^2 obtained is 5.406 which is higher than 3.841 the table value at .05 level with (df=1)) According to the table 5.5 more HASs were possessive and more HASs were not possessive according to the subjects themselves.

On the trait senstivity also the HASs and LASs perceived themselves differentially. (χ^2 = 4.00 which is higher than 3.841 the value required to be significant at.05 level with df = 1). This means that more HASs were senstive than LASs in their own perception according to the Table 5.5 .

Broadly it is seen that on the trait stubborn Vs. non stubborn only parental perception about their children differed between HASs and LASs and other three categories of respondents did not differ from each other.

On trait Irritable Vs. Peace loving, parents, teachers and peers as well differ in their perception

of HASs and LASs and the two groups were not perceived differently only by themselves.

On extrovert Vs. introvert the perceiption of peer was in accordance with the perception of the subjects themselves while this was not the case of parents and teachers whose perception of HASs and LASs did not differ significantly.

On the trait sensitive the three categories of respondents viz. teacher, peer and self differ in their opinion concerning HASs and LASs but the parents did not perceive them differently.

On the trait possessive Vs. not possessive, only the subjects of the two groups viz HASs and LASs perceived themselves differently and the other three categories viz. parent, teacher, peer did not differ significantly.

*****