CHAPTER FIVE

ADJUSTMENT PROCESSES -

- SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

****

Social adjustment is one of the aspects of personality. Educators and psychologists have long been concerned with the concept of adjustment. Maladjustment is recognised in individuals who fail to fit into social group or who appear to live unhappy and unproductive lives. And what is concerned to be socially well-adjusted behaviour varies from country to country and from one culture to another.

The commonly accepted definition of social adaptation or adjustment pertains to the changes in habitual conduct or behaviour which an individual must make in order to fit into community in which he lives.[1]

---

1. H.C. Warren (Ed.) : Dictionary of Psychology. Houghton : Mifflin Co., 1934.

Although this is an accepted definition of social adaptation, it cannot be accepted as definition of social adjustment as such. The reason for this may be put forward as follows :

One should not expect an individual to modify his behaviour so that he may fit into a slum community which has high crime rate and many centres of vice. The adolescent is said to be adjusted when he is so related to a reasonably adequate environment that he relatively is happy, efficient and has proper degree of social feeling and acceptance of social responsibility. Like most people we want to be recognised and approved by our fellows. When some one criticizes our actions, our ego is wounded, our need is thwarted and there is a disharmony between our desire and our ability to fulfil it. We feel that we must adjust in some way. In response to our need for approval, we may act so as to gain favour in the future or we may display other abilities that will bring us recognition. These are quite sensible things to do under circumstances. But we might make excuses for our shortcomings, belittle our accusers or argue that someone else is to be blamed for the criticised act. We might feel hurt and withdraw from the group so as to avoid the risk of further reapproaches. Such behaviour does not really bring social approval, but it tends to reduce our distress.

Human beings are social persons as well as biological organisms. Social interactions among people and between

groups of people are necessary to satisfy even some of our most elementary social needs. On the other hand, people often work in competition or at cross purposes so as to thwart one another's satisfactions. When a child feels insecure and unwanted by his family, when a student feels isolated from his fellows, or when a man is unsuccessful in his work, adjustments are required to mediate between the socially defined needs and the socially determined frustrations. All this is reflected in the extent of social adjustment that the individual achieves.

Adjustment at every stage is difficult and is accompanied by emotional tension. In classroom, it is found that some pupils are popular among their class-mates; some have no friends in the class. This means the former are socially well-adjusted with the classmates and the latter are maladjusted.

Social development and adjustment of an individual are composed of a number of factors such as age, social status, mental ability, school influences and other environmental factors. The factors related to the social adjustment are age, intelligence, sex, achievement and general environmental conditions in the school, parental occupations, socio-economic conditions and home environment.

Home is the first and probably the most significant agent in the adjustment of any individual towards successful living. Home environment contains a number of factors influencing the feelings of security-insecurity. The order of birth, the size of family or the number of siblings may also be one of these

factors. It is a general observation that a family having lesser number of children would provide more security than a family having a large number of children.

One aspect of study in the present investigation is the examination of the relation of birth order and family size to social adjustment and of sex differences, if any, in social adjustment.

With this view in mind, again, Dr. A. S. Patel's Adjustment Inventory consisting of a series of statements (25 on social adjustment and 25 on personal adjustment) was administered to all the subjects as described in the procedure earlier. Their scores on social adjustment (maximum possible being 25) were separately computed and analysed. The results have been summarized in tables marked (SA) as presented below. To test statistically whether sex of pupils, their birth order and family size had amy relation with their social adjustment, these scores were subjected to the statistical technique of analysis of variance (F-Test) as well as L.S.D. Test as explained earlier. The results have been presented below in respective tables as explained earlier, i.e. (a) showing mean scores on social adjustment, (b) showing summary of results of F-Test, and (c) showing results of L.S.D. test wherever needed. The first three summary sheets reveal a general picture - Sheet No. 1 (SA) summarizes the role of main three variables in social adjustment; Sheet No. 2 (SA) shows the results on all 27 main and sub-groups, and Sheet No. 3 (SA) describes the results on only 14 groups under study.

SUMMARY SHEET NO. 1 (SA)

Showing Mean Scores of Main Groups on Social Adjustment

Main Variable	Group	Number	Mean
A. Sex	Boys	735	13.12
	Girls	701	13.00
B. Birth Order	I. First-Born	500	14.44
	II. Second-Born	308	13.68
	III. Middle-Born	332	11.17
	IV. Last-Born	296	12.24
C. Family Size	F1	100	15.84
	F2	183	16.02
	F3	190	13.04
	F4	313	13.48
	F5	291	12.11
	F6	359	11.22
	Grand Total	1436	13.07

SUMMARY SHEET NO. 2

Showing Mean Scores of each Specific Groups on Social Adjustment

Sr. No.	Group	Ordinal Status of the Group	Family Size	Boys No.	Boys Mean	Girls No.	Girls Mean	Total No.	Total Mean
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	I	Only Child	F1	50	16.12	50	15.56	100	15.84
2.	I	First Born	F2 (M.Sex)	50	15.72	50	18.64	100	17.18
3.	I	First Born	F2 (S.S.)	10	14.70	10	15.30	20	15.00
4.	I	First Born	F3 (M.S.)	25	16.36	25	14.04	50	15.20
5.	I	First Born	F3 (S.S.)	10	13.90	10	10.10	20	12.00
6.	I	First Born	F4 (M.S.)	25	16.36	25	14.08	50	15.22
7.	I	First Born	F4 (S.S.)	10	13.50	10	11.10	20	12.30
8.	I	First Born	F5 (M.S.)	25	12.12	25	10.16	50	11.14
9.	I	First Born	F5 (S.S.)	10	15.30	10	12.90	20	14.10
10.	I	First Born	F6 (M.S.)	25	12.12	25	10.20	50	11.16
11.	I	First Born	F6 (S.S.)	10	11.60	10	9.80	20	10.70
	I	First Born	Total	250	14.82	250	14.05	500	14.44

contd....

Summary Sheet No. 2 contd...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
12.	II	Second Born	F3	31	14.19	41	10.21	72	11.93
13.	II	Second Born	F4 (M.S.)	31	18.35	31	14.32	62	16.33
14.	II	Second Born	F4 (S.S.)	36	12.02	36	12.77	72	12.40
15.	II	Second Born	F5	27	15.00	26	16.11	53	15.54.
16.	II	Second Born	F6	25	12.28	24	13.25	49	12.75
	II	Second Born	Total	150	14.36	158	13.03	308	13.68
17.	III	Middle Born	F4 (3rd)	30	12.06	30	14.50	60	13.28
18.	III	Middle Born	F5 (3rd)	25	9.48	20	12.95	45	11.02
19.	III	Middle Born	F5 (4th)	30	9.40	20	13.70	50	11.12
20.	III	Middle Born	F6 (3rd)	25	12.20	20	11.65	45	11.95
21.	III	Middle Born	F6 (4th)	22	10.86	20	10.90	42	10.88
22.	III	Middle Born	F6 (5th)	45	9.40	45	9.86	90	9.63
	III	Middle Born	Total	177	10.44	155	12.01	332	11.17
23.	IV	Last Born	F2	32	13.34	31	15.67	63	14.49
24.	IV	Last Born	F3	27	13.74	21	11.80	48	12.89
25.	IV	Last Born	F4	25	10.48	24	10.33	49	10.40
26.	IV	Last Born	F5	42	11.04	31	11.22	73	11.10
27.	IV	Last Born	F6	32	13.06	31	11.35	63	12.22
	IV	Last Born	Total	158	12.20	138	12.18	296	12.24
		Grand Total		735	13.12	701	13.00	1436	13.07

SUMMARY SHEET No. 3

Showing an Overall Summary of Results (i.e. Mean Scores on Social Adjustment of each Main and Sub-group)

	Groups	Boys No.	Boys Mean	Girls No.	Girls Mean	Total No.	Total Mean
I	All Boys Vs. All Girls	735	13.12	701	13.00	1436	13.07
II	First Born Vs. Other Later Born	500	14.44	936	12.33	1436	13.07
III	Only Child Vs. Other First Born	100	15.84	400	14.09	500	14.44
IV	Only Child Vs. Other First Born (Boys)	50	16.12	200	14.50	250	14.82
V	Only Child Vs. Other First Born (Girls)	50	15.56	200	13.68	250	14.05
VI	First Born of Middle Sex Vs. First Born of same sex	300	14.51	100	12.82	400	14.09
VII	Only Child Vs. Later Born (Excluding First Born	100	15.84	936 ~~400~~	14.09	1036	12.67
VIII	First Born Vs. Last Born (Youngest)	500	14.44	296	12.24	796	13.62
IX	Last Born (Youngest) Vs. Second Born and Middle Born	296	12.24	640	12.38	936	12.33
X	Last Born (Youngest) Vs. Only Child	296	12.24	100	15.84	396	13.15
XI	First Born (Boys) Vs. First Born (Girls)	250	14.82	250	14.04	500	14.44
XII	Second Born ~~Girls~~ Boys Vs. Second Born Girls	150	14.36	158	13.03	308	13.68
XIII	Middle Born Boys Vs. Middle Born Girls	177	10.44	155	12.01	332	11.17
XIV	Last Born Boys Vs. Last Born Girls	158	12.29	138	12.18	296	12.24

As noted above, the first two Summary Sheets give a general picture of all data obtained. However, the statistical analysis takes into account only the data of the groups as presented in Summary Sheet No. 3.

The first row (Group I) of Summary Sheet No. 3 gives on the whole the mean scores (SA) of boys and girls and the corresponding Table No. 1 shows the results of statistical analysis of overall data presented sex-wise and birth order-wise in Tables 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) and also of some data presented sex-wise and family size-wise in Tables 1(d), 1(e) and 1(f). Table 1 gives an overall analysis of data to show contribution of birth order as well as family size for each sex.

The next nine rows - Groups II to X - of Sheet No. 3 and corresponding Tables 2-10 present data (Sex X Birth Order) to enable the reader to make comparison between different birth orders for each sex, irrespective of family size.

The last four rows of Summary Sheet No. 3 - Groups XI to XIV - and corresponding Tables 11-14 present data (Sex X Family Size) enabling us to understand the constribution of family size for each sex separately at each birth order.

In other words, scores on social adjustment have been analysed with respect to two variables studied, viz. birth order and family size for each sex, separately studied. The results showing sex differences and birth order effects have

been presented in Tables 2 to 10. In Tables 2 to 10, the comparison have been made to find out whether birth order is related to social adjustment on the whole or at any level of sex for any sub-group in birth category irrespective of family size. Similarly, scores on social adjustment have been analysed with respect to two variables, viz. sex and family size, studied separately at each birth order. These results have been presented in Tables 11 to 14. In short, the scores on social adjustment were subjected to the statistical technique of analysis of variance (F-test) and also to L.S.D. test where needed (specimen computations are shown in Appendix). All these results have been reproduced in respective (SA) tables from Nos. 1 to 14.

The results have been discussed with respect to studying the contribution or relation of sex and birth order (or their interaction) to the social adjustment of individuals belonging to different ordinal status and coming from families of varied sizes. Thus, the adjustment scores on all the fourteen group comparisons shown in the general summary Sheet No. 3 have been analysed and subjected to F-test with a view to testing the significance of their differences, if any, in social adjustment of individuals of varied family size and birth order, and the results have been presented respectively for each of these fourteen groups in Tables 1 to 14. Wherever needed, on overall finding overall significant difference between the groups from F-test, a further statistical tool called 'Least Significant

Difference Test' has been utilised to check the significance of difference between any two groups at a time within the set of more than two main or sub-groups. The Tables 1 to 14 have been presented, each with three parts, viz. (a) showing mean scores of each main and sub-group; (b) showing the summary of results of analysis of variance performed on the data of groups shown in (a); and finally wherever needed, (c) showing results of L.S.D. Test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. Overall Analysis

The overall general picture emerging from the analysis of all data on social adjustment is revealed in the general Summary Sheets (Nos. 1, 2 and 3)(SA), showing the mean scores of each main and sub-group of birth order, sex-wise and family size-wise. However, the data of only fourteen groups as shown in Summary Sheet No. 3 (SA) have been statistically analysed to study the effects of birth order and sex, and where possible, of family size. (SA) Tables 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) show the summary results of statistical analysis of data on social adjustment as related to sex and birth order, while (SA) Tables 1(d), 1(e) and 1(f) give results of statistical analysis of data on social adjustment as related to sex and family size, all presented in the following pages.

The Summary Sheet No. 3 (SA) reveals in the first row how total boys and girls stand in their scores on social adjustment. Results again revealed lack of significant sex differences in social adjustment. This total is broken up birth order-wise for boys and girls to make comparison between different birth order categories, as shown in next ~~five~~ nine rows (2 to 10) in Summary Sheet No 3 (SA). The same sex-wise and birth order-wise overall data are represented also in (FA) Tables 1(a). Slightly different from data on family adjustment, the social adjustment data in (SA) Table 1(a) reveal that the first-born were the most adjusted (score being 14.44), next best nearer were the second-born (13.68),and as on family adjustment, so on social adjustment, the last-born (12.24) and next stood the least adjusted were the middle-born. The only difference on social adjustment as from family adjustment discussed earlier was that the first-born and the second-born exchanged places,the first-born standing higher on social adjustment. All these differences in birth-order are statistically significant even at .01 level. The striking point to be noted is that even interaction between sex and birth order is insignificant (in contrast to significant interaction in case of family adjustment). This means that only birth order plays an important role in social adjustment.

The same overall data have been rearranged again sex-wise and family size-wise in (SA) Table 1(d) for statistical analysis and also shown at each birth order in last four rows (11 to 14), of Summary Sheet No. 3 (SA). The overall analysis of data in

Table (SA) 1(d) for family size shows that, as earlier in case of family adjustment, so also on social adjustment, the children of F2 were the most adjusted; next in order were F1, F4 and F3 being almost equal than F5 and least F6. In other words, as compared to the position on family adjustment, the picture on social adjustment remains the same, except that F3 and F1 standing second and fourth respectively on family adjustment exchanged position, thus F1 standing second and F3 standing fourth on social adjustment. Any way, again all these differences in family size were statistically also significant. This is more or less a general observation.

For detailed understanding, results of statistical analysis are presented sex-wise and birth order-wise in (SA) Tables 1(a), 1(b), 1(c), while sex-wise and family-wise in (SA) Tables 1(d), 1(e) and 1(f), and have been discussed in details to bring out the contribution of each factor, viz. sex, birth-order and family size, to the social adjustment.

Group I : All Boys Vs. All Girls (Social Adjustment)
Sex Vs. Birth Order

(SA) Table 1(a) - Showing Mean Scores

Birth Order	Boys No.	Boys Mean	Girls No.	Girls Mean	Total No.	Total Mean
First Born	250	14.82	250	14.05	500	14.44
Second Born	150	14.36	158	13.03	308	13.68
Middle Born	177	10.44	155	12.01	332	11.17
Last Born	158	12.29	138	12.18	296	12.24
Total	735	13.12	701	13.00	1436	13.07

(SA) Table 1(b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	5.35	5.35	.0477	Not Sig.
Order of Birth	3	2446.53	815.51	7.27	Sig. at .01
S x O	3	409.67	136.55	1.21	Not Sig.
Within	1428	160146.49	112.14		
Total	1435	163008.04			

(SA) Table 1(c) - Showing Results of Least Gap Difference Test
Birth Order-wise

Group	Boys	Girls	Total
First Born Vs. Second Born	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.
F.B. Vs. Middle Born	Sig. .01	Sig. .05	Sig. .01
F.B. Vs. Last Born	Sig. .05	Not Sig.	Sig. .05
S.B. Vs. M.B.	Sig. .01	Not Sig.	Sig. .05
S.B. Vs. Last Born	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.
MB Vs. L.B.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.

Sex-wise	Among F.B. :	B - G	Not Sig.
	Among S.B. :	B - G	Sig. .05
	Among M.B. :	B - G	Sig. .05
	Among L.B. :	B - G	Not Sig.

(a) Sex Factor

It would be seen from (SA) Table 1(b) the sex was not a contributory factor for social adjustment as it was not for family adjustment (cf. (FA) Table 1(b)). Both boys and girls scored almost equally (13.12 and 13.00) on the whole. The lack of significant interaction between sex and birth order also shows that there were not any sex differences at any specific birth order position. This is in contrast to significant interaction of sex and birth order in case of family adjustment. However, sex did not play any role in contributing to social development mostly in case of children of any birth order. The detailed analysis (in Table (SA) 1(c)) also shows that boys did not differ from girls at any birth order. Among the first-born there were no sex differences; among the second-born the boys scored significantly higher than girls; and among the middle-born the girls scored significantly higher. This accounts for insignificant sex factor as well as insignificant interaction.

(b) Birth Order

Further, (SA) Table 1(b) shows that the only factor significantly and in dependently contributing to social adjustment was birth order, irrespective of sex, i.e. without interacting with sex. From (SA) Table 1(a), it would then be seen that socially most adjusted were the first-born, next in order were the second-born, the last-born and then the middle-born who were the least adjusted. However, the detailed analysis by L.S.D. Test (Table (SA) 1(c)) for comparing sub-groups shows that the first-born and the second-born did not differ significantly

amongst boys, amongst girls and even on the whole. Thus, it could be said in this case of social adjustment also (as in case of family adjustment) that the second-born retained their top position in social adjustment. Further, at most of other positions, there were birth order differences amongst the boys but hardly among the girls; thus the birth order differences amongst boys were mainly responsible for birth order differences in the total population. In other words, it can be said that birth order was a significant factor in social adjustment, especially and mostly in case of boys only. It can be said that the first-born and the second-born formed one group (not mutually different) and similarly the middle-born and the last born formed one group (not mutually different).

(c) Family Size

As justified earlier, the role of the family size in social adjustment was also investigated, since data were available on children from varied sizes of the family. Thus, the same data were rearranged (sex-wise and family size-wise) in order to study the contribution of the family size, if any, to social adjustment. The (SA) Tables 1(d), 1(e) and1(f) present these data.

(SA) Table 1(d) - Showing Mean Scores on Social Adjustment
Family Size x Sex

Family Size	Boys No.	Boys Mean	Girls No.	Girls Mean	Total No.	Total Mean
F1	50	16.12	50	15.56	100	15.02
F2	92	14.78	91	17.26	183	15.02
F3	93	14.61	97	11.547	190	13.04
F4	157	13.62	156	13.14	313	13.48
F5	159	11.60	132	12.74	291	12.11
F6	184	11.47	175	10.96	359	11.22
Total	735	13.12	701	13.00	1436	13.07

(SA) Table 1(e) - Showing the Summary of Results of Analysis of Variance (Social Adjustment)

Family Size x Sex

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	5.34	5.34	0.049	Not. Sig.
Family Size	5	3698.60	779.72	7.20	Sig. at .01
Sex x Family Size	5	5050.01	1010.00	9.33	Sig. at .01
Within (error)	1424	154051.09			
Total	1435	163005.04			

Table 1(e) - Showing Results of L.S.D. Test (Social Adjustment)

Family Size-wise

Group	Boys	Girls	Total
F1-F2	NS	NS	NS
F1-F3	NS	Sig. .05	NS
F1-F4	Sig. .05	Sig. .05	Sig. .05
F1-F5	Sig. .01	Sig. .05	Sig. .01
F1-F6	Sig. .01	Sig. .01	Sig. .01
F2-F3	NS	Sig. .01	Sig. .05
F2-F4	NS	Sig. .01	Sig. .05
F2-F5	Sig. .05	Sig. .01	Sig. .01
F2-F6	Sig. .01	Sig. .01	Sig. .01
F3-F4	NS	NS	NS
F3-F5	Sig. .05	NS	NS
F3-F6	Sig. .05	NS	NS
F4-F5	NS	NS	NS
F4-F6	Sig. .05	NS	NS
F5-F6	NS	NS	NS

Sex-wise :

Group		
For F1	B - G	Not Sig.
For F2	B - G	Sig. .05
For F3	B - G	Sig. .05
For F4	B - G	Not Sig.
For F5	B - G	Not Sig.
For F6	B - G	Not Sig.

The results of family-size ahalysis in above Table (SA) 1(e) again confirm the earlier results (in Table SA-1b) that sex was not a significant factor. The family size was truly a significant factor in social adjustment, as expected and children from F2 were again as expected the most adjusted (score being 16.02). Next were children from F1 (15.84), but F1 and F2 did not differ significantly anywhere amongst the boys, amongst the girls or on the whole. In all other cases, there was a trend that there was a decrease in social adjustment with the increase in family size, among boys as well as among girls (except in F3 group of girls which occupied its position only just above F6).

It would be further noted from results in (SA) Table 1(f) that the pairs F1 and F2, F3 and F4, F4 and F5, F5 and F6 did not differ significantly from each other, amongst girls and ~~xx~~ among boys and on the whole. Similarly, it would be seen that F1 differed significantly from all others (except F2) amongst boys, girls and on the whole; F2 also differed from others (amongst boys except F3 and F4 boys), all amongst girls and on the whole. The other sizes (F3, F4, F5, F6) differed from one another sometimes amongst the boys and never amongst the girls or on the whole. In other words, it can be said that family sizes F1 and F2 were most adjusted, but the family size affected the social adjustment mostly of boys and hardly of girls at other sizes.

This discrepency accounts also for the significant interaction between sex and family size as observed in (SA) Table 1(e).

It is seen from size-wise results in (SA) Table 1(f) based on analysis of data of (SA) Table 1(d) that family size was significant amongst most cases of boys, and few cases of girls; similarly, it is seen from sex-wise results in (SA) Table 1(f) that sex was not significant factor in most of the cases of family size, but was significant only in F3 at .05 level. The significant interaction is accounted for by different tendencies amongst boys and girls of different family-sizes. Thus, (SA) Table 1(d) shows that F1, F2, F3, F6 boys scored higher in social adjustment (F3 significantly higher, while others only tended to be higher); while in F2 and F5, girls tended to score higher in social adjustment. Girls of F2 were most adjusted (score being 17.26) and boys of F1 were next best (16.12); least adjusted were girls of F6 (score being 10.96) and just little above the least were boys of F6 (11.47).

In short, family size was definitely a significant factor in social development, but it also sometimes interacted significantly with sex which by itself was not a significant factor.

This completed the discussion on overall analysis of data presented, in Table 1 discussed at length in Section I above. Next, as noted earlier, attempt is also made to study all possible comparisons of different birth orders of each sex and also to study all possible comparisons of different family sizes of each sex separately at each birth order. Section II below is devoted to describing results of analysis made for comparing

different birth orders as presented in (SA) Tables 2 to 10, and section III below is devoted to discussing results of analysis made for comparing different family sizes as presented in (SA) Tables 11 to 14.

II. Analysis for Comparison Between Birth Order Groups

It has been observed in the earlier section that birth order was a very significant factor contributing to social development, and played its role independently without any interaction with sex (cf. SA - Table No. 1-b). The problem discussed in this section pertains to examining how any one birth order position stands in comparison with the other. In view of this, all possible pairs of comparisons between different birth orders, as suggested in the rows 2 to 10 of the Summary Sheet No. 3 (SA) have been studied and the results discussed in the following paragraphs. The data have been arranged sex-wise separately for comparing pairs of birth orders studied.

(a) Comparison Between the First-Born and the other Later-Born

For the purpose of comparing the first-born and the other later-born, the data have been computed, analysed and presented in such a way that the figures of the first-born boys and girls are tabulated against those of all the later-born including

the second-born, the middle-born and the last-born. (SA) Table 2(a) gives the mean scores of these groups on social adjustment and (SA) Table 2(b) reveals the summary of the results of analysis of variance.

Group II : First-Born Vs. Other Later-Born
Sex Vs. Birth Order (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 2(a) Shwojng Mean Scores

Birth Order	Boys		Girls		Total	
	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean
First born	250	14.82	250	14.05	500	14.44
Later born	485	12.05	451	12.42	936	12.33
Total	735	13.12	701	13.00	1436	13.07

(SA) Table 2(b) Showing Analysis of Variance for above Data

Source	df	S.S.	M.S.	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	5.34	5.34	0.49	Not Sig.
Order of Birth	1	1440.46	1440.46	12.85	Sig. at .01
S X O	1	75.19	75.19	0.24	Not Sig.
Within	1432	161486.05	112.76		
Total	1435	163007.04			

It would be observed from these tables that again the sex, as found earlier, too was here not a significant factor in the social adjustment of the first-born Vs. the later-born; not even its interaction with birth order was significant. The only significant differences were in the birth order, i.e. the first-born significantly differed from the later born as evidenced by results in (SA) Table 2(b). Following this inference, it is observed from (SA) Table 2(a) that the first-born with a mean score of 14.44 were found significantly more adjusted than the later-born with a mean score of 12.33 on social adjustment. There being only two levels of each variables studied here by F-Test, there was no further need for application of L.S.D.test. It should be recalled here that when data were analysed separately for each birth-order and sex in (SA) Tables 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c), the same results were found that neither sex nor interaction was significant, but that only birth order (four levels) was significant. Within this four levels of birth-order, the first-born were not different from the second-born nor from the last-born but were different only from the middle-born; the second-born were different from only the middle-born; and the middle-born were not different from the last-born. However, when data are analysed with respect to the first-born on one hand and all other later-born on the other hand (as in this section), it is seen that the first-born which was earlier found not different from the second-born, but different from the middle and the last-born, had been found to be different from the aggregate of the second, the middle and the last-born. This is a logical

finding in view of different directions of differences getting averaged. Any way, the first-born were socially the most adjusted amongst the separate four groups and were also more adjusted between the two groups.

(b) Comparison Between the Only Child Group and the Other First-Born Group

The data for this purpose of comparison between the only child group on one hand and the other first-born child group on the other have been rearranged and presented in (SA) Tables 3(a) and 3(b).

Group III : Only Child Vs. Other First-born
Sex Vs. Birth Order (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 3(a) Showing Mean Scores

Birth Order	Boys No.	Boys Mean	Girls No.	Girls Mean	Total No.	Total Mean
Only Child	50	16.12	50	15.56	100	15.84
Other First-Born	200	14.50	200	13.68	400	14.09
Total	250	14.82	250	14.05	500	14.44

(SA) Table 3(b) Showing Analysis of Variance for above Data

Source	df	S.S.	M.S.	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	73.72	0.36	0.36	Not Sig.
Order of Birth	1	245.00	245.00	0.88	Not Sig.
S X O	1	320.08	320.08	1.16	Not Sig.
Within	496	138678.40	279.57		
Total	499	139317.20			

It is strikingly revealed by these tables that neither sex nor birth order nor interaction played any significant role in causing differences in social adjustment; this compares well with earlier results with respect to family adjustment (cf. FA - Tables 3(a) and 3(b)) where also neither played any significant role. Thus, the only group followed by number of children did not differ in social adjustment from the other first-born followed by other children. This appears a little strange that no company and company of siblings were almost equal in contributing to social adjustment. It is likely that no company of siblings might be made up for by company of parents or others. Or it might be that the only child and the first-born child when born were same in the beginning years. Though there were statistically no significant differences, the only child tended to be higher in social adjustment (score being 15.84) than the other first-born child (score being 14.09), this is somewhat contrary to expectation for social adjustment. Similarly, boys tended to be higher (14.82) than girls (14.05) in social adjustment as the case was also elsewhere.

(c) Comparison Between the Only-Born Boys and the First-Born Boys

The lack of significant differences between the only child and the other first-born was not in expectation, and hence it was thought that perhaps the separate analysis for boys and for girls in this respect would be more revealing and instructive. Such data for boys are presented in (SA) Table 4(1) and 4(b).

Group IV : Only Child (Boys) Vs. Other First Born (Boys)
(Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 4 (a) - Showing Mean Scores

	Boys	
Birth Order	No.	Mean
Only Child	50	16.12
First-Born	200	14.50
Total	250	14.82

(SA) Table 4 (b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Between Group	1	104.98	104.98	0.20	Not Sig.
Within	248	129502.28	522.18		
Total	249	129607.26			

The analysis of data on only born boys and the first-born boys shows the same results, viz. no differences and confirms the findings of (SA) Tables 3(a) and 3(b). Similarly, there was a trend amongst the only boys to be higher in social adjustment (16.12) than the first-born boys (15.40).

(d) Comparison Between the Only Born Girls and the First-Born Girls

Similar data for the only born girls and the first-born girls are presented in (SA) Tables 5(a) and 5(b).

Group V : Only Child (Girls) Vs. Other First-Born (Girls) (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 5(a) - Showing Mean Scores

Birth Order	No.	Mean
Only Child	50	15.56
Other First-Born	200	13.68
Total	250	14.05

(SA) Table 5(b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Between Group	1	141.38	141.38	3.69	Sig. at .05
Within	248	9494.84	38.28		
Total	249	9636.22			

This analysis is very revealing and brings out the significant differences between the two groups. Thus, the only born girls (score being 15.56) were found statistically more adjusted than the other first-born girls (score being 13.68). This finding justifies the attempt for separate analysis suggested, and does not confirm totally the findings of (SA) Tables 3(a) and 3(b). Thus, only born boys might not be differing from the other first-born boys, but the only born girls did differ from the other first-born girls in social adjustment; this might be reflecting to some extent the prevailing attitudes towards girls in a family.

(e) Comparison Between the First-Born of Mixed Sexes and the First-Born of the same Sex

In view of above finding regarding differences between the first-born boys and girls and other similar considerations, it was thought that perhaps the first-born children of same sex and of mixed sexes living together might show differences in social adjustment. With this hypothesis in view, the data of these groups only were separated out and analysed accordingly. (SA) Tables 6(a) and 6(b) present such analysis of data.

Group VI : First-Born of Mixed Sexes Vs. First-Born of Same Sex (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 6(a) - Showing Mean Scores

Birth Order	No.	Mean
First-Born of Mixed Sexes	300	14.51
-do- Same Sex	100	12.82
Total	400	14.09

(SA) Table 6(b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Between Group	1	215.05	215.05	5.92	Sig. at .05
Within Group	398	14426.71	36.24		
Total	399	14641.76			

This analysis revealed strikingly the significant differences between the two groups and supported the suspected hypothesis. It is nicely seen that the first-born children living in the family with other siblings of mixed sexes showed higher social adjustment (score being 14.51) than the first-born children living with other siblings of same sex (score being 12.84). This is again a logical ginding of importance and interest. Indeed, family environment of mixed siblings provide wider opportunities for later social adjustment in society where the individual has to face persons of both the sexes.

(f) Comparison Between the Only Child Group and the Later-Born Group

It has been found that the first-born were more adjusted than all the later-born (cf. (SA) Tables 2(a) and 2(b)) and that the first-born did not differ from the only born group (cf. (SA) Tables 3(a) and 3(b)). In view of this, it was logically thought to compare the remaining pair, viz. the only child with the later-born and check the results whether the same trend was continued in favour of the only born group with advantage over

the later-born group, the advantage which the first-born group enjoyed and the advantage which was also expected for the only born group which did not differ from the first-born group. In view of this hypothesis, the data are arranged accordingly and the analysis is presented in (SA) Tables 7(a) and 7(b).

Group VII : Only Child Vs. Other Later-Born (Excluding First-Born) Sex Vs. Birth Order (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 7(a) - Showing Mean Scores

	Boys		Girls		Total	
Birth Order	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean
Only Child	50	16.12	50	15.56	100	15.84
Later-Born	485	12.25	451	12.42	936	12.33
Total	535	12.61	501	12.73	1036	12.67

(SA) Table 7(b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	3.83	3.83	0.84	Not Significant
Order of Birth	1	1108.21	1108.21	24.51	Sig. at .01
S x O	1	10.82	10.82	.079	Not Significant
Within	1032	46665.17	45.21		
Total	1035	47788.03			

This analysis again confirms the hypothesis very clearly that the only born group (15.84) were also socially more adjusted than the later-born group (12.33). There were no sex differences nor was interaction significant.

(g) Comparison Between the First-Born and the Last-Born (Youngest)

Next, other comparisons among the birth orders for each sex were separately studied to check the general results obtained in (SA) Tables 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c). Thus, data to compare the first-born and the last-born are presented in (SA) Tables 8(a) and 8(b).

Group VIII : First-Born Vs. Last-Born
Sex Vs. Birth Order (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 8(a) - Showing Mean Scores

Birth Order	Boys		Girls		Total	
	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean
First-Born	250	14.82	250	14.05	500	14.44
Last-Born	158	12.29	138	12.18	296	12.24
Total	408	13.84	388	13.38	796	13.62

(SA) Table 8(b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	40.97	40.97	0.22	Not Significant
Order of Birth	1	900.01	900.01	4.80	Sig. at .05
S x O	1	33.63	33.63	0.17	Not Significant
Within	792	148486.57	187.48		
Total	795	149461.18			

The statistical analysis showed no significant sex differences not significant interaction; the only significant factor was birth order. The first-born were significantly more adjusted socially (14.44) than the last-born (12.24). This confirms the finding in (SA) Table 1(b). In short, the last-born and the first-born did differ in social adjustment; the last-born were less adjusted.

(h) Comparison Between the Last-Born Group and the Aggregate of the Second and Middle Born Group

As seen above, the last-born differed from the first-born. It was thought to compare the last-born with the rest of the group, viz. the aggregate of the second and the middle born. Data were accordingly summated and are presented in (SA) Tables 9(a) and 9(b).

Group IX : Last-Born Vs. Second or Middle Born
Sex Vs. Birth Order (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 9(a) - Showing Mean Scores

Birth Order	Boys		Girls		Total	
	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean
Youngest	158	12.29	138	12.18	296	12.24
Second Born & Middle Born	327	12.23	313	12.53	640	12.38
Total	485	12.26	451	12.42	936	12.33

(SA) Table 9(b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	6.81	6.81	0.28	Not Significant
Order of Birth	1	4.19	4.19	0.17	Not Significant
S x O	1	7.99	7.99	0.11	Not Significant
Within	932	22230.39	23.90		
Total	935	22249.38			

The analysis shows that there were no significant differences between the sex nor between the birth order nor there was significant interaction between sex and birth order. It would be recollected from results in (SA) Tables 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) that the last-born were not different from the second-born and also from the middle-born separately, and here in this section too, the last-born did not differ also from the aggregate of the second and the middle born.

(i) Comparison Between the Last-Born (Youngest) and the Only Child Group

It was noted that the first-born differed from the last-born (cf.(SA) Tables 8(a) and 8(b)), and that the first-born and the only born group did not differ in social adjustment (cf. (SA) Tables 3(a) and 3(b)). It was thought logically to check the comparison between the last-born and the only child group, which naturally should differ. To verify this hypothesis, data were arranged accordingly and are presented in (SA) Tables 10(a) and 10(b).

Group X : Last Born Vs. Only Child (Social Adjustment)
Sex Vs. Birth Order

(SA) Table 10 (a) - Showing Mean Scores

Birth Order	Boys No.	Boys Mean	Girls No.	Girls Mean	Total No.	Total Mean
Last Born	158	12.29	138	12.18	296	12.24
Only Child	50	16.12	50	15.56	100	15.84
Total	208	13.21	188	13.07	396	13.15

(SA) Table 10 (b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	1.70	1.70	.049	Not Sig.
Order of Birth	1	968.80	968.80	2.82	Sig. .05
S x O	1	7.02	7.02	.068	Not Sig.
Within	392	133665.69	342.73		
Total	395	134643.21			

The statistical analysis confirms this hypothesis that the only child group significantly differed from the last-born group and scored higher (15.84) than the last-born group (12.24). There were only birth order differences, and there were no significant sex differences nor was there significant interaction.

III : Analysis for Comparison Between Family Sizes

The preceding sections have been devoted to the discussion of social adjustment of children as related to their sex and birth order position. However, equally important factor in the family is the size of the family. In the earlier discussion on the birth order, it has been already found that the second-born is the most adjusted member in the family, indirectly hinting that a family with a size of two children is the most desirable expectation. In order to study the influence of the family size directly and more systematically, the data obtained were classified further according to the social adjustment of boys and girls in families of various sizes ranging from one child to six or more in the family, and analysed at each birth order, as given below.

(a) Family Size Within the First-Born

Such data for the first-born boys and girls are represented in Table 11(a) below showing the mean scores of first-born boys and girls in family sizes with one, two, three, four, five and six or more children. It would be argued that the first-born in F1 being the only child should not be included in this analysis of the first-born just as second-born of F2 or third

born of F3 and so on being the last-born are not included in analysis of second-born and so on as shown in later sections in Tables 12, 13 and 14. However, as shown by earlier analysis in Table 3, only child did not, in any way, differ from the first-born, the first-born of F1 were included here. All these data were subjected to statistical techniques of F-Test and L.S.D. Test to find the significance of differences and the summary of results has been given in (SA) Tables 11(a), 11(b) and 11(c) in the following pages.

Group XI : First-Born Boys Vs. First-Born Girls
Sex Vs. Family Size (Social Adjustment)

(SA)Table 11(a) - Showing Mean Scores of Each Group

Family Size	Boys No.	Boys Mean	Girls No.	Girls Mean	Total No.	Total Mean
F1	50	16.12	50	15.56	100	15.84
F2	60	15.55	60	18.08	120	16.81
F3	35	15.65	35	12.91	70	14.27
F4	35	15.54	35	13.22	70	14.37
F5	35	13.02	35	10.94	70	11.98
F6	35	11.97	35	10.08	70	11.02
Total	250	14.82	250	14.05	500	14.44

Group XI : First Born Boys Vs. First Born Girls
Sex Vs. Family Size (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 11(b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	73.72	73.72	.263	Not Sig.
Family Size	5	2111.97	422.39	1.50	Not Sig.
S x F	5	490.36	98.07	.350	Not Sig.
Within	488	136641.15	280.00		
Total	499	139317.20			

(SA) Table 11(c) - Showing Results of L.S.D. Test

Family Size-wise

Group	Boys	Girls	Total
1. F1 - F2	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.
2. F1 - F3	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
3. F1 - F4	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
4. F1 - F5	Sig. .05	Sig. .05	Sig. .05
5. F1 - F6	Sig. .05	Sig. .05	Sig. .05
6. F2 - F3	N.S.	Sig. .05	N.S.
7. F2 - F4	N.S.	Sig. .05	N.S.
8. F2 - F5	N.S.	Sig. .05	Sig. .05
9. F2 - F6	Sig. .05	Sig. .05	Sig. .05
10. F3 - F4	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
11. F3 - F5	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
12. F3 - F6	Sig. .05	N.S.	Sig. .05
13. F4 - F5	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
14. F4 - F6	Sig. .05	Sig. .05	Sig. .05
15. F5 - F6	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

Sex-wise :

In F1 :	B - G	Not Sig.
F2 :	B - G	Not Sig.
F3 :	B - G	Not Sig.
F4 :	B - G	Not Sig.
F5 :	B - G	Not Sig.
F 6 :	B - G	Not Sig.

This analysis shows lack of significance of sex differences in social adjustment, thus confirming the earlier findings in (SA) Tables 1(c) showing lack of sex differences amongst the first-born on the whole, as well as at each size as seen in (SA) Table 11(c) in this section. Further this analysis strangely shows also lack of significant family size differences as well as lack of significant interaction between sex and family size. However, this apparent lack of significant interaction seems a little misleading. The detailed analysis of data by L.S.D. Test given in (SA) Table 11(c) indicates that some pairs of family sizes of boys or girls showed significant differences and others did not. For example, family size pairs F1 and F5, F1 and F6, F2 and F6, F4 and F6 showed differences with respect to both boys and girls groups separately and also on the whole; while pairs F1 and F2, F1 and F3, F1 and F4, F3 and F4, F3 and F5, F5 and F6 always show differences neither for boys nor for girls nor on the whole. Other pairs somewhere showed differences for boys and elsewhere for girls. F2 girls were the most adjusted (18.08) and next best were F1 boys (16.12). Such trends in different directions, particularly sudden rise in F2 girls seem to cancel not only main effects but also account for insignificant interaction between sex and family size on social adjustment.

On the whole, it is clearly observed that children from F2 size were the most adjusted socially (16.81), the nest best were F1 children (15.84). Next in order were F4 and F3 both forming almost equal groups (14.37) and (14.27), and F5 and F6 again forming equal groups (11.98 and 10.02) on the whole.

Excepting at F2 and F1, there was a general trend that as the size of family increased, there was a decrease in social adjustment, as there was the case with respect to family adjustment in earlier chapter (cf. (FA) Table 11). This is again a very useful and interesting finding for the government agencies and social workers propagating the need for family planning with a slogan "two enough".

(b) Family Size Within the Second-Born

When the second-born children are found usually to be most adjusted, it would be interesting to examine also the effect of family size within the second-born. The results of analysis of the data on the second-born children according to their family size and sex are summarized in (SA) Tables 12(a), 12(b) and 12(c).

Group XII : Second-Born Boys Vs. Second-Born Girls
Sex Vs. Family Size (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 12(a) - Showing Mean Scores

Family Size	Boys No.	Boys Mean	Girls No.	Girls Mean	Total No.	Total Mean
F3	31	14.19	41	10.21	72	11.93
F4	67	14.95	67	13.49	134	14.22
F5	27	15.00	26	16.11	53	15.54
F6	25	12.28	24	13.25	49	12.75
Total	150	14.36	158	13.03	308	13.68

(SA) Table 12 (b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	134.48	134.48	5.61	Sig. at .01
Family Size	3	486.66	162.22	6.77	Sig. at .01
S x F	3	243.99	81.33	3.39	Sig. at .05
Within	300	7186.69			
Total	307	8051.82			

(SA) Table 12 (c)-Showing Results of L.S.D. Test

Family Size-wise

Group	Boys	Girls	Total
F3 - F4	Not Sig.	Sig. .05	Sig. .01
F3 - F5	N.S.	Sig. .01	Sig. .01
F3 - F6	N.S.	Sig. .05	N.S.
F4 - F5	N.S.	Sig. .05	N.S.
F4 - F6	Sig. .05	N.S. N.	N.S.
F5 - F6	Sig. .05	Sig. .05	Sig. .05

Sex-wise	In F3 :	B - G	Sig. at .01
	F4 :	B - G	Not Significant
	F5 :	B - G	Not Significant
	F 6 :	B - G	Not Significant

This analysis revealed that all sources, viz. sex, family, size and also the interaction between sex and family size, were significant as far as social adjustment of the second-born was concerned; this is just in contrast to all sources being insignificant with respect to social adjustment of the first-born as shown above, in (SA) Tables 11(a), 11(b) and 11(c).

Thus, sex factor was significant for the second-born; second-born boys did differ from second-born girls as observed also in (SA) Table 1(c); on the whole boys scored higher (14.36) than girls (13.03) on social adjustment. Among the family sizes, only F3 boys scored significantly higher (14.19) than F3 girls (10.21). No other sizes showed significant sex differences among the second-born children as revealed by (SA) Table 12(c). Thus, it could be said that the significant sex differences revealed here in (SA) Tables 12(b) and 12(c) and earlier in 1(b) and 1(c) among the second-born were really speaking due to the contribution of children from F3 size of the family.

As regards the family size effects, it was also revealed that the family size was a significant factor for the second-born. Here F5 group was socially most adjusted; next almost equal was F4; next was F6 and least adjusted was F3 group, both F6 and F3 being almost equal. There did not appear the usual trend of decrease in adjustment with increase in size.

The detailed analysis of sub-groups in (SA) Table 12(c) shows that among second-born boys, the F3, F4 and F5 groups did not differ from each other; only the least adjusted F6 was

different from F4 and F5; while among the second-born girls the most of size groups differed from one another except F4 and F6. To put a little differently, in F3 and F6 comparison, F3 boys scored higher than F6 boys, and F6 girls scored significantly higher than F3 girls, thus making total score differences of F3 - F6 quite insignificant. Similar is the case with F4 - F5 comparison. All trends account also for the significant interaction between sex and family size which can be explained also by the fact that at F3 and F4 the boys scored higher and at F5 and F6 the girls scored higher in social adjustment.

In other words, it could be said that sex and family size though apparently significant did not independently contribute to social development of the second-born, but they did so in interaction with each other, which was significant.

(c) Family Size Within the Middle-Born

The data of the middle-born children analysed sex-wise and family size-wise are presented in (SA) Tables 13(a), 13 (b) and 13(c) below.

Group XIII : Middle-Born Boys Vs. Middle-Born Girls
Sex Vs. Family Size (Social Adjustment)

(SA) Table 13(a) - Showing Mean Scores

Family Size	Boys		Girls		Total	
	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean
F4	30	12.06	30	14.50	60	13.28
F5	55	9.43	40	13.32	95	11.07
F6	92	10.51	85	10.52	177	10.51
Total	177	10.44	155	12.01	332	11.17

(SA) Table 13 (b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	205.94	205.94	21.23	Sig. .01
Family. Size	2	343.65	171.82	17.71	Sig. .01
S x F	2	233.08	116.54	12.01	Sig. .01
Within	326	3164.85	9.70		
Total	331	3947.52			

(SA) Table 13 (c) - Showing Results of L.S.D. Test

Family Size-wise	Boys	Girls	Total
F4 - F5	Sig. .01	Not Sig.	Sig. .01
F 4 - F6	Sig. .01	Sig. .01	Sig. .01
F5 - F6	Not Sig.	Sig. .01	Not Sig.

Sex-wise In	F4 :	B - G	Sig. .05
	F5 :	B - G	Sig. .01
	F6 :	B - G	Not Sig.

The statistical analysis of the middle-born also shows all sources viz. sex, family size and interaction to be significant, as earlier table (SA) 12 shows all sources to be significant in case of the second-born.

The significant sex factor confirms also the same finding in (SA) Table 1(c) for the middle-born. In contrast to the second-born boys scoring higher than the second-born girls shown in above (SA) Table 12, in case of the middle-born here the girls scored higher (12.01) than that of boys (10.44) on the whole.

The significant family size factor within the middle-born also confirms the earlier finding within the first-born that the higher the size, the lesser the social adjustment; the F4 was most adjusted, next was F5 and least was F6.

The detailed analysis of data of sub-groups in (SA) Table 13(c) shows that in F4 and F5 the boys differed from girls, while in F6 there were no sex differences. Similarly, among boys the family size pairs those differed were F4-F5 and F4-F6, while among girls the differing pairs were F4-F6 and F5-F6. All this accounts for significant interaction between sex and family size as far as social adjustment of the middle-born is concerned.

(d) Family Size Within the Last-Born (Youngest)

Finally, the data of the last-born on social adjustment in family sizes of F2, F3, F4, F5 and F6 for both the sexes (excepting of F1 group being the only or the first or the last born group unidentified clearly) were summarized and are presented sex-wise and family size-wise in (SA) Tables 14(a), 14(b) and 14(c).

Group XIV : Last Born Boys Vs. Last Born Girls (Social Adjustment) Sex Vs. Family Size

(SA)

Table 14 (a) - Showing Mean Scores

Family Size	Boys No.	Boys Mean	Girls No.	Girls Mean	Total No.	Total Mean
F2	32	13.34	31	15.67	63	14.49
F3	27	13.74	21	11.80	48	12.89
F4	25	10.48	24	10.33	49	10.40
F5	42	11.04	31	11.22	73	11.10
F6	32	13.06	31	11.35	63	12.22
Total	158	12.29	138	12.18	296	12.24

(SA) Table 14 (b) - Showing Analysis of Variance for Above Data

Source	df	SS	MS	F.Ratio	Remarks
Sex	1	0.88	0.88	.297	Not Sig.
Family Size	4	597.88	149.47	5.04	Sig. .01
S x F	4	175.47	43.86	1.48	Not Sig.
Within	286	8469.74	29.61		
Total	295	9243.97			

(SA) Table 14 (c) - Showing Results of L.S.D. Test

Family Size-wise	Boys	Girls	Total
F2 - F3	Not Sig.	Sig. .01	Sig. .05
F2 - F4	Sig. .05	Sig. .01	Sig. .01
F2 - F5	Sig. .05	Sig. .01	Sig. .01
F2 - F6	N.S.	Sig. .01	Sig. .05
F3 - F4	Sig. .01	N.S.	Sig. .05
F3 - F5	Sig. .05	N.S.	N.S.
F3 - F6	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
F4 - F5	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
F4 - F6	Sig. .05	N.S.	N.S.
F5 - F6	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

Sex-wise

In F2 :	B - G	Sig. at .05
F3 :	B - G	Not Significant
F4 :	B - G	Not Significant
F5 :	B - G	Not Significant
F6 :	B - G	Not Significant

This analysis revealed that only the family size was the significant factor; sex or interaction were insignificant. That the sex factor is insignificant confirms the earlier similar finding in (SA) Table 1(c) for the last-born. Even the detailed analysis in (SA) Table 14(c) shows that in all family sizes except F2, there were no sex differences.

The only significant factor for social adjustment of the last-born was family size. The F2 group was the most adjusted, the next best was F3 and then F6, then F5 and least adjusted was F4. There did not seem here the usual trend of decreasing adjustment with increasing size. It would be seen that F2 differed from all other sizes while all other sizes were mutually not much different, mostly for both boys as well as girls. This means that there was no significant interaction; only the family size factor was independently contributed to the social development of the last-born, and specifically mostly F2 size played important role in this case.

It may be summarized here that in case of the first-born no source was significant, that in case of the second-born and the middle-born all sources, viz. sex, family size and their interaction, were significant, and that in case of the last-born only the family size was significant factor in social adjustment. Can it be said in case of social adjustment as suggested earlier in case of family adjustment (ref. to last para before the summary in Ch. 4), that as the size of the family increases, the birth order and the family size play role of differential importance ? This may be tested by further research with better controls.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

1. The overall analysis of data on social adjustment revealed the following observations :

(a) Boys and girls on the whole did not differ significantly on scores in social adjustment.

(b) Birth order of a child was a significant factor contributing to social adjustment. On the whole, the most adjusted socially were the first-born and the second-born, both being almost equal; next were the last-born and then the least adjusted were the middle-born.

(c) There was significant interaction between sex and birth order, thus showing that the birth order was mainly the contributing factor in social adjustment.

(d) Family size also played a significant role in social adjustment. F2 group was the most adjusted and then beginning with F1 there was a trend of decrease in social adjustment with the increase in family size.

(e) However, family size interacted significantly with sex as far as social adjustment was concerned. Among boys, F1 was the most adjusted and then all other sizes were in decreasing order of adjustment systematically in the same order of increase of size. (F2, F3 and F4 forming almost equal groups, and then F5 and F6 being equal). Among girls, F2 was the most adjusted, next best was F1; and then in decreasing order were F4, F5, F3 and F6, a;; these being not much different among themselves. This accounts for significant interaction.

2. When data on social adjustment were analysed to compare findings on children of varied birth order, the analysis warranted the following inferences :

(a) Comparing the first-born with all the other later-born siblings, it was found that -

(i) there were no sex differences.

(ii) the first-born significantly were socially more adjusted than the later-born.

(iii) there was no significant interaction between sex and birth order, i.e. birth order was mainly the contributing factor.

(b) Comparing the only child group with the other first-born it was found that -

(i) it was interestingly observed that there were no significant differences between the only children and other first-born children either due to sex, birth order or interaction, i.e. both were the same as far as social adjustment was concerned.

(c) The separate analysis of data of these boys and these girls showed that -

(i) the only born boys were not different from the other first-born boys.

(ii) however, the only born girls were significantly more adjusted socially than the other first-born girls.

(d) The analysis of the data of the first-born and boys and first-born girls as siblings of mixed sex versus siblings

of same sex in family showed that -

(i) the first-born children of mixed sex among the siblings were significantly more adjusted socially than the first-born siblings of the same sex in a family.

(e) Comparing the only child group with the other later born group, it was found that -

(i) there were no sex differences.

(ii) the only child group was significantly more adjusted socially than the later born.

(iii) there was no significant interaction.

Thus, comparison of the first-born with the other later born showed same results as the comparison of the only born with the other later born group.

(f) Comparing the first-born with the last-born, it was found that -

(i) there were no sex differences.

(ii) the first-born were significantly more adjusted socially than the last-born.

(iii) there was no significant interaction.

(g) Comparing the last-born with the only child group, it was found that -

(i) there were no sex differences.

(ii) the only child group was significantly more adjusted socially than the last-born group.

(iii) there was no significant interaction.

(h) Comparing the last-born with aggregate of the second and the middle-born, it was found that -

(i) there was no differences due to either sex, birth order or interaction, i.e. both groups were the same.

These findings are same as findings in (f) above while comparing the first-born and the last-born, thus equating again the first-born and the only group as in (b) above.

3. When data on social adjustment were analysed to compare the findings on children belonging to families of different sizes, the following conclusions were warranted :

(a) Within the first-born :

(i) There were no sex differences.

(ii) There were no differences due to family size.

(iii) There was apparently no significant interaction between sex and family size due to different directions of social adjustment of boys and girls at different sizes. F2 girls and F1 boys were the most adjusted, and then there was a trend of decrease with increase in family size.

(b) Within the second-born :

(i) Boys were significantly more adjusted socially than the second-born.

(ii) Family size was a significant factor. Sizes in decrease order of adjustment stood thus : F5, F4, F6 and F3 on the whole.

(iii) There was significant interaction between sex and family size among the second-born. F5 was most adjusted both among the boys and the girls, but the least adjusted was F6 among the boys and F3 among the girls.

(c) Within the Middle-born :

(i) Girls were adjusted than boys.

(ii) Family size was a significant factor. There was a trend of decrease in social adjustment with increase in family size. The order was : F4, F5 and F6.

(iii) There was significant interaction between the sex and the family size among the middle-born. F4 was the most adjusted group among both the boys and the girls; but the least adjusted group was F5 among the boys and F6 among the girls.

(d) Within the last-born :

(i) There were no sex differences.

(ii) Family size was a significant factor. F2 group was the most adjusted. There was a general trend of decrease in social adjustment with the increase in family size.

(iii) There was no significant interaction between sex and family size.

It would be seen that the only case where family size was a significantly contributing factor, independently of sex was the case of the last-born group. In case of the first-born

family size (nor the sex) was significant. In case of both the second-born and the middle-born, family size was significant, but with significant interaction with sex. In short, it can be said that family size was on the whole a significantly contributing factor, and there was a general trend of decrease in social adjustment with the increase in family size.