

A study of the effect of family climate on social competence in adolescents

VARSHA GOEL* AND RITU GARG

Department of Home Science, Shri Ram Girls College, MUZAFFARNAGAR (U.P.) INDIA

ABSTRACT : Present study was conducted to know the influence of family climate on social competence of an adolescent is of great importance. Family climate affects the social competence during a more crucial period in life, *i.e.* adolescence. Adolescence is often considered as a period of “storm and stress”. Any negligence of the individual at this stage leads to serious problems in later life which is bad not only for the individual but also for all those who come in contact with him and for the society in which they live. Study was carried out on 100 adolescents (50 boys and 50 girls) from Agra city. The results show gender differences in perception of the family climate and social competence which proves that in Indian culture specially that of small cities the parents still give differential treatment to their sons and daughters and the society has certain gender biases still prevailing.

KEY WORDS : Family climate, Social competence, Adolescents

View Point Article : Goel, Varsha and Garg, Ritu (2015). A study of the effect of family climate on social competence in adolescents. *Internat. J. Home Sci. Extn. & Comm. Manage.*, 2 (1): 49-57.

Article History : Received : 25.11.2014; Revised : 05.12.2014; Accepted : 19.12.2014

INTRODUCTION

Child is born and lives his life in an environment physical, social and emotional. It is a member-active or inactive, of many groups and plays a complicated role in all of them. He is a member of a family, of a neighbourhood, of a school, of a religious group and of a nation and he lives his life as a member of all of them simultaneously. Thus, family is the most important socializing agent that influences the child life. It is within the family, the basic unit of society, that a child learns the fundamentals of social interactions and acquires the behavior patterns and basic personality structure. “The family has a special role in a child’s life” was pointed out by Dutta (1981). It is universally accepted that family plays a very significant role in the all round development of a child. Parent-child interaction and parents’ way to deal with their children, develop certain attitudes among the children towards their home environment. The word “climate” is a more

comprehensive one. It includes with in itself the word environment’. The human elements around the child is called environment’. It embraces the social, physical and emotional activities of the family. All these combined together constitute the “Family climate”.

The family which consists of parents-father and mother and siblings, *i.e.* brothers and sisters, involves interaction amount itself. The totality of these interactions is the base of the family. The child lives in a family environment after his birth and establishes family relationships. The child is always in interaction with his parents and other family members. Through, these interactions, the child becomes able to identify himself and the position that he occupies with reference to others. Authorization parenting style leads to ineffective social interaction and ineffectiveness in adolescents due to punitiveness, restrictiveness and control as its main characteristics. Democratic parents encourage independence, are warm and nurturing, they control with explanation and

allow adolescents to express their views which intern leads to social competence and responsibility in adolescents. Laissez-faire (Permissive) parents are characterized by lack of involvement, non-punitive and impose few demands and adolescent has a lot of freedom and this leads to immature, poor self-restraint, poor leadership. Rejecting-neglecting parents are characterized by rejecting or neglectful of child-rearing responsibilities leading to antisocial, immature, psychological problems. The social competency of the individual develops as a result of these styles. Social competence is the sum total of all psychophysical system of an individual. It includes social interactions, values, systems, beliefs, temperament, and process of adjustment. All these segments of social competence are influenced by the family. Social competence is an important ingredient of modern civilization, and is the essential attribute of the members of a progressive onwards moving society. The cultural purity and social diversity of India provide enough opportunities to Indian children for the acquisition of high order social competence, through rich and varied interpersonal relations.

Social competence means the attaining of maturity in social relationship. It is the "process of learning to conform to group standards, mores, traditions and becoming imbued with a sense of oneness, intercommunication and cooperation" (Freeman and Showel, 1953).

Adolescence is a crucial period in one's life. Every human being has to pay through this period and this stage brings its immense problems along with it. Adolescence is the time when the individual is confronted with various family, school, social and personal problems. However, adolescence is not a problem period but a stage in human development which has certain but natural problems. In other words, the adolescent years are, pre-eminently, a period of social development and adjustment. During the preceding years of childhood there have been, to be sure, a beginning of socialization and some acquisition of fundamental social skills.

Present study was to observe the effect of family climate on social competence among adolescents. I have tried to examine the relationship between the family environment and personality traits in adolescents.

Objectives:

- To study the family climate (dimension) of adolescent boys and girls.
- To study the social competence (dimension) of adolescent boys and girls.
- To study the relationship between various dimensions of family climate and social competence in context of adolescents.

Limitations :

- After obtaining the list of intermediate colleges of Agra City only four colleges were selected for data collection.

- The study was limited on class 10th students only.
- Due to the shortage of time, sample size was small; the present study was limited to 50 boys and 50 girls only.

Review of literature:

The review of literature helps the researcher to investigate a specific field of his interest in respect of researchers that have been conducted in India as well as abroad. It provides insight as well as direction in indicating, identifying the research problem, in selection a sample, in selection appropriate methodology and the statistical techniques. Hence, review of related literature is an important prerequisite to the actual planning and then the execution of any research work. History related to family climate and social competence.

Dauvan and Adelson (1966), they found that the most successful adolescent experience seemed to occur in families in which interest, involvement and intensity of interaction are at moderate levels families in which teenagers are able to express their own view points freely, even if those view points conflicts with their parents, and in which they can actively participate in family decision making.

Dutta (1981), who has shown that the family has a special role in a child's life. The impact of the family on the child's competency is of great importance.

Elder (1980), suggest that teenagers most positive about parents who encouraged them to participate in discussion and consult them about decision but reserve the right to make the final decision, as well as about parents who try to give their adolescent equal say in decision. Teenagers give their lowest ratings to parents who are autocratic in making family decisions.

Faizunisa and Parameswaran (1965), found that maternal behavior like indulgence, over protectiveness and dominance tend to be associated with higher frequency of problems.

Fenter *et al.* (1990), examined specific aspects of student's home environment and the relationship of those home environments characteristics to the manifestation of student behavior problem in school. According to data analysis, all variables of home environment were significant in determining whether or not a student would exhibit behavior problem in school.

Gonzalez *et al.* (2000), focused the relationship between perceived family environment and family structure, and general self-efficacy. Results showed the family structure was a significant predictor of general self-efficacy, with participants from intact families tending to have higher general self-efficacies than participants from non-intact families.

Ladd *et al.* (1988), studied the difference between young adult perceptions of family environment, family values, sexual behavior, sexual attitudes and attitude toward divorce by gender and family type. Results indicate that students from all three family types consider family values to be very

important. In conclusion, it appears that gender is more discriminating than family type on how family social environment is perceived. The experience of living in a particular family type does effect students attitudes divorce, but no judgement can be made about future divorce behavior.

Lamb *et al.* (1988), presented social competence of Swedish pre-schoolers and found that the high socio-economic status, high quality home care and early temperament facilitated personality maturity.

Lindsey *et al.* (1992), determined consistency in teachers' judgments' of social competence. Preferences for high versus low inference criteria. This study showed there was a significant effect for the ambiguity factor, with teachers' preferences for higher inference criteria increasing significantly when they were evaluating ambiguous classroom social behaviour.

Sun *et al.* (1988), examined the associations between family relationships and social competence during late adolescence. The family relationship measures included closeness to father, closeness to mother, low parental intrusiveness, and contentment at home. The social competence measures included social self-esteem/social competence, masculinity, femininity, shyness, satisfaction and importance of opposite sex relationships and satisfaction and importance of same sex relationships and satisfaction and importance of same sex relationships. The results supported the notable gender differences in family relationships and social competence over time. Taken together, these results, suggest that makes and females have different experiences in separating from the family. For males, after leaving home, family ties gradually diminish, for females, there was positive correlation between family relationships and social competence during both time periods.

METHODOLOGY

Keeping in view the objectives of the present study, the

researcher has organized the procedure of the study under the following heads:

Methods of the study :

I have used descriptive method for this study.

Main variables of the study :

In the present study I have chosen independent variable (Family climate of adolescent boys and girls), controlled variable (Age 13-16 years of the adolescent) and dependent variable (Social competence).

Selection of sample :

The sample was selected on random basis and the sample drawn for the study was the high school students of Agra city. For this study I have taken 100 adolescent (boys and girls) of 13-16 years of ix and x grade.

In this study for data collection I have taken 2 standardized questionnaires (Family climate scale and social competence scale).

After the data collection was completed the scores were tabulated respondent wise and were arranged in the tabular form and computed for statistical analysis, interpretation and discussion. After this I have used appropriate mean, standard deviation, student t-test and correlation coefficient for analyzing the data.

OBSERVATION AND ASSESSMENT

Focusing upon the above information the results was interpreted in Table 1, 2, 3 and 4.

In relation to favorable family climate and adolescents boys scored higher mean values than girls. The obtained 't' value is 1.154. This value is not significant even at 0.05 level. It means that boys have no difference in there favorable family climate.

In relation to unfavorable family climate of the

Table 1 : Showing mean, S.D and 't'- value of favourable and unfavourable family climate

Sr. No.	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value
Favourable family climate					
1	Boys	50	69.88	8.392	1.154 (NS)
2	Girls	50	67.8	9.592	
Unfavourable family climate					
3	Boys	50	51.64	14.613	3.003(*)
4	Girls	50	60.08	13.468	

NS=Non-significant

Table 2 : Showing mean, S.D. and 't'-value of social competence

Sr. No.	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	't"-value
Social competence					
1.	Boys	50	191.22	26.614	0.841 (NS)
2.	Girls	50	187.52	16.086	

NS=Non-significant

Table 3 : Following table shows the relationship between favourable and unfavourable family climate on various dimensions of social competence in context of boys

Group	N	Favourable family climate	S.C.	SM	SL	ST	Sco	PSA
Boys	50	t-value	0.507	0.971	0.488	1.800	0.873	0.893
		r-value	0.073	0.070	0.070	0.251	0.125	0.128
NS								
		Unfavourable family climate						
		t-value	1.410	1.189	0.444	1.597	1.083	2.082
		r-value	0.199	0.169	0.064	0.225	0.154	0.288
NS								
		Favourable freedom Vs Restrictiveness						
		t-value	1.507	1.500	1.230	0.285	1.132	1.151
		r-value	0.213	0.212	0.175	0.041	0.161	0.164
NS								
		Unfavourable freedom Vs Restrictiveness						
		t-value	0.830	0.621	0.582	0.238	0.573	1.227
		r-value	0.119	-0.089	-0.084	0.034	-0.082	0.174
NS								
		Favourable indulgence Vs Avoidance						
		t-value	0.119	1.882	1.726	0.170	1.642	0.688
		r-value	-0.017	-0.262	-0.242	-0.025	-0.231	-0.099
NS								
		Unfavourable indulgence Vs Avoidance						
		t-value	1.637	3.176	2.070	2.024	2.687	2.331
		r-value	0.230	0.417	0.286	0.280	0.362	0.319
			NS	*	*	*	*	*
		Favourable fairness Vs Partiality						
		t-value	0.016	0.437	0.236	0.120	1.029	0.659
		r-value	-0.002	0.063	0.034	-0.017	0.147	0.095
NS								
		Unfavourable fairness Vs Partiality						
		t-value	2.242	0.537	0.736	0.126	0.088	3.309
		r-value	0.035	0.077	-0.106	0.018	0.013	-0.431
NS								
		Favourable attention Vs Negligence						
		t-value	1.514	1.704	0.144	0.958	1.688	2.507
		r-value	-0.213	-0.239	-0.021	-0.137	-0.237	0.340
NS								
		Unfavourable attention Vs negligence						
		t-value	0.769	1.058	0.075	0.058	0.866	1.198
		r-value	0.110	0.151	-0.011	-0.008	-0.124	0.170
NS								
		Favourable acceptance Vs Rejection						
		t-value	1.394	1.398	1.075	0.795	1.306	2.768
		r-value	0.194	0.198	0.153	0.114	0.185	0.371
NS								

Contd..... Table 3

Contd.... Table 3

Unfavourable acceptance Vs Rejection						
t-value	0.077	0.501	0.849	0.069	0.294	1.414
r-value	0.011	-0.072	0.122	-0.010	0.042	-0.200
NS						
Favourable warmth Vs Coldness						
t-value	0.597	2.150	1.610	0.492	2.016	2.002
r-value	0.086	0.296	0.226	0.071	0.279	0.278
	NS	*	NS		*	*
Unfavourable warmth Vs Coldness						
t-value	0.698	0.863	0.175	0.144	0.643	0.887
r-value	0.100	0.124	-0.025	-0.021	0.092	0.127
NS						
Favourable Trust Vs Distrust						
t-value	1.109	0.977	0.789	0.738	1.014	0.941
r-value	0.158	0.140	0.113	0.106	0.145	0.135
NS						
Unfavourable trust Vs Distrust						
t-value	0.854	1.110	0.125	0.447	1.940	0.127
r-value	0.122	0.158	0.178	0.064	0.270	-0.018
NS						
Favourable dominance Vs submissiveness						
t-value	1.930	2.206	1.176	1.177	1.047	0.622
r-value	-0.268	0.303	-0.167	-0.167	-0.149	-0.089
	NS	*			NS	
Unfavourable dominance Vs submissiveness						
t-value	1.558	2.206	0.296	1.009	2.072	1.472
r-value	0.219	0.303	0.043	0.144	0.286	0.208
	NS	*	NS		*	NS
Favourable expectation Vs hopelessness						
t-value	0.507	0.506	0.621	0.721	0.089	0.409
r-value	0.073	0.073	0.089	0.104	0.013	-0.059
NS						
Unfavourable expectation Vs hopelessness						
t-value	0.321	0.973	0.146	0.860	1.891	1.029
r-value	-0.046	0.139	0.021	-0.123	0.263	0.147
NS						
Favourable open communication Vs controlled communication						
t-value	0.644	0.865	0.744	0.418	1.332	0.944
r-value	0.093	-0.124	0.111	0.060	-0.189	-0.135
NS						
Unfavourable open communication Vs controlled Communication						
t-value	0.513	0.384	0.440	0.110	0.135	0.187
r-value	-0.074	0.055	-0.063	0.016	0.019	-0.027
NS						

* Shows significant at 0.05 % level.

NS- Not significant.

Table 4 : Following table shows the relationship between favorable and unfavorable family climate on various dimensions of social competence in context of girls

Group	N	Favourable family climate	SC	SM	SL	ST	SCo	PSA
Girls	50	t-value	0.495	0.899	0.905	1.372	0.503	2.987
		r-value	0.071	0.129	0.130	-0.194	-0.072	0.396
					NS			*
		Unfavourable family climate						
		t-value	0.304	0.570	1.467	1.023	1.280	0.785
		r-value	-0.044	0.082	-0.207	-0.146	0.182	-0.133
					NS			
		Favourable freedom Vs restrictiveness						
		t-value	0.938	1.047	1.980	0.426	2.930	0.617
		r-value	0.134	0.149	-0.275	-0.061	0.390	0.089
				NS	*	NS	*	NS
		Unfavourable freedom Vs restrictiveness						
		t-value	0.295	0.399	0.711	0.609	0.535	0.501
		r-value	-0.043	0.049	-0.102	0.088	-0.077	-0.072
					NS			
		Favourable indulgence Vs avoidance						
		t-value	0.027	0.508	0.224	1.104	1.708	0.980
		r-value	0.004	-0.073	0.032	-0.157	0.239	0.140
					NS			
		Unfavourable indulgence Vs avoidance						
		t-value	1.557	0.990	1.135	1.851	0.641	0.758
		r-value	-0.219	-0.141	-0.162	-0.258	-0.092	-0.109
			NS	*	*	*	*	*
		Favourable fairness Vs partiality						
		t-value	0.521	0.028	1.637	0.246	2.440	1.042
		r-value	0.075	-0.004	-0.230	0.035	0.332	-0.149
					NS		*	NS
		Unfavourable fairness Vs partiality						
		t-value	1.084	1.515	0.005	0.444	0.545	2.526
		r-value	0.155	0.214	-0.001	0.064	0.078	0.343
					NS			*
		Favourable attention Vs negligence						
		t-value	0.248	0.290	2.940	0.510	0.026	0.556
		r-value	0.036	0.042	0.380	0.073	-0.004	0.080
				NS	*		NS	
		Unfavourable attention Vs negligence						
		t-value	0.318	0.582	0.689	0.157	0.282	0.977
		r-value	0.046	0.084	-0.099	-0.023	0.041	0.140
					NS			
		Favourable acceptance Vs rejection						
		t-value	1.353	1.304	0.684	0.108	3.848	0.765
		r-value	0.192	0.185	-0.098	-0.016	0.486	0.110
					NS		*	NS

Table 4 contd...

Contd.... Table 4

Unfavourable acceptance Vs rejection						
t-value	2.287	2.291	0.209	0.849	2.319	0.475
r-value	0.313	0.314	0.030	-0.122	0.317	0.068
	*	*	NS		*	NS
Favourable warmth Vs coldness						
t-value	0.597	2.150	1.610	0.492	2.016	2.002
r-value	0.086	0.296	0.226	0.071	0.279	0.278
		NS			*	NS
Unfavourable warmth Vs coldness						
t-value	0.155	0.104	0.129	1.089	1.122	1.233
r-value	0.022	0.015	-0.019	-0.155	0.160	-0.175
			NS			
Favourable trust Vs distrust						
t-value	1.564	1.091	1.378	0.617	4.073	0.662
r-value	0.220	0.155	-0.195	0.089	0.507	0.095
		NS			*	NS
Unfavourable trust Vs distrust						
t-value	0.278	0.301	1.158	1.446	1.405	1.171
r-value	0.040	0.043	0.165	-0.204	0.199	-0.167
			NS			
Favourable dominance Vs submissiveness						
t-value	0.669	0.000	1.114	0.618	1.882	0.777
r-value	0.096	0.000	-0.159	-0.089	0.262	0.111
			NS			
Unfavourable dominance Vs submissiveness						
t-value	0.185	0.206	0.091	0.226	0.863	1.548
r-value	-0.027	-0.030	0.013	0.033	0.124	-0.218
			NS			
Favourable expectation Vs hopelessness						
t-value	0.767	0.371	0.943	0.863	0.916	0.362
r-value	0.110	0.053	-0.135	0.124	0.131	-0.052
			NS			
Unfavourable expectation Vs hopelessness						
t-value	1.661	1.769	0.412	2.405	2.132	0.867
r-value	0.233	0.247	-0.059	-0.328	0.294	0.124
		NS		*	*	NS
Favourable open communication Vs controlled communication						
t-value	0.756	1.048	2.132	0.678	0.803	0.641
r-value	-0.108	-0.150	0.294	0.097	0.115	-0.092
		NS	*		NS	
Unfavourable open communication Vs controlled communication						
t-value	0.470	0.272	1.499	0.984	1.641	0.331
r-value	0.068	-0.039	-0.211	0.141	0.230	0.048
			NS			

*= Significant at 0.5% level of significance, NS= Not significant

adolescents Girls scored higher mean values than boys. The obtained 't' value is 3.003 is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean value for girls has shown higher unfavorable family climate than boys. It confirms that there is also a great gender difference in relation to family climate in adolescence. This can be explained by the fact that even though the parents do not drastically show different treatment towards boys and girls in our culture, still boys are given slight preferential treatment and the parental attitude is more favourable for them.

In relation to social competence of adolescents, boys scored higher mean values than girls. The obtained 't' values is 0.841. This value is not significant even at 0.05 level. It means that boys and girls have no difference in their social competence. But the higher mean value of boys shows the level of social competence is higher in boys than for girls.

Boys show significantly positive co-relationships between these areas but in the dimension unfavorable Fairness Vs Partially was found the negative correlation. The results also show the effect of family climate on social competence in context of boys. Similar results have been reported by Dutta (1981) who has shown that the family has a special role in a child's life. The impact of the family on the child's competency is of great importance.

On the basis of correlation matrix of girls, we can say that if the environment of the family is good or healthy, the attitude of girls is positive towards the society. Girls have always been suppressed. In India, if the family climate is good, girls feel that the society is changing for betterment and they feel encouraged to face the society. If there is no partiality in the family between boys and girls than there is no doubt that the character of social leadership, social competition, social competence is developed in both the sexes equally. These results are also supported by the results of Dauvan and Adelson (1966), they found that the most successful adolescent experiences seemed to occur in families in which interest, involvement and intensity of interaction are at moderate levels. Families in which teenagers are able to express their own view points freely, even if those view points conflicts with their parents and in which they can actively participate in family decision making.

Last but not least I want to find out the effect of family climate on social competence of adolescent boys and girls and the result show gender differences in perception of the family climate and social competence which proves that in Indian culture specially that of small cities. The parents still give differential treatment to their sons and daughters and the society has certain gender basis still prevailing.

The present study will serve as a guideline to the parents in their behavior towards their adolescents' boys and girls so that they provide a healthy and favorable climate with in the family without any gender discrimination also that they may motivate and promote social development in their adolescent

children and help them to acquire social competency which will equip them effectively to deal with life.

Acknowledgement :

Author is thankful to Dr. Gul Mathur, Reader, Department of Home Science, Faculty of Arts, Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Agra, for her kind guidance, motivation and unconditional support for this work.

REFERENCES

- Anthony, James E. and Koupernik, Curille (1970).** *The child in his family*, John Wiley and sons, New York, U.S.A.
- Bhusan, Vidya and Sachdeva, D.R. (1996).** *An introduction to sociology*, Kitab Mahal, Allahabad, PP 160-161, 410.
- Bossard, James H.S. and Boll, Eleasnor Stroker (1960).** *The sociology of child development*, 3rd Ed., Harper and Brother Publishing, New York, PP.29, 47,112.
- Choudhary, Paul D. (1995).** *Child Welfare/ Development*, Atmaram and Sons, Delhi, INDIA.
- Cole, Luella (1948).** *Psychology of adolescence*, 3rd Ed., Rinehart and company, Inc, New Delhi, INDIA.
- Corsini, Raymond J. (1987).** *Concise encyclopedia of psychology*, Wiley Interscience, vol.1144, PP.930.
- Douvan, E. and Adelson, J. (1966).** *The adolescent experience*. John Wiley, New York, U.S.A.
- Dutta, R. (1981).** Family and mental problems. *Your Health*, **30** (12) : 195-196.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. (1980).** Adolescence in historical perspective. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbooks of adolescent psychology* (pp. 3-46). New York: Wiley.
- Faizunnica, A.R. and Parames Waram, E.G. (1965).** Maternal behaviour and behaviour problem in children. Research Bulletin of the Department of Psychology, Osmania University, Hyderabad, No. 1 pp. 47-65.
- Festinger Leon and Katz Daniel (1970).** *Research methods in the behavioral sciences*, Ameriand Publishing Company. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
- Freeman, Howard E. and Showel Morsis (1953).** The role of the family in the socialization process. *J. Soc. Psychol.*, **37** : 97-101.
- Fuligni, Andrew, J. (1997).** The academic achievement of adolescents from immigrant families; The role of family background, attitude and behavior. *J. Child Development*, **68** (1-3) : 351.
- Good, C.V. (1961).** *Essentials of Educational: Research Methodology and Design*, 7th Ed., Appelton Century and Company, New York, U.S.A.
- Garrison, Karl C. and Garrison Karl C. Jr. (1975).** *Psychology of adolescence*, 7th Ed., Printice Hall INC, New Jersey.
- Gordon, Ira J. (1962).** *Human development*, Harper and Row Publisher, New York.

Hurlock, Elizabeth B. (1956). *Child development*, 3rd Ed., McGraw Hill Book Company INC.

Kerlinger, Fred N. (1995). *Foundations of behavioural research*, 3rd Ed., Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Mahale Meera N. (1987). *The Adolescent's* (Their family situations and the education), Mittal Publications, Delhi, INDIA.

Mangil Frank N. (1987). *International encyclopedia of psychology*, Willey Interscience, 2, pp. 970.

Paul, Mussen Henry, Jerome, Conger John and Carol, Huston Aletha (1984). *Child development and personality*, Harper and Row, New York, U.S.A.

Papallia Diana E., Olds Selly Wendkos (Fifth Edition). *Human development*, Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Ltd., New

Delhi.

Rogers Dorothy (1962). *The psychology of adolescence*, Meredith Publishing Company.

Santrock John W. (1998). *Child development*, 8th, University of Texas of Dallas, The McGraw Hill Companies.

Strang Ruth (1957). *The Adolescent views himself*, McGraw Hill Book Company, INC, PP. 356-357.

Schickedanz Judith A., Schickedanz David I., Hansen Karen and Forsyth Peggy D. (1993). *Understanding children*, 2nd Ed., Mayfield Publishing Company, California, PP.627.

Stewart Clarke Alison, Friedman Susan and Koch Joanne (1987). *Child development*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, U.S.A.

Stagner Ross (1948). *Psychology of personality*, 2nd, New York, McGraw, pp. 355.

2nd
Year
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★