Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies 27 (1995) 91-96.

ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOUR OF CHILDREN AND RELATED FACTORS

LATA KUMARI AND SUDHA CHHIKARA

Adaptive behaviour may be defined as the performance of the daily activities required for personal and social sufficiency. Three important principles are inherent in this definition of adaptive behaviour. First, adaptive behaviour is age related. Adaptive behaviour increases and becomes more complex as one grows older. For younger children, activities such as dressing and getting along with playmates are important. For adults holding a job and managing money are necessary. Secondly, adaptive behaviour is defined by the expectations and standards of other people. The adequacy of an individual's adaptive behaviour is judged by those who live, wrok and interact with the individual. Finally, adaptive behaviour is defined by typical performance, not ability. While ability is ncessary for the performance of daily activities, an individual's adaptive behaviour is inadequate if the ability is not demonstrated when it is required. For example, if a person has the ability to perform according to basic rules of safety and verbalizes the rules when asked, but seldom follows them, adaptive behaviour is considered to be inadequate in that area. Thus, adaptive behaviour is the skill of social and personal sufficiency enacted through daily activities which grow from simple to complex. To find out the levels of adaptice behaviour in the children of crucial age (6-7 years), a study had been undertaken with the following specific objectives.

1. To ascertain the level of adaptive behaviour in the male and female children of 6-7 years age group.
2. To study the socio-economic factors influencing adaptive behaviour.

Methodological Procedure

The study was conducted in the Hisar city of Haryana State. Different areas of the city were selected randomly and a sample of 60 children (30 male and 30 female) was selected at random from the selected areas. Adaptice behaviour was assessed by using reviesd Vineland Adaptive Behabiour scales (1984), which assess personal and social sufficiency of individuals from birth to adulthood. There are three versions of the revised vineland : the Interview Edition, Survey From ; the Interview Edition, Expanded From : and the Classroom Edition. For the present study, the Interview Edition, Survey Form was used. It measures adaptive behaviour in the four domains and of their subdomains :

i) *Communication domain has 3 sub-domains* :
a) Receptive—What the individual understands.
b) Expressive—What the individual says.
c) Written—What the individual reads and writes.
ii) *Daily Living Skills domain* has 3 sub-domains :

a) Personal—How the individual eats, dresses and practices personal hygiene.
b) Domestic—What household tasks the individual performs
c) Community—How the individual uses time, money, telephone and job skills.
iii) *Socialization domain* has also 3 sub-domains:
a) Interpersonal Relationships: How the individual interacts with others.
b) Play and Leisure Time—How the individual plays and uses leisure time.
c) Coping skills—How the individual demonstrates responsibility and sensitivity to others.
iv) *Motor Skills domain*: It is for individuals 5 years or under. It has 2 sub-domains.
a) Gross—How the Individual uses arms and legs for movement and coordination.
b) Fine—How the individual uses hands and fingers to manipulate object.

Results

The findings emerged from the study are:

i) *Adaptive levels*:

The raw scores for each domain i.e. communication, daily living skills and socialization were calculated and converted into standard scores.

TABLE 1. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN ACCORDING TO THE ADAPTIVE LEVELS

Adaptive level	Standard Score range	Frequency (n = 60)	Boys (n = 30)	Girls (n = 30)
High	131 to above 160	0	0	0
Moderately high	116 to 130	0	0	0
Adequate	85 to 115	11(18.33)	5(16.66)	6(20)
Moderately low	70 to 84	42(70)	20(66.66)	22(73.33)
Low	Below 20 to 69	7(11.66)	5(16.66)	2(6.66)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Table 1 shows that none of the respondent achieved the high and moderately high adaptive level. Majority of the respondents (70%) had moderately low adaptive level followed by respondents who has adequate adaptive level (18.33%) and low adaptive level (11.66%).

When the data were analysed for boys and girls separately, it was observed that 73.33 per cent of the girls and 66.66 per cent of the boys had moderately low adaptive level. A very few girls (6.66%) and 16.66% of the boys had low adaptive level.

ii) *Comparison of standard mean and computed mean scores*:

Table 2 reveals the overall performance of girls and boys on communication domain, daily living skill domain and socialization domain. On communication and daily living skills domain girls performed better than boys. While in socialization domain both boys and girls were almost equal in their performance. The overall performance of indian sample is, however, lower on all the three domains as compared to the American sample (standard mean).

TABLE 2. COMPARISON OF STANDARD MEAN AND COMPUTED MEAN:

Domain	Standard mean	Computed mean		
		Boys	Girls	Total
Communication domain	98.7	89.5	94.7	92.1
Daily living skills domain	100.2	92.9	95.3	94.1
Socialization domain	102.7	74.8	74.6	74.7

iii) *Maladaptive levels*:

TABLE 3. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN ACCORDING TO MALADAPTIVE LEVELS

Maladaptive level	Score range	Frequency (n = 60) (%)
Non-significant	0 to 5	46(76.66)
Intermediate	6 to 12	14(23.33)
Significant	13 to 54	0 (0.00)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Table 3 shows the maladaptive levels corresponding to raw scores of children. It is evident from the table that 76.66 per cent of the respondents had non-significant maladaptive level which indicates that these respondents do not exhibit a large number of maladaptive behaviours when compared with others of the same age in the national standardization sample. Only 23.33 per cent of the respondents had intermediate maladaptive level indicationg that although these respondents exhibit more maladaptive behaviours than 50 per cent of the individuals of the same age in the national standardization sample, the frequency is not large enough to be significant. None of the respondent had significant maladaptive level.

iv) Comparison of computed raw score mean and standard mean *on maladaptive behaviour domain*

TABLE 4. COMPUTED RAW SCORE MEAN AND STANDARD MEAN ON MALADAPTIVE BEHAVIOUR DOMAIN

Mean	Total	Boys	Girls
Computed Mean	3.8	4.1	3.6
Standard Mean	6.8	—	—

Table 4 shows that Indian sample had lower mean score (3.8) as compared to American sample (6.8) on maladaptive behaviour domain. It is also evident that boys had shown more maldaptive behaviour than girls.

Factors affecting adaptive behaviour

Different socio-economic factors which can affect the adaptive behaviour have been presented in Table-5.

It is evident from Table-5 that most of the respondents (63.63%) falling in the adequate level of adaptive behaviour belonged to the mothers who were post graduate, whereas,

TABLE 5. SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS AFFECTING ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOUR OF CHILDREN

Category	Level of adaptive behavour			Total	Cal χ^2
	Adequate	Moderately Low	Low		
1. Education of Mother upto Matric	2 (18.18)	10 (23.80)	4 (57.14)	16	
Graduate	2 (18.18)	23 (54.76)	2 (28.57)	27	10.856*
Post graduate	7 (63.63)	9 (21.42)	1 (14.28)	17	
2. Education of Father upto Matric	1 (9.09)	9 (21.42)	4 (57.14)	14	
Graduate	4 (36.36)	25 (59.52)	1 (14.28)	30	10.552*
Post graduate	6 (54.54)	8 (19.04)	2 (28.57)	16	
3. Family Income					
Low (3000)	1 (9.09)	16 (38.09)	5 (71.42)	20	
Middle (3000-6000)	3 (27.27)	15 (35.71)	1 (14.28)	20	9.971*
High (3000)	7 (63.63)	11 (26.19)	1 (14.28)	20	
4. Occupation of Mother					
Working	6 (54.54)	10 (23.80)	5 (71.42)	21	8.581*
Non-Working	5 (45.45)	32 (76.20)	2 (28.57)	39	
5. Occupation of Father					
Business	8 (72.72)	13 (30.95)	6 (85.71)	27	
Service	3 (27.27)	29 (69.04)	1 (14.28)	33	12.801*

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.
★ Significant at 5% level.

57.14% of the children having low level of adaptive behaviour belonged to the mothers who possessed the education upto matric. Mothers of 14.28 per cent of the children in low level

of adaptive behaviour were post graduate. χ^2 (chi square) value (10.856*) also indicates the significant association between educatin of mother and adaptive behaviour of children.

Table-5 also shows the significant and positive association between education of father and adaptive behaviour of children ($\chi^2 = 10.552$*). It is further evident that most of the children (54.54%) who had adequate level of adaptive behaviour belonged to the fathers whose educatinal level is post graduate. While, 57.14 per cent of the children falling in low level of adaptive behaviour belonged to the fathers who possessed education upto matric. Only 9.09 per cent of the children, whose fathers were upto matric, had adequate level of adaptive behaviour.

Family income was also found to be significantly associated with adaptive behaviour of children ($\chi^2 = 9.971$*). Table- 5 indicates that 63.63 per cent of the children falling in adequate level of adaptive behaviour were from high income group, whereas, majority of the children (71.42%) having low level of adaptive behaciour belonged to low income group. Only 9.09 per cent of the children having adequate lecel of adaptive behaviour were from low income group.

It is further evident from Table 5 that occupation of mother and father was also found to be significantly and positively associated with adaptive behaviour of children ($\chi^2 =$ 8.581* and 12.801*, respectively).

Conclusion

Thus, it can be concluded that most of the children had moderately low level of adaptive functioning. Girls performed better than boys on communication and daily living skills domains. Boys showed more maladaptive behaviour as compared to girls. Socio-economic factors such as education, occupation of parents and family income were significantly associated with adaptive behaviour of children. Results of the study indicate the need of educational intervention progroms which can improve the behaviour of children. Programs may be planned and implemented with the help of parents, school teachers and field functionaries of welfare agencies.

HARYANA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSTY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, A. (1982), *Psychological Testing* (5th ed.), New York : Macmillan.

Beery, K.E. & Buktenica, N.A. (1967), *Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration*, Chicago : Follett.

Cicchetti, D.V., & Sparrow, S. S. (1981b), Developing criteria for establishing the interrater reliability of specific items in a given inventory, *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 86, 127-137.

Cronbach, L. J. (1970), *Essentials of Psychological Testing* (3rd ed.), New York : Harper & Row.

Grossman H.J. (Ed.). (1983), *Classification in Mental Retardation*, Washington, DC.,

American Association on Mental Deficiency.

Jensen, A.R. (1980), *Bias in Mental Testing*, New York : The Free Press.

Kaufman, A.S., & Doppelt, J.E. (1976), Analysis of WISC-R standardization data in terms of the startification variables, *Child Dvelopment*, 47, 165-171.

Mercer, J.R., & Lewis, J.F. (1978), *Adaptive Behaviour Inventory for Children*, New York : The Psychological Corporation.

Reschly, D.J. (1982). Assessing mild mental retardation : The influence of adaptive behaviour, sociocultural status, and prospects for nonbiased assessment, In C.R. Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The Handbook of School Psycholgy* (pp.209-242), New York : Wiley.

Sattler, J.M. (1982), *Assessment of Children's Intelligence and Special Abilities* (2nd Ed.), Bosten : Allyn & Bacon.

Silverstein, A.B. (1971), Deviation social quotients for the Vineland Social Maturity Scale, *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 76, 348-351.

Sparrow, Sara, S., Balla. David. A. and Cicchetti. Domenic. V. 1984, *Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales*, American Guidance Service, Minnesota.