

Construction and Validation of MESPA – Self Rating Scale (Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation Self Rating Scale)

*Shyny T. Y

*Ph.D (Psychology) Bharathiar University, Coimbatore
Corresponding Author: Shyny T. Y*

Abstract: NEO FFI are limited to a few studies because It is constructed to measure only 5 factors of personality like Neuroticism, , Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. But for advance study and research multidimensional factors of human beings should be measured. So there is a need for preparing new rating scale which can measure 5 aspects of human beings like Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation. This rating scale has a great significance in the study of correlating parenting styles with all these 5 dimensions of adolescents and also important in clinical and research settings with children suffering from poor self esteem , mental health disorders and personality problems .

Keywords: Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality, Achievement motivation

Date of Submission: 05-07-2017

Date of acceptance: 17-07-2017

INTRODUCTION

In the mid- to late-1990s, Costa and McCrae came to understand that some items on the NEO PI-R were outdated or too difficult for many test-takers to understand. Research also began to show that the NEO PI-R had the potential to be used with adolescents and children as young as 10. The possibility of using the NEO with young people led Costa and McCrae in 2002 to administer the NEO PI-R to over 1,900 high school students. The research identified 48 "problem" items that reflected either participant difficulties with item wording and/or low corrected item total correlations (CITCs). Alternative items were developed to replace the "problem" items; the revised instrument was administered to new samples. The NEO PI-R and a revised version of the instrument were administered to 500 adolescents, 635 adults, and 449 middle school age children (12-13 year old) For both the adolescent and adult sample, the item/facet correlations were higher for the revised version of the NEO than for NEO PI-R. In addition, the internal consistency, factor structure, and tests of convergent and discriminant validity suggested that the revised version could be used with middle school children. Of the original 48 "problem" items, 37 were improved in terms of clarity and/or CITC. In 2005, Costa and McCrae published the latest version of the NEO Inventories, NEO PI-3. The new version included revisions of 37 items. With the creation of the NEO PI-3, Costa and McCrae intended to make the inventory accessible to a wider portion of the population. The improved readability of the NEO PI-3 compared to the NEO PI-R allowed the newer measure to be used with younger populations and adults with lower educational levels. Additionally, with the replacement of the 37 items, the psychometric properties of the NEO PI-3 were slightly improved over the NEO PI-R. In addition to increasing the readability of the NEO PI, the NEO PI-3 added a glossary of less familiar terms to aid in administration. In this study NEOFFI with 60 item is used for the correlative study with MESPA self rating scale. NEOFFI is used to measure only five factors of personality . But newly constructed MESPA can measure five dimensions of a person like Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation.

I. Review Of Literature

The five most important dimensions of personality are conscientiousness, emotional stability, agreeableness, extraversion, and openness. The five-factor representation was originally described by Tupes and Christal (1961), on the basis of reanalysis of various data sets using bipolar variables constructed by Cattell (1951) and Goldbl 992). Cattell was the first to develop a method for improving the factor analytic pursuit of basic personality traits by commencing with a complete field of personality traits, called the trait sphere (Cattell

1951).). Psychometric Properties of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory Costa and McCrae's (1989, 1992) NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI), Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R), and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO FFI) were developed with the aim of assessing the five domains of the FFM: (1) neuroticism (N), the tendency to experience negative emotions and psychological distress in response to stressors; (2) extraversion (E), the degree of sociability, positive emotionality, and general activity; (3) openness to experience (O), levels of curiosity, independent judgment, and conservativeness; (4) agreeableness (A), altruistic, sympathetic, and cooperative tendencies; and (5) conscientiousness 1 Boston University, Boston, MA, USA Corresponding Author: Anthony J. Rosellini, Center for Anxiety and Related Disorders, Department of Psychology, Boston University, 648 Beacon Street, 6th Floor, Boston, MA 02215-2013, USA Email: ajrosell@bu.edu 28 Assessment 18(1) (C), one's level of self-control in planning and organization. The five domains are hypothesized to be relatively orthogonal to one another. The NEO inventories are composed of descriptive statements (e.g., "I am not a worrier," "I really enjoy talking to people") rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The NEO PI and PI-R consist of 180 and 240 items, respectively, and may be used to compute five domain (i.e., N, E, O, A, and C) and 30 facet (six sub factors for each of the five domains) scores. In contrast, the NEO FFI contains 60 items and may be used to derive only the five domain scores (12 items per domain). NEO FFI items were selected from the NEO PI items that demonstrated the strongest correlations with their respective domain factor score, regardless of the item's intended facet (i.e., the 30 NEO PI facets are not equally represented by NEO FFI items). Each of the five domains of the NEO FFI has been found to possess adequate internal consistency and temporal stability ($\alpha = .68$ to $.86$, Costa & McCrae, 1992; $r = .86$ to $.90$, Robins, Fraley, Roberts, & Trzesniewski, 2001). Despite favourable reliability estimates, principal component analysis (PCA), exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) examinations of the NEO FFI have produced mixed findings. For instance, Egan, Deary, and Austin (2000) evaluated the NEO FFI in a large nonclinical sample using PCA and EFA with varimax and oblique rotations. Although the anticipated five-factor structure was generally supported (i.e., the majority of items loaded adequately onto their expected factor), a handful of items were found to have (a) salient cross-loadings (e.g., items with loadings $\geq .30$ on more than one factor), and/or (b) non salient primary factor loadings (e.g., items with no loadings $\geq .30$). Such findings are consistent with prior PCA and EFA examinations of the NEO FFI in nonclinical samples (e.g., Holden & Fekken, 1994; Parker & Stumpf, 1998) and have served as a catalyst for studies attempting to resolve these undesirable results. For instance, McCrae and Costa (2004) responded to Egan et al. (2000) by evaluating each NEO FFI item and replacing those that consistently performed poorly in PCA and EFA. Weak items were identified by quantifying the extent of empirical support for each item with a thorough literature review (e.g., calculating how many studies found certain items to have loadings $< .30$). In total, 14 items were identified and replaced with other items from their respective NEO PI-R domain. Unfortunately, these revisions resulted in only trivial psychometric improvements, leading the authors to conclude that published version of NEO FFI was sufficient. Fewer studies have evaluated the NEO FFI with CFA. Although Egan et al. (2000) conducted a CFA to replicate the solution obtained with PCA/EFA, they did not report goodness-of-fit statistics. Studies that have considered CFA model fit have failed to support the conjectured latent structure of the NEO FFI. For instance, Schmitz, Hartkamp, Baldini, Rollnik, and Tress's (2001) CFA of the NEO FFI in a sample of German outpatients with psychosomatic complaints found that two-, four-, and five-factor models failed to result in adequate fit (e.g., goodness-of-fit index = $.82$ to $.84$, root mean square residual = $.12$ to $.16$). Moreover, CFA inter factor correlations failed to support hypotheses about the orthogonal nature of the NEO domains (e.g., N and E $r = -.46$). Marsh et al. (in press) recently obtained similar results using CFA in a large nonclinical sample (i.e., poor model fit, high inter factor correlations). Although CFA examinations of the NEO FFI are limited to a few studies, these findings are consistent with results obtained in CFA studies of the NEO PI and NEO PI-R (e.g., non significant factor loadings and poor goodness-of-fit statistics; Church & Burke, 1994; Parker, Bagby, & Summerfeldt, 1993). In addition to criticisms about the lack of psychometric support for the NEO FFI (e.g., Egan et al., 2000; Parker & Stumpf, 1998; Schmitz et al., 2001), such findings have led researchers to question the adequacy of CFA in the study of personality structure (see Aluja, Garcia, Garcia, & Seisdedos, 2005; Church & Burke, 1994; McCrae, Zonderman, Costa, Bond, & Paunonen, 1996; Parker et al., 1993; Vassend & Skrandal, 1997). For instance, McCrae et al. (1996) argued that "there is no theoretical reason why traits should not have meaningful loadings on three, four, or five factors" (p. 553). Likewise, others have hypothesized that the congeneric model used in CFA (i.e., specification of each indicator to load onto a single latent factor) is overly restrictive, as personality indicators are prone to have salient secondary loadings unless factors are defined by only a small number of nearly synonymous items (Church & Burke, 1994). Marsh et al. (2009) also discuss how CFA models that fix cross-loadings to zero may inflate NEO inter factor correlations to appear non orthogonal. Much of this discussion reflects a fundamental difference in how CFA and EFA attempt to obtain simple structure (i.e., the most interpretable solution). In EFA with two or more factors, factor rotation is needed to obtain simple structure because the factor-loading matrix is fully saturated (i.e., all indicators are freely

estimated). Conversely, factor rotation is unnecessary in CFA because simple structure is obtained by fixing most (if not all) item–factor cross-loadings to zero. Accordingly, the increased parsimony of CFA models (i.e., model over identification) allows for model specifications not possible in the EFA framework (e.g., freely estimating indicator error co-variances). Along these lines, a good-fitting measurement model is needed prior to examining structural (i.e., regressive) paths between latent variables, thus making CFA an important prelude to structural equation modelling. Exploratory structural equation modelling (ESEM) is a recently developed methodology that combines the techniques of EFA and CFA (see Asparouhov & Muthén, 2009). ESEM is unique in that it may be used to simultaneously examine EFA and CFA measurement models and generate parameter estimates according to either framework. For example, ESEM may be used to freely estimate the relationships between all observed and latent variables, implement orthogonal and oblique factor rotations, specify correlated errors, calculate standard errors and goodness-of-fit statistics, and regress endogenous latent variables on exogenous latent variables. The advancement of ESEM has allowed researchers to examine the properties of the NEO FFI in novel ways. Marsh et al. (in press) was the first study to use ESEM to evaluate the NEO FFI. The data were modeled with and without a priori specification of 57 correlated errors corresponding to NEO FFI item pairs derived from the same NEO PI facets (e.g., correlated error was specified between Items 1 and 21 because both load on the Anxiety facet of the N domain of the NEO PI). Although ESEM without correlated errors provided better model fit than CFA, fit statistics were still generally below prevailing standards of acceptable fit (e.g., Tucker–Lewis index [TLI] = .82; comparative fit index [CFI] = .85). In contrast, ESEM with correlated errors resulted in marginally acceptable fit (TLI = .89; CFI = .91; root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = .03), by far the most promising model fit ever obtained for the NEO FFI. ESEM also resulted in weaker inter factor correlations than CFA, which is more consistent with FFM theory (i.e., the five domains are hypothesized to be orthogonal). Although the goodness-of-fit statistics obtained from the ESEM models were modest relative to proposed “cutoffs” (e.g., TLI and CFI near or greater than .95; Hu & Bentler, 1999), others have contended that these guidelines may be overly restrictive (e.g., Beauducél & Whittmann, 2005; Marsh, Hau, & Grayson, 2005; Marsh, Hau, & Wen, 2004). In particular, Marsh et al. (2005) recommend that psychometric evaluations of longer questionnaires (e.g., 50 or more items, five or more factors) should not use model fit guidelines with excessive strictness. Moreover, Marsh et al. (in press) conclude that traditional CFA models are not appropriate for the NEO FFI and that ESEM should be used in its place to utilize the benefits of confirmatory models (e.g., adjustment for measurement error). Although the findings of Marsh et al.’s (in press) ESEM support the factor structure of the NEO FFI in normative samples. But no study has yet existed for measure Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation at a time..

II. Method

64 Participants in this study were of the adolescents between the age group of 12 to 18. Mean age of participants was 15. The gender of the participant was unequal. MESPA Self Rating scale with 45 items were employed here. Reliability for MESPA Self Rating scale is completed. Split half reliability and item analysis is find out by using participants of this study. Validity was examined through a comparison with the NEOFFI. 5 Personal aspects like Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation are embedded here in a random order. 1,4,10,14,19,24,28,32,37,41 are mental health items. 8,17,26,35,44 are items of emotional intelligence. 7,16,25,34,23 included under self esteem. 2,11,20,29,38 are personality extraversion items. 3,12,21,30,39 are personality openness items. 5,13,22,31,40 are personality agreeableness items. 6,15,23,33,42 are personality conscientiousness items. 9,18,27,36,45 are items of achievement motivation.

III. Research Hypothesis

1. There will be consistent personal dimensions across ages as reported by Parent subjects of adolescents with age group twelve, fifteen & eighteen.
2. There will be relatively high positive correlation between NEOFFI Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and MESPA Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness.
3. The Item analysis of Reliability Coefficient will be greater than .70 for the MESPA SELF RATING SCALE

IV. Results

Table 1

<i>Reliability-NEW</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
MESPA	0.990	45
<i>Reliability-OLD</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
NEOFFI	0.961	60

TABLE 1 shows reliability is .99 for the MESPA and .96 for NEOFFI. So we can say this newly constructed MESPA Self Rating Scale has very strong internal consistency.

Table-2 Means, Standard Deviation and F value for Age- NEOFFI

Variable	Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p value
Neurotic	12 years	22	24.82	15.09	0.018	0.982
	15 years	22	25.82	18.41		
	18 years	20	25.30	19.11		
Extraversion	12 years	22	38.36	20.96	0.150	0.861
	15 years	22	38.77	21.61		
	18 years	20	41.70	21.36		
Openness	12 years	22	35.36	21.05	0.340	0.713
	15 years	22	38.09	19.84		
	18 years	20	40.30	17.07		
Agreeableness	12 years	22	26.05	17.75	0.176	0.839
	15 years	22	27.27	18.69		
	18 years	20	24.15	14.42		
Conscientiousness	12 years	22	26.05	17.76	0.311	0.734
	15 years	22	27.36	18.51		
	18 years	20	23.30	13.98		

Table-3 Means, Standard Deviation and F value for Age-MESPA

Variable	Age	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p value
Mental health	12 years	22	16.55	11.04	0.210	0.811
	15 years	22	16.77	10.91		
	18 years	20	18.60	11.55		
Emotional intelligence	12 years	22	8.41	5.59	0.041	0.960
	15 years	22	8.50	5.71		
	18 years	20	8.90	6.36		
Self esteem	12 years	22	8.23	5.73	0.256	0.775
	15 years	22	8.77	5.55		
	18 years	20	9.45	5.30		
Extraversion	12 years	22	7.82	5.95	0.421	0.658
	15 years	22	8.59	5.76		
	18 years	20	9.45	5.52		
Openness	12 years	22	3.91	4.36	0.981	0.381
	15 years	22	5.41	5.50		
	18 years	20	3.45	4.35		
Agreeableness	12 years	22	3.86	5.05	0.721	0.490
	15 years	22	5.18	5.76		
	18 years	20	3.35	4.44		
Conscientiousness	12 years	22	8.27	5.58	0.261	0.771
	15 years	22	8.82	5.58		
	18 years	20	9.55	6.06		
Achievement motivation	12 years	22	16.59	12.04	0.020	0.980
	15 years	22	16.36	12.16		
	18 years	20	17.10	12.38		

In table 2 and table 3 Age group was considered to be the independent variable, which included three age groups as (a) 12 years; (b) 15 years; and (c) 18 year. The results of the ANOVA test depicted in Table 2 reveals that statistical value is greater than 0.05 for all the variables. So we conclude that the mean score of different variables does not differs with age.

Table-4

Correlation-TOTAL	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
MES-NEO	0.899	0.883	0.915	16.163	<0.001
Age = 12 years	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
MES-NEO	0.944	0.928	0.960	12.795	<0.001
Age = 15 years	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
MES-NEO	0.908	0.883	0.933	9.692	<0.001
Age = 18 years	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
MES-NEO	0.842	0.798	0.886	6.622	<0.001

A positive correlation exist for the variables of new and old scales as in these case the correlation coefficient has value greater than 0.5 and p value less than 0.05.

Table-5

Construction and Validation of Mespa – Self Rating Scale (Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self

The correlation between old and new –total data	Correlation coefficient	Lower r bound	Upper r bound	Z	p
Extraversion-Old and Extraversion-New	0.895*	0.878	0.912	15.799	<0.001
Openness-Old and Openness-New	0.486	0.422	0.550	4.379	<0.001
Agreeableness-Old and Agreeableness-New	0.896*	0.879	0.913	15.888	<0.001
Conscientiousness-Old and Conscientiousness-New	0.606*	0.553	0.659	5.999	<0.001

*Significant correlation

Pearson Correlation is used to identify the relationship between old and new questionnaires and the result is exhibited in. We can conclude that correlation is significant. Here Table 5 point out this significant correlation.

Table-6

Age = 12 years	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Extraversion-Old and Extraversion-New	0.906	0.880*	0.932	9.572	<0.001
Openness-Old and Openness-New	0.496	0.388	0.604	2.555	0.018
Agreeableness-Old and Agreeableness-New	0.833	0.789*	0.877	6.733	<0.001
Conscientiousness-Old and Conscientiousness-New	0.713	0.642*	0.784	4.548	<0.001
Age = 15 years	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Extraversion-Old and Extraversion-New	0.890	0.860*	0.920	8.729	<0.001
Openness-Old and Openness-New	0.558	0.459	0.657	3.007	0.006
Agreeableness-Old and Agreeableness-New	0.943	0.927*	0.959	12.672	<0.001
Conscientiousness-Old and Conscientiousness-New	0.680	0.603*	0.757	4.148	<0.001
Age = 18 years	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Extraversion-Old and Extraversion-New	0.894	0.864*	0.924	8.465	<0.001
Openness-Old and Openness-New	0.422	0.298	0.546	1.975	0.062
Agreeableness-Old and Agreeableness-New	0.918	0.894*	0.942	9.821	<0.001
Conscientiousness-Old and Conscientiousness-New	0.439	0.317	0.561	2.073	0.051

*Significant correlation

For all variables other than openness and agreeableness correlation coefficient is less than 0.5 and p value is less than 0.05. So we can say correlation is significant.

Table-7

<i>Variables</i>	<i>group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p value</i>
MES1	Low	16	0.81	0.40	21.706	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES2	Low	16	0.75	0.45	20.125	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES3	Low	16	0.44	0.51	20.006	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES4	Low	16	0.44	0.51	20.006	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES5	Low	16	0.00	0.00	11.662	<0.001
	High	16	2.31	0.79		
MES6	Low	16	0.00	0.00	13.024	<0.001
	High	16	2.63	0.81		
MES7	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES8	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES9	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES10	Low	16	0.31	0.48	22.456	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES11	Low	16	0.38	0.50	21.000	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES12	Low	16	0.38	0.50	21.000	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES13	Low	16	0.00	0.00	11.783	<0.001
	High	16	2.38	0.81		
MES14	Low	16	0.06	0.25	47.000	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES15	Low	16	0.00	0.00	12.247	<0.001
	High	16	2.50	0.82		
MES16	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
MES17	Low	16	0.44	0.51	20.006	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		

MES18	Low	16	0.44	0.51	-	20.006	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES19	Low	16	0.25	0.45	-	24.597	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES20	Low	16	0.13	0.34	-	33.669	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES21	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES22	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	12.247	<0.001
	High	16	2.50	0.82	-		
MES23	Low	16	0.06	0.25	-	6.504	<0.001
	High	16	1.81	1.05	-		
MES24	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES25	Low	16	0.25	0.45	-	24.597	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES26	Low	16	0.25	0.45	-	24.597	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES27	Low	16	0.38	0.50	-	21.000	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES28	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES29	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES30	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES31	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	15.267	<0.001
	High	16	2.69	0.70	-		
MES32	Low	16	0.13	0.34	-	33.669	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES33	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	13.693	<0.001
	High	16	2.50	0.73	-		
MES34	Low	16	0.13	0.34	-	33.669	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES35	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES36	Low	16	0.13	0.34	-	33.669	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES37	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES38	Low	16	0.19	0.40	-	27.908	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES39	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES40	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	11.825	<0.001
	High	16	2.13	0.72	-		
MES41	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES42	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	12.247	<0.001
	High	16	2.50	0.82	-		
MES43	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES44	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-		
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		
MES45	Low	16	0.06	0.25	-	47.000	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00	-		

Table 7 result revealed there is a strong validity for each items. P value is less than .05 ie; correlation is Significant at .001 level.

V. Discussion

The objective of this study is to design and construct a new measure MESPA to evaluate like Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation. Review of literature point out the use of the 5 personality dimensions instead of 5 personal dimensions. Adolescents at a particular age group of 2,15,18 is consider for the study. The 5 sub scales of the MESPA show high reliability and validity. The usual limitation of this study was small sample of 64 makes this a pilot study. Some other problem were difference in geographical areas like urban and rural. Another limitation was the Gender difference of the population.

VI. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to provide a five dimensional personal self rating scale to identify their Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation. This rating scale is also important in clinical and research settings with children suffering from poor self esteem, mental health disorders and personality problems. This study has great importance in academic field as well as job selection field to find out students with high achievement motivation, emotional intelligence and good personality. This research examines how these multi personal dimensions relate to adolescents of different age group 12, 15 and 18. MESPA RATING SCALE shows very high reliability and validity. Item analysis shows significant correlation with NEOFFI. So we can accept MESPA as a standard tool. MESPA is a valuable gift for teachers, parents, researchers, psychologists, counsellors and psychiatrists to study their students, children, clients and patients.

VII. References

- [1] Costa P.T, & McCrae, R.R. (1992), Normal Personality assessment in clinical practice : The NEO Personality Inventory, Psychological assessment, 4,5-13
- [2] Mangala,C.V. (2009) Adjustment of students to their Home Environment, Indian journal of Psychometry and Education, 41 (1&2), 1260-63
- [3] Mc Crae R.R., Costa P.T, Martin T.A (2005). “The NEO-PI 3: “The NEO – PI-3 : A more readable revised NEO Personality inventory”. Journal of Personality assessment 84(3) : 261-270.
- [4] McCrae, R.R; & Costa P.T (February 2004), “A contemplated revision of “A revision of the NEO Five factor Inventory”. Personality and Individual differences 36 (3) : 587-596. DOI : 10.1016/S0191-8869 (03) 00118-1.
- [5] Singh, T.et al. (2011) Inter active Influence of Adjustment and Gender on Academic Achievement. Psycholinguae, 41 (2), 318-325
- [6] Cohen, S., & Edwards, J. R. (in press). Personality characteristics as moderators of the relationship between stress and disorder. In R. W. J. Neufeld (Ed.), *Advances in the investigation of psychological stress*. New York: Wiley.
- [7] Ahmed, S. M. S., Valliant, P. M., & Swindle, D. (1985). Psychometric properties of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 61, 1235–1241.
- [8] Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and the well-being of children: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 26–46.
- [9] American Association of University Women. (1991). *Short changing girls, short changing America*. Washington, DC: Author.
- [10] Ammerman, M. S., & Fryrear, J. L. (1975). Photographic enhancement of children’s self-esteem. *Psychology in the Schools*, 12, 319–325.
- [11] Arnett, J. J. (1999). Adolescent storm and stress, reconsidered. *American Psychologist*, 54, 317– 326.
- [12] Bachman, J. G., Green, S., & Wirtanen, I. D. (1971). *Youth in transition: Vol. 2. Dropping out—Problem or symptom?* Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- [13] Bachman, J. G., & O’Malley, P. M. (1977). Self-esteem in young men: A longitudinal analysis of the impact of educational and occupational attainment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 365–380.
- [14] Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review*, 103, 5–33.
- [15] Cohen, S., & Hoberman, H. M. (1983). Positive events and social supports as buffers of life change stress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 13,99-125.
- [16] Cohen, S., & McKay, G. (1983). Social support, stress, and the buffering hypothesis: A theoretical analysis. In A. Baum, S. E. Taylor, & J. Singer (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology and health* (Vol. 4, pp. 253- 267).
- [17] Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Conway, M., & Ross, M. (1984). Getting what you want by revising what you had. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47,738- 748.
- [18] Ryan RM, and Deci EL (2001). On happiness and human potential: a review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166.
- [19] Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, Platt S, Joseph S, Weich S, Parkinson J, Secker S, and Stewart-Brown S (2007). The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): development and UK validation. *Health & Quality of Life Outcomes*, 5 (63), doi:10.1186/1477-7525-5-63.
- [20] Tennant R, Joseph S, and Stewart-Brown S (2007). The Affecto meter 2: a measure of positive mental health in UK populations. *Quality of Life Research*, 16 (4), 687-695.
- [21] Coyne, J. C., & Gottlieb, I. H. (1983). The role of cognition in depression: A critical appraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 472-505.
- [22] Crandall, V. J., Solomon, D., & Kelleway, R. (1955). Expectancy statements and decision times as functions of objective probabilities and reinforcement values. *Journal of Personality*, 24, 192-203.
- [23] Crary, W. G. (1966). Reactions to incongruent self-experiences. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*. 30, 246-252.
- [24] Crocker, J. (1982). Biased questions in judgment of covariation studies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8, 214-220.
- [25] Cutrona. C. E. (1982). Transition to college: Loneliness and the process of social adjustment. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy* (pp. 291- 309). New York: Wiley.
- [26] Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 261–271.
- [27] Anderman, E., & Maehr, M. L. (1994). Motivation and schooling in the middle grades. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 287–309.
- [28] Austin, J., & Vancouver, J. (1996). Goal constructs in psychology: Structure, process, and content. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 338–375.
- [29] Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman. Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum. Dweck, C., & Leggett, E. (1988). A social cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256–273.
- [30] Elliot, A. (1997). Integrating the “classic” and “contemporary” approaches to achievement motivation: A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. In M.L. Maehr & P.R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 10., pp. 143–179).
- [31] Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. Elliot, A., & Church, M. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 218–232.
- [32] Elliot, A., & Harackiewicz, J. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 968–980.

Construction and Validation of Mespa – Self Rating Scale (Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self

[32] Darley, J. M., & Fazio, R. H. (1980). Expectancy confirmation processes arising in the social interaction sequence. *American Psychologist*, 35, 867-881. deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York: Academic Press.

[33] Diener, C. I., & Dweck, C. S. (1978). An analysis of learned helplessness: Continuous changes in performance, strategy, and achievement cognitions following failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 451-462.

[34] Diener, C. I., & Dweck, C.S.(1980).An analysis of learned helplessness: II. The processing of success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 940-952.

[35] Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542-575.

[36] Duval, S., & Wicklund, R. A. (1972). *A theory of objective self-awareness*. New York: Academic Press.

[37] Dweck, C. S., & Licht, B. G. (1980). Learned helplessness and intellectual achievement. In M. E. P. Seligman & J. Garber (Eds.), *Human helplessness: Theory and applications* (pp. 197-222). New York: Academic Press

[38] . Eckland, B. K. (1968). Theories of mate selection. *Eugenics Quarterly*, 15, 71-84. Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.

[39] Feather, N. T. (1966). Effects of prior success and failure on expectations of success and subsequent performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 287-298.

[40] Feather, N. T. (1968). Change in confidence following success or failure as a predictor of subsequent performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 38-46.

[41] Feather, N. T. (1969). Attribution of responsibility and valence of success and failure in relation to initial confidence and task performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 13, 129-144.

[42] MESPA – SELF RATING SCALE

[43] (Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation Self Rating Scale)

MESPA – SELF RATING SCALE

(Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation Self Rating Scale)

By
SHYNY T. Y

Ph.D (Psychology)

Bharathiar University, Coimbatore

Name: Age: Sex: M/F.....

Instructions: Read each statement carefully and indicate your single response by putting a “tick” mark against it in an appropriate box

Sl No	Statements	Not true at all	Just a little true	Often true	Very much true
1	Anxiety and tension				
2	Laughing easily				
3	Trying new and foreign food				
4	Sad and depressed				
5	Courteous				
6	Keeping Surroundings clean and neat				
7	Feeling of confidence with many good qualities				
8	Knowing others from their non verbal messages like voice tone, facial expression etc.				
9	Enjoying Challenging tasks and competition				
10	Disturbed sleep				
11	Enjoying gatherings				
12	Fond of art and nature				
13	Co-operative				
14	Feeling of helplessness and need for others help				
15	Perform assigned task on time				
16	Ability to do things as others				
17	Experiencing others emotions just by looking their face.				
18	Starting new work just after finishing the present one.				
19	Feeling of inferior to others				
20	Active and cheerful				
21	Intellectual curiosity				
22	Thoughtful and considerate				
23	Working hard to achieve a goal in an orderly fashion.				
24	Feeling of loneliness and helplessness				
25	Feeling of self respect and proud				
26	Complimenting others and helping them for positive thinking.				
27	Doing things indifferent from others by using unique skills				
28	Digestive problem and acidity.				
29	Light hearted				
30	Abstract thinking				
31	Harmonious with family members and co-workers				
32	Asthma or other allergy problems.				

