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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As stated by Bonney (1), the key idea behind sociometry is that within every formal organization there is an informal, spontaneous organization consisting of interpersonal attractions and repulsions. This unstructured organization greatly affects the ability of the formal organization to function properly, and plays a very significant role in the personal successes and failures of the group.

Acceptance by one's peers is a highly valued and sought after state, and whether acceptance is gained or not is a very important area in the development of a person's behavior. Many studies have stressed the importance of acceptance by one's peers. Especially in the classroom, once a child has a position, or several positions, a structure is formed. This structure becomes a dominant aspect of his school environment and of his total like situation. This position is important in determining his mental health, his motivations, and his ability to participate in classroom interaction. The evidence is clear that the interpersonal social structure of the classroom forms rapidly and maintains a high degree of stability throughout the school year. Children are making differentiations in their judgements of one
another, and the fact of being highly liked or being perceived as an expert are both highly significant paths to social influence in the socio-emotional structure of a group.

One study, dealing with a highly structured military unit, presented data on the problem of why some individuals were better liked and more accepted than others. The results were said to be related to any normal or real life group situation where a hierarchial arrangement of power, prestige, authority, and status exists (14). A person who had a positive attitude toward authority had a greater probability of receiving more positive sociometric nominations than a person who had a negative attitude toward authority. The more important positions an individual fulfilled, the greater the probability of his receiving more positive sociometric nominations than an individual who fulfilled fewer important positions.

The conclusions drawn from the data by Hilkevitch (12) indicated that there were significantly more complementary traits among boys who interact than there were common traits that were not complementary. Social interaction took place between boys who complemented each other in strength or weakness of personality. Communality of traits was also found in the intellectual sphere. So, people with similar levels of intellectual functioning are more likely to interact with each other, whether they are
sociometrically high or sociometrically low persons in the group. Reciprocal choice-behavior of girls was based more on similarity than on difference of attributes. The tendency on the part of the girls was to constrict or narrow their social fields, and this may be in keeping with cultural standards and serve as a defense mechanism in maintaining peer status. Therefore, the girls would be expected to display less interaction and less emotional expansiveness or feelings of need for others.

Several studies (1, 15, 18) have indicated that one very important reason for persons being attracted to other persons is that there is a fulfillment of some kind of need; so the persons who can acquire the most diversified capacities and abilities for meeting the needs of others should be the highly accepted persons. This point of view was supported by Murphy (18). In this study, the person of high choice status was characterized as being both friendly and aggressive. Murphy states that this point was due primarily to the fact that our culture emphasizes both cooperative and aggressive behavior. If persons are low in the abilities to fulfill the needs of others, then they are at a disadvantage in regard to gaining sociometric status in any group. Another very important factor in the sociometric status of a person is the perceived needs of the group of which he is a member. If the resources he has to offer are not the ones
perceived as being valuable to the group that he is functioning in, then his sociometric status will suffer.

According to Bonney, Hoblit, and Dreyer (4), a high choice status on any criterion was due not to great amounts of certain desirable traits, but to a more effective integration and use of a variety of traits which are appropriate to a particular kind of situation and which are in accord with the expectations or wishes of a fairly large proportion of the participants in that kind of situation. So, the sociometrically high pupils maintain the kinds of total personalities which enhance the self-conceptions of a relatively large number of other persons.

Goslin (10) also stated that social interaction was based on the accuracy of the participants' expectations about one another's behavior. According to him, a social system would be likely to fall apart if the expectations of the members were not correct most of the time, and the individual would find himself alienated from the system if he made very many mistakes in his guesses about how he was perceived by the others. Mead (16) pointed out that social interaction could take place among individuals who had developed the ability to distinguish between themselves and others and the ability to take the roles of the other in anticipating how the other individuals would react to them.

Several studies (6, 9, 19, 20) have shown that persons who exhibit good emotional adjustment and good mental health
are chosen more frequently on sociometric tests. And, persons perceive other persons whom they like best as more similar to themselves than others whom they like less.

These studies have emphasized the importance of certain areas of development which a person must function well in if he is to achieve high sociometric status in his particular group. As stressed, acceptance by one's peers was found to be an extremely important factor in the mental health of an individual.

Purpose of the Present Study

This study was designed to contrast the differences between sociometrically high and sociometrically low individuals, in regard to nine selected variables which were considered to differentiate between these individuals. These variables were (1) emotional expansiveness, (2) attitude toward school, (3) intelligence (I.Q.) scores, (4) standardized achievement test scores, (5) height and weight, (6) family size, (7) sex distribution, (8) social roles that highs were perceived as fulfilling, (9) occupations of the fathers of the sociometrically high and low pupils.

Related Literature

One of the early investigations by Bonney (3) showed the fact that there was a considerable overlapping on the upper end of the I.Q. ranges for the groups considered, but very little at the lower ends of the I.Q. ranges. The
persons who had high I.Q.'s were found in both the socio-
metrically high and sociometrically low groups studied, but
persons with low I.Q.'s were rarely found in the high socio-
metric groups. Several other studies (8, 13, 17) have
stressed the importance of having high intellectual abili-
ties in regard to being high in the sociometric structure
of a group.

It was hypothesized that the sociometrically high
pupils would have higher or more positive attitudes toward
school than the sociometrically low pupils. In a study re-
lated to this, Cheong (5) disclosed an interesting point.
The degree to which a teacher was perceived as being experi-
mentalistic was related positively to the pupils' attitudes
toward school. Experimentalism was defined as the prevailing
atmosphere that the teacher inspired in the classroom. This
type of teacher was one who was constantly trying to find new
and interesting ways to instruct her pupils, one that allowed
the pupils to take an active role in the affairs that affect-
ed the class, and one that was generally creative. Pupils
who perceived their teachers as this type of person had a
more positive attitude toward school. The perception of a
teacher, as being experimentalistic or not, by a pupil was
shown to have a positive or negative affect upon the atti-
tude this pupil had in regard to the whole school in gen-
eral. This may be of extreme importance in establishing a
good relationship between the pupil and the school.
Studies by Bonney (2) and Hardy (11) have shown that family size has very little relationship to the personal-social adjustment of pupils. Pupils who were only children through pupils who were members of large families were found to have good personal-social adjustments in school, and pupils with good personal-social adjustment were usually high in sociometric status. Without good personal-social adjustments, pupils cannot relate well with others and therefore they cannot establish stable relationships, which are required of sociometrically high pupils. But there was a general trend indicating that sociometrically high pupils were usually members of families of two or three children, and rarely were sociometrically high pupils members of families of six or more children. This finding did not hold true for the sociometrically low pupils; they were found to be members of families of various sizes, but generally they were members of families of larger size (more than two or three) than were the sociometrically high pupils.

Dimock's study (7) added validity to the assumption that body size was related to sociometric status. His study was restricted to boys only. He found that boys with superior body builds were generally higher in sociometric status than boys of inferior body structures. The boys with inferior structures were characterized as having more unreciprocated friendship choices and as being more unrealistic in their appraisal of the attitudes of others.
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Pupils of low sociometric status will exhibit more emotional expansiveness than pupils of high sociometric status.

2. Pupils of high sociometric status will have significantly higher attitudes toward school than pupils of low sociometric status.

3. Sociometrically high pupils will have higher average I.Q. scores than sociometrically low pupils.

4. Sociometrically high pupils will make better scores on standardized achievement tests than sociometrically low pupils.

5. There will be a difference, in a positive direction, between the average heights and weights of the sociometrically high and the sociometrically low pupils.

6. Sociometrically high pupils will be members of smaller families than sociometrically low pupils.

7. There will be more boys in the high sociometric group, and more girls in the low sociometric group.

In addition to the following hypotheses that were tested, two other relationships were observed but not subjected to statistical treatment. More specifically, the following relationships were noted:

1. The social roles, which involved making contributions to the group (especially in areas carrying prestige
in the classrooms), that the sociometrically high pupils were perceived as fulfilling.

2. The types of occupations that the fathers of the sociometrically high pupils performed as compared to the types of occupations that the fathers of the sociometrically low pupils performed in regard to difficulty and complexity of demands in human ability terms.
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CHAPTER II

METHODS

Subjects

This study was part of a larger study done by the Psychology Department of North Texas State University. Data for the larger investigation was collected on third grade pupils on three different occasions: September, 1967, January, 1968, and May, 1968. Some of the data in the present study was drawn from all three sampling occasions, but most of the data used was obtained from the January sample on the assumption that it would be highly representative of the pupils' status throughout the year.

The pupils used in the January testing consisted of forty-two third grade pupils. This sample of pupils was from a population of seventy-two third grade pupils enrolled in either one of two public schools, A or B, or one private school, C. The two public schools were located in a medium-size Texas city of approximately forty thousand, and the private school was located in a large Texas city. The forty-two third grade pupils were divided into two groups. One group, of twenty-one pupils, consisted of the sociometrically high pupils; the other group was composed of twenty-one sociometrically low pupils. There was no attempt to equate
these two groups on the basis of sex, because the distribution of sex was one of the variables investigated. The sociometrically high pupils were determined by the following method. The sociometrically high pupils had to be in the upper third of their respective class in three out of the four distributions employed. These four distributions consisted of the three sociometric questions of the Sociometric Questionnaire (see Appendix I) and the total score obtained upon the Social Roles Test (see Appendix III). The total score on the Social Roles Test was obtained by summing all of the nominations each person received on each of the eighteen roles described on this instrument. Therefore, to be classified as high a child had to be (1) in the upper third on all three sociometric questions, or (2) in the upper third on the social roles total scores and on at least two of the sociometric questions.

The sociometrically low pupils were the pupils who were in the lower third of the class, in regard to the number of nominations received, on at least three of the four distributions already discussed in relation with the sociometrically high pupils above.

This criterion, of three out of four distributions, seemed very adequate since the majority of the studies investigated in the area of this study used only one distributions as a criterion for determining the sociometrically high and low pupils.
Procedure and Measurements

Three measuring instruments were employed in this study: (1) a sociometric questionnaire, (2) an attitude toward school scale, and (3) a social roles test.

The sociometric questionnaire (see Appendix I) was administered to the third grade pupils on all three testings. The questionnaire consisted of three questions which were designed to measure different processes.

The first question was designed to measure the degree of admiration which the pupils had for each other. The results were interpreted as indicating the extent to which each pupil was perceived by his classmates as a person of power and prestige.

The second question was designed to measure the psyche-tele process within a group. The psyche-tele process was defined as the degree to which each pupil was perceived as a desirable person to be with in a situation that is strictly of a personal-social nature, requiring primarily personality assets and capacities to meet emotional and social needs (1). The criterion of play associate was used because it seemed to be the most appropriate criterion for the psyche-tele process within a school setting.

The third question was designed to measure the socio-tele process, or the process involved in the kind of attractions between individuals which are related to work-type objectives. It asked with whom you would like to work, because the person
who can exert influence and command respect is not always
the person desired as an associate to work with.

This study employed the data collected in the three
testings to determine the emotional expansiveness of the
sociometrically high and sociometrically low groups. The
term emotional expansiveness refers to the degree of social
outreaching, or feeling of need for others, as shown by the
number of choices given on the three sociometric questions.
Indiscriminate choosing was counteracted by suggesting that
probably four or five names under each question was enough,
but this was not effective in all cases. The emotional ex-
pansiveness of each group of sociometrically high and low
pupils was obtained by summing the total number of choices
given by the pupils in each group on the questionnaire.

The attitude toward school scale employed was the "North
Texas School Attitude Scale" (see Appendix II) developed by
Bonney. The items used in the scale were obtained from three
sources: (1) similar scales, (2) from direct observations of
school pupils, and (3) from papers written by 120 fifth and
sixth grade pupils in response to a form which asked them to
write out in their own words how they felt about any aspect
of their school experiences they wished to comment on, such
as classes, teachers, and rules. The scale was administered
in the May testing, and consisted of forty-seven items which
were responded to on the basis of Nearly Always, Sometimes,
Seldom, and Never. The average test-retest reliability, for
four classes on the fourth and fifth grade levels, over a one-week period, was .80. The data obtained from this scale was used in relation with the sociometrically high and low pupils of the January testing.

The school records furnished data on the I.Q.'s, scores on standardized achievement tests, and heights and weights of the sociometrically high and sociometrically low pupils. The I.Q. scores were obtained from either the appropriate Otis or California Test of Mental Maturity. The standardized achievement test scores were given in terms of median battery placement scores.

Data concerning the family size of the sociometrically high and sociometrically low pupils was obtained by the use of a form in which the pupil wrote this information. The family size was measured in regard to the number of siblings and did not include the parents. Siblings were included even if they were only half brothers and sisters. The ages of the siblings ranged from under one year to slightly over twenty-three years of age.

The sex distribution was determined by figuring the per cent of boys and the per cent of girls in each of the sociometrically high and sociometrically low groups of the three schools employed.

In regard to the two variables in which statistical treatment was not employed, the following procedures were used. The data obtained from the social roles test given
on the two testing dates (see Appendix III) of September, 1967, and January, 1968, was used. This social roles test was developed by Bonney and the laboratory school teachers of the North Texas State University Laboratory School and was designated as "How Pupils See Each Other." All the roles were related to things or activities done in the classroom, not to personality traits. All of the roles were stated in a positive manner and there were no unfavorable roles. The particular use of this instrument in the present study was to determine which roles were perceived as being "common" to sociometric highs. Several examples of these roles would be (1) Who is among the best in making an oral report before the class? (2) Who is among the best in acting out a play or dramatization? (3) Who is among the best in thinking out the answers to a problem in one of our school subjects (arithmetic, science, etc.) as given in a book or by the teacher?

Data concerning the father's occupation of the sociometrically high and sociometrically low pupils was obtained from the pupils by having them fill out a form in which they stated their father's occupation. The occupations were rated and assigned a "weighted score" on the basis of increasing difficulty and complexity of human abilities required by the method devised by Paterson, Gerken, and Hahn (3), which will be discussed in detail in the "Treatment" section of this chapter.
Treatment of Data

The total number of choices given on the sociometric questionnaire by the sociometric highs and the sociometric lows in each school were divided by the number of pupils in each group, respectively, yielding an average number of choices given by the highs and by the lows in each of the three schools (A, B, C) employed on the September and January testings. This treatment of the data produced a set of three averages of emotional expansiveness for the highs for September and three averages for the lows for September. The emotional expansiveness means of the highs and the emotional expansiveness means of the lows of the three schools were compared and a t test for unmatched groups was employed to determine if the two groups, in any of the three schools, differed significantly in regard to the number of choices given on the three sociometric questions of the sociometric questionnaire. The same procedure was employed, in regard to the January testing data in order to see if the highs and the lows differed significantly in their emotional expansiveness. Again the t test was used to determine if any of the differences were significant. The level of significance required in this study was the .05 level.

Scores on the North Texas School Attitude Scale were used to determine if sociometrically high pupils had a significantly higher or more positive attitude toward school than did the sociometrically low pupils. These scores were
totaled for each group (the highs and the lows), and were divided by the number of pupils in each group, respectively yielding an index of attitude toward school scores for the highs and the lows in each school. The mean scores of the highs were compared with the mean scores of the lows in each school respectively, and a $t$ test to determine the reliability of the difference between means of unmatched groups was applied.

The totals of the I.Q. scores for the sociometrically high and low groups (January testing) were obtained and were divided by the respected number of pupils in each group in each school, giving an average I.Q. score for the high and the low groups in each school. The averages of the sociometrically high pupils were then averaged, giving an overall I.Q. mean score for the highs. The same procedure was applied to the lows. Again the $t$ test for unmatched groups was used to determine if the difference between these two means was significant at the .05 level.

Totals of the median battery placement scores were obtained for the highs and the lows in each school using school records as described previously. These totals were divided by the number of pupils in each group in each school in order to give an average placement score for the highs and the lows in each school. The means of the average scores of the highs and the lows, from the three schools combined, was obtained. The $t$ test for unmatched groups was employed.
The total weight, in pounds, and the total height, in inches, were obtained for the sociometrically high and low groups in each school by summing the weights and the heights of the pupils in each group. In each school, an average weight and an average height was determined for each group. The means of the highs and the means of the lows, on both of these variables, were averaged giving an over-all average weight and an over-all average height. A t test, for unmatched groups, was used to determine if these over-all average weights and heights differed significantly at the .05 level.

From the data acquired about family size for the January highs and lows, an over-all average number of siblings for the highs and an over-all average number of siblings for the lows were determined. This data was subjected to a t test (for unmatched groups) to see if it differed significantly.

The per cent of boys and the per cent of girls in each of the sociometrically high and low groups in the third grades of the three schools involved for all three testings were determined. The per cents were averaged, giving a comprehensive mean per cent of the boys and of the girls in the high and low groups. The over-all per cents of the boys in the high and low groups were compared with the over-all per cents of the girls in these two groups to determine if the per cents of boys and girls differed significantly. The
formula for the significant difference between per cents was applied.

From the social roles data, a list of roles considered to be strongly characteristic of sociometrically high pupils was determined by the following method:

First, a child was considered to be characterized by a particular role if he received nominations for the role from twenty per cent or more of his classmates. The twenty per cent figure was taken as a criterion of being noticed in a group for a particular role because this has been found to be an appropriate proportion for this purpose from extensive studies conducted on classroom groups in California, as reported by Lambert and Bower (2). All of the highs in all three grades received twenty per cent or more nominations for numerous roles. However, a role was not considered to be a strong characteristic of the highs as a group unless at least one third of them received nominations for it.

There was not a single role for which one third of any low group received nominations for at the twenty per cent level. This negative result makes the findings for the highs more distinctive and differentiating.

After the above results for the highs were obtained a further, more restrictive criterion was applied. Since there were four classes in each of the three schools there were twelve classes included in each of the September and January testings. A role was not listed as strongly characteristic
of the highs unless it met the criteria described above in six out of the twelve classes in each testing.

For example, if a social role, such as "Thinking out the answers to problems in a school subject," was found to be listed among the social roles given to the highs (at the twenty per cent level) and this role occurred in one-third of the sociometrically high pupils studied in each of the grades investigated (third through six) for the three schools concerned, then that role was considered as a social role common to highs. If in the twelve classes involved (four grades, three schools), the social role "Think Out" was found to be listed as common in six out of these twelve classes, then it was considered as a role characteristic to highs on the particular testing involved. Since two testings were involved, the social role "Think Out" had to be listed as common to the highs on both testings before it could be considered as strongly characteristic of sociometrically high pupils.

As mentioned in Chapter I, no statistical technique was applied to the data collected in regard to the social roles, since no testable hypothesis was formulated to the relationship between sociometric states and precise social roles.

The occupations of the fathers of the pupils in the high and low groups were assigned a "weighted score" using the procedure devised by Paterson, Gerken, and Hahn (3). Their procedure involved listing occupations in an order of increasing difficulty and complexity of the human abilities
required in regard to ability patterns which covered seven abilities. These abilities are as follows:

1. Academic ability—the ability to understand and manage ideas and symbols.

2. Mechanical ability—the ability to manipulate concrete objects and the ability to deal mentally with mechanical movements.

3. Social intelligence—the ability to understand and manage people.

4. Clerical ability—the ability to do rapidly and accurately detailed work such as checking, proofreading, recording, and similar activities.

5. Musical talent—the capacity to sense sounds, to image these sounds in reproductive and creative imagination, to be aroused by them emotionally, to be capable of sustained thinking in terms of these experiences, and, ordinarily, to give some form of expression in musical performance or in creative music.

6. Artistic ability—the capacity to create forms of artistic merit and the capacity to recognize the comparative merits of forms already created.

7. Physical agility—the ability to control bodily movements by use of large and small muscle groups usually involving an element of gross strength in such a way that bodily movements are closely synchronized, efficient, and rapid.
In the sample of 432 occupations with which Paterson, Gerken, and Hahn were working, the range of weighted scores assigned to the various occupational patterns was from seven to twenty-one. The higher the score an occupation received, the more it required in the terms of human abilities.

An average of the weighted scores for the occupations of the fathers of the sociometrically high and low pupils in each third grade class in each of the three schools for the January testing was determined. Then, the means of the highs and the means of the lows were averaged, respectively, giving an over-all average fathers' occupational weighted score for each group. Again, no statistical procedure was employed in regard to this data, since it was studied only on a descriptive analysis basis without a hypothesis to test.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS

As mentioned previously in Chapter II, an aspect of sociometric data is the extent to which subjects choose each other. The greater the number of choices given, the more the group members show emotional expansiveness toward each other. This aspect can be measured only when no limit is placed on the number of choices each subject is to give. In this research no exact limit was placed on the choice process but a suggestion was stated in the directions that probably each one would not want to give more than four or five choices in response to any one question.

In this study the focus on emotional expansiveness bears on the questions: Are those who are low in choice status in an elementary school class less out-reaching in their relations with others than are those who are high in choice status? Could their low status be partly a function of their lower responsiveness to others; or on the other hand, do they tend to protect themselves against their perceived low status by excessive generosity in choosing? It is the latter alternative which is hypothesized in this research.
In accumulating the data bearing on the questions stated above each choice was counted as one score even when, as in some instances, the same child's name was listed under more than one sociometric question. This was necessary to measure the full range of the choice process. The existence of differences in emotional expansiveness was shown in the present data by the range in choices given. For example, in one group the range of choices given by a particular child on all three questions combined was from three to fifteen, and in another class from five to fourteen.

The following tables give the data on means of number of choices given in the three third grade classes under study:

**TABLE I**

**MEANS FOR NUMBER OF CHOICES GIVEN BY THREE THIRD GRADE CLASSES IN SEPTEMBER TESTING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean for Highs</th>
<th>Mean for Lows</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1.5416</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>0.5387</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.6123</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the above data that there are no reliable differences between the highs and the lows in their emotional expansiveness toward their classmates.
TABLE II
MEANS FOR NUMBER OF CHOICES GIVEN BY
THREE THIRD GRADE CLASSES IN
JANUARY TESTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Means for H highs</th>
<th>Means for L lows</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>0.2313</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>1.8653</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining all the results in Tables I and II, it is evident that those pupils who were least desired as associates could not be said to be so because they were less eager to associate with others. From a psychological standpoint, this fact may be considered desirable since willingness to relate to others is generally a positive condition for interpersonal improvement. The hypothesis stating that the sociometrically low pupils would exhibit more emotional expansiveness than the sociometrically high pupils, at a significant level, was not supported.

As noted in Chapter II, a t test of the significance of the difference between the means of two unmatched groups was used to test the hypothesis that pupils of high sociometric status will have significantly higher attitudes toward school than pupils of low sociometric status. As shown in Table III, there were no statistically reliable differences
between the sociometrically high and the sociometrically low pupils in regard to their attitudes toward school.

**TABLE III**

*MEANS, df, t, AND P OF ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL SCALE OF SOCIOMETRICALLY HIGH AND SOCIOMETRICALLY LOW THIRD GRADE PUPILS FOR JANUARY*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N Higns</th>
<th>N Lows</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Means of Higns</th>
<th>Means of Lows</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>125.3</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>0.0352</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>119.9</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>0.9587</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>0.9872</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table III, it is evident that the two public schools, A and B, has a higher average attitude toward school than the private school, C. This was the case in both the high and the low groups. Even more impressive was the fact that the low groups of the two public schools had an average attitude toward school that was higher than the average attitude toward school held by the high group of the private school. This clearly indicates that the atmosphere of the two public schools (in this study) breeds a more positive attitude toward school that the atmosphere of the private school in this study.

Hypothesis III stated that the sociometrically high pupils would have, on the average, a higher mean I.Q. score
than the sociometrically low pupils. This hypothesis was confirmed as revealed in the following table.

**TABLE IV**

**TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN I.Q. MEANS OF SOCIOMETRICALLY HIGH AND SOCIOMETRICALLY LOW THIRD GRADE PUPILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>I.Q. Means</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highs Lows</td>
<td>Highs Lows</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Q. Means</td>
<td>18 15</td>
<td>118 102</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The I.Q.'s were not available on all of the high and low pupils of the January testing. This was due to incomplete school records, and nothing in this study could be done about this inconsistency. It should be noted that the difference between the mean I.Q.'s of the highs and the lows was a total of sixteen points. This was a very significant finding, and reveals the point that the highs have more intellectual ability than the lows.

Previous studies have shown that persons with high I.Q.'s can be found at all levels of sociometric status; but, that people with low I.Q.'s are not so well distributed, especially at the upper end of the sociometric scale (1, 2). I.Q. has been found to correlate at about .30 with sociometric status (3). So, having a high I.Q. is generally considered as a positive factor in regard to obtaining sociometric status, but it is by no means a guarantee.
Another variable, which is closely related to I.Q., is the score obtained on standardized achievement measures. It was hypothesized that the sociometrically high pupils would, on the average, make better scores on standardized achievement tests than the sociometrically low pupils. This hypothesis was confirmed and the results are as shown in the following table.

TABLE V

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEDIAN BATTERY PLACEMENTS OF SOCIOMETRICALLY HIGH AND LOW THIRD GRADE PUPILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N Highs</th>
<th>N Lows</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Median Battery Placements Highs</th>
<th>Median Battery Placements Lows</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Battery Placements</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.895</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Studies have shown that pupils who achieve well in school are accepted to a larger degree than pupils who are under-achievers (4). This follows the general conception that popular and prestigious people are people who are acheivers, not people that sit passively on the sideline.

Some studies have insisted that body types were related to the manner in which a person was perceived (5). The well developed, healthy type of body built was said to characterize the extrovertive type of person, and this type of person was hypothesized as being well-liked, popular, and
high in sociometric choice status. The hypothesis stated that there was a significant difference in the heights and weights of the sociometrically high and low pupils was not confirmed. It was stated that the sociometrically high pupils would, on the average, weigh more and be taller than the sociometrically low pupils. The difference between the average heights of the sociometrically high pupils and the sociometrically low pupils for the January testing, was only twenty-two hundredths of an inch, while the difference between the weights was 6.65 pounds. Neither of these differences was found to be significant at the .05 level, when subjected to the t test for the reliability of difference between means of unmatched groups, as shown by the following table.

TABLE VI
MEAN WEIGHTS, MEAN HEIGHTS, df, t, AND P OF SOCIOMETRICALLY HIGH AND LOW THIRD GRADE PUPILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Pupils</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Highs</th>
<th>Lows</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highs Lows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (inches)</td>
<td>18 17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52.67</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>0.0265</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (pounds)</td>
<td>21 20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>56.99</td>
<td>1.8343</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted that, as in the case involving the I.Q.'s, the data concerning the height and weight of all of the forty-two pupils comprising the high and low groups was not available from the school records. This was a variable that could not be controlled in the present study.

It was hypothesized that the sociometrically high pupils would be members of smaller families, in regard to the number of siblings, than the sociometrically low pupils. It was mentioned in Chapter I that the sociometrically high pupils generally came from families of two to three siblings, and generally not from families of six or more siblings. One of the purposes of this present study was to determine if the sociometrically high pupils were members of smaller families than the sociometrically low pupils. The average number of siblings, for the highs as a group, was found to be 1.73, while the average number of siblings, for the lows as a group, was found to be 2.49. The highs, in this study, did come from families that were composed of two to three children, generally. No sociometric high pupil (using January data) came from a family that was composed of six or more children, but several were "only" children—a condition which seemed to have no negative effect upon sociometric status. The lows came from families ranging from one to six children, with the mean family size being three to four children. Therefore, the lows did generally come from larger families than the highs.
A *t* test, for the reliability of the difference between the means of unmatched groups, was run to see if the average number of siblings for the two groups (highs, 1.73; lows, 2.49) differed significantly. The results of the *t* test showed that the two means did not differ significantly (see Table VII).

### TABLE VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N Highs</th>
<th>N Lows</th>
<th>df</th>
<th><em>t</em></th>
<th><em>P</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Siblings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding added support to the conclusions drawn in another study (6) in regard to the small importance that family size has in relation to sociometric status of pupils.

The distribution of boys and girls in the sociometrically high and low groups, as found in this study, added some support to the results found in another study (1). The per cent of boys in the sociometrically high groups, for January, was higher than the per cents of girls and the sociometrically low groups were even more marked. The per cents of the girls in the sociometrically low groups was higher than the per cents of the boys in all three of the schools studied. The finding, in reference to the
generally larger percentage of boys in the upper brackets of social prestige, was particularly interesting in view of the usually more accelerated maturity of girls at this age (third grade, ages eight and nine).

The following tables give the per cents of boys in the high groups and the per cents of girls in the low groups. These per cents were treated statistically by the formula for the significant difference between per cents.

**TABLE VIII**

**PER CENT OF BOYS IN HIGH GROUPS FOR THREE SCHOOLS FOR JANUARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Per Cent of Boys</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.040</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.864</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the above table, only in one class is the difference between the per cents of boys and girls significant.

**TABLE IX**

**PER CENT OF GIRLS IN LOW GROUPS FOR THREE SCHOOLS FOR JANUARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Per Cent of Girls</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.407</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.681</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, in only one class out of three was the per cent found to be significant. Hypothesis VII cannot be confirmed, because of the inconsistent results found among the three schools. But it can be partially supported because there was more boys in the sociometrically high groups in two out of the three schools studied, and one of these was found to be significant at the .01 level (school A). The hypothesis also gained support from the data on the per cent of girls in the low groups in the three schools. There was a higher per cent of girls in all of the low groups studied, and one group (school C) had a per cent that was significant at the .001 level.

Another pertinent question in reference to sociometric data bears on the kind of personal-social attributes which characterize those who are highly chosen. Some writers think that these socially desirable individuals are primarily characterized by superficial qualities, that they are eager to please others, and are lacking in basic character. Occasionally they may be thought of as "social butterflies" and may be played down as "merely popular."

To throw some light on these issues the data from the Social Roles measurement obtained in grades three, four, five, and six in all three schools was related to the highs and the lows. This was done in a series of steps, which were described in Chapter II. Briefly, a child was considered to be characterized by a particular role if he received nominations
for the role from twenty per cent of his classmates. But, a role was not considered as characteristic of the highs, as a group, unless at least one-third of them received nominations for it at the twenty per cent level.

There were no social roles, out of the entire eighteen employed, for which one-third of any low group received nominations at the twenty per cent level. This finding, of negative results in regard to the lows, makes all the differences to be reported between the highs and the lows more distinctive and differentiating.

After the above results, considering the highs, were found, the following procedure was followed. Since there were three schools containing four classes, there were twelve classes included in each of the September and January testings. A social role was not listed as strongly characteristic of the highs unless it met the criteria described above in six out of the twelve classes.

In the September testing there were five roles on which one-third or more of the highs received nominations from twenty per cent or more of their classmates in six or more of the twelve classes. They are as follows:

1. Among the best in giving oral reports
2. Among the best in acting in a play or dramatization
3. Most likely to offer good suggestions during a class discussion in social studies or some other subject
4. Among the best in making posters or other kinds of art exhibits
5. Among the best in thinking out the answers to a problem in one of our school subjects (arithmetic, science, etc.) as given in a book or by a teacher.
Obviously these kinds of activities are not the ones in which "social butterflies" are expected to excel. Instead, they demand very solid abilities.

In the January testing there were eight roles for which one-third of the highs received nominations from twenty percent or more of their classmates in at least six of the twelve classes. Five of these were the same as those on the September list. The three additional ones were the following:

1. Most likely to do or say something which helps the group settle some kind of difficulty on the playground or in the halls
2. Among the best in writing stories which are interesting to the rest of the class
3. Most likely to offer to share materials when needed by other children

Since five of the roles as stated above, met the criteria on both the September and January testings, these roles were considered to be the most strongly characteristic classroom roles for the highs in this study. The one role which met the criteria in eleven out of the twelve classes in January was the number five listed in the September group bearing on thinking out solutions to academic problems. This finding emphasizes how much the highly chosen children on the three sociometric questions were also highly regarded as good thinkers on academic topics. The next highest one (nine out of twelve classes) was "being good in making oral reports." Again it is evident that children in this study who were most desired for interpersonal associations were also among the most admired for genuine abilities and for capacities to make contributions to their respective groups.
As stated in Chapter II, no hypothesis was made as to which social roles would be considered as highly characteristic of the sociometrically high pupils. Therefore, this data was not treated statistically, because this variable was observed largely on an exploratory basis—attempting to discover which social roles were strongly characteristic of the highs.

The occupations of the fathers of the sociometrically high and low pupils were observed on a superficial basis and no statistical treatment was applied to the findings. These occupations were rated in regard to the difficulty and complexity of the job demands in human ability terms, by the method devised by Paterson, Gerken, and Hahn as described in Chapter II. It was the general conclusion that the fathers of the sociometrically high pupils would have, on the average, a higher occupational rating than the fathers of the lows. The average weighted scores for the fathers of the highs and the lows are given below.

TABLE X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Group</th>
<th>Average Weighted Scores of Father's Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highs</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lows</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was only seven tenths of one weighted score between the fathers of the sociometrically high pupils
and the fathers of the sociometrically low pupils. The general conclusion of this study was not supported.

It was concluded that it was not the complexity of the occupational background from which a pupil came that was important, in regard to his or her sociometric status. Again, the major factor seemed to be the personality traits of the individual and that individual's ability to fulfill the needs of others, whatever they may be.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This present study disclosed that sociometrically low pupils, in the two public schools and the one private school employed, were not more emotionally expansive than pupils of high sociometric status. This results did not support the hypothesis stated in this study, and was in disagreement with the results of studies conducted by Bonney.

The sociometrically high pupils did not exhibit the expected higher attitude toward school than the sociometrically low pupils. There was a higher attitude toward school score given by one of the public schools (B) and the private school (C), by the highs. But these scores were not statistically significantly higher than the scores given by the lows in these two schools. Obviously, some pupils who are very successful with their peers are not very high in their positive feelings toward their school.

A highly statistically significant difference was found in regard to the I.Q.'s and the scores on the standardized achievement tests between the highs and the lows. In both cases the highs were clearly superior. These results supported hypotheses III and IV of this study. The sociometrically high group had a mean I.Q. that was sixteen points greater than the sociometrically low group. This reflects
the social advantage of bright pupils in an academic situation. And the highs had a standardized achievement test score average that was one grade placement higher than that obtained by the lows.

The highs were not found to be more superior in height and weight, as compared to the lows. The highs did have an average weight, as a group, that was nearly seven pounds more than the lows, but this was not statistically significant. The difference in height was nearly nil.

The average number of siblings of the highs and lows did not differ significantly either. The highs were members of smaller families, on the average, than were the lows; but, the difference between the mean family size of the two groups was not large enough to be statistically significant in order to support the hypothesis of this study.

The sex distribution of the sociometrically high and low groups was in agreement with results found in other studies. There was a higher percentage of boys than girls in two out of three of the schools studied. But only one of these per cents was significant at the .05 level. The percent of girls in the low groups, of the three schools, was even more marked. There was a higher per cent of girls in all three groups, but again, only one of these per cents was statistically significant. The hypothesis dealing with this variable was therefore only partially supported, indicating that additional investigations in this area are needed.
The implication that the sociometrically high pupils were perceived as filling certain roles of social and academic significance in the structure of the classroom was supported. This study showed that there were five social roles which were strongly characteristic of the sociometrically high pupils involved in the September and January testings.

In regard to the weighted scores of the fathers' occupations, the difference between the mean weighted scores of the fathers' occupations of the sociometrically high group and the sociometrically low group was so small that no conclusions could be drawn in favor of the assumption that the highs' fathers would be men who performed demanding jobs or jobs which required more in terms of difficulty and complexity of demands in human ability terms.

Implications

Several practical implications can be drawn from this present study. One is that the sociometrically high pupils can be expected to be pupils who are in the upper portion of their respective class in regard to I.Q.'s and standardized achievement test scores. Another is the conclusion that the highs will consist of a greater per cent of boys than girls, and that there is an even better probability that the lows will consist of a greater per cent of girls.

The findings of this investigation show that certain factors are generally unimportant in determining which pupils
will be sociometric highs and which will be sociometric lows. These factors are family size, height and weight, and the occupation of the pupil's father. All of these factors were found to be irrelevant in discriminating between the highs and the lows.

Although the full significance of the relationship between sociometric status and attitude toward school was not revealed by the present study, there is the general implication that the highs do not have a significantly higher or better attitude toward school than the lows, as measured by the North Texas School Attitude Scale.

It seems evident, from the present study, that emotional expansiveness or the "social-outreaching" for others does not characterize the sociometrically low groups more than the highs, as was hypothesized at the beginning of the study.

The general observation to the effect that the sociometrically high pupils would be perceived as fulfilling roles which indicate significant contributions to the classroom groups in making oral reports, aiding in the solution of social and academic problems in the classroom, etc., was confirmed.
APPENDIX I

SOCIOMETRIC TEST

How We See Other Children

Directions: Please give the names asked for in three questions below so your teacher can better understand this class and help everyone in it to profit from being in this group.

You may put the same names under more than one of the questions if you wish, but you will probably want to name some new ones under each of the three questions. Be sure to put the last names of pupils who have the same first names.

1. Which pupils in this class do you believe are the best leaders—the ones who can get things done and who can influence others. You may list as many as you wish, but probably you will not want to list more than four or five.

2. Which other pupils in this class would you choose to be with you for a play group—one in which you play games and have fun. List as many as you wish, but you probably will not want to name more than four or five.
3. Which other pupils in this class would you choose to work with you on a committee or work project—one which requires that you obtain information and prepare a report to be given to your teacher, and possibly before your class. You may list as many as you wish, but you probably will not want to name more than four or five.
APPENDIX II

ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL SCALE

North Texas School Attitude Scale

Your Name ___________________________ Date __________________
Your Class ___________________________ School __________________

Directions: Please answer each of the questions below by putting a check mark (X) under one of the four headings given in the columns to the right of the questions.

These four columns are:

(1) Nearly Always or Most of the Time (2) Sometimes
(3) Seldom (4) Never

<p>| 1. During school hours, I would rather be in school than anywhere else. | 2. Whenever I find or make something which I think the other students and the teacher will like, I bring it to school. | 3. Whenever I make something like a booklet, or have a good test paper, I take it home. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nearly Always | Sometimes | Seldom | Never | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1 Nearly Always</th>
<th>2 Sometimes</th>
<th>3 Seldom</th>
<th>4 Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. During play periods everyone has a fair chance to do well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My abilities are recognized and given fair place in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When a student does not like something in this school there is someone who will listen to him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When I see a way that I can help out another student I will try to do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I believe my school work is fairly judged or graded by my teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My teachers are eager for me to learn new things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My teachers expect me to do my best in all my school work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When a problem comes up in our school groups we discuss with the teacher how best to deal with it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I like to go to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel free to ask my teachers anything I want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearly Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I get along O.K. with girls. (boys only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I get along O.K. with boys. (girls only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I am glad to see other students do well in their school work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I feel that my teachers like me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My parents are pleased with my school work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I feel that I am succeeding in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I like my teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I feel free to get up out of my seat without asking permission of the teacher, to talk to another child about school work, or to borrow a pencil, a book, or something.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Most other students that I know in this school like me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>In class discussions I raise my hand to volunteer information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I am encouraged to work on projects of special interest to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I feel free to speak out in class and tell other students what I think of things they have said or done (in regard to school work).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Most of the other students like to see me do well in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My teachers do all they can to help me understand what I am supposed to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Our required homework is about right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. When I break a school or group rule, spill or break something, I feel free to admit it to my teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. When I need to, I can work quietly in this class without being disturbed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I hope I can go to school for many more years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I am proud of my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I enjoy our play periods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My teachers understand how I feel about things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nearly Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I have sat near or worked with other students whom I wanted to be with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>A student in this class can be different from others in some ways and not be made fun of or avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>When a student annoys others, or interferes with what the group is trying to do, he is controlled or punished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>A student who has a sense of humor is really appreciated in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>A smart student who is very good in his school work is admired in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>In this classroom I have felt relaxed and at ease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>My class work is interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>The rules of this school are enforced with fairness for everyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>When it comes to being strict, the teacher of this class is about right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Nearly Always</td>
<td>2 Sometimes</td>
<td>3 Seldom</td>
<td>4 Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>There are plenty of books for our needs in the school library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I feel that what I am learning in school will be valuable to me in later life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I try hard to make a good record in all my school subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

SOCIAL ROLES TEST

How Pupils See Each Other

Your Name_________________ Your School_________________

Directions: By listing the names asked for in the blanks below you will help your teacher to better understand this class, so she can help each child gain the most from this year's work.

In the blanks under the questions below you may list the name of any child more than once if you wish, but probably you will want to think of some different names to put under the different questions. If you believe that no child fits a particular question you may leave the space blank.

In this class which children are:

1. Most likely to do or say something unusual or original.

2. Most likely to dare to be different in some ways from most of the group.

3. Most likely to do or say something which helps the group settle some kind of difficulty on the playground or in the halls.

4. Most likely to do or say something which helps settle a difficulty between two or more children in the classroom.
5. Among the best in making an oral report before the class.
6. Among the best in acting a part in a play or dramatization.
7. Most likely to do or say something to cheer up a group or introduce some kind of humor.
8. Among the best in making posters or other kinds of art exhibits.
9. Among the best in playing games during play periods or noon hours.
10. Among the best in writing stories which are interesting to the rest of the class.
11. Among the best in bringing to the class some form of musical enjoyment through singing, playing the piano, violin, horn, or other instrument.
12. Most likely to show some concern about the difficulties and failures of other children.
13. Most likely to show concern about the whole class doing well and being a "good class" in whatever is undertaken.
14. Most likely to offer good suggestions during a class discussion on a topic in social studies, language arts, or some other subject.
15. Among the best in being friendly with most other class members.
16. Most likely to offer to share school materials when needed by other children.

17. Most likely to have a good time and enjoy himself wherever he is.

18. Among the best in thinking out the answer to a problem in one of our school subjects (arithmetic, science, etc.) as given in a book or by the teacher.
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