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A review of the literature reveals a gross lack of well defined studies that can be put to effective use in the schoolrooms to promote social acceptability. This investigation is concerned with the formulation of such a study using the highly accepted individuals of a classroom as interaction partners with the socially isolated members in such a manner as to effectively increase the sociability of the isolated members.

This study has a three-fold purpose. The first is to develop a technique that can be implemented within the confines of a classroom by the classroom teacher without the need of professional consultants. The second is to demonstrate that the technique will effectively increase social acceptability for the isolated individuals. The third is to demonstrate that the highly accepted individuals can be used as therapeutic agents without the loss of social acceptability themselves.

The subjects were twenty-five second grade pupils, fourteen boys and eleven girls, attending the North Texas State University Laboratory School during the 1969-1970 school year. The subjects were given a sociometric test, devised by the author for the study, and then divided into four quartiles on the basis of choices received on the initial sociometric test.
Following a five-week period of pairing the high-high (socially accepted) and low-low (socially isolated) subjects, known as the interaction period, a second sociometric test was given. Pairs would undertake tasks whenever feasible, and each pairing would be recorded on a weekly data sheet which was collected by the experimenter every Friday.

Results suggest that directed interaction, as used in this study, is very effective in increasing social acceptability of socially isolated children. Moreover, there was not a significant decrease in social acceptability of the high-high individuals. This further suggests that this technique, if used properly, will benefit those individuals which need it, and at the same time, cause no detrimental effects to the individuals responsible for the increase in added social acceptance.

The results of this study suggests that this particular procedure for developing social acceptance is indeed an effective one. Since the procedure is not complex, it can certainly be used by classroom teachers not well versed in sociometric procedures as a way of aiding those individuals that lack social acceptability. Since there are very few well defined procedures that can be used to improve social acceptance, this method would appear to merit further investigation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Whenever people come together lines of association and interaction will form. These lines will be established in any group, voluntary or involuntary, opened or closed, and eventually each member will assume a role which he will tend to maintain for the remainder of that particular group's existence, unless some important changes in the group functioning are made.

Some members will be accepted; others will become group or subgroup leaders who will exert influence throughout the whole group structure. These members will consequently be happy and secure in the role that they have been selected to fill. However, there will be those members who will be rejected. They may be superficially accepted in an involuntary group situation, such as a school classroom, and they may appear to be content in their role. Yet, soon, many of the rejected members will feel insecure and frustrated in the role they occupy. Northway has summarized why the need exists for studies concerning isolated individuals. She states:

Because of the potential dangers isolated individuals hold for a democratic society and because of the effects isolation has on personality development, we have been concerned with studies of the children who are least acceptable to their age mates (19, p. 10).

Thus, the development of social acceptability, the
development of a mature and responsible outlook in coping with the "real" world, and the initiation of intellectual growth should be of utmost concern to all persons associated with any aspect of the educational processes of our youth. Indeed, it should be one of the primary goals of education to make individuals accepted by their associates in childhood as well as in adulthood (?). With an increase in social acceptability, research has suggested, not only is there likely to be scholastic and behavioral improvement but there is also a gain of self-confidence and a reduction of tension (19). Jennings has stated:

...when certain qualities have been pronounced and integrated in the personality expression of the individual (such a quality as relatively great freedom from self-concern, sufficient to enable him to be concerned with matters affecting many others than himself), there are likely to persist, for they reflect a high level of emotional growth and maturity and thus may be expected to act favorably upon his future relationship with persons in other sociogroups (14, p. 21).

Indeed, social acceptability, popularity, and social status have been the center of discussion and research for many decades. Using the techniques and principles of Moreno, "the father and promoter of sociometry in America" (5, p. 62), researchers have investigated the relationship of sociometric status with a multitude of other seemingly related and unrelated variables.

Perceived similarity seems to be one variable that is directly related to valuation. Davitz (9) reported that highest sociometric choices tend to be perceived as more similar to self than are lowest sociometric choices. Moreover,
Fiedler, Arrington, and Blaisdell (11), in their study of twenty-five fraternity men, concluded that members perceived fellow members liked best as more similar to their ideal-self than those they liked least. Bonney (1, 2) reported that perceived similarity between mutual friendship pairs was greater than non-reciprocal pairs although the difference was not significant. Similarly, Lindzey and Urdan (15) concluded that generally individuals who choose each other appeared to be more alike on personality measures than those individuals who rejected one another.

The question of whether a social hierarchy can be reshaped or reformed by the manipulation of membership freedom of association with preferred members is of vital importance. If the social hierarchy, once formed, cannot be manipulated, the only alternative to the question of social isolates or rejects would be physical removal of these individuals from the present social structure and placement of them in another group. This would not only require a vast amount of additional time and effort but would not insure the acceptance of an isolate in the new group. In fact, Moreno (17) has set forth the "law of the social atom" which in part states that there is a great possibility that social isolates will remain social isolates not only in their present group but may also remain social isolates in other groups and in the future as well. Moreover, Evan (10) cites Morgan as suggesting that children who are socially acceptable in one type of situation
will probably remain socially acceptable in other types of groups and situations, and they will probably remain socially acceptable when they become older.

Thus, one can conclude that social acceptability is a very important factor in personality development, not only in the great importance it has in the present, but principally, in the influence it may have in the future of an individual. Not only does social acceptability affect early socialization, which is of vital importance in learning how to get along with other individuals, but moreover, in the long run, it will affect socialization in the future which may have an even more important affect on the individual.

However, studies in group stability demonstrate that once the social hierarchy is formed and established, it is relatively stable and not subject to much change if there is no outside pressure or manipulation that will force the established hierarchy to reorganize. The little change that does occur has been described by Jennings as an "equilibrium in flux." She states:

The movement which takes place continually within it (hierarchy) are compensatory movements which do not disturb the total structure viewed as a totality—the total structure tends to retain its characteristics from one time to another even though the respective position of its carriers (the population) alter from time to time. Upward and downward shifts are bound to occur since interaction cannot be static (14, p. 23).

Witnicyl and Thompson (23), using four different sixth grade classrooms in three different schools, found stability
coefficients ranging from .60 to .90 after time intervals of one week and five weeks had elapsed from the time of the initial sociometric test. Similarly, Hunt and Solomon (13), studying the stability of a summer camp consisting of twenty-three boys, limiting one choice for the best-liked camper, obtained correlations between .70 and .95 for one-week intervals and between .42 and .84 for two-week intervals. Zeieny (24), using twenty-nine college students as his sample, obtained stability coefficients between .94 and .97 over a one-week interval between tests.

The consistency of stability coefficients seem to be maintained even after more extended periods of time have elapsed from the first test. Byrd (3), using twenty-seven fourth graders and unlimited number of choices for a classroom play, obtained a stability coefficient of .89 after a two-month interval. Northway (20) obtained correlation coefficients of .57 and .56 after time intervals of two and three months respectively, with a sample of thirty-six nursery school children having three choices each. Moreover, Bronfenbrenner (6), using a whole elementary school as a sample, obtained coefficients between .27, for the nursery school, and .59 for the fifth and sixth grade classroom, after a semester of class had elapsed from the initial test date. Newstetter, Feldstein, and Newcomb (18), using a population of sorority girls, reported stability coefficients ranging from .88, for a one-week time span, and .90 for a nine-week time span. Similarly, McIntyre
obtained a stability coefficient of .65 after a six-month period, using three-hundred-and-fifteen male college students as a sample. Using a population of four-hundred girls in a state reformatory, Jennings (14) obtained a reliability coefficient of .65, after an eight-month time span.

Other population samples have been studied that are not related to any educational setting such as an elementary school, high school, or college. Wherry and Fryer (22), using one-hundred-and-thirty-six Signal Corps Officer Candidates at Ft. Monmouth, N. J., obtained reliability coefficients of .75, after a one-month period, and .58, after a four-month time lapse. Similarly, in his study involving twelve companies of forty-two to fifty-four men each from the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, French (19) obtained stability coefficients between .46 and .66 after ten-week intervals between tests.

One of the longest time-span studies to date, however, is that of Bonney (3, 4). Studying the stability of sociometric status over a four-year period, he obtained stability coefficients ranging from .67 to .84 for one-year intervals between successive grade levels.

Thus investigators, using populations as different as nursery school children and officer candidates, have demonstrated that groups are relatively stable as far as the social structure is concerned. One can readily understand that the social isolate is thus condemned to remain a social isolate if manipulation from the outside does not occur.
Significance of Study

As previously stated (13), isolation presents a potential threat to the democratic society as well as causing detrimental effects on the isolates' personality development. Since freedom from self-concern will liberate individuals from the shackles of self-consciousness and awareness of unacceptability, the acceptance of all individuals within a social group is of the utmost importance. With acceptance, the individuals are then free to add to the potential growth and expansion of the group itself.

However, studies have demonstrated the relative stability of the social hierarchy, as just reviewed. Thus, it is of vital importance to develop techniques that can reorganize the social hierarchy in such a manner that it may become a better functioning organization and thus benefitting all of the group's members.

Since perceived similarity seems to be one of the variables that is directly related to peer acceptance (1, 2, 8, 10, 14), directed interaction of members of a particular group from the same socio-economic background may bring to surface similarities which were unknown due to lack of verbal interaction. Thus with surfaced similarities, the probability for increased social acceptance within the group should be greatly increased.
Hypotheses

From the knowledge gained in the studies just reviewed, the following hypotheses are stated for this study:

1. That some of the individuals classified as isolates in the initial pre-sociometric test will gain in social acceptance during the interaction period as measured by the post-sociometric test.

2. That some of the individuals classified as isolates in the initial pre-sociometric test will not gain, or lose, in social acceptance during the interaction period as measured by the post-sociometric test.

3. That some of the individuals classified as isolates in the initial pre-sociometric test will decrease in social acceptance during the interaction period as measured by the post-sociometric test.

4. That the mean score of the bottom sociometric quartile will significantly increase, in both socio- and psychogroup criteria, during the period of interaction.

5. That the mean score of the other three quartiles will not significantly increase or decrease, in either the socio- or psychogroup criterion, during the period of interaction.

6. That the stability coefficient obtained by comparing the first and initial sociometric test to the second and post-sociometric test will be lower than those obtained in previous studies.
Definition of Terms

Since the experimental design of this study called for the division of a classroom into four quartiles or quarters, a special nomenclature was required to designate each particular quartile. The following terminology was used:

1. High-high group was composed of the most popular individuals in the classroom and were the top twenty-five per cent choice receivers on the initial sociometric test.

2. Low-high group was composed of individuals in such a manner that twenty-five per cent of the individuals in the total classroom received more choices and fifty per cent received fewer choices on the initial sociometric test.

3. High-low group was composed of individuals in such a manner that fifty per cent of the individuals in the classroom received more choices and twenty-five per cent received fewer choices on the initial sociometric test.

4. Low-low group was composed of the least popular individuals, thus being the twenty-five per cent least accepted subjects in the classroom as measured on the initial sociometric test.
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CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

There has been a multitude of studies investigating the relationship of social acceptability to numerous other variables such as achievement, physical skills, academic skills, performance skills, age, I. Q., socio-economic status, proximity of living, creativity, and ratings on personality tests. A survey of the literature, however, reveals a gross lack of research directed solely at the formation of specific procedures that can be easily initiated and employed in an average classroom by the teacher. These procedures, if used correctly, may well be the factor influencing the reorganization of a group structure and thus, consequently, may help some of its members achieve very badly needed social acceptability. Very appropriately, Barclay has stated:

We need to know what specific procedure will bring about a change in behavior, rather than to know more about what variables are related to each other (3, p. 246).

Furthermore, Davis has suggested:

...there is little in the literature to indicate the techniques which are being used to increase the degree of social acceptance by the teachers in their classroom (6, p. 219).

It should be quite evident that relationships per se, although worthwhile information, will not be the driving force of the eventual acceptance of an isolate in our particular group.
In the long run, and maybe this should be stated in the short run as well, what is drastically needed are systematic steps that can be introduced in the classroom which may eventually be successful in developing social acceptance for a particular individual. Thus, researchers should start to approach the problem of isolation by investigating procedures that may lead to change rather than continuing the practice of having such a large proportion of the research directed at the identification of factors affecting classroom acceptability. What is needed are procedures that will initiate change in the present. It should be quite evident, also, that one does not necessarily need to know all the variables that cause or affect a particular type of problem before trying to alliviate the problems themselves.

Praise, rewards, and social reinforcement have been used rather effectively as the principle variable in the manipulation and control of social acceptability. This is under the assumption that if a person is rewarded or reinforced in the presence of the group, the individual will ultimately develop positive attitudes towards the group itself, and, more importantly, the group will develop positive attitudes towards the particular individual.

Lott and Lott (10), using forty-eight children, from the University of Kentucky Elementary School, administered two sociometric tests and subsequently divided the subjects into
individuals who had not chosen each other on the sociometric
tests. A game was then introduced in which the objective was
to land a rocket on four planets and thus receive a small
plastic car model as a prize for each successful planet landing.
However, the investigator was able to control the number of
planets that each member would be allowed to reach. Thus,
some members were able to reach all four planets while others
were able to reach only three, two, one, and in some cases, no
planets at all. Shortly after the completion of the game, a
final sociometric test was given. The proportion of play
group members chosen by rewarded members was found to be sig-
nificantly greater than the proportion of group members chosen
by nonrewarded subjects.

Similarly, Flanders and Havumaki (7), in their investigation
of thirty-three groups of ten subjects each at the tenth grade
level, used praise as the variable to affect social accepta-
bility. Seventeen groups, of the thirty-three groups used,
were individually orientated; that is, the experimenter would
praise comments from individual members. However, members
seated in odd numbered chairs were praised while members seated
in even numbered chairs were not praised. In the remaining
sixteen groups, the experimenter praised the group as a whole
and did not choose any particular group member for individual
praise. After the discussion period had ended, sociometric
tests were given. Results suggested that those individuals
received a significantly greater proportion of choices as compared to those that were seated in the even numbered chairs and did not receive individual praise. Moreover, seat assignments were not a significant factor in the group where group praise was solely given.

Thus, the few investigations concerning the effect of praise, or reward, seem to indicate that these variables can be used advantageously in the formation of social acceptability. Yet, the manipulation of these two variables would not seem to be enough to reorganize the social structure within most classrooms. Initially, the social isolate must make a proper and correct response which might lead to praise by the teacher. If the response does not occur, praise, or reward, must then be necessarily withheld until the appropriate time. Secondly, the isolate must make the proper response in the presence of the group itself, in this case the classroom. Naturally, if the response does not occur in the presence of the group, the giving of praise will not affect his acceptance in the group one way or the other. Finally, and probably most important, the response must be one which is approved and recognized by the group itself. In the end, it is the group that either accepts or rejects the individual, not the teacher.

The use of interaction and verbalization between group members has also been used to initiate social acceptability. Necomb (14) has defined the assumption which are necessary to make if one were to use this particular variable as a means
for the formation of social acceptability. He states:

...when persons interact, the reward-punishment ratio is more often such as to be reinforcing than extinguishing; and, second, that on-the-whole rewarding effects of interaction are most apt to be obtained from those with whom one interacts most frequently (14, p. 567).

Using verbalization as the main variable for the production of interpersonal affect, Bovard (5) divided one-hundred-and-four subjects into four groups. In two of these groups, verbal interaction was promoted; in the two remaining groups, the interaction was curtailed. Results suggested that there was a significantly higher rating of interpersonal affect in the group-centered group as compared to the leader-centered groups.

In somewhat of a different manner, Newcomb (14) suggests that interpersonal attraction is affected by verbal interaction. Data was received from individuals for roommate assignments. However, half of the room assignments were made in such a manner that there seemed to be little likelihood of interpersonal attraction. On the other hand, the other rooms were so assigned as to maximize interpersonal attraction. However, from the very beginning, and during each successive week, the mean level of attraction between roommates was higher as compared to non-roommates.

Kiesler (9) suggests that "like" and "dislike" towards an individual can be produced by the manipulation of statements, either approving or disapproving, directed towards a speaker.
framework of verbal behavior. Somewhat simply, individuals will more often show their liking of other individuals who had previously approved of them. Kiesler's subjects were seventy-two ninth grade girls divided into groups of three girls each. The girls were placed, one per booth, in such a manner as to remain unknown to one another. The girls were instructed to choose one statement from a pair that were flashed on a screen that most nearly applied to them. The number one or two would then light up in the other two booths to indicate the choice made. After the selection, the other two girls were told to press either a 'like' or 'dislike' button indicating whether they liked the first girl on the basis of the way she answered the item. However, in actuality, the experimenter was controlling the feedback for all participants. Results indicate that the subject expressed greater liking for the girls who had previously shown liking of them for their preference than the girls who had "expressed" considerable dislike for their preference.

Nevertheless, when using interaction as the principle vehicle to promote social acceptance, one must insure that the isolate receives positive feedback from his peers. All interaction is not necessarily positive reinforcement. Consequently, the teacher must provide an atmosphere in which the probability of positive reinforcement towards an isolate is relatively high.

The use of groups and group discussions as the primary
mode for promoting acceptance are probably the most widely reported techniques in the literature. Amidon and Hoffman (1), Lund (11), and Roberts (15), in their very descriptive analysis of techniques used to develop social acceptance, present the technique of group discussion as very capable of developing and initiating social acceptance. Furthermore, Newcomb (14) has suggested not only that the opportunity for positive reinforcement is increased in a group but also that positive attraction will increase with the opportunity to interact.

One of the first questions that may arise, and with good reason, is if the other group members will accept the isolate into the group. This question may be answered very well with the results from Friedman and Sherrill's (8) unique study. Female students from the University of Texas were administered a twenty item, five-point scale, test ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Responses were to indicate basic characteristics necessary in "choosing" or "accepting" a roommate. Results strongly support the hypothesis that individuals will accept a wider range of roommates than they would voluntarily choose.

Thus, one can now understand the theoretical assumptions on which group discussion procedures are formulated. Not only is there the improved probability of interaction, which over an extended period of time increases the probability of positive reinforcement, but also the assumption that individuals will accept other individuals more readily than if they were
actually able to choose them themselves.

Using the group and discussion techniques as the primary vehicles for improving social acceptability, McCleary (12) suggested that group harmony can be developed by first increasing the individuals' sense of belonging to the group by developing the factors in his personality which seem to be detrimental for acquiring social acceptability. Secondly, one must provide an activity which lead to norms of operation that would be acceptable to all group members. These two steps were accomplished by dividing the class, which was a junior English class, into sociometrically composed groups and by assigning the topic of bibliographies. Discussions were held about what factors enhanced personality, personality development, whether personality could be changed, and other related topics. Results from the second sociometric test indicated that there was improved group cohesiveness, indicated by a substantial decrease in the number of isolates and also by a decrease in the number of exclusive cliques.

Similarly, Shoobs (16) sociometrically divided a class into groups and stressed the importance of working with each other, as well as contributing to one's team. Results indicate that group discussion can be used effectively in developing social acceptability. Similar results were reported by McClelland and Ratliff (13) in essentially the same type of experimental procedure. The proposition was also put forward that if sociometric techniques were used for nine years, from
kindergarten through elementary school, it would be possible that children would begin to feel, believe, and think as understandingly as they act.

Conversely, Ammondon (2), using group discussion, individual counseling, and an intensive social program to increase isolates' or fringers' social acceptability in the eleventh grade, suggested that group discussion should not be considered as a simple procedure for increasing the student's acceptance. No change was in fact measured after the use of discussion. However, both the techniques of counseling and intensive social program did result in improved social acceptability for the isolates.

As one can surmise, the manipulation of group interaction for the end result of better social acceptability for the isolates, as well as better group cohesiveness, is no easy matter. Thus, the manipulator must be very knowledgeable, not only about the subjects he is to work with, but also about the subject of sociometric groupings itself.
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects for this study were twenty-five second grade pupils, fourteen boys and eleven girls, attending the North Texas State University Laboratory School during the 1969-1970 school year.

Measuring Instruments

Initially, the design of the study called for the identification of the subjects who were highly or lowly accepted by their peers. Therefore, a sociometric test devised by the author, shown in Appendix I, was used to identify those individuals.

Northway has defined a sociometric test as:

A sociometric test is a means for determining the degree to which individuals are accepted in a group, for discovering the relationships which exists among these individuals, and for disclosing the structure of the group itself (11, p. 3).

Since Jennings has stated: "...a population tends to form two distinguishable kinds of groups." (8, p. 3), the author constructed the sociometric test in such a fashion as to be able to accurately tap and probe the two existing types of social structures.

Jennings defines those two types of social structures as:
sociogroups, i.e., a group where sociometric structure is based on a criterion which is collective in nature; such a socio-criterion is working in a common work unit. Psychogroups, i.e., groups where sociometric structure is based on strictly private criterion which is totally personal in nature; such a psycho-group is associating in the time the individual has at his disposal (8, p. 3).

The questions were so constructed as to be as general as possible, without losing its power to elicit the proper responses from the group. Generality over specificity was made since Moreno and Jennings have stated:

Sociometric test, ought to be constructed more and more in such a fashion that they are able to embrace as far as possible the full complexity of the actual interrelations existing in the population. The more flexible the procedure is made the more it becomes capable of tapping those concrete actualities (10, p. 6).

Only positive questions were asked, although this is an area in which agreement among sociometric specialists is not one-hundred per cent. Northway (11), on one hand, suggests that negative questions are very artificial and may cause resentment and comment in the group thus harming, instead of benefitting, the group process. On the other extreme of the continuum, Smuckers (14) has used negative questions to measure group pressure or tension. Yet, Jennings (7) has used rejections, or negative questions, but has kept them separate from choices, or positive questions, and results.

The California Test of Mental Maturity (Short-Form) was also administered before the actual re-socialization procedure began. Although Bonney (1, 2), Furfey (5), Yamamoto (17), Shoobs (13), and Brooks (3) have suggested that there is not
a direct relationship between social status and intelligence, these studies have suggested that group members achieving high social status do not usually have I. Q.'s below the group mean, while members lacking social status may possess high, as well as low, I. Q.'s. Herber (6) makes a similar conclusion, suggesting that intelligence does have an affect on popularity but that the relationship is probably curvilinear rather than rectilinear. Therefore, necessary precautions were needed to insure that the population that was to receive the re-socialization procedure did not contain individuals possessing I. Q.'s radically lower than the mean of the group as a whole. However, there was no significant difference between the means of the low-low (isolated) and the high-high (popular) groups, using the t tables in McGuigan (9).

Design and Procedure

Using the combined scores of the socio- and psychogroup criterion, the top seven choice receivers and the bottom seven choice receivers were identified. The top seven choice receivers and the bottom seven choice receivers were designated as the high-high and low-low groups respectively.

Since the author was unable to be present for every classroom hour, the classroom teacher, as well as those of music, art, and gym, were given instructions on the procedure to be used with the high-high and low-low subjects.

The following instructions were given to all teachers
previously mentioned:

**Project Friendly Persuasion:** It is thought that students will have more friends if they can be exposed in a positive, sucssful way to the class.

This is the plan: to pair a popular child with a not-so-popular child in any kind of positive activity so that the other children in the class can see and hear them together---to associate them together in their minds.

Dr. Bonney has done studies to show that children believe what they see---if a person smiles, he is friendly; if a person scowls, he is mean and so on. Perhaps if children see other children doing well in some particular activity, then, they will also be judged as being successful and thus gain in social acceptance. If they feel successful, they will hopefully succeed in many activities that they have not yet attempted.

Grade 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is hoped that by pairing students from Group 1 with students from Group 2, students in Group 2 will become exposed in a positive way to an entire group. It would be especially beneficial if after this exposure students in Group 2 could teach others in some way, thus enhancing their social image.

Each time you have a pair do something at all such as:
- sit together
- lead a discussion
- work on a report
- committee work
- puppet show
- art show
- walking to gym or lunch room
- scientific project

will you please jot down on the chart listing the students involved and activities accomplished. I will check with you during the week and collect the charts every Friday.

Thus the classroom teacher paired a socially high and a socially low child in such endeavors as: walking to lunch, gym, or swimming pool, science projects, picking up mail, returning books to the school library, cleaning and tidying
up the classroom library, giving book reports, and any of a
wide variety of activities which would lend itself to this
type of pairing procedure. Moreover, the experimenter would
select a high-high and low-low sociometric child to act as
"daily assistants." These selected individuals would help
pass out pencils, pass out and collect questionnaires, and
otherwise perform any type of activity that would lend it-
self to this technique.

Furthermore, it was stressed that the same two individuals
would not function in pairs for more than two activities per
day. This limitation was imposed so that the isolated child
would benefit from the social acceptability of all the popular
children and not constrain the situation in such a fashion
as to restrict one isolate to the popularity of one other
child.

After the interaction period, t-tests were conducted
between mean scores of the pre- and post-sociometric test,
of the sociogroup and psychogroup criteria, using tables
presented by DuBois (4). Moreover, a rank-order correlation
was computed between pre- and post-sociometric tests, as
recommended by Northway and Weld (12), in order to obtain the
stability coefficient. Tables presented by Spence (15) were
used in this computation.

None of the subjects were ever informed of their soci-
metric standings. Furthermore, none was ever aware that a
research project was being conducted. No radical changes
were initiated since performing in pairs had been a natural occurrence since the first day of class.

All pairings were recorded daily on a week data sheet. (See Appendix II) Data sheets were collected each Friday. The actual experimental period lasted from March second, 1970 to April seventh, 1970, a time period of five weeks.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The nature of small groups does not, in fact, lend itself very well to the use of group statistics. It is attributed to the fact that a great amount of increase or decrease in the group's mean is necessary to generate a significant $t$. This may be the reason why many researchers using small groups in their investigations have not obtained any significance even though particular individuals had an increase or decrease in their pre- and post-scores. Thus, individual scores must be presented to decrease the possibility of significant sociometric changes being lost in the process of group statistics. For this reason, the present study hypothesized, in part, that

1. Some of the individuals classified as isolates in the initial pre-sociometric test will gain in social acceptance during the interaction period as measured by the post-sociometric test.

2. Some of the individuals classified as isolates in the initial pre-sociometric test will not gain or lose in social acceptance during the interaction period as measured by the post-sociometric test.

3. Some of the individuals classified as isolates in the initial pre-sociometric test will decrease in social acceptance during the interaction period as measured by the post-sociometric test.

Table I presents the individual scores for both the pre- and post-sociometric tests, in both the socio- and psychogroup.
As seen in Table I, subjects 24, 19, 1, and 16, increased in acceptability as measured by the increase in their sociometric scores. Subjects 12 and 15 remained the same in their acceptability. Also, subject 10 decreased in acceptability. Thus, hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 are supported.

During the interaction period, daily records were kept on Weekly Data Sheets. Tabulation of number of pairings throughout the interaction period are presented in Table II.
Data presented in Table II demonstrates that all isolated subjects had approximately the same number of pairings with highly accepted subjects. Moreover, all social isolates were also paired with the experimenter and one highly accepted subject between two and three times during the five week interaction period.

It was also hypothesized that

(4) The mean score of the bottom sociometric quartile will significantly increase, in both socio- and psychogroup criterion, during the interaction period.

(5) The mean scores of the other three quartiles will not increase or decrease significantly, in either the socio- or psychogroup criterion, during the interaction period.

Table III presents the difference between the mean of the sociogroup status of the low-low sociometric group (socially isolated) before and after the interaction period.

**TABLE III**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>2.1402</td>
<td>1.5567</td>
<td>3.7762</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N=7

As can be seen from Table III, the interaction period significantly increased the mean score of the sociogroup.
criterion for the low-low group. This suggests that this type of technique is effective in increasing sociogroup status of socially isolated individuals.

Table IV presents the difference between the mean of the pre- and post-interaction period of the psychogroup status of the low-low sociometric status group.

**TABLE IV**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>0.5712</td>
<td>0.7293</td>
<td>3.2132</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>1.4292</td>
<td>1.4983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N=7

Results presented in Table IV indicate that interaction significantly increased psychogroup status for the socially isolated group. Thus, this type of technique is beneficial for increasing psychogroup status of socially isolated individuals. Together with the data presented in Table III, Hypothesis 4 is supported.

Table V presents the difference between the mean of the pre- and post-interaction period of the sociogroup status of the high-low (third quartile) sociometric status group. It should be remembered that the high-low, as well as the low-
high (second quartile), served as control groups and did not participate in the actual interaction period.

**TABLE V**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>2.2360</td>
<td>1.2771</td>
<td>1.7681</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>2.8560</td>
<td>1.4570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is suggested that the interaction between the low-low status group and the high-high status group did not affect the sociogroup status of the high-low status group.

Table VI presents the difference between the mean of the pre- and post-interaction period of the psychegroup status of the high-low sociometric status group.

**TABLE VI**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
<td>1.1166</td>
<td>1.1211</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>2.7142</td>
<td>1.7497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N=6
As presented in Table VI, data suggests that the interaction between the low-low and high-high groups did not affect psychogroup status of the high-low sociometric group.

Since the high-low sociometric group, although not composed of isolates or fringers, are not overly accepted by the group it would be useful to include this quartile in the interaction process so that the individuals may also benefit in increased sociogroup and psychogroup status.

Table VII presents the difference between the mean of the pre- and post-interaction period of the sociogroup status of the low-high (second quartile) group.

**TABLE II**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>5.6000</td>
<td>1.9595</td>
<td>-0.8375</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>5.4000</td>
<td>2.8705</td>
<td>( N=5 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant change was obtained in sociogroup status of the low-high social acceptability group from the interaction between the low-low and high-high sociometric groups. One should remember that the low-high (second quartile) group did not participate in the interaction period and served, along with the high-low sociometric group, as the control group.
Table VIII presents the difference between the mean of the pre- and post-interaction period of psychegroup status of the low-high social acceptability group.

**TABLE VIII**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.4042</td>
<td>-0.9842</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td>1.2489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N=5

Psychegroup status of the low-high sociometric group was not significantly affected by the interaction conducted by the low-low and high-high sociometric groups. Moreover, with the data obtained from Table VII, it is suggested that interaction does not increase sociogroup or psychegroup status of a particular group unless direct participation is accomplished. This is further supported by the fact that neither sociogroup nor psychegroup status was increased in the high-low sociometric group which also served as a control group. Thus, the low-high can be used effectively within the confines of this technique by pairing them up with members of the low-high sociometric status group, since the low-high individuals do have the status required to be used effectively in this manner.
Table IX presents the difference between the mean of the pre- and post-interaction period of the sociogroup status of the high-high (highly accepted) group.

**TABLE IX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>14.2857</td>
<td>2.1190</td>
<td>-0.7956</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>13.5714</td>
<td>2.7181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table IX, sociogroup status was not affected by the interaction conducted with the low-low group.

Table X presents the difference between means of the pre- and post-interaction period of psychegroup status of the high-high sociometric status group.

**TABLE X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>10.8571</td>
<td>1.8846</td>
<td>-0.1419</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>10.7142</td>
<td>4.1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N=7*
As can be seen from Table X, psychogroup status was not affected by the interaction conducted with the low-low group.

It can be seen from Table III through Table X that during the interaction period there was a significant increase in the sociogroup, as well as psychogroup, status for the low-low sociometric status group. Moreover, there was no significant increase, nor decrease, in either the sociogroup or the psychogroup status for the remaining three quartiles (low-high, high-low, and high-high). Thus Hypothesis 4 and 5 are also supported.

Discussion

The fact that the first three hypothesis were supported may indicate that there are indeed certain individuals that will not benefit from this type of in-class therapy. However, there still remains the fact that the greater majority did in fact benefit from this particular procedure. This is certainly the case in many types of group therapy since it is very unlikely that a certain procedure would be effective for all the participants.

Moreover, the important point suggested by this study is that the high-high status group did not significantly decrease in their social acceptance. This is very important since many teachers and other practitioners would be hesitant in using a particular procedure that would help those who needed help while at the same time hurting those who were
responsible for the improvement. Consequently, this procedure is useful in any type of classroom since the sociometric status in each classroom will include those who are very popular or socially accepted and those who are isolated.

It is indeed very important to realize that the pairing of the highly accepted and the lowly accepted was the main factor and impetus in establishing added acceptability for the lowly accepted. This point is suggested by the fact that the other two quartiles (high-low and low-high) that were not involved in any fashion with the interaction period did not benefit in any way from the procedure.

Furthermore, the rank-order correlation of 0.12, obtained between the first and second sociometric tests, indicated that this particular procedure did, in fact, radically change the sociometric hierarchy of the group. This is even more apparent when one compares the stability coefficient of this particular study with those discussed previously (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12).
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

A review of the literature reveals a gross lack of well defined studies that can be put to use in the classrooms to promote social acceptability. Since lack of social acceptance may affect not only the individual's present life style, but also his future as well, it is necessary to develop procedures and techniques that can be put in effect in our schoolrooms that will ultimately benefit those that lack in social acceptance.

The subjects were twenty-five second grade pupils, fourteen boys and eleven girls, attending the North Texas State University Laboratory School during the 1969-1970 school year. The subjects were given a sociometric test, devised by the author for the study, and then divided into four quartiles on the basis of choices received on the initial sociometric test.

Following a five-week period of pairing high-high and low-low sociometric subjects, known as the interaction period, a second sociometric test was given. Comparison on individual results obtained from the first and second sociometric tests yielded these results on the following hypotheses:

1. That some of the individuals classified as isolates in the initial pre-sociometric test would gain in social
the post-sociometric test. Subjects 24, 19, 1, and 16 increased in social acceptance; therefore, the first hypothesis was supported.

2. That some of the individuals classified as isolates in the initial pre-sociometric test would not gain, or lose, in social acceptance during the interaction period as measured by the post-sociometric test. Subjects 12 and 15 remained the same in social acceptance; therefore, the second hypothesis was supported.

3. That some of the individuals classified as isolates in the initial pre-sociometric test would decrease in social acceptance during the interaction period as measured by the post-sociometric test. Subject 10 decreased in social acceptance; therefore, the third hypothesis was supported.

Furthermore, eight t-tests and one rank-order correlation were employed, yielding these results on the following hypotheses:

4. That the mean scores of the bottom sociometric quartile would significantly increase, in both socio- and psychogroup criterion, after the interaction period. The differences were significant at the .05 and .02 levels respectively; therefore, hypothesis four was supported.

5. That the mean score of the other three quartiles would not significantly increase or decrease, in either socio- or psychogroup criterion, after the period of interaction. The differences were not significant at the .05 level; there-
fore, the fifth hypothesis was also supported.

6. That the stability coefficient obtained by comparing the first and second sociometric test would be lower than those obtained in previous studies. The rank-order coefficient of 0.12 was lower than those obtained in previous studies; therefore, the sixth hypothesis was supported.

The results of this study suggest that this particular procedure for developing social acceptance is indeed an effective one. Since the procedure is not complex, it can certainly be used by classroom teachers as a way of aiding those individuals that lack social acceptability.

Since there are very few well defined procedures that can be used to improve social acceptance, this method would appear to merit further investigation.
APPENDIX I

SOCIOCETRIC TEST DEVISED BY F. R. BROOKS

1. Who in this room would you like to work with in a committee. Please do not write more than seven names since a committee of more than eight people is too big. If you want a committee of three people, not counting yourself, write down three names. Remember, do not write down more than seven names.

2. Who in this room would you invite to a movie party if your Mother told you that you could invite five people. Remember not to invite more than five friends to your party since your Mother told you that your car was not big enough to invite more.

*All instructions were read aloud. A board with all the children's name was placed in front of the room so that all the children were able to see it. The experimenter walked around the room to answer questions.*
APPENDIX II

WEEKLY RECORD SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you please try to pair any of the above with any of the below for any activity and record the activity:

A   B   C   D   E   F   G
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