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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The twentieth century has marked widespread changes in all fields of human endeavor. These drastic changes have been nothing short of revolutionary in effect. With these changes in our society and in our way of life have come problems of great magnitude in the fields of education. Mass education has been recognized as the key to the future and the vehicle to advancement in all social and scientific areas.

The public schools have felt the pressures of business, industry, and higher education to produce a certain kind of graduate adept in those skills and abilities that are so greatly in demand. The schools have accepted this challenge and have revised their academic programs and put greater demands upon the administrators, teachers, and students. The public schools also have the problem of deciding what standards should be met by each student before that student is passed from grade to grade through the school system toward the desired goal of a high school education.

Educators can no longer follow the philosophy that there must be a fixed authoritative system of schooling to which children must be subordinated. They must also reject
the function of the schools as being to fit pupils into the scheme so far as they will fit, and to throw all others out (29).

These public schools are in reality faced with an enigma: the setting of standards that all pupils must meet and the realization that each pupil is a different, unique individual whose capabilities are dictated by heredity, environment, interest, need, attitude, aptitude, and effort. The schools have a common set of academic standards that should be met, and also pupils that run the gamut in scholastic abilities. The result has been the setting of arbitrary standards that must be met or the pupil is confronted with failure and nonpromotion. When this action is taken is the problem solved or does this only add confusion to existing problems?

The Problem and Its Purpose

Nonpromotion is a common practice in the public schools of today but little is known of its consequences. Stroud (28) in his study of nonpromotion found that 25 per cent of all elementary school pupils are failed at some time during their elementary school years.

Ypsilantis and Bernert (31) in their study stated that about four million pupils, or about one-fifth of the total school population, were retarded one year or more in their age-grade placement in the United States in 1950. Although
children may be retarded for many different reasons, the main cause of this overagerness is nonpromotion.

Myers (25) stated in his study that according to reports of a number of large cities, from 10 to 15 per cent of the pupils in the elementary schools fail each year. The nonpromotion rate will probably change from year to year and from school system to school system, but the number of unsuccessful pupils involved is large.

Myers (25) also stated that one of the two mental attitudes is apt to grow out of failure. Either there will be a feeling of humiliation, a loss of pride, and self respect; or, more likely, the pupil will compensate by blaming the teacher or the school. Either of these mental attitudes would be unwholesome.

The preadolescent is going through the socialization process. The success of this process is very important because it is the foundation for future relationships with peers. Preadolescence is a period of growing independence, self-reliance, and the immersion of the individual into the peer culture. The child's success in finding the approval of his peers and security in the gang life of later childhood is likely to affect the confidence with which he attempts to adjust to the peer culture of adolescence (5).

In our public schools each year thousands of pupils are retained in the same grade for an additional year. For many
different reasons these pupils are subjected to the same course of study for a second year. Some school systems fear that the quality of school work would depreciate and the standards of achievement of the schools would drop to scandalous depths if the failure rate should approach zero. Other school systems set arbitrary standards of achievement which must be met without consideration of the capabilities of the pupils. Regardless of the reasoning behind the act of nonpromotion the pupil must bear the brunt of the experience, be it good or bad.

The purpose of this study is to examine a group of pupils who have been unsuccessful in the elementary schools. This study seeks to find the impact of failure on elementary school pupils. It is hoped that this study will make a contribution to our understanding of the common practice of nonpromotion and its effect on the elementary school pupil.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to compare a group of successful and unsuccessful pupils who were in the fifth and sixth grades. It was the purpose to make comparisons between these two groups in terms of (1) school achievement, (2) mental ability, (3) personality, (4) pupils as perceived by teachers and peers, (5) pupils' perceptions of teacher and school, (6) self perception, (7) school attendance, and (8) socioeconomic status.
Significance of this Problem

Do pupils have adequate personalities when they have experienced failure during two years in only a span of seven or eight years of school? Do these unsuccessful pupils feel wanted, liked, and acceptable when in their elementary school careers they have undergone failure twice? Should one expect these unsuccessful pupils to be leaders in their classroom when failure has been their lot (9)?

The adequate personality according to Combs and Snygg (9, p. 262) is a child who sees himself as liked, acceptable, wanted and able, living in a world with which he can cope. Positive self definitions can arise from positive self-experience. A positive view of the world is likely to be found only in those who have found their own experience with the world to be generally enhancing.

Jersild (18, p. 18) states that if a child lives in an environment in which he is opposed, thwarted, and rejected, he will begin at an early age to develop the kind of behavior which we find in a pupil who perceives himself as one who is abused. He will feel hostile and probably will project his hostility onto others.

Farley, Prey, and Garland (15) stated in their study that repetition of a grade may result in discouragement and a sense of failure that will breed undesirable attitudes, discourage industry, and kill initiative. If grade failure and retardation have an adverse effect on character
development, careful consideration must be given to every pupil failure lest character be sacrificed in order to maintain high standards of promotion.

Aguilera and Keneally (1) in their study of the psychiatric implications of school failure found over a period of eleven years that school failure was one of the most frequent complaints that brought children to the clinic. They found that failure occurred most frequently in boys; 85.5 per cent of school failures were boys. The failure pupils were found to be suffering from emotional immaturity, inferiority feelings, lack of concentration, restlessness, tenseness, or other more serious symptoms, such as temper tantrums, stuttering, and social inadequacy.

Stroud (28) in his study of failure rates stated that probably the average annual failure rate was 7 or 8 per cent and that about 25 per cent of the pupils had repeated a grade at some time in the course of their elementary school experience. Stroud's study gives insight into the magnitude of the failure problem.

Cotter (11) stated that school failure remains shockingly widespread. Four million children in the United States were not advanced to the next grade during the 1964-65 school year. This article shows the number of elementary school pupils who experience failure each year.

Failure in the form of nonpromotion is common in elementary school. It has been recognized as a solution to
some problem, otherwise the practice would not be so extensive. Research has shown that failure is a nostrum with little or no curative powers (8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 19, 27). The problem attacked in the present research study is significant because there is a need to know more precisely the impact of failure on elementary school pupils.

Related Studies

Otto and Melby (27) evaluated the threat of failure as a factor in achievement. The study was based on 352 pupils in grades two and five. One group of pupils was told that there would be no failures and the other group was told that anyone who did not work hard and do well would have to repeat the grade.

The results of the Otto and Melby study (27) showed that pupils who were told at the beginning of the year that all pupils would be in the following grade the next year would do as well in achievement, as measured by the New Standard Achievement Test, as children who throughout the semester were reminded that they must do good work or suffer nonpromotion. This study seemed to indicate that the threat of failure did not motivate the pupils to greater effort.

Hall and Demarest (17) in a study covering ten years sought to find the effect of a change in promotional policy on achievement scores. They found that the regular promotion of children, that is, keeping them with their own
age group, did not result in a lowering of academic achievement. This study also found that the average reading grade did not change, average intelligence quotient remained approximately the same, and the average chronological age for the grade dropped.

Farley (14) in his study of the effects of failure upon the child found that failure cannot be depended upon to stimulate effort and improve achievement. Farley found that a number of the failure pupils had poorer test results at the end of the study than at the beginning while others had about the same. This situation is attributed to confusion resulting from constant maladjustment and failure.

In his conclusions Farley (14) stated that repeated failure caused the child to receive no satisfaction from his work and frequently caused him to become so discouraged that continued effort seemed futile. When the child was confronted with impossible tasks he was likely to become antagonistic; an outlet for this state of mind may be in behavior characterized by sulkiness and poor social relationships or truancy and delinquency.

Meek (23) in his study of failure stated that the unsuccessful pupil was generally a quitter and did about as poor work in his second attempt as he did in the first attempt at the work of a given grade. The pupil started his second year in the same grade with a grievance against the teacher and the entire situation. Hostility was evident in the child
as well as in his parents. The child reacted to failure by becoming morbidly sensitive or brazenly indifferent.

In Bedoian's study (4) of the social acceptability and social rejection of the underage, at-age, and overage pupils in the sixth grade, it was stated that the unsuccessful child lacked social acceptance in his grade group. The unsuccessful child was denied the status and recognition that his peers received. Bedoian also found that the unsuccessful child was not only ignored in classroom activities, but that he was actively disliked by his classmates. Bedoian concluded that the child was rare who was not affected when he was ignored and relegated to a life of isolation, thus suffering a loss of prestige within his group.

Borgeon (6), in his study of causes of failure as given by pupils, stated that the causes given suggested that the fundamental weakness was the failure to establish proper attitudes in the child toward work, toward teachers, parents and other adults, and toward life. According to Borgeon these failure pupils did not enjoy the majority of their present everyday experiences and were not enthusiasts for anything in particular.

In their study, Farley, Frey, and Garland (15) using the Otis Self-Administering Test of Mental Ability and the Stanford Achievement Test found a definite relationship between the grade progress of twelve-year-old pupils and ability and achievement. This study found that there was no great
difference in the attendance records of failure and regularly promoted pupils; pupils who failed seemed to attend school as much as the pupils that had not failed.

Farley, Frey, and Garland (15) also found that a number of pupils were not correctly graded if achievement and ability are considered the proper basis for grade placement. There was no significant relationship between grade placement and socioeconomic status.

Farley, Frey, and Garland (15) also stated that repetition of a grade might result in discouragement and a sense of failure that would breed undesirable attitudes, discourage industry, and kill initiative. If grade failure and retardation have an adverse effect on character development, careful consideration must be given to every pupil failure, lest character be sacrificed in order to maintain high standards of promotion.

Goodlad (16) in his study of promotion and nonpromotion found that socially the promoted children were rejected significantly less by classmates as persons not desired for very best friends. The nonpromoted children tended to be both accepted and rejected as very best friends more than promoted children when acceptance and rejection were considered simultaneously as one score.

It is important to note that Goodlad had matched groups; one group was retained in the first grade for a second year while the other was promoted to the second grade. The
groups were matched on the basis of mental age, chronological age, and achievement (16). This matching would eliminate some differences that would normally occur between pupils who had failed and those who had not failed.

Goodlad also found twenty items of social and personal differences that significantly differentiated between the two groups when he analyzed the items of the California Test of Personality. No differences were found in the total scores or subscores of the test (16).

Goodlad found no significant differences between the two groups when teachers appraised the behavior of the pupils by using the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule (16). It should be noted that the pupils in this study failed only one year.

An item analysis of the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule showed a greater tendency for the nonpromoted children to be defiant to discipline, to be unpopular with children, to have temper outbursts, and to bully and steal. Statistical test of significance showed only two items, "unpopular with children" and "stealing," as significant at better than the 5 per cent level. Goodlad stated that the tendency for the nonpromoted group to be more unpopular with other children stood out as the most significant difference revealed by the item analysis (16).

Goodlad (16) stated that his study suggested that repeating a grade was detrimental to the social and personal
adjustment of boys and girls. There were no significant differences between the groups for total scores on any instrument or on any subsection of instruments purporting to measure personal adjustment.

Kyte (20), in his study of first grade promotion, considered intelligence and its relation to other causes of nonpromotion. Kyte found that the teachers listed the most common cause for failure in the first grade as being the slow learning rate of the pupils. Of the group listed as slow learners, Kyte found that 57 per cent were children with normal mentality, 31 per cent were cases of dull pupils, and approximately 6 per cent were either feeble-minded or mentally deficient, and 6 per cent were above normal in intelligence. Over a period of twelve school years, Kyte, after studying 2,379 cases of failure involving 1,485 pupils, found that 63.9 per cent of the pupils had intelligence quotients of 90 or higher as measured by the Stanford-Binet.

Chansky (7) studied the progress of promoted first grade pupils and failure pupils repeating grade one and found that no difference in personal and social adjustment occurred during the year after promotion and nonpromotion. Relative to ability, Chansky found that the promoted children were observed to be underachieving to a greater extent than the retained children. The subjects for this study were those low achievers who, in the teacher's judgment, should not be
advanced to the second grade. The teachers and principals then selected those pupils who seemed to be good risks for promotion and the poor risks were retained. The promoted group consisted of thirty pupils and the nonpromoted group consisted of thirty-three pupils.

Cook (10) in his study of high standards of promotion found that the effects of nonpromotion were reduction of the mean intelligence of the classes and a significant lowering of the achievement average of the grades compared with schools with more lenient standards of promotion. It was also found that there was some evidence that adjustment of instruction to the ability of the child was superior in every subject except arithmetic in the schools with low ratios of over-ageness. It is important to note that the rate of failure was higher in schools with pupils of lower socioeconomic status.

Cook's study (10) was concerned with 35,463 seventh grade students in 148 school systems in 148 Minnesota towns with populations of less than 4,000. These figures show the extensiveness of this study.

Volberding (30) in her study of successful eleven-year-olds found that the successful pupils were more often from middle-class homes, more often girls than boys, more intelligent, better adjusted personally and socially, and more concerned with play in competitive groups. In this study the unsuccessful pupils were those who ranked below
the average of the group on the measures of social and academic success in school.

Volberding (30) used the Revised Individual Stanford-Binet Test, Form L, the Metropolitan Achievement Test, and a "guess who" sociometric device. The California Test of Personality and Pintner's Aspects of Personality Test were the instruments used to determine personality development.

Anfinson (2) in his study sought to find what relationship would be found between nonpromotion and pupil personality. Anfinson matched groups of pupils of junior high age; one group consisted of pupils who had made normal school progress and the other of individuals who had experienced nonpromotion in one or more semesters. The pupils were matched on the basis of school attendance, chronological age, sex, intelligence, and socioeconomic status. The final group was composed of 232 pupils (59 pairs of boys and 57 pairs of girls).

Anfinson (2) found when he gave the Symonds-Block Questionnaire that there was a significant difference between the groups in social and personal adjustment. In a comparison of the groups on the basis of Block's norms, 45 per cent of the nonrepeaters and 61 per cent of the repeaters were classed as below average in social and personal adjustment. Nonrepeaters ranked higher in their adjustments to administration of school, their teachers, and their personal affairs. Repeaters ranked higher in adjustment to the
social life of school, other pupils, and their homes and families.

Anfinson (2), in conclusion, stated that in the groups studied, maladjustment was not directly associated with nonpromotion or even with double nonpromotion to such an extent that nonpromotion may be regarded as the essential factor in future maladjustment.

Coffield and Blommers (8) studied the effects of nonpromotion on educational achievement in the elementary school. They found that the educational progress of seventh graders who had failed once typically performed on a par with matched promoted seventh graders who had spent one year less in school. In conclusion, Coffield and Blommers stated that if the reason for nonpromotion is nonachievement, then it seems clear that little is gained by requiring the repetition of a grade.

Kamii and Weikart (19) selected a group of thirty-one seventh graders who had failed one year in the fifth or lower grade as the experimental group and a random group of thirty-one seventh graders as the control group. The variables studied were (1) the marks received at the end of the first semester in the seventh grade in five academic subjects (arithmetic, literature, science, language, and social studies), (2) the results of the Iowa Every Pupil Test of Basic Skills scores in reading and arithmetic, and (3) intelligence scores on the California Test of Mental Maturity.
Kamii and Weikart (19) found that giving the students an extra year in elementary school did not improve their marks in academic subjects. The difference in marks between those pupils who had failed and those who had not failed was significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence.

Kamii and Weikart (19) found that the retained group did not achieve as much as the control group. There was a difference in the two groups which was significant beyond the 1 per cent level of confidence. The mean reading grade level was 7.59 for the normal group and 5.67 for the retained group. The mean arithmetic grade level was 7.37 for the normal group and 5.73 for the retained group.

Kamii and Weikart (19) found that the mean I. Q. was 94 for the retained group and 112.6 for the normal group. The t test yielded a t ratio of 5.38 which was significant beyond the 1 per cent level of confidence.

Morrison and Perry (24) made a study of the acceptance of the overage pupils in grades four, five, and six. They found that the overage children at these grade levels had little opportunity for social acceptance. The study showed that the overage child had a significantly lower choice status with his peers. Through no fault of his own the overage child tended to be deprived of the opportunity of achieving status. This child failed to receive recognition from his teachers for academic achievement and lost status
with his peers because of difference in age. They also found that the children of these levels seemed to be highly sensitive to differences in age, and other factors did not seem to compensate for this age disparity. Morrison and Perry felt that their study pointed to the need of keeping the child with his own age group.

McElwee (22) in her study of 300 retained children found that the pupils were more restless, talkative, stubborn, listless, and quarrelsome than were the normal and accelerated pupils. She also found that the retained children were disinterested in and indifferent toward their classwork. The subjects for this study were from the second, third, and fourth grades. The retained subjects were those pupils who were retarded one or more terms in grade progress.

From the results and conclusions of the studies cited one finds that the need for additional study of unsuccessful pupils is very evident. In the field of promotional practices the area involving personal-social adjustment probably is the area most barren of research (16).

A survey of the research showed that some studies have used the California Test of Personality with few significant results (16, 30). It is the purpose of this study to analyze the personal-social area of development. The Rorschach was used in this study as one means of comparing the personality development of the successful and unsuccessful pupils. The Rorschach was used to determine the differences between the
two groups in (1) creativity as measured by $K$ responses, (2) quality of form perception as measured by $F^*$ percentage, (3) range and quality of content ($K$), (4) quality and number of $W$ responses, and (5) conformity as measured by $P$ responses. In no instance in the available research was the Rorschach used to determine the personality development of the successful and unsuccessful pupils.

The California Test of Personality was used as one means of determining personal and social development. The use of the combination of this instrument and the Rorschach should give an adequate evaluation of the personality development of the pupils.

In measuring the intelligence of the pupils, various instruments had been used. Goodlad (16), Otto and Melby (27), Hall and Demarest (17), and Cook (10) used the Kuhlmann-Anderson; Farley, Frey, and Garland (15) used the Otis; Anfinson (2) used the Otis and the California Test of Mental Maturity; and Volberding (30), and Chansky (7) used the Stanford-Binet. Only two of the above studies used an individual test and this scale had only one score. There was a need to have a study using a test that had a verbal and performance intelligence quotient. The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children met this need.

In most studies school failure has been defined as one semester or one year (2, 7, 8, 16, 19). There was a need
for a study concerning the pupils who had failed two or more years and were still in the intermediate elementary grades. These pupils had felt the full impact of failure; these were the unsuccessful pupils. This study was concerned with these unsuccessful pupils.

In none of the available research had three perceptions been joined together to give a picture of pupil development; this was attempted in this study. This study has attempted to develop teacher perception, peer perception, and self perception of the successful and unsuccessful pupils in the areas of leadership, withdrawal, and aggression. This was attempted by a forced choice Behavior Description Chart to which the teacher responded and the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument which incorporated the same characteristics for peer perception and self perception. In the peer perception each pupil named those in his class who have leadership, withdrawal, and aggression characteristics by responding to "guess who" statements. The self perception was accomplished by having the pupil put his name by those statements which he felt described himself. A copy of the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument is given in Appendix A and a copy of the Behavior Description Chart is given in Appendix B.

This study also attempted to assess the pupil's perception of various characteristics of the teacher in the
My Teacher Questionnaire. This questionnaire had items which dealt with the teacher's disposition, treatment of pupils, teaching, interest in children's activities, status in pupil's esteem and sense of humor. A questionnaire of this type had not been used in any available study of successful and unsuccessful pupils. A copy of this questionnaire is given in Appendix C.

This study attempted to develop the teacher's perception beyond the Behavior Description Chart by use of the Pupil Adjustment Inventory. This was a five place rating scale which enabled the teacher to rate each pupil in fourteen areas of development. These areas were (1) achievement in grade as related to aptitude, (2) attitude toward schoolwork, (3) sociability, (4) social acceptance, (5) types of associates, (6) temperament, (7) personal worth, (8) state of health, (9) activities and interests, (10) attitudes toward school, (11) school attendance, (12) school's influence upon the child, (13) economic status, and (14) family life. This inventory gave a clear perception of how the teacher viewed the successful and unsuccessful pupils. This inventory was not used in any available research and was an important addition to this study. A copy of this instrument is given in Appendix D.

To determine the social status of the pupils the Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument was used. This instrument was unique because it was a "full scale" sociometric device. Every pupil in the class responded to every other pupil in the
class as to social acceptance or rejection. A copy of this form is given in Appendix E.

How well each pupil accepted the other members of the class was determined by adding up the points that each pupil gave to the other members of the class. The totals of all class members were relatively ranked to give each pupil a place based on how well he accepted his peers.

The quality of the pupil's sociometric status was determined by identifying the pairings of responses. A single bond of acceptance or rejection running from one child to another represented a different situation from that in which the bond was reciprocated (16). This study attempted to determine the quality of bonds in five classifications: strongly mutual, moderately mutual, strongly unreciprocated, moderately unreciprocated, and mutually rejected.

These sociometric techniques were not attempted in any of the available research to determine social acceptance of successful and unsuccessful pupils. This was an important addition to this study.

Because of these unique additions and new research techniques, this study should add to the knowledge of successful and unsuccessful pupils. It is hoped that this study will add to our knowledge relating to the impact of failure on the elementary pupils.
Limitations of this Study

1. This study was limited to a large suburban school system that is contiguous to a metropolitan area.

2. This study was limited to pupils only as long as they were pupils of this independent school district in which the study was made.

3. The unsuccessful pupils in this study were limited to six elementary schools which represented approximately 75 per cent of the elementary school enrollment of the district. The successful pupils were limited to one large elementary school whose pupils represented a cross section of the socioeconomic population of the suburban area.

4. This study was limited to successful and unsuccessful male pupils who were in the fifth and sixth grades.

5. This study excluded pupils who were eligible for special education classes.

Definition of Terms

Successful pupil - a pupil who had not been retained in a grade and was in the fifth or sixth grade.

Unsuccessful pupil - a pupil who had been retained for two years and was in the fifth or sixth grade.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were made regarding this study.

It was hypothesized that:
I. The group of successful pupils would have significantly higher mean scores on all sections of the California Achievement Test.

II. The group of successful pupils would have significantly higher mean intelligence quotients as measured by the California Test of Mental Maturity.

III. The group of successful pupils would have significantly higher mean intelligence quotients on the verbal, performance, and full scale I. Q.'s of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children.

IV. The group of successful pupils would make significantly higher mean scores on the California Test of Personality.

V. There would be significant differences in personality development as measured by Rorschach responses.

A. The successful group of pupils would make a significantly higher mean score on the F+ percentage than would the unsuccessful group.

B. The successful group of pupils would make a significantly higher mean score on the W per cent than would the unsuccessful group.

C. The successful group of pupils would make a significantly higher mean score on the number of P responses than would the unsuccessful group.
D. The successful group of pupils would make a significantly higher mean score on the number of M responses than would the unsuccessful group.

E. The successful group of pupils would make a significantly higher mean score on the number of content categories (K) than would the unsuccessful group.

VI. The successful group of pupils would be significantly better adjusted as measured by the mean of the teachers' responses to the Pupil Adjustment Inventory.

VII. There would be a significant difference in the teachers' perception of the two groups of pupils as shown by the means of the three behavioral characteristics identified by the Behavior Description Chart. It was hypothesized that the teachers would perceive the successful group of pupils as having significantly more leadership, less aggression, and less withdrawal characteristics.

VIII. The successful group of pupils would have a significantly higher mean score on the My Teacher Questionnaire.

IX. There would be a significant difference in the peer perceptions of the two groups as measured by the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument responses, as follows:

A. It was hypothesized that the successful group of pupils would have more leadership, less withdrawal, and less aggression characteristics as reflected by the means of the peer responses.
E. It was hypothesized that the unsuccessful group of pupils would have less leadership, more withdrawal, and more aggression characteristics as measured by self perception responses.

X. There would be a significant difference in the mean school attendance of the two groups of pupils. It was hypothesized that the successful group of pupils would attend school more often than the unsuccessful group of pupils as shown by school attendance records.

XI. There would be a significant difference in relative class sociometric ranks of the two groups.

A. It was hypothesized that the unsuccessful group of pupils would rank significantly lower in relative class sociometric rank as measured by the Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument.

B. It was hypothesized that the successful group of pupils would rank significantly higher in acceptance of other class members as measured by the Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument.

C. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the quality of the pupils' sociometric bonds.

1. It was hypothesized that the successful group of pupils would have a significantly higher mean in strongly mutual bonds.
2. It was hypothesized that the successful group of pupils would have a significantly higher mean in moderately mutual bonds.

3. It was hypothesized that the successful pupils would have a significantly lower mean in strongly unreciprocated bonds.

4. It was hypothesized that the successful pupils would have a significantly lower mean in moderately unreciprocated bonds.

5. It was hypothesized that the successful pupils would have a significantly lower mean in mutually rejected bonds.

XII. The successful pupils would have a significantly higher socioeconomic rank as determined by the Sims Score Card.

Procedures for Collecting and Treating Data

In a preliminary survey to determine the possible number of pupils available for study it was found that there was not a sufficient number of girls for a comparison group. This finding was in agreement with Volberding (30) who found that boys were more often unsuccessful pupils. This study was therefore limited to unsuccessful male pupils.

From six elementary schools in a single school system twenty-nine white male pupils who had failed two years were identified as unsuccessful subjects. These pupils were in twenty-six different classrooms.
Thirteen of the unsuccessful pupils were in the fifth grade. The age range of this group of fifth graders was from twelve years and five months to thirteen years and two months. The mean age of this fifth grade group was twelve years and eight months. These pupils came from five different elementary schools and eleven different classrooms. All ages were based on the ages of the pupils as of December, 1965, when the California Test of Mental Maturity was administered.

The remaining sixteen unsuccessful pupils were from the sixth grade. The age range of these sixth grade pupils was from thirteen years and four months to fourteen years and nine months. The mean age of this group was thirteen years and eleven months. These pupils came from five different elementary schools and fifteen different classrooms.

The successful pupils came from one large elementary school. The pupils were randomly selected from eight classrooms by selecting every other pupil from the class roll and skipping any pupil that had failed a grade. The ages as quoted are based on the pupils' ages as of December, 1965, when the California Test of Mental Maturity was administered.

Fifteen of the successful pupils came from the sixth grade. These pupils were randomly selected from four classrooms. The age range was from eleven years and five months to twelve years and three months. The mean age of the sixth grade successful pupils was eleven years and eleven months.
The remaining fifteen successful pupils came from the fifth grade. These pupils were randomly selected from four classrooms. The range of ages was from ten years and four months to eleven years and two months. The mean age of the pupils was ten years and nine months.

Six of the classrooms had successful and unsuccessful pupils. The elementary schools in this study had a modified self-contained classroom system with music being the only subject not taught by the homeroom teacher. The school system used school buses to transport the children to school.

The school system in which this study was made was composed of sixteen schools: twelve elementary schools, three junior high schools, and one high school. These schools provided facilities for 13,000 scholastics. The schools were organized on the 6-3-3 grade basis. The community was one of the fastest growing cities in the state during the decade from 1950 to 1960 with the population growing from 2,000 to 43,000. The community was composed of predominately upper-lower and lower-middle class socioeconomic groups. The housing was the type that would attract the lower income groups.

The following instruments and procedures were used to determine the significant differences between the successful and unsuccessful groups:

In testing hypothesis I, the following was done:

The California Achievement Test, Elementary Level, Form X,
was administered to both the successful and unsuccessful groups. Mean achievement scores were determined in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, total reading, arithmetic reasoning, arithmetic fundamentals, arithmetic total, mechanics of English, spelling, total language, and total battery for both groups. Differences between these means were determined. Significance of difference between means was tested by the Fisher's \( t \) test statistical technique. Acceptance of significance of difference was at the 5 percent level of confidence or better.

In testing hypothesis II, the following was done:
The California Test Of Mental Maturity, Short Form, 1963 S-Form, Level II, was given to both groups. The language, non-language, and total test intelligence quotient means were computed for the successful and unsuccessful groups. The significance of the difference between means was tested by the \( t \) test method.

In testing hypothesis III, the following was done:
The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children was administered to each pupil in both groups. The means were computed for the successful and unsuccessful groups on the verbal, performance, and full scale intelligence quotients of the Wechsler. The difference between the means was then computed. The significance of the difference between the means was determined by using the \( t \) test.
In testing hypothesis IV, the following was done:
The California Test of Personality, Elementary Form, 1953 Revision, Form BB, was administered to both groups of pupils. Mean scores were determined in personal adjustment, social adjustment, and total adjustment for the unsuccessful and successful groups. Difference between means was computed and the significance of difference was determined by using the t test technique. Since the difference was not significant at the 5 per cent level or better, the sub-sections under personal adjustment and the sub-sections under social adjustment were statistically treated as stated above. Chi square was also used to statistically detect significance in individual test items.

In testing hypothesis V, the following was done:
The Rorschach was administered individually to each of the unsuccessful and successful pupils. The quality and quantity of the Rorschach responses were determined. The areas that were considered were (1) creativity as measured by M responses, (2) quality of form perception as measured by F+ percentage, (3) range and quality of content, (4) quality and number of W responses, (5) conformity as measured by P. To determine the significance of the quantity of responses the difference between means was determined by applying the t test of statistical significance. The quality of the Rorschach responses was interpreted by using the standard manual of interpretation (3).
In testing hypothesis VI, the following was done:
Each teacher who had one or more of the unsuccessful or successful pupils filled out the Pupil Adjustment Inventory, Short Form, for each pupil. The Pupil Adjustment Inventory was published by Houghton Mifflin Company and was developed by the School of Education, University of Pennsylvania. The rater marked one of the five points along a continuum. The results were statistically treated by assigning a numerical value to each point on the scale; the values ranged from one to five. The five would mean far above average in adjustment and the one would mean far below average in adjustment. The assignment of numerical values made possible the computing of means for each group in the following areas of pupil adjustment: academic, social, emotional, physical, activities and interests, school's influence upon the child, and home background. The difference between the means was tested by using the t test of statistical significance.

In testing hypothesis VII, the following was done:
Each teacher who had an unsuccessful or successful pupil completed the Behavior Description Chart for each of the pupils. This instrument was developed by Havighurst and was used in the Quincy, Illinois, study (13). The instrument was devised to detect withdrawal, aggression, and leadership characteristics in pupil behavior as perceived by the teacher. Mean scores in withdrawal, aggression, and leadership were
determined for both groups. Differences between these means were computed. Significance of difference between means was tested by the \(t\) test procedure.

In testing hypothesis VIII, the following was done: Each pupil in the successful and unsuccessful group filled out a My Teacher Questionnaire. This questionnaire was developed by Carroll H. Leeds in a dissertation that was submitted to the University of Minnesota (21). This instrument was designed to reveal how the pupils perceived the teacher in the areas related to teacher's disposition, treatment of pupils, teaching, interest in children's activities, status in pupil's esteem, and sense of humor. The means were determined for both groups and the difference between means was computed. Significance of difference between means was tested by the \(t\) test procedure. Chi square was used to select items that significantly differentiated between the two groups.

In testing hypothesis IX, the following was done: The Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument was used. This instrument is a modification of the Behavior Description Chart which was developed by Havighurst (13). The title and instructions came from an instrument developed by Cunningham (12). The modification of the instrument consisted in pulling the leadership, withdrawal, and aggression statements from the Behavior Description Chart and putting them into the form of "guess who" statements. Before the instrument was
used in this study it was administered to a class of pupils to determine whether the pupils could comprehend the statements and whether the teacher concurred with pupil responses. This instrument was then given to all members of every class that had an unsuccessful or successful pupil. The means were computed for the two groups in the areas of leadership, aggression, and withdrawal. The difference between means was computed and the significance of this difference was determined by the t test. The t test was also used to isolate items that significantly differentiated between the two groups.

Each pupil also put "myself" if a statement was particularly self-descriptive. The "myself" responses were then tabulated for each of the three areas: leadership, withdrawal, and aggression. The means were determined and tested by the t test procedure to determine significance. Chi square was used to isolate items that significantly differentiated between the two groups.

In testing hypothesis X, the following was done:
The attendance for the two groups was obtained from the school records for the first semester of the 1965-1966 school year. The group means were computed and the mean difference was tested by the t test method of determining significance.

In testing hypothesis XI the following was done:
The Classroom Social Distance Scale, developed by
Cunningham (12), was modified and used as a Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument. Each pupil responded to one of five statements arranged along a continuum ranging from acceptance to complete social rejection. Each pupil in class expressed his acceptance or rejection of every other pupil in the class. Numerical values were assigned to each statement ranging from a +2 to a -2 (see Table I). This enabled an aggregate score to be obtained for each class member by algebraically adding the scores.

**TABLE I**

**SOCIOMETRIC STATEMENTS AND NUMERICAL VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Numerical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would like to have him as one of my best friends</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to have him in my group but not as a close friend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to be with him once in a while but not often or for long at a time</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't mind his being in our room but I don't want to have anything to do with him</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish he were in some other room</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual pupils were then ranked by total score from the highest total score, the most accepted, to the lowest score, the least accepted, by using relative rank. The rank for each successful and unsuccessful subject was then
determined. The mean rank for each group was then computed. The difference between means was tested for significance by the t test procedure.

The responses given to all members of the class by each pupil were also algebraically added to get a total of the points given. This enabled a relative rank to be assigned to each class member based on how well he accepted the other members of the class. The mean rank for each group based on points given was then determined. The difference between means was computed and tested for significance by the t test procedure.

The bond of acceptance or rejection running from one child to another was tabulated in five categories. This enabled a determination of the quality of the social relationships. The five bond classifications were: strongly mutual, moderately mutual, strongly unreciprocated, moderately unreciprocated, and mutually rejected. These bonds were determined for each of the successful and unsuccessful pupils. The means for each of the two groups were determined in each of the five bond categories. The difference between the means was determined and checked for significance by the t test technique. This bond technique was developed and used at North Texas State University in an instrument called, "The North Texas Sociometric Scattergram (26)."

In testing hypothesis XII, the following was done: The instrument used was the Sims Score Card published by
Harcourt, Brace, and World. This instrument was administered to each pupil of both groups. The mean score for each group was computed and the difference between means determined. The significance of the difference between means was determined by applying the $t$ test. A copy of this form is given in Appendix F.
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CHAPTER II

RESPONSES OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS TO THE TESTING INSTRUMENTS

In this chapter the data gathered by the Rorschach Test, California Test of Mental Maturity, Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, and the California Achievement Test are reported. The statistical significance of the findings is listed.

The Rorschach Test

The Beck system (1) was used for the administration and scoring of the Rorschach. The Rorschach cards were given to the subject one at a time, and the subject was allowed to give his associations as to what he thought the cards presented. The responses for each card were recorded verbatim. The cards were presented to each subject in the same order. This was the free association period.

Immediately following the free association period, after the subject had given his final association to Card X, the inquiry commenced. In the inquiry the subject was asked to elaborate on the percepts that he reported during the free association period. The purpose of the inquiry was to obtain the determinants. The subject's responses were again recorded verbatim.
Responses were considered scorables if the percent given in the free association period was again recognized in the inquiry. Each response was judged in three major ways: location—the area of the blot initiating the percept; determinants—the aspect of the ink blot that determined the response; and content—that which was seen.

Location responses were scored as to the quality of the design, (F+) or (F-). Other determinants were human movement (M), pure color (C), form dominating color (FC), color dominating form (CP), form primary with shading secondary (FY), shading primary with form secondary (YP), form primary with texture secondary (FT), texture primary with form secondary (TP), pure distant perspective (V), form primary with distant perspective secondary (FV), and distant perspective primary with form secondary (VP). When that aspect of the ink blot that determined the response was a combination of determinants, the responses were evaluated as blends. Form primary with distant perspective secondary and with shading also being a factor (FV.V) was a commonly scored blend.

Content responses were scored as follows: human being (H), part of a human being (Hd), animal (A), anatomy (An), architecture (Ar), antiquity (Aq), botany (Bt), clothing (Cg), clouds (Cl), death (Dh), fire (Fi), food (Fd), geography (Ge), landscape (Ls), mythology (My), personal (Pr), and science (Sc).
The total number of elements for each category (location, determinants, and content) was added together according to type and set down in three columns. Each of the location factors was converted to a percentage of the total number of responses. These percentages determined the approach, the emphasis placed upon W, D, and Dd; and also the sequences or the orderliness with which the subject proceeds from one location to another.

Two percentages were obtained from the determinants. The total number of $F^+$ and $F^-$ responses was added, and this sum was then divided by the number of responses in the protocol to obtain the $F$ per cent. The total number of $F^+$ responses was added to the total number of $F^-$ responses, and this sum was divided by the total number of $F^+$ responses to obtain the $F^+$ percentage.

The relationship between the total number of scored $M$ responses and $C$ sum was also derived from the determinants and referred to as the Experience Balance. All $M$ responses were scored 1. The $C$ sum was derived from the values given the $PC$, $CP$, and $C$ responses. $PC$ was given the value of $0.5$, $CP$ the value of 1, and $C$ the value of 1.5.

The total number of animal responses was divided by the total number of responses to obtain the animal per cent ($A\%$).

Another factor used in this study was the number of popular ($P$) responses. These are the responses that occur
most often. They were judged P if they were included in Beck's list of twenty-one popular responses (1, p. 208).

The total number of content categories was added to obtain K. The results of the Rorschach are presented in statistical form in Table II.

### TABLE II

**LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEANS OF THE SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL GROUPS OF PUPILS ON THE RORSCHACH INDICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Successful Pupils M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P+%</td>
<td>65.63</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>60.53</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>2.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W%</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level of confidence.

The P+ per cent mean score for the successful group of pupils was 65.83 with a standard deviation of 8.48, as compared with a mean of 60.53 and a standard deviation of 10.27 for the unsuccessful group. When the t test of the difference between the means was applied, a t ratio was generated that was significant at the .05 level of confidence. The hypothesis was accepted that the successful group would make a
significantly higher mean score on the form level per cent (F%) than the unsuccessful group.

On the whole responses per cent (W%) the means for the successful and unsuccessful group of pupils were 14.76 and 16.03 respectively. When the t test of significance was applied the difference between the means was not significant. The hypothesis was rejected that the successful group of pupils would have a significantly higher mean score on the W per cent than would the unsuccessful group.

On the popular responses (P) the mean score for the successful group of pupils was 5.03 with a standard deviation of 1.60, as compared to a mean score of 4.56 and a standard deviation of 1.54 for the unsuccessful group. The difference between the means was not significant and the hypothesis was rejected that the successful group would make a significantly higher mean score on the number of popular responses than would the unsuccessful group.

The movement response (M) mean score for the successful group of pupils was 1.56 as compared to a mean of 1.10 for the unsuccessful group. There was more variability among the successful group of pupils as shown by the standard deviations for the two groups of 1.45 and 1.07. The difference between the means was not significant. The hypothesis was rejected that there was a significant difference in the movement response means.
The $K$ (number of content categories) mean score for the successful pupils was 8.93 as compared with a mean of 7.43 for the unsuccessful group of pupils. The successful group had a standard deviation of 2.80 and the unsuccessful group had a standard deviation of 2.36. The difference between the means was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The **California Test of Mental Maturity**

The **California Test of Mental Maturity**, Short Form, 1963 S-Form, Level II, was administered in group situations to the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils. The tests were scored and the results were tabulated on the pupil profile.

### TABLE III

**THE RESULTS OF THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF MENTAL MATURITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Section</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Group</th>
<th>Successful Group</th>
<th>Fisher’s $t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>100.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Language</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85.65</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>92.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>96.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The results of the **California Test of Mental Maturity** were listed in Table III. The successful pupils' mean intelligence quotient on the language portion of the
California Test of Mental Maturity was 100.26 as compared to a mean intelligence quotient of 77.00 for the unsuccessful pupils. The standard deviation for the successful pupils was 12.35 as compared to 13.49 for the unsuccessful pupils. The range of the language intelligence quotients for the successful pupils was 75 to 124 as compared to 36 to 106 for the unsuccessful pupils. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence. The hypothesis was retained that there was a significant difference between the two groups of pupils on the language portion of the California Test of Mental Maturity.

On the non-language portion of the California Test of Mental Maturity, the mean for the successful group of pupils was 92.60 as compared with 85.65 for the unsuccessful group. There was more variability among the unsuccessful pupils as shown by the standard deviation of 13.91. The range of non-language intelligence quotients for the successful pupils was 75 to 122 whereas the range was 51 to 108 for the unsuccessful pupils. The difference between the means was not significant at the 5 or better per cent level. The t ratio would have to reach 2.00 to be significant at the .05 level (2, p. 430). This lack of significance necessitated the rejection of the hypothesis that there was a significant difference between the two groups on the non-language portion of the California Test of Mental Maturity.
The total intelligence quotient on the California Test of Mental Maturity (see Table III) was 96.46 for the successful pupils as compared to 79.65 for the unsuccessful pupils. The largest amount of variability occurred on this section of the test. The standard deviation for the successful pupils was only 9.72, as compared to 12.16 for the unsuccessful pupils. The successful pupils had a range of 47 points (75 to 122) while the unsuccessful pupils had a range of 57 points (51 to 108). The difference between the means was significant at a point beyond the .001 level of confidence. The hypothesis was retained that there was a significant difference between the two groups on the total intelligence quotient as measured by the California Test of Mental Maturity.

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children

Each pupil, from both unsuccessful and successful groups, was administered the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children as directed by Wechsler (3). The results of this testing and the statistical treatment were put in table form (Table IV).

The successful pupils' mean verbal intelligence quotient (102.76) was higher than the unsuccessful pupils' (84.44), and their verbal intelligence quotient range was 79 to 124 as compared with a range of 66 to 105 for the unsuccessful group of pupils. There was more variability in the successful group as shown by the standard deviation of 11.38, as compared with a standard deviation of 8.62 for the unsuccessful...
group. As listed in Table IV the greatest difference between the two groups was in the verbal area of the Wechsler and this difference was significant at the .001 level of confidence. The hypothesis was accepted that there was a significant difference between the two groups on the verbal portion of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children.

### TABLE IV

**THE RESULTS OF THE WECHSLER INTELLIGENCE SCALE FOR CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal I. Q.</td>
<td>84.44</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>102.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance I. Q.</td>
<td>92.72</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>97.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Scale I. Q.</td>
<td>87.31</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>100.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The mean performance intelligence quotient for the successful group of pupils was 97.60 which was higher than the mean of 92.72 for the unsuccessful pupils. The range for the successful group was 78 to 129, as compared to 67 to 111 for the unsuccessful group. The standard deviations of the two groups varied very little; 9.57 for the unsuccessful group and 9.48 for the successful group. When Fisher's t test was applied to the difference between the means no
significant difference was found. McNemar (2) listed 2.00 as being the $t$ ratio for the .05 level of confidence with 57 degrees of freedom. The hypothesis that there was a significant difference between the means of the two groups on the performance section of the *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children* was rejected.

The mean intelligence quotient for the full scale of the Wechsler for the successful group was 100.30 with a range of 79 to 126, as compared to a full scale intelligence quotient mean of 87.31 with a range of 69 to 109 for the unsuccessful group of pupils. There was more variability in the intelligence quotients of the successful pupils as shown by the 9.60 standard deviation. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence and the hypothesis was retained that there was a significant difference between the two groups, favoring the successful pupils.

**The California Achievement Test**

The *California Achievement Test, Elementary Level, Form X*, was given to both the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils in a group situation. The results of the *California Achievement Tests* in statistical form were listed in Table V.

The *California Achievement Test* was given to fifteen fifth grade pupils and fifteen sixth grade pupils; these pupils composed the successful group. The unsuccessful group had sixteen pupils in the sixth grade and thirteen


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Section</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Vocabulary</td>
<td>- .70</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>- .90</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic Reasoning</td>
<td>- .63</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic Fundamentals</td>
<td>- .46</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>- .53</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics of English</td>
<td>- .62</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Language</td>
<td>- .73</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Battery</td>
<td>- .65</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since both groups of pupils were in two grades, the groups had to be compared by deviations in years from the achievement norms.

**Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

***Significant at the .001 level of confidence.
pupils in the fifth grade. Since both groups of pupils were in two grades, the groups had to be compared by deviations of the individual scores from the achievement norms, which were 5.3 (fifth year and third month) for the fifth grade and 6.3 (sixth year and third month) for the sixth grade. All deviation mean scores cited in this section of the study are in the form of deviations, in years, from the achievement norms.

Reading

On the "reading vocabulary" section of the California Achievement Test the mean deviation from grade norm for the successful group was +.39 as compared to a mean of -.70 for the unsuccessful group. The successful pupils were 3.9 months ahead of grade norm. The successful group deviation range was from -1.4 to +2.0 and the unsuccessful group deviation range was from -4.3 to +.9. The unsuccessful group had more variability as shown by the standard deviation of 1.02. The difference between the means was significant at better than the .001 level of confidence. The hypothesis that there was a significant difference between the groups on the reading vocabulary section of the California Achievement Test was substantiated.

On the "reading comprehension" section of the California Achievement Test the mean score for the successful group of pupils was -.15 deviation from the grade norm while the norm
deviation of the unsuccessful pupils was -1.15. The deviation range for the successful group of pupils was from -2.8 to +1.7 as compared to a range of -4.0 to +.3 for the unsuccessful pupils. It should be noted that the successful pupils did not achieve grade level on this section of the test. The difference between the means was significant at the .01 level of confidence. This finding supported the hypothesis that there was a significant difference between the two groups in reading comprehension favoring the successful pupils.

The deviation mean score for the group of successful pupils on the "total reading" section of the California Achievement Test was +.16 and the deviation mean score for the unsuccessful group of pupils was -.90. The range for the successful group of pupils was from -2.1 to +1.9 as compared to a range of -4.2 to +.6 for the unsuccessful pupils. The unsuccessful pupils' standard deviation was .92 and the standard deviation for the successful pupils was 1.0. The difference between the means was significant at better than the .001 level of confidence. The hypothesis was supported that the successful group of pupils was significantly different from the unsuccessful group of pupils and the successful pupils were higher in total reading achievement.

Arithmetic

The deviation mean score for the successful group of pupils on the "arithmetic reasoning" section of the California
Achievement Test was +.45 and the deviation mean score for the unsuccessful group of pupils was -.63. The successful pupils' range was from -1.0 to +1.5, as compared to -2.8 to +.3 for the unsuccessful group. There was more variability among the unsuccessful group as shown by the standard deviations of .76 and .57. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence. This result supported the hypothesis.

On the "arithmetic fundamentals" section the deviation mean score of the successful group of pupils was +.15, as compared to -.16 for the unsuccessful pupils. The successful pupils had a range in deviations from -.9 to +1.2, as compared to -3.4 to +.8 for the unsuccessful group of pupils. There was a difference in variability between the two groups with the unsuccessful group of pupils having .78 standard deviation and the successful group of pupils having a standard deviation of .55. The difference between the means was significant at better than the .01 level of confidence. The difference was significant and favored the successful group of pupils. The hypothesis was retained that there would be a significant difference between the two groups favoring the successful pupils.

The "total arithmetic" deviation mean score for the successful group of pupils was +.30 and -.53 was the deviation mean score for the unsuccessful group of pupils. The range was -.6 to 1.1 for the successful group and -3.0
to .7 for the unsuccessful group. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence. This result supported the hypothesis that there was a significant difference between the two groups in the area of arithmetic achievement.

Language

The deviation mean score for the successful group of pupils on the "mechanics of English" section of the California Achievement Test was +.34 as compared to -.62 for the unsuccessful group of pupils. The successful group range was -1.7 to +2.0 while the unsuccessful group range was -2.5 to +.6. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence. This supported the hypothesis that there would be a significant difference between the two groups in this area of the California Achievement Test.

The "spelling" section of the California Achievement Test yielded a deviation mean score of -1.23 to the unsuccessful group of pupils and a mean score of +.81 to the successful group. This section had the greatest ranges for the two groups; the successful group range was -3.3 to +4.4, as compared to a range of -3.9 to +1.9 for the successful group. The minimum score for the successful group was almost as low as the minimum score for the unsuccessful group. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence. This supported the hypothesis that the
successful group of pupils would be significantly higher in spelling achievement.

The deviation mean score for the successful group of pupils on the total language section of the test was +.41 while the unsuccessful group mean score was -.73. The ranges for the successful and unsuccessful groups were -1.7 to +2.3 and -2.7 to +.7 respectively. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence and the hypothesis that the successful group of pupils would have a significantly higher mean on the total language section of the California Achievement Test was retained.

Total Battery

The results of the California Achievement Test supported the hypothesis that there was a significant difference between the two groups favoring the successful group of pupils. The total battery deviation mean score for the successful group was +.30 and the mean score for the unsuccessful group was -.65. The range in the total battery was -1.7 to +2.3 for the successful group, as compared to -2.7 to +.7 for the unsuccessful group. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.
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CHAPTER III
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS
AS REVEALED BY VARIOUS INSTRUMENTS AND
SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

The results of other standardized instruments of this study are presented in this chapter. The findings are presented from the following sources: California Test of Personality, Behavior Description Chart, Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument, Pupil Adjustment Inventory, Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument, My Teacher Questionnaire, Sims Score Card, and school attendance records.

The California Test of Personality

The California Test of Personality was administered to both groups of pupils. The results of the California Test of Personality showed little difference between the two groups (Tables VI and VII). The statistics of the California Test of Personality were based on raw scores and not percentiles.

As can readily be seen in Table VI, there were no divisions of the California Test of Personality which differentiated between the two groups to a significant level. The results of the two divisions, personal and social adjustment, showed that the performance of the two groups were essentially the same.
A comparison of the successful and unsuccessful pupils as shown by the raw score results of the California Test of Personality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Adjustment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Self reliance</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Sense of personal worth</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sense of personal freedom</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Feeling of belonging</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Withdrawal tendencies</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Nervous symptoms</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Adjustment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Social standards</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Social skills</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Anti-social tendencies</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Family relations</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. School relations</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Community relations</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>9.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Highest possible raw score on each sub-division was 12.
In the personal adjustment section, three results of the sub-sections favored the successful group of pupils and three favored the unsuccessful group. The successful group of pupils had more self-reliance and a better sense of personal worth. The successful group also perceived themselves as having less nervous symptoms.

The unsuccessful group of pupils had a better sense of personal freedom and fewer withdrawal tendencies. The unsuccessful group also had more feeling of belonging than the successful group. This feeling of belonging was not substantiated by the sociometric findings of this study. The test manual stated that this feeling of belonging was based on family relations, peer relations, and a cordial relationship with people in general (1). This result was in conflict with the Whole Class Sociometric Instrument which gave a mean rank in class of twenty-fourth for the unsuccessful pupils.

In social adjustment the unsuccessful group of pupils had larger mean scores in four of the six sections. The unsuccessful pupils had larger mean scores in social standards, anti-social tendencies, family relations, and school relations. The successful pupils had larger means in social skills and community relations. The largest difference between the two groups was in the area of social skills where the $t$ test generated a $t$ ratio of 1.67, which was far short of being significant but did show a trend. The pupils with
social skills had a liking for people and gave assistance to them even when it was an inconvenience (1).

A chi square analysis (Table VII) was made of the California Personality Test items to determine if any of them discriminated between the two groups at a significant level. Only seven items were found that discriminated between the two groups at the .05 level of confidence or better. Due to the fact that many of these items were related to other data an interpretation was withheld until Chapter IV.

The Behavior Description Chart

The Behavior Description Chart was used to develop the teachers' perceptions of the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils. The statistical results of the Behavior Description Chart were shown in Table VIII.

In leadership characteristics the unsuccessful group of pupils had a mean score of .72 as compared to a mean score of 4.10 for the successful group. The standard deviations were 1.20 and 3.61 with the successful group of pupils having the larger standard deviation. The t test of significance yielded a t ratio which, with 57 degrees of freedom, made the difference between the means significant at the .001 level of confidence. The hypothesis was substantiated that the successful pupils would have significantly more leadership characteristics as measured by the teachers' responses to the Behavior Description Chart.
TABLE VII

ITEMS OF THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY THAT DISCRIMINATED BETWEEN THE SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS AT THE FIVE PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE OR BETTER*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of Pupils Missing Question</th>
<th>Chi Square Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. May you usually choose your own friends?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Are the rules in your grade better suited to younger children?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Do some of your friends seem to think that you are too restless?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Is it easy to admit when you are wrong?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Do you like to speak or sing in front of people?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Are many people so stubborn that they make you quarrel with them?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Do you like to stay away from pupils of the other sex at school?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Yates correction formula was applied to any question containing a frequency of five or less.

**Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

***Significant at the .01 level of confidence.
TABLE VIII

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS AS MEASURED BY THE BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The mean scores for aggression behavior characteristics were 1.13 and .73 for the unsuccessful and successful groups of pupils respectively. The standard deviation for the unsuccessful group of pupils was 2.09 as compared to 1.23 for the successful group. As listed in Table VIII the unsuccessful group of pupils had a larger number of aggressive characteristics as perceived by the teachers, but the difference between the mean scores was not statistically significant at the .05 level or better. The hypothesis was therefore rejected that the teachers would see significantly more aggressive characteristics in the behavior of the unsuccessful pupils.

The mean number of withdrawal characteristics for the unsuccessful group of pupils as perceived by the teachers' responses to the Behavior Description Chart was 3.89 as
compared to a mean score of 2.50 for the successful group. The standard deviations, as listed in Table VIII, were almost the same for both groups of pupils. The test of significance found the difference between the mean scores to be significant at the .05 level of confidence. The hypothesis was retained that the teachers would see significantly more withdrawal tendencies in the behavior of the unsuccessful pupils.

The **Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument**

**Peer Perception**

The responses of the peers were tabulated and checked for significance. In Table IX the statistical results of the **Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument** were listed. The significance of each of the three behavioral areas by individual "guess who" item was listed in Tables X, XI, and XII.

The unsuccessful group of pupils was listed by their peers as having leadership characteristics an average of 9.68 times with a standard deviation of 14.33 while the successful group of pupils was listed an average of 14.46 times with a standard deviation of 19.95. As perceived by the peers the successful pupils had more leadership characteristics, but statistical analysis revealed that the difference between the mean scores was not significant at the .05 level or better; therefore, the hypothesis was rejected that the peers
would see significantly more leadership characteristics in
the successful group of pupils.

**TABLE IX**

**PEER PERCEPTION AS MEASURED BY THE SOCIAL ANALYSIS
OF THE CLASSROOM INSTRUMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>14.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>8.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>23.79</td>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>9.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The mean number of times that the unsuccessful group of pupils was listed as having withdrawal characteristics was 16.20 with a standard deviation of 15.00. The successful group of pupils had a mean of 8.73 with a standard deviation of 8.46. The difference between these two means was significant at better than the .05 level of confidence and the hypothesis was retained that the peers would perceive the successful pupils as having less withdrawal characteristics as measured by the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument.

The means of the unsuccessful and successful pupils for the aggression section of the Social Analysis of the
Classroom Instrument were 23.79 and 9.36 respectively. The unsuccessful group of pupils had more variability in responses as shown by the standard deviations for the two groups of 25.47 and 10.48. The test of significance revealed that the difference between the means was significant at better than the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis was retained that the peers would perceive the unsuccessful group of pupils as being significantly more aggressive as measured by the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument.

The data compiled in Table X revealed the significance of the individual items of the leadership questions from the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument. Although the ten questions did not differentiate between the groups to a significant degree, one question was found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence. The peers perceived the control pupils as liking jobs which gave them responsibility (p<.05). The unsuccessful pupils had larger means on two of the items: "Here is a pupil that other pupils are eager to be near or on his side" and "Here is a pupil that is a natural leader." The results on the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument (Table IX) showed that the successful pupils had a larger mean when all of the leadership items were considered.

The results of an analysis of the peer responses to the withdrawal items of the Social Analysis of the Classroom
### TABLE X

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PEER RESPONSES OF THE LEADERSHIP ITEMS OF THE SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF THE CLASSROOM INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's $t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Here is a pupil that others go to for help.</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Here is a pupil that other pupils are eager to be near or on his side.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Here is a pupil that has confidence in his work.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Here is a pupil that is a natural leader.</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Here is a pupil that helps to make and enforce rules.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Here is a pupil that makes sensible, practical rules.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Here is a pupil that takes an active part in group and other activities</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Here is a pupil that likes jobs which gives him responsibility.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Here is a pupil that figures out things for himself.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Here is a pupil that is quick to see valuable things in other people's suggestions</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.
Instrument are in Table XI. This set of ten "guess who" statements differentiated between the two groups at the .05 level of confidence. Listed in Table XI are the items that were the most indicative of how the peers perceived the unsuccessful group of pupils. The one most important characteristic observed by the peers was that the unsuccessful pupils felt ill at ease and fearful; this item was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The peers also saw the unsuccessful pupils as sensitive, touchy, hurt by criticism and the unsuccessful pupils appeared to be tense or ill at ease when reciting or appearing before the class; these characteristics were significant at the .05 level of confidence. The peers did not notice the presence or absence of the unsuccessful pupils; this difference between the two groups was significant at the .05 level of confidence. It was unusual that on one item, although not a significant one, the unsuccessful pupils had a smaller mean score; this was found on question number eleven, "Here is a pupil who is extremely quiet and not active."

The results of an item analysis of the individual items of the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument in the area of aggression are listed in Table XII. Seven of the ten items were significant at the .05 level or better. The two most significant characteristics (p<.01, p<.02) of the unsuccessful group of pupils as observed by their class peers
### TABLE XI
AN ANALYSIS OF THE PEER RESPONSES TO THE WITHDRAWAL ITEMS OF THE SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF THE CLASSROOM INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Here is a pupil that lacks confidence in himself.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Here is a pupil that is easily confused.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Here is a pupil that is sensitive, touchy, hurt by criticism.</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Here is a pupil that is extremely quiet and not active.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Here is a pupil that feels ill at ease and fearful.</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Here is a pupil that becomes discouraged easily.</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Here is a pupil that is shy and keeps to himself.</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Here is a pupil that is tense or ill at ease when reciting or appearing before a class or group.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Here is a pupil whose presence or absence is not noticed by other children.</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Here is a pupil that is hard to know.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .01 level of confidence.
TABLE XII
AN ANALYSIS OF THE PEER RESPONSES TO THE AGGRESSION ITEMS OF
THE SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF THE CLASSROOM INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Here is a pupil that causes disturbances.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Here is a pupil that children find hard to get along with.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Here is a pupil that shows off and is an attention getter.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Here is a pupil that is boastful.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Here is a pupil that frequently gets into fights.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Here is a pupil that breaks rules.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Here is a pupil that others cannot work with.</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Here is a pupil that likes to quarrel and argue.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Here is a pupil that acts without thinking and is easily excited.</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Here is a pupil that tries to bully and rule over others.</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .02 level of confidence.

***Significant at the .01 level of confidence.
were "Here is a pupil that breaks rules" and "Here is a pupil that tries to bully and rule over others." The peers also saw the unsuccessful pupils as individuals who get into fights, cause disturbances, and attract attention by showing off. The unsuccessful group of pupils are also the ones with whom others cannot work. These characteristics were significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Self Perception

The self perception score was developed by tabulating the responses of "myself" from the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument for the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils. The pupil wrote "myself" by those statements that particularly described his behavior. The statistical results of this section of the study are listed in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

SELF PERCEPTION OF THE SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS
AS DEVELOPED BY THE SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.
The mean score of the leadership characteristics for the unsuccessful group of pupils was 1.72 in comparison with a mean score of 2.06 for the successful group of pupils. The variability of the two sets of responses was very much the same as shown by the standard deviations of 1.83 and 1.91. Although the successful group of pupils perceived themselves as having more leadership qualities, the difference between the mean scores was not statistically significant and the hypothesis was rejected that the successful group of pupils would perceive themselves as having significantly more leadership characteristics.

The mean scores of the withdrawal characteristics of the unsuccessful and successful groups of pupils were 1.44 and 1.06 respectively. The standard deviations were 1.67 and 1.54, with the unsuccessful group of pupils having more variability. The statistical test proved that the difference between the two mean scores was not significant. The hypothesis was rejected that the unsuccessful pupils would see themselves as having significantly more withdrawal tendencies.

The unsuccessful group of pupils perceived themselves as having more aggression characteristics as shown by their mean score of 1.34 as compared to the mean score of 0.53 for the successful group. The unsuccessful group of pupils had more variability, as shown by their standard deviation of 1.62. The successful group of pupils had a standard deviation of .88. The difference between the means was significant at the
.05 level of confidence. The hypothesis was retained that the unsuccessful group of pupils would see themselves as having aggression as shown by their responses on the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument.

The Pupil Adjustment Inventory

The Pupil Adjustment Inventory reflected the teacher's perception of the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils. The factors included in the inventory are those that research has revealed to be associated frequently with adjustment problems of pupils (4).

In "achievement" the mean score for the unsuccessful group of pupils was 1.82, as compared to a mean score of 3.06 for the successful group (see Table XIV). The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The mean scores for the "attitude toward school work" were 1.96 for the group of unsuccessful pupils and 3.20 for the successful group. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The mean score for the "sociability" section for the unsuccessful group of pupils was 2.68, with the successful group having a mean score of 3.36. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The mean scores for the "social acceptance" section for the unsuccessful and successful group of pupils were 2.34
### TABLE XIV

A COMPARISON OF THE SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS AS REFLECTED IN THE TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO THE PUPIL ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement as related to aptitude</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward school work</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social acceptance</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of associates</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperament</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal worth</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of health</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities and interests</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward school</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School attendance</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School's influence upon pupil</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic status</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family life</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total inventory</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>47.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .001 level of confidence.
and 3.23 respectively. The difference between the means was significant at a point beyond the .001 level of confidence.

In the "types of associates" section of the Pupil Adjustment Inventory the unsuccessful group of pupils had a mean score of 2.34 and the successful group mean score was 3.46. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The results of the "temperament" section gave the unsuccessful group of pupils a mean score of 2.10 and the successful group a mean score of 3.10. The means were statistically treated by the t test method and the difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

On the "personal worth" section of the Pupil Adjustment Inventory the unsuccessful group of pupils had a mean score of 2.44 as compared to a mean score of 3.20 for the successful group. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The unsuccessful group of pupils received a mean score of 3.27 on the "state of health" section, while the successful group received a mean score of 4.13. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The mean score for the "activities and interests" section was 2.34 for the unsuccessful group of pupils while the successful group received a mean score of 3.36. The
difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

On the "attitude toward school" section the unsuccessful group of pupils had a mean score of 2.51 and the successful group had a mean score of 3.46. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The "school attendance" section did not discriminate significantly between the two groups as perceived by the teacher. The mean scores were 3.48 and 3.83 for the unsuccessful and successful groups of pupils respectively. The difference between the means was not significant at the .05 level or better. This finding was in direct conflict with the school attendance records, which showed a significant difference (p<.05) in the attendance of the two groups.

There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the successful and unsuccessful group in the "school's influence upon the pupil" section. The mean score for the unsuccessful group of pupils was 2.37 and the mean score for the successful group was 3.43. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

On the "economic status" section the teachers perceived the unsuccessful group of pupils as having a significantly lower economic status. The mean scores were 2.58 and 3.10, with the successful group of pupils having the larger mean.
The difference between the mean scores was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups on the "family life" section of the Pupil Adjustment Inventory. The mean score for the unsuccessful group of pupils was 2.68 as compared to a mean score of 3.56 for the successful group. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The total inventory discriminated between the two groups at the .001 level of confidence. The mean scores were 35.00 and 47.53, with the successful group of pupils having the higher score. On this inventory, as previously stated, the higher the score the better adjusted was the pupil. The successful group of pupils were significantly better adjusted, as measured by the teachers' responses to the Pupil Adjustment Inventory. The hypothesis was retained that the successful pupil would be significantly better adjusted, as measured by the teachers' responses to the Pupil Adjustment Inventory.

The Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument

Acceptance of Successful and Unsuccessful Pupils by Peers

Every pupil in every class responded to the Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument. This enabled each pupil to give an acceptance or rejection response to every pupil in the class. The statement checked was given a numerical score and
all responses received by a pupil were algebraically added for a total. The totals for all the pupils of each class were relatively ranked from the highest score to the lowest. A copy of the sociometric ranking device will be found in Appendix E. The results of the Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument are given in Table XV.

The relative rank range for the unsuccessful group of pupils was fifth place to thirtieth place in the class with, a mean of 23.62 and a standard deviation of 6.59. The range of the successful group of pupils was from first place to twenty-ninth place in the class, with a mean of 13.65 and a standard deviation of 8.91. The difference between the means was significant at a point beyond the .001 level of confidence. The hypothesis that the unsuccessful pupils would be significantly lower in class sociometric rank as measured by the Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument was retained.

### TABLE XV

A COMPARISON OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS AS SHOWN BY THE RESULTS OF THE WHOLE CLASS SOCIOMETRIC RANKING INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher’s t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of pupils by peers</td>
<td>23.62</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>13.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of peers</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures are based on relative class rank.

**Significant at the .001 level of confidence.
Acceptance of the Class by the Successful and Unsuccessful Pupils

The responses to other members of the class, that were given by the successful and unsuccessful pupils, were added and a total score determined. This was also done for each peer in the class. The totals were then relatively ranked and a place, or rank, was given to each pupil's total. This gave a comparative rank to each pupil based on how well he accepted the other members of the class.

The range of the relative ranks for the unsuccessful group of pupils was from first to thirty-fourth place. The mean for the unsuccessful group was 16.77 with a standard deviation of 10.15. The range for the successful group was from second place in the class to thirty-second place, with a mean of 15.15 and a standard deviation of 8.31. There was more variability among the unsuccessful pupils and they were lower in relative rank. The t test of the significance of difference between means was applied and the difference was not statistically significant. The hypothesis that the successful pupils would rank significantly higher in acceptance of other class members as measured by the Whole Class Sociometric Ranking Instrument was rejected.

Sociometric Bonds of Acceptance and Rejection

It is very important in determining social status that the bonds of acceptance or rejection between pupils be
considered. Flotow (2) stated that choices and mutual relationships must be considered in determining the social status of a pupil. This portion of the study was an attempt to determine the quality of the relationships (see Table XVI). Data listed in Table XVII revealed a statistical comparison of the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils as determined by sociometric bonds.

TABLE XVI
LEGEND FOR DETERMINING SOCIOMETRIC BONDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Relationships</th>
<th>Weighted Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly mutual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately mutual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly unreciprocated</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately unreciprocated</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually Rejected</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strongly mutual bonds.—The range for the strongly mutual pairings for the unsuccessful group of pupils was from 0 to 10, with a mean 3.06 and a standard deviation of 2.70. The range for the strongly mutual pairings for the successful pupils was 0 to 17, with a mean of 6.16 and a standard deviation of 4.48. The figures reflect a much wider range for the successful group of pupils and more variability for that group. When the t test of significance of difference between means was applied the result showed that the difference was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis was retained that the successful pupils would have a significantly higher mean score in strongly mutual bonds.

TABLE XVII

A COMPARISON OF THE TWO GROUPS IN SOCIOMETRIC BONDS OF ACCEPTANCE AND REJECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bond</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Pupils</th>
<th>Successful Pupils</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly mutual</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately mutual</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly unreciprocated</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately unreciprocated</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually rejected</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.
Moderately mutual bonds.--The range for the moderately mutual bonds was 0 to 14 for the unsuccessful group of pupils and 0 to 16 for the successful group. The mean for the unsuccessful group was 5.79, with a mean of 8.86 for the successful group. The standard deviations for the successful and unsuccessful groups were 4.10 and 3.18 respectively. The difference between the means was significant at the .01 level of confidence. This substantiated the hypothesis that the successful pupils would have a significantly higher mean in moderately mutual bonds.

Strongly unreciprocated bonds.--The ranges of the strongly unreciprocated bonds for the unsuccessful and successful groups of pupils were 0 to 8 and 0 to 5 respectively. The mean for the unsuccessful group was 1.41, as compared to 1.23 for the successful group. The difference between the means was not significant. The hypothesis was rejected that the successful group of pupils would have a significantly lower mean in strongly unreciprocated bonds.

Moderately unreciprocated bonds.--The ranges for the moderately unreciprocated pairings were 0 to 18 for the unsuccessful group of pupils and 0 to 13 for the successful group. The mean for the unsuccessful group was 6.93 with a standard deviation of 3.46. The mean for the successful group was 4.46 with a standard deviation of 3.21. The difference between the means was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis was retained that the
successful group of pupils would have a significantly lower mean in moderately unreciprocated bonds.

Mutually rejected bonds.--The range of mutually rejected bonds was 0 to 10 for the unsuccessful group of pupils and 0 to 6 for the successful group. The means were 2.58 for the unsuccessful group of pupils and .96 for the successful group. The standard deviations were 2.81 for the unsuccessful group of pupils and 1.40 for the successful group. The difference between the means was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis was retained that the successful group of pupils would have a significantly lower mean in mutually rejected bonds.

The My Teacher Questionnaire

The total scores for the pupils on the My Teacher Questionnaire were not high; the highest possible score was fifty. The mean inventory total score of the unsuccessful group of pupils on the My Teacher Questionnaire was 37.00 as compared to 32.70 for the successful group of pupils. The standard deviations were 8.16 and 8.33, with the successful group having the larger standard deviation. The t test of the significance of the difference between means gave a t ratio of 1.96, which was not significant according to the table (3) when the degrees of freedom are 57. The hypothesis was rejected that the successful group of pupils would be significantly better adjusted in their perception of their
teachers as measured by the mean total score on the My Teacher Questionnaire.

The unsuccessful group of pupils had a better mean score on the My Teacher Questionnaire than the unsuccessful group. The unsuccessful group of pupils were not as critical in their responses as the successful group. This outcome was unexpected, but perhaps this fits into the pattern of behavior that was indicative of the unsuccessful pupil.

Since the mean scores for the two groups did not significantly differentiate between the two groups, the chi-square item analysis method of determining significance was used to detect any item out of the fifty items on the questionnaire that differentiated significantly between the two groups. The data shown in Table XVIII indicated that some items out of the fifty did significantly differentiate between the two groups. These items are discussed in Chapter IV when conclusions as to their importance are attempted in the light of other data obtained in this study.

The Sims Score Card

The mean for the successful group of pupils on the Sims Score Card was 15.89 as compared with a mean of 14.89 for the unsuccessful group. The successful group of pupils had a standard deviation of 2.88 and the unsuccessful group had a standard deviation of 3.83. The difference between the means was not statistically significant. The hypothesis was
TABLE XVIII
A COMPARISON OF THE ITEMS OF THE MY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE THAT DISCRIMINATED BETWEEN THE SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS AT THE FIVE PER CENT LEVEL OR BETTER\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of Pupils Missing Question</th>
<th>Chi Square Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are there usually flowers and plants in your room?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does this teacher speak to you when she meets you on the street?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Does this teacher take part in children's games?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Does this teacher think she is always right and the pupils are always wrong?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Does this teacher often scold a pupil in front of other people?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Does this teacher talk too much?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is this teacher easily annoyed or bothered?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Does this teacher often keep pupils in at recess or after school?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Does this teacher often punish the whole class when only one or two are to blame?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Yates correction formula was applied to any question that had a frequency of five or less.
\textsuperscript{b}Significant at the .05 level of confidence.
\textsuperscript{c}Significant at the .01 level of confidence.
\textsuperscript{d}Significant at the .001 level of confidence.
rejected that the successful pupils would have a significantly higher socioeconomic rank as determined by the Sims Score Card.

School Attendance

In attendance the successful group of pupils had a mean of 86.70, while the unsuccessful group has a mean attendance of 81.44. Perfect attendance was 89 days. The successful group of pupils had a standard deviation of 2.47 and the unsuccessful group had a standard deviation of 10.82. The application of Fisher's $t$ test to the difference between the means gave a $t$ ratio which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. The hypothesis was accepted that the mean school attendance for the successful pupils would be significantly higher than that of the unsuccessful pupils.
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CHAPTER IV

A SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In this chapter an attempt is made to examine the findings of this study and to develop a total picture of the impact of failure upon a group of elementary school children. It is the purpose of this chapter to make comparisons of the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils in terms of socioeconomic status, school achievement, mental ability, personality, pupils as perceived by teachers and peers, pupils' perceptions of teacher and school, self perception, and school attendance.

Leadership, Withdrawal, and Aggression Perceptions

Perceptions of Leadership

The teachers perceived (Table XIX) a significant difference between the two groups at the .001 level of confidence on all ten leadership items. The peers did not see a significant difference in the two groups in the area of leadership. There was no significant difference between the two groups in self perception of leadership qualities. However, item analysis of peer perception and self perception responses detected some individual items that were statistically significant.
**TABLE XIX**

TEACHER RESPONSES TO LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS IN
RELATIVE RANK*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Relative Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Here is a pupil that others go to for help.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Here is a pupil that other pupils are eager to be near or on his side.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Here is a pupil that has confidence in his work.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Here is a pupil that is a natural leader.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Here is a pupil that helps to make and enforce rules.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Here is a pupil that makes sensible, practical rules.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Here is a pupil that takes an active part in group projects and other activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Here is a pupil that likes jobs which gives him responsibility.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Here is a pupil that figures out things for himself.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Here is a pupil that is quick to see valuable things in other people's suggestions.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This group of questions was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

**Questions are ranked from items showing the greatest difference between the two groups to those showing the least.
The teachers saw the unsuccessful group of pupils as individuals who did not take an active part in school (p<.001) perhaps because of the lack of ability to make sensible, practical plans in their approach to academic pursuits (p<.001). The unsuccessful pupils were not easily influenced by suggestions from their teachers (p<.001) probably because they did not see any value in what the teachers suggested (p<.001). The lack of leadership characteristics as seen by the teachers was directly orientated toward classwork and activities.

The teachers also perceived the unsuccessful group of pupils as lacking in self-confidence and in the ability to figure out things for themselves (p<.001). The unsuccessful pupils were also not ones to whom others would go for help and they did not help to make and enforce rules. The teachers listed "likes jobs which give responsibility" as the item that discriminated the least between the two groups in favor of successful pupils.

The peers saw the biggest leadership difference (Table X) between the two groups as being the desire for jobs which give responsibility. To the peers, the unsuccessful group of pupils were individuals who would not assume responsibility (p<.05). Perhaps this was caused by the characteristic that the peers list in second place; they saw the unsuccessful pupil as lacking in self-confidence when compared to the successful pupil. The peers also saw
the unsuccessful group of pupils as lacking in the ability to make sensible, practical plans. Two of the characteristics favored the unsuccessful pupils; these were "Here is a pupil that is a natural leader" and "Here is a pupil that other pupils are eager to be near or on his side." The difference between these two characteristics was not significant but this showed a normal response to an older, aggressive pupil. The sociometric portion of this study showed the rejection which the peers have for the unsuccessful pupils. Although only one item was statistically significant, the relative ranking of the characteristics did show a trend. The data in Table X revealed the levels of significance for all the leadership characteristics.

The data shown in Table XX indicated that none of the leadership self perception responses of the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils to the Social Analysis of the Classroom Instrument were significant. There were some noticeable trends. The unsuccessful group of pupils disliked jobs which gave them responsibility; or the results could be interpreted to mean that the successful group of pupils liked jobs which gave them responsibility more than the unsuccessful group of pupils. The unsuccessful group of pupils saw themselves as individuals who did not make sensible, practical plans; at least, six of the successful pupils put themselves in this category of making sensible,
TABLE XI
AN ITEM ANALYSIS OF THE SELF-PERCEPTION OF LEADERSHIP OF THE SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Pupils Responding</th>
<th></th>
<th>Chi Square Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Here is a pupil that others go to for help.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Here is a pupil that other pupils are eager to be near or on his side</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Here is a pupil that has confidence in his work.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Here is a pupil that is a natural leader.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Here is a pupil that helps to make and enforce rules.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Here is a pupil that makes sensible, practical rules.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Here is a pupil that takes an active part in group and other activities.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Here is a pupil that likes jobs which give him responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Here is a pupil that figures out things for himself.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Here is a pupil that is quick to see valuable things in other people's suggestions.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Yates correction formula was applied to all items which contained a frequency of five or less.*
practical plans and only three of the unsuccessful pupils listed themselves. A valid interpretation could not be made on the other self perception leadership items.

Perceptions of Withdrawal

The teachers perceived a difference between the two groups in withdrawal characteristics which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. The peers perceived a difference in the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. The self perception responses did not reflect a statistical significance in any questions.

The teachers perceived the unsuccessful pupil as being a pupil who was hard to know. The teacher did not understand this pupil who was rejected by the class; average sociometric rank of the unsuccessful pupil was twenty-fourth in the class. The unsuccessful pupil was seen by the teacher as being tense or ill at ease when reciting or appearing before a group. Perhaps this tenseness was because of rejection or because he was not as competent in academic activities as the successful pupils. This academic ineptness was shown by the results of the achievement tests. The relatively ranked withdrawal responses of the teachers are listed in Table XXI.

The teachers perceived the unsuccessful pupil as being easily confused, shy, extremely quiet, and not active.
### TABLE XXI
TEACHER RESPONSES TO PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS IN
RELATIVE RANKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Relative Rank*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Here is a pupil that lacks confidence in himself.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Here is a pupil that easily confused</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Here is a pupil that is sensitive, touchy, hurt by criticism.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Here is a pupil that is extremely quiet and not active.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Here is a pupil that feels ill at ease and fearful.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Here is a pupil that becomes discouraged easily.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Here is a pupil that is shy and keeps to himself.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Here is a pupil that is tense or ill at ease when reciting or appearing before a class or group.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Here is a pupil whose presence or absence is not noticed by other children.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Here is a pupil that is hard to know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This group of questions are significant at the .05 level of confidence.

*Items are ranked from those items having the greatest difference between teacher responses to those having the least.
These characteristics are those of a rejected, unsuccessful pupil. The teacher did not understand the plight of this pupil.

The peers perceived their unsuccessful classmate as ill at ease and fearful \( (p < .01, \text{Table XI}) \). They saw these characteristics exemplified when the unsuccessful pupil was asked to recite or appear before a group \( (p < .05, \text{Table XI}) \). Because of this they perceived the unsuccessful pupil as being sensitive, touchy, and hurt by criticism \( (p < .05, \text{Table XI}) \). The peers also perceived the unsuccessful pupil as being one whose presence or absence was not noticed by the other children \( (p < .05, \text{Table XI}) \). None of the self perception responses in the area of withdrawal was significant \( (\text{Table XXII}) \), but the unsuccessful group of pupils did differ from the successful group.

The unsuccessful pupils perceived themselves as being sensitive, touchy, and hurt by criticism. This perception agreed with that of the peers \( (p < .05, \text{Table XI}) \) and that of the teachers \( (p < .05) \). As listed in Table XII the characteristics of "being easily confused" and "feels ill at ease and fearful" were also trends. There seemed to be a reluctance of the unsuccessful pupil to claim ego damaging statements as characteristic of his own behavior.

**Perceptions of Aggression**

An analysis of the teacher responses revealed that there was no significant difference between the groups in
TABLE XXII
AN ITEM ANALYSIS OF THE SELF PERCEPTION OF WITHDRAWAL
OF THE SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Pupils Responding</th>
<th>Chi Square Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Here is a pupil that lacks confidence in himself.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Here is a pupil that is easily confused.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Here is a pupil that is sensitive, touchy, hurt by criticism.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Here is a pupil that feels ill at ease and fearful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Here is a pupil that becomes discouraged easily.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Here is a pupil that is shy and keeps to himself.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Here is a pupil that is tense or ill at ease when reciting or appearing before a class or group.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Here is a pupil whose presence or absence is not noticed by other children.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Here is a pupil that is hard to know.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Yates correction formula was applied to all items which contained a frequency of five or less.
the area of aggression. As seen by peers, the two groups differed on all the aggression items (p<.01, Table IX). There was a significant difference between the two groups in the self perceptions of aggression (p<.05, Table XIII).

Although the teacher perceptions did not differentiate between the two groups at a significant level the teachers did see the unsuccessful pupils as more aggressive. The teachers perceived four of the unsuccessful pupils as being individuals who break rules while none of the successful pupils were so listed. The teachers also perceived six of the unsuccessful pupils as causing disturbances, while listing only two of the successful pupils in this category. The pupils in the unsuccessful group were perceived as being boastful; three of the unsuccessful pupils were identified as being boastful while only one of the successful pupils fitted this description. The data in Table XXIII revealed the teachers' responses in the area of aggression.

The peers saw a significant difference between the two groups (Table IX) in aggression (p<.01). The most significant characteristics as perceived by the peers were the "breaking of rules" (p<.01, Table XII), and "bullying and ruling over others" (p<.01, Table XII). These characteristics may have caused the low sociometric status of the unsuccessful pupils; it would be understandable that the peers would reject pupils with such characteristics.
### TABLE XXIII

**TEACHER PERCEPTION OF AGGRESSION CHARACTERISTICS IN BEHAVIOR OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Pupils Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Here is a pupil that causes disturbances.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Here is a pupil that children find hard to get along with.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Here is a pupil that shows off and is an attention getter.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Here is a pupil that is boastful.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Here is a pupil that frequently gets into fights.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Here is a pupil that breaks rules.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Here is a pupil that others cannot work with.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Here is a pupil that likes to quarrel and argue.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Here is a pupil that acts without thinking and is easily excited.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Here is a pupil that tries to bully and rule over others</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These items combined were not significant at the .05 level or better (see Table VIII).*
The peers also saw a significant difference ($p < .05$, Table XII) between the groups in the following aggression characteristics: (1) causing disturbances, (2) boasting, (3) fighting, (4) showing off and attention-getting, and (5) breaking rules. These characteristics probably caused the peers to reject the unsuccessful pupils.

It was interesting to note that the peers perceived a difference in aggression which was significant at the .01 level whereas the teachers saw no statistically significant difference between the two groups. Perhaps this was because most of the aggression of the unsuccessful pupils was unnoticed by the teachers or happened when the teachers were not present. The teachers were not present on the school buses or on the playground before and after school. Aggression, even in the presence of the teacher, did not have to be noticeable.

The self perception responses of the successful and unsuccessful pupils to the aggression items were different but the difference was not significant. The trend as developed in chi square values showed aggressive characteristics in the unsuccessful pupils. This trend confirmed the perception held by the successful pupils. The unsuccessful pupils were cognizant of the aggressive characteristics in their own behavior. The results presented in Table XXIV showed that an item analysis of the self perception responses of the successful and unsuccessful pupils did not reveal any statistically significant items. There were some important differences
### TABLE XXIV

**AN ITEM ANALYSIS OF THE SELF PERCEPTION OF AGGRESSION OF THE SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of Pupils Responding</th>
<th>Chi Square Value***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Here is a pupil that causes disturbances.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Here is a pupil that children find hard to get along with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Here is a pupil that shows off and is an attention getter.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Here is a pupil that is boastful.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Here is a pupil that frequently gets into fights.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Here is a pupil that breaks rules.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Here is a pupil that others cannot work with.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Here is a pupil that likes to quarrel and argue.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Here is a pupil that acts without thinking and is easily excited</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Here is a pupil that tries to bully and rule over others.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All items combined were significant at the .05 level of confidence. (See Table XIII).

***Yates correction formula was applied to all items which contained a frequency of five or less.
between the two groups. The most important differences of the unsuccessful pupil identified by the chi square technique were "one that shows off and is an attention getter" and "one that others cannot work with." This self analysis of the unsuccessful pupils agreed with the peer perception of the same characteristics. It should be noted that the aggression group of items significantly differentiated between the two groups at the .05 level (Table XIII) even though individual items did not.

Sociometric Status

As shown in Table XV the unsuccessful group of pupils had a sociometric rank of 23.62 in class as compared with a rank of 13.65 for the successful group of pupils. The average size of the twenty-six classrooms from which the unsuccessful group of pupils came was thirty. This means that 76 per cent of the class members had higher social status than the average unsuccessful pupil. This put the unsuccessful pupil in the bottom quarter of the class as far as acceptance was concerned. The difference was statistically significant (p<.001).

The unsuccessful pupil was highly rejected by his peers. Perhaps this rejection was a result of the aggressive characteristics that the peers observed. The bullying and overbearing actions of the unsuccessful pupil may have caused the peers to reject him. There is the possibility
that peer rejection caused aggression in the behavior of the unsuccessful pupil and this new aggression caused more peer rejection.

The unsuccessful group of pupils accepted the peers as readily as the successful group. The acceptance rank of the unsuccessful group of pupils was 16.77 as compared to 15.15 for the successful group. The unsuccessful pupil was not realistically accepting his class peers in the light of the large disparity between what he received and what he gave in sociometric status. The unsuccessful pupil was readily accepting his peers who in turn rejected him. This showed the desire of the unsuccessful pupil for status in the class social atmosphere. The data vividly showed the futility of his effort.

The low sociometric status was shown in the quality of the sociometric bonds. As listed in Table XVII, the unsuccessful pupil had only three best friends in the class; this was shown by the mean score of the strongly mutual bonds. The successful pupil had six best friends in the class. The successful pupil had twice as many best friends, and the difference was statistically significant (p<.01).

The unsuccessful pupil did not have as many close friends as the successful pupil; this was shown by the moderately mutual bonds. The successful pupil had on the average three close friends more than the unsuccessful pupil and the difference was statistically significant (p<.01).
The status of the pupil was based upon how he accepted others and how others accepted him. The feelings between pupils must be mutual to support a friendship. The addition of the strongly mutual and moderately mutual bonds gave a picture of the status of the pupil. This addition gave the successful pupil a total of 15.02 friends in an average class of 30 whereas the unsuccessful pupil would only have 8.85 best and close friends. Put another way the successful pupil would have 50 per cent of the class as best and close friends, whereas the unsuccessful pupil had only 29 per cent of the peers in this category.

There was no significant difference between the two groups in strongly unreciprocated bonds. This bond (Table XVI) was based on a pairing of complete acceptance (+2) with complete rejection (-2). A large mean in this area would show a lack of contact with social reality. The unsuccessful pupil did have a larger mean in this area; however, the difference was not statistically significant.

An explanation of how bonds were determined was given in Table XVI. The numerical values which go with each statement of rejection and acceptance were also listed.

Moderately unreciprocated bonds were pairings composed of one statement of acceptance paired with one statement of rejection; this bond excluded "-2 and +2" and "+2 and -2" pairings. The unsuccessful pupil had 6.93 bonds of this type. The successful pupil had 4.46 moderately unreciprocated bonds. The unsuccessful pupil had approximately
seven peers in the class that he accepted who did not reciprocate his feelings or seven he rejected who accepted him. The former was probably the case because the unsuccessful pupil had a class rank of 23.62 based on points received from other pupils and a peer acceptance rank of 16.77; this showed that the unsuccessful pupil was accepting the other members of the class but they were not accepting him. This would be a very frustrating experience for a preadolescent boy who wanted to become more independent of parents and other authority figures and more dependent upon acceptance of peers. This situation could generate the aggression that was very evident in the peer perception.

In mutual rejection, the unsuccessful group of pupils had two and one-half times more bonds than did the successful group. For the unsuccessful group of pupils mutual rejection simply was disliking a pupil who disliked him; the unsuccessful pupil who was cognizant of the feelings of a peer reciprocated the same attitude. The successful pupil did not average one bond of this type. The unsuccessful group of pupils did not have more mutually rejected bonds because the unsuccessful pupils accepted many pupils who rejected them. The total of 8.34 for the strongly unreciprocated and moderately unreciprocated bonds showed that the unsuccessful pupils accepted many of the pupils who rejected them. Any reduction in this 8.34 total would mean an increase in the mutually rejected bonds.
In a class of thirty pupils (excluding the unsuccessful pupil) the unsuccessful pupil had 8.85 best and close friends, 8.34 pupils who rejected him whom he accepted, and 2.58 pupils who disliked him and whom he disliked. This adds up to a total of 19.77 of the pupils; the remaining 10.23 pupils are tolerant and do not accept or reject him; they do not mind being around him some of the time but not often or for long at a time. This unsuccessful pupil, whom the teachers saw as lacking in leadership (p<.001, Table VIII) and withdrawn (p<.05) and whom the peers saw as aggressive (p<.01, Table IX) and also withdrawn (p<.05), saw himself as aggressive (p<.05, Table XIII). The unsuccessful pupil appeared to be socially inadequate.

These findings supported the findings of most studies. Meek (16) found hostility evident in the behavior of the unsuccessful pupil. Morrison and Perry (17) stated that the unsuccessful pupil had a lower sociometric status through no fault of his own and he was deprived of the opportunity of achieving social status. Bedoian (4) found the unsuccessful pupil to be lacking in acceptance in his grade group; he was denied status and recognition and was actively disliked by his classmates. Anfinson (2) found that the unsuccessful pupils ranked higher in adjustment to the social life of the school and other pupils; this finding was in contrast with the data obtained in this study and many of the other studies.
The California Test of Mental Maturity

The results presented in Table IV showed that there was a significant difference in two of the three intelligence quotients obtained from the California Test of Mental Maturity. In all portions of the test the successful pupils had a larger mean score.

The successful pupils had a significantly higher mean score \((p<.001, \text{Table III})\) on the language portion of the California Test of Mental Maturity. This result indicated that the unsuccessful pupils would have difficulty competing with the successful pupils in activities that were strictly verbal.

On the non-language section of the California Test of Mental Maturity, the \(t\) ratio of 1.99 was short of the 2.00 which was needed to be significant at the .05 level of confidence \((15)\). This result agreed with the findings of the performance section of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children \((\text{Table IV})\) in which a comparison of the means yielded a \(t\) ratio that was not significant. This indicated that the unsuccessful pupils could more effectively compete with the successful pupils in activities that were non-language or non-verbal in nature. Since the unsuccessful pupils had failed two years in the span of their elementary school experience it seemed reasonable to assume that if lack of achievement was a factor in the failure, then the achievement demanded for promotion was of the verbal type.
This means that the unsuccessful pupils were victims of a verbal curriculum.

There was a significant difference ($p < .001$) between the two groups on the total intelligence quotient of the California Test of Mental Maturity. It was interesting to note the results of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (Table IV) because the unsuccessful pupils had a full scale intelligence quotient that was 7.66 points higher than the results of the California Test of Mental Maturity. The Wechsler has been generally regarded as a better indicator of intelligence because it is an individual test (5).

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children

The data shown in Table IV indicated that there were some statistically significant results obtained from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. On the verbal portion of the test the unsuccessful group of pupils had a mean intelligence quotient of 84.44 as compared to 102.76 for the successful group. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence. It seemed apparent from these results that the schools failed the pupils who did not come up to arbitrary achievement standards. The pupils with less verbal ability would not achieve on a level with their more adept peers.

On the performance section of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children the unsuccessful group of pupils had a
mean intelligence quotient of 92.72 as compared to 97.60 for the successful group of pupils. The t test technique yielded a t ratio of 1.93 which was below the 2.00 needed to be statistically significant at the .05 level. In other studies the tests used have not had a performance section or a performance intelligence quotient. Other studies have used the Otis (10), the Kuhlmann-Anderson (8, 11, 12, 18), and the Stanford-Binet (6, 21). No available study used the Wechsler.

On the performance section of the Wechsler, eighteen of the twenty-nine unsuccessful pupils made a performance intelligence quotient of ninety or better. Twenty-three of the thirty successful pupils had a performance intelligence quotient of ninety or better. These findings indicated that greater emphasis was placed on the verbal skills in the elementary grades, and this was probably a factor in the unsuccessful group's academic failure.

On the full scale section of the Wechsler the unsuccessful group of pupils had a mean of 87.31 as compared to a mean of 100.30 for the successful group. The difference between the means was significant at the .001 level of confidence. The extremely low score on the verbal section of the Wechsler when averaged with a high performance score caused the full scale intelligence quotient on the Wechsler to be below the average intelligence range.

The results of the Wechsler showed that the average unsuccessful pupil could not cope with academic verbal
pursuits as well as his successful peer. The futile attempt to compete with the successful pupil may be related to the lack of leadership perceived by the teacher and the aggression perceived by the class peers. The unsuccessful pupil who was about two years older than the average successful pupil could not compete in a strictly verbal classroom situation; therefore he resorted to aggressive behavior. The unsuccessful pupil could not compete academically but he could compete in physical activities. In class the unsuccessful pupil reticently sat and was perceived as withdrawn by the teacher and peer. His reticence may be related to his lack of verbal ability.

The California Achievement Test

The results on the California Achievement Test (Table V) showed that the unsuccessful pupils were significantly ($p<.01$ to $p<.001$) lower in all areas of achievement. In no area was the actual grade placement reached by the unsuccessful group of pupils. The unsuccessful pupils were from 4.6 months to 1.23 years retarded in achievement. The successful pupils were above actual grade placement in all achievement areas except reading comprehension where they were (-1.5 months) below actual grade placement.

The unsuccessful group of pupils was one year behind the successful group in reading comprehension; the unsuccessful pupils were one year and one and one-half months
below the actual grade placement in reading comprehension. In reading vocabulary the unsuccessful pupils were below 
(-.70) the actual grade placement. Reading was the lowest area of achievement of the unsuccessful group of pupils.

Spelling was another section of the California Achievement Test in which the unsuccessful group of pupils was below actual grade placement. The unsuccessful group of pupils was 1.23 years below the norm in this section.

These results showed that if the unsuccessful group of pupils was failed two years to improve their achievement the purpose for the failure was not realized. The unsuccessful group of pupils had a total battery mean score that was 6.5 months below the actual grade placement even after being retained for two years.

Anfinson (2) found that there was no significant difference between the successful and unsuccessful pupils in arithmetic problems and arithmetic fundamentals. He also found that the successful pupils were significantly higher in reading. These results agreed with the basic findings of the present study.

Chansky (6) found that the successful pupils had better achievement scores in vocabulary and reading comprehension. This agrees with the findings of this study; the unsuccessful group of pupils were very low in reading achievement (Table V).
Coffield and Blommaers (7) found that unsuccessful pupils did not achieve the norm for the grade involved even after repeating the grade. Farley (9) found that failure could not be depended upon to stimulate effort or improve achievement. This agreed with the present study which found that the successful pupils were still six and one-half months retarded in achievement even after having experienced failure twice.

Otto and Melby (18) found that pupils who were told that everyone would pass to the next grade at the end of the year achieved as well as pupils who were told that they must do good work or suffer failure. Hall and Demarest (12) found that pupils who were passed succeeded academically as well as pupils who repeated grades. The present study agreed with these findings and both have indicated that failure did not improve achievement.

The Rorschach Test

Two of the five areas used to determine the differences between the two groups of pupils were statistically significant (Table II). The other areas contributed some knowledge of the differences between successful and unsuccessful pupils, although not at a significant level.

In the area of F+ percentage the successful group of pupils had a significantly higher mean (p<.05). This indicated the successful group of pupils would have a significantly higher observation capacity, recall capacity, ability to
concentrate, and good attention and persistence. Piotrowski (19, p. 106) stated that the $F+$ percentage indicated whether the individual would have a better adjustment to the requirements of everyday living. Beck (3) stated that this was the area through which the individual showed his ability to direct his thinking from higher centers, i.e., with conscious attention and discriminating judgment.

The unsuccessful group of pupils had a higher mean score in percentage of whole responses ($W%;$ this result was in the opposite direction of the hypothesis. These responses to the Rorschach are thought to be a reflection of one's sense of theoretical relationships. Probably the reason that there was not a significant difference between the groups in this area was because of the age differential between the two groups; the unsuccessful pupils were approximately two years older in average age than the successful pupils.

There was no significant difference between the two groups in the number of popular responses ($P$) but the successful group of pupils did have a larger mean score. Piotrowski (19) stated that the popular responses indicated that the individual shared common ideas of his social group. The successful group of pupils may have had a little better grasp of the social situation and therefore, a higher mean score. It must be remembered, however, that this difference between the groups could have easily happened by chance.
The successful group of pupils had a larger movement (M) mean score than the unsuccessful group of pupils. The difference between the mean scores was not significant (see Table II). Rorschach (20) emphasized the idea that the movement responses were positively correlated with creative imagination and with the intelligence level although the correlations need not be high. Piotrowski (19, p. 142) stated that "the more prominent the M in a subject's record . . . the more he was likely to act upon his own ideas rather than upon suggestions from outside sources."

There was a significant difference (p<.05) between the two groups of pupils in the area of the number of content categories. The successful pupils had a significantly higher mean score. A wide range of content was indicative of broad interests. Halpern (13, p. 36) stated that the number of content categories reflected the breadth and nature of the individual's interests. Halpern perceived limited content categories as indicative of a constriction of interests resulting either from intellectual limitations or emotional inhibition.

Piotrowski (19) stated that the variety of content was significant even for the quantitative evaluation of intelligence. Rorschach (20, Beck (3) and Klopfer (14) all considered the breadth of content to be directly related to intelligence.
The more intelligent successful group of pupils probably had a broader field of interest than the unsuccessful group. There was a significant difference (p < .001) between the two groups on the full scale of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children.

The My Teacher Questionnaire

There was no significant difference between the responses of the successful and unsuccessful pupils to the My Teacher Questionnaire. The unsuccessful group of pupils had a higher mean score than the successful pupils; the unsuccessful pupils appeared to be less critical of the teachers.

There were some items on the questionnaire that differentiated between the two groups at a significant level (see Table XVIII). The unsuccessful group of pupils were more cognizant of the physical classroom environment as shown by their responses to question number two: "Are there usually flowers and plants in your room?" Thirteen of the unsuccessful pupils answered "no" to question number two and this question was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The successful group of pupils (Table XVIII) expected more interaction with the teacher than did the unsuccessful group of pupils. The successful group of pupils expected the teachers to speak to them when they saw them on the street; this item was significant at the .05 level of
confidence. The successful group of pupils also expected the teachers to take part in children's games; this item discriminated between the two groups at the .01 level of confidence.

Either the successful group of pupils seemed to have more conflict with teachers in classroom situations than the unsuccessful pupils or they had a better awareness of what was happening in class. The successful group of pupils felt that the teachers thought they were always right and the pupils were always wrong (p<.05, Table XVIII). The successful group also thought that the teachers often scolded pupils in front of the class (p<.05). The successful pupils felt that the teacher talked too much (p<.05); this could be the attitude of a group of energetic pupils who were anxious to participate in all classroom activities. The successful pupils perceived the teacher as being easily annoyed (p<.05, Table XVIII) and one who kept the children in at recess or after school (p<.001). Those successful pupils were well accepted by their peers and recess would mean an opportunity for socialization. The unsuccessful pupils were rejected and probably only limited socialization occurred at recess for them; recess did not have the same meaning for both groups of pupils. The successful pupils perceived the teacher as being one who would often punish the whole class when only one or two were to blame (p<.05); it was obvious
from this perception that the successful pupils had been kept in when they were not guilty of breaking the rules. This attitude would be typical of the average pupil.

The California Test of Personality

The California Test of Personality did not significantly differentiate between the two groups of pupils on any section or sub-section (Table VI). The application of chi square to the individual test items isolated seven items that differentiated between the two groups at the 5 per cent level of confidence or better (Table VII). There were other items, although not significant, that showed a difference between the two groups and reflected a trend.

The unsuccessful pupils felt that they were rejected socially (see Table XXV). Twice as many unsuccessful pupils as successful pupils felt that they were not invited to parties they would like to attend. Nine of the unsuccessful pupils felt that other children did not want to have them as companions; whereas, only four of the successful pupils had this feeling. Seven of the unsuccessful pupils felt that other children did not like them; only three of the successful pupils felt that they were disliked. These trends, although not significant, showed that the unsuccessful pupils perceived their lack of social status. These trends supported the sociometric findings of this study.
TABLE XXV

A COMPARISON OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PUPILS AS SHOWN BY CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of Pupils Missing Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you usually keep at your work even when other children want you to stop?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Can you usually keep other children from being mean to you?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Are you invited to the parties you would like to attend?</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Do children like to have you go around with them?</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Do many of the children at school seem to like you?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Are you afraid of things without knowing why?</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Is it necessary to be fair to people one does not like?</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Should boys and girls who get low marks be kept out of fun at school?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Should one make a practice of telling others about the mistakes they make?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Are you made to feel that you are as good as anyone else in your family?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. Do you feel that most people near your home are worth knowing?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*None of these items was found to be significant when chi square statistical analysis was applied. Yates correction formula was used when a frequency was five or less.
The unsuccessful group of pupils felt that they were mistreated by class peers. Ten of the unsuccessful pupils answered "no" to question number twelve: "Can you usually keep other children from being mean to you?" Only five of the thirty successful pupils gave a "no" answer to this question (see Table XXV).

Twice as many unsuccessful as successful pupils felt it was not necessary to be fair to people they did not like. This aggressiveness was substantiated by the peer perception (p<.01, Table IX). The unsuccessful group of pupils thought it was acceptable behavior to make a practice of telling others about the mistakes they make; more than three times as many unsuccessful pupils as successful pupils had this feeling. To a related question it was shown that it was difficult for the unsuccessful group of pupils to admit that they were in the wrong (p<.05, Table VII).

There was a difference in the perception of the home as viewed by the successful and unsuccessful pupils. Eleven of the unsuccessful pupils said that they were not made to feel that they were as good as anyone else in the family; only five of successful pupils made this response. More of the unsuccessful pupils felt that most people near their home were not worth knowing. The unsuccessful group of pupils was usually able to choose their own friends (p<.01, Table VII); this characteristic was indicative of a lower class home.
In relation to school work several conclusions were drawn. In school work the unsuccessful group of pupils were more likely to quit their work if asked to do so than were the successful group of pupils. Twenty of the twenty-nine unsuccessful pupils did not like to speak or sing in front of people; this item was significant at the .01 level of confidence. This substantiated the withdrawal characteristics of the unsuccessful pupils as perceived by the teachers ($p<.05$, Table VIII) and the peers ($p<.05$, Table IX). The unsuccessful group of pupils (Table VII) thought that their friends perceived them as being too restless in class; this California Test of Personality question was significant at the .05 level of significance.

The results of the California Test of Personality agreed with Aguilera and Keenally (1) who found that unsuccessful pupils had inferiority feelings, were restless, and socially inadequate. The results also agreed with Meck (16), who found that hostility was evident in the behavior of the unsuccessful child.

The Pupil Adjustment Inventory

The teachers perceived a significant difference ($p<.001$, Table XIV) between the successful and unsuccessful groups of pupils in all areas with the exception of school attendance. The teacher appeared to have a negative attitude toward the unsuccessful group of pupils.
In the academic area of the Pupil Adjustment Inventory the teachers perceived the unsuccessful group of pupils as achieving below estimated aptitude. A copy of the Pupil Adjustment Inventory will be found in Appendix D. The mean score of 1.82 was actually below the "2.0" mark which indicated "below estimated aptitude." In "attitude toward schoolwork," the teachers perceived the unsuccessful group of pupils as being pupils who seldom completed required work and needed to be prodded to do what was done. This finding agreed with Farley (9) who stated in his study that failure cannot be depended upon to stimulate effort or improve achievement.

The "social" area of the Pupil Adjustment Inventory was composed of "sociability," "social acceptance," and "types of associates." In "sociability" the mean score of 2.68 for the unsuccessful group of pupils would put them between the points for "2" and "3." At point "2" on the continuum it was stated that the pupils were unsympathetic, cold, indifferent, and friendly with one or a very few, and at point "3" it was stated that the pupil was courteous and usually liked to be with others. Obviously the unsuccessful group of pupils was composed of both types of individuals. The statistical results of this study are listed in Table XIV.

In "social acceptance" the unsuccessful group of pupils had a mean score of 2.34; this would be between points "2" and "3" on the rating line. A rating of "2" meant that the
pupil won acceptance from only a few individuals outside his peer group and was only partially accepted by his peers. A rating of "3" would be an individual who was usually accepted by his peers. This rating received by the unsuccessful group meant that there were a number of pupils of limited social status in the unsuccessful group. This supported the sociometric data of this study.

The unsuccessful pupils associated with those who were sometimes in trouble or those who were completely indifferent; this would be a "2" rating on the continuum of the inventory. The unsuccessful group of pupils had a mean score of 2.34 which would be above a "2" rating. Some of the unsuccessful pupils were in the normal range which would increase the mean score.

The "emotional" area of the inventory was composed of two sections: "temperament" and "personal worth." A mean score of 2.10 in "temperament" meant that the pupils in the unsuccessful group as seen by their teachers, were easily provoked, excitable, and unusually passive most of the time. A mean score of 2.44 in "personal worth" meant that about one-half of the unsuccessful pupils were shy, extremely quiet, and lonely; they would also be aggressive towards others at times. The other half were normal pupils. This teacher perception in this area agreed with the perceptions held by the peers.
The "physical" area was composed of one section: "state of health." The unsuccessful group of pupils received a mean score of 3.27 which was average; the successful group of pupils rated "above average" in health and this caused the difference between the two groups to be significant.

The "activities and interests" section was composed of "activities and interests," "attitude toward school," and "school attendance." In "activities and interests" the unsuccessful group of pupils received a mean score of 2.34 which meant that about two-thirds of the pupils over-concentrated on one interest or participated spasmodically in one activity; the other one-third would be considered normal. The mean score of the unsuccessful group of pupils on the "attitude toward school" was 2.51. About one-half of the unsuccessful pupils were average and one-half had little or superficial interest in school. In school attendance there was no significant difference between the two groups of pupils; this teacher perception was not substantiated by school attendance records.

The "school's influence upon the pupil," as perceived by the teacher, was satisfactory for only a few of the unsuccessful pupils. The mean score of 2.37 was just above the "2" point which stated that some effort was made to relate the school program to the pupil's needs and interests.

The "home background" section of the inventory was composed of "economic status" and "family life." The "economic
status" mean score was 2.58 which was about half way between point "2," poor economic status, and "3," comfortable status. The successful group of pupils had a mean score of 3.10 in this area which would put them in the "comfortable status." The "family life" mean score for the unsuccessful group of pupils was 2.68. A "2" rating meant that the parents often neglected the children or catered too much to the child's whims; a "3" rating meant that the parents were interested in their children and provided limited help. The teachers perceived a significant difference (p<.001, Table XIV) in the family life and economic status of the two groups; this did not agree with the results of the Sims Score Card.

The Sims Score Card

There was no significant difference between the two groups in socioeconomic status as determined by the Sims Score Card. The successful group of pupils did have a larger mean score, which could have indicated that they had a higher socioeconomic status. The results obtained from the score card did not agree with the teachers' perception of the socioeconomic status of the unsuccessful pupils as obtained from Pupil Adjustment Inventory.

The city situation was unique in this study because of the vast amount of growth that had taken place in a very short length of time. The city was the second fastest growing city in the state during the decade of 1950 to 1960.
This may have caused a confusion in the measurement of social status which does not occur in a more static situation. Another situation that existed was the mobility of the citizens in this large metropolitan area; this tended to break down the socioeconomic strata of the area involved.

Farley, Frey, and Garland (10) were doubtful whether a great deal of confidence could be placed in the results of the Sims Score Card. They found instances where brothers and sisters in the same home secured scores that differed considerably. Either the pupils answered questions carelessly or without understanding, or they deliberately misrepresented their own perceptions.

School Attendance

The unsuccessful group of pupils did not attend school as regularly as the successful pupils. The difference in school attendance was significant (p<.05). The standard deviation of the unsuccessful pupils of 10.82 showed a large variability in the attendance as compared with the standard deviation of 2.47 for the successful pupils.

Many factors may have contributed to this lack of school attendance. The unsuccessful pupils were rejected by their peers, as shown by a significant difference (p<.001) in the sociometric status (Table XV). The peers perceived (Table IX) the unsuccessful pupils as being significantly
withdrawn ($p < 0.05$) and aggressive ($p < 0.01$); this would make an unwholesome situation in the classroom for the unsuccessful pupils. The teachers (Table VIII) perceived the unsuccessful pupils as being significantly withdrawn ($p < 0.05$) and lacking in leadership ($p < 0.001$).

The parents of the unsuccessful group of pupils may not have stressed school attendance as much as the parents of the successful group. The teachers' responses to the Pupil Adjustment Inventory indicated that there was no difference in the school attendance of the two groups. This was difficult to explain in light of the fact that the teacher maintained the daily register of attendance for the pupils. The teachers must not have noticed if the unsuccessful pupils were absent or present.

The unsuccessful group of pupils did not have the verbal ability that the successful group of pupils had and this could account for the lack of regular school attendance. The unsuccessful pupils would not enjoy the verbal activities as much as their more capable peers. These factors were related to the lack of attendance but it would be difficult to isolate definite causative factors.
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Conclusions

The object of this study was to make a comparison of successful and unsuccessful elementary school pupils. The comparisons were made in terms of mental ability, personality, school achievement, pupils as perceived by teachers and peers, self perception, socioeconomic status, sociometric status, and school attendance. An attempt was made to examine all data derived from the study in order to develop a total picture of the impact of failure upon a group of elementary school children.

This study, endeavoring to determine the impact of failure upon a group of elementary school pupils, has brought about the following conclusions:

1. The unsuccessful pupil was lower in verbal mental ability than the successful pupil.

2. There was no significant difference between the successful and unsuccessful pupils in performance intelligence quotients; however, there was a trend for the unsuccessful pupils to be lower.

3. Unsuccessful pupils made higher intelligence quotients on performance tests than on non-language tests.
4. The unsuccessful pupil was not as broad in interests as the successful pupil as measured by the number of content categories of the Rorschach.

5. The unsuccessful pupil was lower in observation capacity, recall capacity, ability to concentrate and persistence as measured by the good form percentage of the Rorschach responses.

6. There were no major differences in the personality of successful and unsuccessful pupils as measured by the total test or sub-sections of California Test of Personality.

7. There was a trend for unsuccessful pupils to be aggressive and withdrawn as measured by individual items of the California Test of Personality.

8. The unsuccessful pupils were six months below actual grade placement although they had failed twice.

9. The unsuccessful pupils made their highest achievement scores in arithmetic and mechanics of English but these scores were below actual grade placement.

10. The unsuccessful pupils made the lowest achievement scores in spelling and reading comprehension.

11. The teachers perceived the unsuccessful pupils as significantly lacking in leadership characteristics.

12. The teachers perceived the unsuccessful pupils as achieving below their estimated aptitude and seldom
completing required work; they had to be prodded to do what was done.

13. The teachers perceived the unsuccessful pupils as being significantly withdrawn.

14. There was a trend for the teachers to perceive the unsuccessful pupils as more aggressive than the successful pupils.

15. The peers perceived the unsuccessful pupil as being more aggressive and withdrawn than the successful pupil.

16. There was a trend for the peers to perceive the unsuccessful pupil as lacking in leadership characteristics.

17. The peers perceived the unsuccessful pupil as being ill at ease and fearful.

18. The peers perceived the unsuccessful pupil as being sensitive, touchy, and hurt by criticism.

19. The peers perceived the unsuccessful pupil as one who breaks rules, gets into fights, causes disturbances, tries to bully and rule over others, and is an attention getter and show off.

20. The unsuccessful pupil perceived himself as being aggressive.

21. There was a trend for the unsuccessful pupil to see himself as more withdrawn and lacking in leadership than the successful pupil.
22. There was a trend for the unsuccessful pupil to be lower in socioeconomic status.

23. The unsuccessful pupil was in the lower quarter of the class according to sociometric rank; about 78 percent of the class members had higher social status.

24. The unsuccessful pupil did not realistically accept his peers in view of his low social status.

25. Based on sociometric bonds the unsuccessful pupil had only three "best" friends in a class of thirty as compared with six for the successful pupil.

26. Based on sociometric bonds the unsuccessful pupil only had 5.79 "close" friends in class as compared to 8.86 for the successful pupil.

27. The unsuccessful pupil did not attend school as regularly as the successful pupil.

28. A comparison group of girls was not found in the elementary schools surveyed; it is concluded that unsuccessful pupils are more often boys.

29. A large percentage of all failing grades was given without consideration for the welfare of the individual pupil.

30. A child should be expected to advance at his own individual rate in school, according to his own abilities and potentialities.

Impact of Failure

From these findings and conclusions it seems that the impact of failure on the unsuccessful pupil is as follows:
1. The unsuccessful pupil is subjected to extreme social rejection, which results in a low prestige position in the class social atmosphere and a small number of friends and a large number of peers who reject him. The unsuccessful pupil attempts to attain an acceptable status by force, which only intensifies the rejection of other pupils against him.

2. The unsuccessful pupil is frustrated in his efforts to participate in an environment in which he is inadequately equipped to compete. He is low in ability and low in achievement and is not challenged by the situation because he is confronted with a situation beyond his capacity; he develops a "don't care" attitude and reacts against the school.

3. The unsuccessful pupil has a negative self-concept which causes him to accept himself as defeated and incapable of dealing with life, and makes him content to live a lackadaisical existence.

4. The unsuccessful pupil dislikes his hostile, non-productive, academic environment; this causes him to attend school irregularly. This absence causes a lapse in the learning process which makes it even more difficult for him to keep pace with his peers. The world beyond the school is not hostile, and it offers the unsuccessful pupil an opportunity for recognition and a feeling of success and security.
5. The unsuccessful pupil has anti-social tendencies in his behavior which are recognized as hostility by his peers. The unsuccessful pupil recognizes these aggressive characteristics in his behavior and identifies with them without realizing that they are anti-social in nature. Even hostility can be recognized as an accomplishment by a rejected child; he is fighting a hostile environment.

6. The unsuccessful pupil is perceived by his peers as an individual who is significantly withdrawn and aggressive, and lacking in leadership. The unsuccessful pupil is not considered by his peers as worthy of social acceptance because he is sensitive, touchy, tense, boastful; he is a show-off, and a bully.

7. Failure has put the unsuccessful pupil in a class where the teacher perceives him as socially and academically inadequate. The teacher perceives him as withdrawn and lacking in leadership. In class work the teacher perceives him as the pupil who never attempts any school work or one who must be prodded to do what he does and then he seldom completes required work. The teacher does not expect much in class performance from the unsuccessful pupil, and she gets what she expects.

8. The unsuccessful pupil is withdrawn, a reaction which may be caused by his feeling of inadequacy. He is inadequate because of academic ineptness, insecurity, social rejection, and a feeling of being different.
9. The unsuccessful pupil is six months below his actual grade placement in achievement even after being retained for two years. His failure has not solved his problem of substandard achievement but it has produced a multiplicity of problems which have far-reaching personal, social, and emotional effects.

Recommendations

After an analytical study of the data in the foregoing chapters, the following recommendations are presented.

1. The curriculum can meet the needs of the unsuccessful pupil by less emphasis upon the verbal learning activities and more on performance.

2. A broader and more flexible curriculum should be provided for all, and especially for the unsuccessful pupils.

3. An enriched and varied curriculum should be based upon individual needs and differences in order that pupils may experience satisfactory adjustment in their curricular experience.

4. A wholesome school life should exist, with harmonious teacher-pupil relationships.

5. Schools should be adjusted to the child instead of having the child adjusted to the set of standards of the school.

6. School officials should realize that the whole child - mind, body and emotions - goes to school and the needs of the whole child should be met.
7. Good teaching, accompanied by thorough understanding and sympathetic guidance, is necessary for the best possible growth and adjustment of the whole child.

8. All implications of failure should be considered before a child is retained in a grade for a second year.

9. A study should be made of the unsuccessful female pupils in the intermediate grades.

10. A longitudinal study should be made of unsuccessful pupils which would follow them into secondary schools and beyond.

11. A large sampling of unsuccessful pupils should be studied to give more validity to the study.

12. A study should be made to determine techniques to be used by the teacher to improve pupil social status in the classroom.

13. A study should be made to isolate teacher practices that develop negative pupil attitudes toward the teacher and the school.

14. A study should be made of parental attitudes toward successful and unsuccessful pupils.
SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF THE CLASSROOM INSTRUMENT

NAME ___________________________ School ___________________________
Grade __________ Teacher __________ Date __________ Age __________

DIRECTIONS

Below are some word pictures of members of your class. Read each statement and write down the names of the persons whom you think the descriptions fit.

Remember:

One description may fit several persons. You may write as many names as you think belong under each.

The same person may be mentioned for more than one description.

Write "myself" if you think the description fits you.

If you cannot think of anyone to fit a particular description, go on to the next one.

You will have as much time as you need to finish. Do not hurry.

Now you are ready to begin

1. Here is a pupil that lacks confidence in himself (or herself).

2. Here is a pupil that is easily confused.

3. Here is a pupil that others go to for help.

4. Here is a pupil that is sensitive, touchy, hurt by criticism.

5. Here is a pupil that other pupils are eager to be near or on his (or her) side.

6. Here is a pupil that has confidence in his work.
7. Here is a pupil that is a natural leader.

8. Here is a pupil that causes disturbances.

9. Here is a pupil that other children find hard to get along with.

10. Here is a pupil that helps to make and enforce rules.

11. Here is a pupil that is extremely quiet and is not active.

12. Here is a pupil that shows off and is an attention getter.

13. Here is a pupil that feels ill at ease and fearful.

14. Here is a pupil that makes sensible, practical plans.

15. Here is a pupil that takes an active part in group projects and other activities.

16. Here is a pupil that becomes discouraged easily.

17. Here is a pupil that is boastful.
13. Is a pupil that is shy and keeps to himself.

14. Is a pupil that frequently gets into fights.

15. Is a pupil who breaks rules.

16. Is a pupil who stands out in group when reciting or writing.

17. Is a pupil that others cannot get along with.

18. Here is a pupil that likes jobs which give him (or her) responsibility.

19. Here is a pupil whose presence or absence is not noticed by other children.

20. Here is a pupil that likes to quarrel or argue.

21. Here is a pupil that acts without thinking and is easily excited.

22. Here is a pupil that figures out things for himself (or herself).
28. Here is a pupil that is quick to see valuable things in other people's suggestions.

29. Here is a pupil that tries to bully and rule over others.

30. Here is a pupil that is hard to know.
Please answer the following statements concerning the behavior of

BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION CHART

DIRECTIVE: In each of the sets of descriptive statements below, pick out two statements: (1) Pick out that statement which you find fits the child most aptly—the one which the child is most likely. (2) Then pick out the statement which the child is least like. Place the letter "M" by the statement which you find fits the child most aptly. Place the letter "L" by the statement which the child is least like.

Example: A boy in your class is a very good pupil and is punctual in completing and handing in his homework.

A. Always on time with assignments
B. Occasionally hands in work in on time
C. Never hands in work in on time
D. Usually hands in his work on time
E. Makes no attempt to do homework

You would put the letter "M" by statement "A" because this is most likely the pupil and an "L" by statement "C" because this is least like the pupil.

Please mark two statements in each numbered set of statements:

1. A. Others come to him for help.
B. Causes disturbances.
C. Lacks confidence in himself.
D. Reports those who break the rules.
E. Shows emotions in a restrained way.

2. A. Other children find it hard to get along with him.
B. Is easily confused.
C. Other children are eager to be near him or on his side.
D. Likes to see things done his way.
E. Interested in other people's opinions and activities.

3. A. Sensitive, touchy, hurt by criticism.
B. Shows off, attention getter.
C. Is self-confident.
D. Enjoys being a part of the group without taking the lead.
E. Dislikes criticism.

4. A. Is extremely quiet and passive.
B. Is a natural leader.
C. Is boastful.
D. Does his share, but does not seek leadership.
E. Finds excuses when his work is not done.

5. A. Frequently gets into fights.
B. Helps to make and enforce rules.
C. Seems anxious and fearful.
D. Criticizes other People.
E. Is generous when in the mood.
6. **A.** Makes sensible, practical plans.
   **B.** Breaks rules.
   **C.** Becomes discouraged easily.
   **D.** Usually willing to share with others.
   **E.** Does not care what others think.

7. **A.** Takes an active part in group projects and other activities.
   **B.** Is shy and retiring.
   **C.** Others cannot work with him.
   **D.** Polite.
   **E.** Assertive.

8. **A.** Quarrelsome.
   **B.** Is tense or ill at ease when reciting or appearing before a group.
   **C.** Likes jobs which give him responsibility.
   **D.** Is quiet and seems content with himself.
   **E.** Enjoys conversation.

9. **A.** His presence or absence is not noticed by other children.
   **B.** Figures out things for himself.
   **C.** Is impulsive and easily excited.
   **D.** Is a good follower.
   **E.** Is usually courteous to other children.

10. **A.** Tries to bully and domineer over others.
    **B.** Is quick to see valuable things in other people's suggestions.
    **C.** Is hard to know.
    **D.** Is boisterous.
    **E.** Pleasant to talk with, but seldom initiates a conversation.
APPENDIX C

MY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Here are some questions about your teacher. You will answer them by drawing a line around "Yes", "No," or "?" depending upon how you feel about the question.

Please answer the questions honestly. None of the teachers or the principal will ever see this paper or know how you answered the questions. No one will ever know how you answered them, for you are asked not to write your name on the paper.

What grade are you in? Underline one: 4 5 6

1. Do you like school? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes No ?
2. Are there usually flowers and plants in your room? . . Yes No ?
3. Does the teacher praise you for doing good work? . . Yes No ?
4. Does this teacher scold the pupils a lot? . . . . Yes No ?
5. Is this teacher usually cross? . . . . . . . . Yes No ?
6. Does this teacher explain the school work so that you can understand it? . . . . . . . Yes No ?
7. Does this teacher speak to you when she meets you on the street? . . . . . . . . . . Yes No ?
8. Is this teacher able to keep the children quiet in the classroom? . . . . . . . . Yes No ?
9. Does this teacher make the school work interesting? . . Yes No ?
10. Is this teacher often bossy? . . . . . . . . . . Yes No ?
11. Is it easy for you to go to this teacher with all of your problems? . . . . . . . . Yes No ?
12. Does this teacher force her ideas on the pupils? . . Yes No ?
13. Is this teacher usually kind to you? . . . . . . . Yes No ?
14. Does this teacher keep her promises? . . . . . . Yes No ?
15. Does this teacher take part in the children's games? . Yes No ?
16. Does this teacher think she is always right and the pupils are wrong? . . . . . . . Yes No ?
17. Does this teacher have "pots" or favorites among the children? ........ Yes No ?
18. Does this teacher often scold a pupil in front of other pupils? ........ Yes No ?
19. Is it easy to please this teacher? ........ Yes No ?
20. Does this teacher talk too much? ........ Yes No ?
21. Is this teacher easily annoyed or bothered? ........ Yes No ?
22. Is this teacher usually fair with the pupils? ........ Yes No ?
23. Is this teacher always fussing at the pupils? ........ Yes No ?
24. Does this teacher usually pay attention to you when you raise your hand? ........ Yes No ?
25. Does this teacher often keep pupils in at recess or after school? ........ Yes No ?
26. Does this teacher make fun of some pupils? ........ Yes No ?
27. Do most of the pupils like this teacher? ........ Yes No ?
28. Does this teacher usually laugh with the pupils when something funny happens? ........ Yes No ?
29. Is this teacher fair in her grading? ........ Yes No ?
30. Does this teacher talk too loudly? ........ Yes No ?
31. Does this teacher give everyone a chance to recite? ........ Yes No ?
32. Does this teacher explain what you don't understand? ........ Yes No ?
33. Does this teacher get "mad" when you don't understand? ........ Yes No ?
34. Is this teacher always willing to help you with your schoolwork? ........ Yes No ?
35. Does this teacher seem to like children? ........ Yes No ?
36. Does this teacher often punish the whole class when only one or two pupils are to blame? ........ Yes No ?
37. Does this teacher scold you when you make a mistake? Yes No ?
38. Does this teacher give you a chance to ask questions? ........ Yes No ?
39. Does this teacher lower your grade when you help anyone else? ........ Yes No ?
40. Does this teacher often get angry with the pupils? Yes No ?
41. Does this teacher let you make up work in which you have failed? Yes No ?
42. Are you afraid to ask this teacher for help? Yes No ?
43. Does this teacher usually give you lots of homework? Yes No ?
44. Does this teacher punish a pupil in front of other pupils? Yes No ?
45. Is this teacher willing to give extra help to the pupils who need it? Yes No ?
46. Does this teacher see things the way children do? Yes No ?
47. Is this teacher interested in what you do outside of school? Yes No ?
48. Does this teacher explain your lessons clearly? Yes No ?
49. Do you like this teacher? Yes No ?
50. Do the other children like this teacher? Yes No ?
### Pupil Adjustment Inventory

#### Short Form

**Characteristics**

**A. Academic**

1. **Chronological age of grade**
   - Two or more years over age for grade
   - One year over age
   - Chronological age at grade
   - One year below age for grade
   - Two or more years below age for grade

2. **Achievement in schoolwork**
   - Far below estimated ability
   - Below estimated ability
   - Equal to estimated ability
   - Above estimated ability
   - Far above estimated ability

3. **Attitude toward schoolwork**
   - Almost never attempts any schoolwork
   - (a) Seldom completes required work
   - (b) Must be prodded to do what he does
   - Does what is required
   - Generally does more work than is required
   - Is entirely creative in schoolwork

**B. Social**

1. **Sociability**
   - [Blank]
   - (a) Rude
   - (b) Dislikes everyone
   - (c) Anti-social
   - (d) Engages in undesirable group activity
   - (a) Unsympathetic
   - (b) Cold
   - (c) Indifferent
   - (d) Friendly with one or a very few
   - (a) Courteous
   - (b) Usually likes to be with others
   - Very outgoing and friendly, but not a leader
   - Responsibly participates in group activities

2. **Social acceptance**
   - Is not liked by most of those not in his peer group
   - Rejected by his peers
   - Rejected by his peers
   - (a) Wins acceptance from only a few individuals outside his peer group
   - (b) Partially accepted by his peers
   - (a) Individuals not in his peer group find it easy to become friendly with him
   - (b) Usually accepted by his peers
   - (a) Sought after by numerous friends and admirers
   - (b) Generally accepted
   - (c) Received enthusiastically by most groups and individuals
   - (a) Admired and emulated by others

3. **Types of associates**
   - Associates with those who are often in trouble or socially irresponsible
   - (a) Associates with those who are sometimes in trouble
   - (b) Associates with those who are completely indifferent
   - (a) Associates with those in community who are neither socially responsible
   - (b) Associates with those who are socially irresponsible
   - (a) Associates with those who are socially responsible
   - (b) Associates with those who are highly responsible socially

**C. Emotional**

1. **Temperament**
   - Unstable most of the time
   - Unreliable
   - (a) Easily provoked
   - (b) Excitable
   - (c) Unusually passive most of the time
   - (a) Generally self-controlled
   - (b) Self-reliant
   - (a) Adapts to trying situations
   - (b) Well-balanced

**Note:** Fill out any statements below your rank which do not apply.
### D. PHYSICAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Very poor health</th>
<th>(a) Poor health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) tires easily</td>
<td>(b) tires fairly easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Extreme physical handicap</td>
<td>(c) Partially disabled by a physical handicap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Appears to have no interest</td>
<td>(d) Displays some interest in several things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Overconcentrates on one activity</td>
<td>(e) Participates in two activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Shows interest in many things</td>
<td>(f) Does not permit minor indispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Sees school as a meaningful experience</td>
<td>(g) Does not permit minor indispositions to interfere with attendance or punctuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Likes to get out of school</td>
<td>(h) Attends school regularly and is punctual except when absences are regarded as detrimental to self or others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. ACTIVITIES AND INTERESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Constantly feels inferior</th>
<th>(b) Aggressive towards others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) Constantly feels superior</td>
<td>(d) Seems to recognize his strengths and weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Appears to feel that he is not appreciated by a few people</td>
<td>(f) Accepts and works with his strengths and weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Constantly enjoys productive use of his abilities</td>
<td>(h) Appears to feel that he is desirably esteemed by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Never seems to tire under normal activity</td>
<td>(j) Rarely tires under normal activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. SCHOOL'S INFLUENCE UPON PUPIL

- The normal growth of this pupil is not encouraged by school organization.
- Some effort made to relate program to this pupil's needs and interests.
- This pupil's needs and interests are frequently met by the school.
- This pupil's needs and interests are consistently met by the school.
- This pupil's needs are satisfied by new activities created and developed by the school.

### G. HOME BACKGROUND

1. **Economic status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent economically</th>
<th>Poor economic status</th>
<th>Comfortable status</th>
<th>Above average status</th>
<th>Affluent economic status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **Family life**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Seems to be rejected by parents</th>
<th>(b) Often neglected by parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) Needs to be regarded by parents in every situation</td>
<td>(d) Parents seem to cater too much to child's whims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Parents interested in their children and provide limited help</td>
<td>(f) Parents understandingly guide children as they go through growth stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Parents and children mutually understand one another, sharing responsibilities and cooperatively solving family problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

WHOLE CLASS SOCIOGRAPHIC RANKING INSTRUMENT

NAME: 
GRADE: 
SCHOOL: 
TEACHER: 

INSTRUCTIONS:
First, read the headings of all five columns. You should put one "X" in the column telling how you feel about the pupil whose name is on the left side of this sheet.
You should put an "X" by your name telling how you feel the rest of the class feels about you.
You should put a piece of paper across this sheet to make sure that the "X" is put by the right pupil's name and in the right column.
Your rejection or acceptance of others has nothing to do with whether you think this pupil is good or bad; we cannot have everyone as our best friends therefore we select only a few.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>as of Pupils</th>
<th>Would like to have him as one of my best friends</th>
<th>Would like to have him in my group but not as a close friend</th>
<th>Would like him once</th>
<th>Would like to be with him once \ bringing him once in a while</th>
<th>Don't mind his being in our room but I don't want to have anything to do with him for long</th>
<th>Wish he were in some other room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>
SOUTHERN SCIENCE OCCUPATIONAL RATING SCALE

by Verner M. Sims  College of Education, University of Alabama

Directions: Most of us identify the people working at a given occupation as generally belonging to a certain social class. In this scale you are going to classify according to social prestige the people who generally follow a selected group of occupations. Of course, for any occupation there may be exceptions, since occupation is not the only factor in determining social prestige. The exceptions are not to be considered here, however. What is wanted is your opinion as to how people who follow the different occupations rate as a general rule. Look at the list of occupations below. Following each occupation there are four letters: S, H, L, and D. Check each occupation by drawing a circle around one of these letters as follows:

S if you feel the people in this occupation generally belong to the same social class you and your family do,
H if you feel the people in this occupation generally belong to a higher social class than you and your family do,
L if you feel the people in this occupation generally belong to a lower social class than you and your family do,
D if you are not familiar enough with the occupation to be sure or if you do not care to answer for a particular occupation.

There are no “right” or “wrong” answers on this Scale — only your opinions. There is no time limit, but most people finish in less than 20 minutes. Do not spend too much time on any item.

Scale — Form A

1. United States army colonel 
2. Owner-operator of small bakery 
3. Bricklayer 
4. Cashier of small grocery store 
5. Cotton-mill worker 
6. Newspaper editor 
7. Civil engineer 
8. Owner-operator of large farm 
9. Garbage collector 
10. Janitor 
11. State supreme court judge 
12. Corporation lawyer 
13. Real estate salesman 
14. Surgeon 
15. Telegraph operator 
16. Transcontinental railroad president 
17. Owner of a chain of stores 
18. High school teacher 
19. Telephone operator 
20. University president 
21. Owner-operator of neighborhood grocery store 
22. House-to-house brush salesman 
23. Certified public accountant 
24. United States ambassador 
25. Bookkeeper (for a store) 
26. President of large bank 
27. Government clerk 
28. Building contractor 
29. Cook (for a family) 
30. Dentist 
31. Druggist 
32. Factory worker 
33. Farm hand 
34. Filling-station attendant 
35. Truck gardener or farmer 
36. Mayor of large city 
37. Automobile mechanic 
38. Minister 
39. Railroad ticket agent 
40. Radio announcer 
41. State treasurer 
42. Executive vice-president of large corporation

NAME: ___________________  SEX: M. F.  AGE: ______  DATE: _______
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