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CHAPTER I

PROBLEM FOR INVESTIGATION

Nature of Problem

There is evidence that observant and analytical persons have noted personality differences for as long as man's thoughts have been recorded, and that they have tried to understand what factors were present that made one person acceptable to his fellows and another not acceptable.

Many of these observations came to be accepted as truths by large numbers of people. Others began to notice that the presence or absence of some or often many of the traits generally thought to make for acceptable or non-acceptable personalities did not in fact seem to bring about the expected results in relation to the individual's group standing.

In order to supplement observation, studies have been made in an attempt to devise accurate means of measuring groups to determine the high or low social acceptance of individuals within the group.\footnote{Merl E. Bonney, "The Constancy of Sociometric Scores and Their Relationship to Teacher Judgments of Social Success, and to Personality Self-Ratings," Sociometry, VI (1943), 409-424.} Additional studies
have measured the personality traits of the different members in the group in an effort to determine which traits or combination of traits were characteristic of the rejected group. These group analyses have come to be known as sociometric studies. This growing fund of information presents a new and challenging concept of the factors that make an individual acceptable in his family, school, or community.

The purpose of this study is to determine which items on a personality rating scale are most valid in describing individuals who have been selected on the basis of social acceptance.

Source of Data

From a series of previous studies conducted over a period of six years with grade-school children in the North Texas State Teachers College Demonstration School and in the ward schools of Denton, Texas, Dr. Merl E. Bonney has worked out a personality rating scale including factors known to be important in inter-personal relationships but not previously included in any of the standardized personality rating scales. These factors were grouped in advance according to ten different categories, one pertaining to abilities, one a miscellaneous grouping, and the other eight to personality traits.
This scale was given in two forms, as a part of a large research study, to 1,211 of the 1,905 students enrolled in North Texas State Teachers College in the fall of 1945. On the "Rating Others" form, the students were asked to rate a friend and to write the name of one additional friend; and on the basis of these choices it was possible to tabulate the number of choices each person received. There were 153 students who received three or more choices. These constituted the "high" group. Students who rated themselves but who received no rating by another student constituted the "low" group.

Limitations

This study is limited to an analysis of the data obtained from the popular individuals selected on the basis of student choices.

Definition of Terms

"Personality" is a term much used and misused by many people, and the idea it is meant to convey varies much from one person to another. It is possible to find many attempts at defining the term. Stagner defines personality as "individual differences in non-adaptive behavior."² Others think of personality as the effect

the individual has upon other people with whom he has contacts. In this study the term is used to mean the effect the individual has upon others and also the individual's own ideas regarding himself in relation to others.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

A study made by Merl E. Bonney concerned the following three aspects of sociometric data: (1) the constancy of sociometric scores over a period of four years as compared with the constancy of measurements of intelligence and academic achievement, (2) the relation between social status as measured by teacher judgments, and (3) the relation between sociometric scores and the results obtained from a personality self-rating scale.¹

The subjects in this study were children in the second, third, fourth, and fifth grades in two public elementary schools and in the Demonstration School associated with the North Texas State Teachers College in Denton, Texas. The study covered a period of four years. The total number of children in the groups during that time was eighty.

Popularity or social acceptance was determined by pupil choices. The teachers were asked to rate the pupils

¹Merl E. Bonney, "The Constancy of Sociometric Scores and Their Relationship to Teacher Judgments of Social Success, and to Personality Self-Ratings," Sociometry, VI (1943), 409-424.
at the end of the school year and on the fifth-grade level on the basis of social acceptance according to the following categories: highest group, above average, about average, below average, and lowest group.

The data in this study showed that general social acceptance was as constant as intelligence and academic achievement. The teacher ratings were found to agree rather well with pupil ratings. The outstanding exceptions were in cases in which the pupils were "bright" in school work. The teachers failed to distinguish between admiration and liking.

From the ratings obtained on the personality self-rating scales, it was found that there is a strong tendency for the more popular children to rate themselves in a more favorable manner than do the less popular ones. However, some children very low in social acceptance according to pupil ratings did rate themselves high, apparently in order to compensate for their lack of standing in the group.

The above findings show that some doubt should be cast upon the validity of conclusions reached as a result of scores on personality tests when a "good personality" is measured entirely on a basis of self rating.
This study showed that, contrary to popular writings on social acceptance, it is the total person that counts, not individual traits whether good or bad.

A later study by Bonney was made to determine what traits are important in inter-personal relationships. The subjects were fourth-grade children in three schools of Denton, Texas. One of the schools was the Demonstration School associated with the North Texas State Teachers College. The other two were public schools.

The data were gathered by (1) trait ratings on the part of both teachers and pupils, and (2) pupil choices of friends.

This study showed that the significant trait differences between the popular and unpopular children fell into two groups. The first group was composed of strong, aggressive personality traits such as leadership, enthusiasm, daring, and active participation in recitations. The second group consisted of traits that seemed less definite but which were more related to direct inter-personal relationships such as a pleasing appearance, a cheerful disposition, and friendly attitudes.

The above findings indicate that an individual is

---

2 Merl E. Bonney, "Personality Traits of Socially Successful and Socially Unsuccessful Children," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXIV (1943), 449-472.
accepted by his group far more because of what he does than for what he refrains from doing. It is necessary for the individual to make some contribution in order to make his presence felt in the group.

William F. Thomas and Paul Thomas Young used 676 students in elementary psychology courses at the University of Illinois in their study on personal social success. The group was made up of 328 men and 348 women.

Each subject was given a previously prepared form on which he was asked to list initials of friends and indicate their sex. They were asked to list them in groups according to whether they were liked or disliked, giving their reasons briefly. Assurance was given that the work was strictly anonymous.

The answers showed that individuals like a greater number of people of the same sex. On the other hand the person most liked was apt to be of the opposite sex. The factor of sexual attraction doubtless entered in as the group was made up of college students at the mating years. Despite this, the one person most disliked was generally a member of the same sex.

In tabulating the reasons for liking and disliking,

---

the students mentioned most frequently the trait of intelligence. Such traits as cheerfulness, kindness, consideration, friendliness were listed as reasons for liking males.

Men ranked intelligence first in general, but college men rated "beauty" first and "intelligence" second as reasons for liking women. Women ranked "beauty" sixteenth as a reason for liking other women.

Males ranked "sex appeal" fifth as a reason for liking females. Females ranked this trait only twenty-seventh as a reason for liking males. However, it was found that, generally speaking, men and women liked and disliked the same traits.

The most frequently mentioned reason given by both sexes for disliking a person was "conceit." Other reasons for disliking persons were selfishness, deceit, snobishness, and being self-centered.

The traits suggested which lead to a likeable personality were extrovertive. Those which lead to a displeasing or hated personality were introvertive. The traits which make one well liked pertained to attitudes or behavior in social situations such as consideration, cheerfulness, helpfulness, loyalty, generosity, kindness, friendliness. Females, in particular, liked persons who
were kind, thoughtful, and who were willing to do things for them.

In her study of friendship patterns and personality traits, Van Dyne used as subjects forty-two girls. The average age was sixteen years. All were attending a private girls' summer camp.

Data for personality traits were obtained by self-ratings on a personality scale. Then the subjects were asked to list their friends in order of preference.

The conclusions drawn from this study were:

(1) There is some indication that the closer the friend, the higher the chronological age correlation.
(2) Girls tend to choose as friends other girls of similar age and a similar degree of dominance and sociability.
(3) The degree of emotional stability, self-sufficiency, introversion, and self-confidence seems to have little to do with the formation of friendships among adolescent girls.
(4) There is little relationship between the personality traits and chronological age.4

Another contribution to the fund of information on group structures was made by Vreeland in her study of fraternity groups.5 Both men’s and women’s groups were included. Each member was given a list which included all


members. They were asked to rate all members in the order of preference. Only the five highest ratings were used in this report.

This study showed that in spite of the policy of these organizations to provide equal acceptance for all, there was a persistence of both stars and isolates in the groups. The trend of votes went from the least popular to the most popular. It was thought that class membership overshadowed personality traits as upperclassmen received many more votes than students in the lower classifications. The time factor was important as greater age, experience, and general sophistication were factors affecting prestige.

Roe made a study of inter-personal relations among high school students.⁶ The purpose of this study was to discover some of the ways in which popular students differed from those who were not so popular. He used a personality rating scale developed by Merl E. Bonney containing items related to certain personality traits.

The students were asked to rate themselves on the "self-rating" form and to rate a friend of the same sex on the "rating others" form, adding the name of one other

friend. On the basis of these pupil choices they were divided into a high group containing forty-five students and a low group containing thirty students.

From the data considered in this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The popular students were superior to the unpopular students in physical appearance, health, and vigor.

2. The popular students were more emotionally stable and controlled than were the unpopular students.

3. Both groups were low in social aggressiveness, the initiation of social contacts and social events, but the popular students seemed to have a slight lead over the unpopular students in this trait.

4. The unpopular students seemed to have a slight lead over the popular students in adaptability and tolerance, but, perhaps, this can be explained by the weak students having formed the habit of adjusting themselves to meet any situation because it seemed to be the easier way.

5. The popular students were superior to the unpopular students in dependability -- a sense of obligation in all personal and group relationships.

6. The unpopular students were slightly superior to
the popular students in dependence on others for assistance and emotional support.

7. The popular students were a better source of new experience to others than were the unpopular students.

8. The popular group rated higher in social service motivation and an attitude of good will toward others than did the unpopular students.

9. The superior group in abilities was the popular group.

While Roe used Bonney's scale in his study of high school students, his method of handling the data was different from the method used by the present writer. However, his study will be referred to when his findings can be related to those in the current study.
CHAPTER III

OBTAINING DATA

For measuring traits in this study, personality questionnaires were used which had been prepared by Merl E. Bonney, professor of psychology at North Texas State Teachers College.¹ Two questionnaires were used, one a "self-rating" type and the other a "rating by others" form. Each person filling out a self-rating form was asked to rate a friend of his. Also he listed another friend. As these questionnaires were being used to obtain data for a larger study being carried on by the college, the writer did not administer all of the tests personally. Various departments of the college were asked to devote one class period to the completion of these questionnaires.

There were 1,905 students enrolled in college at the time the tests were given. Of this number, 1,211 rated themselves and a friend as well as naming an additional friend. Those making choices constituted 63.5 per

¹The specific questions, grouped according to traits, will be found in the Appendix.
cent of the student body. The total number of choices was 2,374. There were 153 students in the "high" group which was 12.5 per cent of the total student body. In other words, the popular students received 22.5 per cent of the total number of votes.

From the questionnaires received the writer selected those that fell in the group that were "high" as indicated by the number of choices they received by other students who chose them in either first or second choice as preferred friends.

Nature of Questionnaires

The self-rating personality scale used was designed to obtain information in eleven categories grouped under major sections. The completed first page provided information as to name, sex, age, classification, church preference, siblings, major subject, and ambition. The second half of Section III pertained to offices held in the previous years. The remainder of the questionnaire was devoted to 170 questions pertaining to nine traits important in determining a person's personality and his social acceptance. The questions used all pertained to overt indicators of the traits to be measured, making possible the type of questionnaire used when rating another person. In the scale for rating others, the questions
were identical with those in the self-rating scale except for the substitution of third-person wording. They were numbered the same as on the self-rating form. Section IV of the self-rating form was not duplicated in the rating of others, since it pertained to attendance at church and other group functions, and it was believed that such items could not be rated accurately by others. The second half of Section III pertaining to offices held was also omitted from the rating by others.

The traits measured by this instrument were:

1. Physical appearance, health, and vigor.
2. Emotional stability and control.
3. Social aggressiveness.
4. Tolerance and adaptability.
5. Dependability.
6. Dependence on others.
7. Being a source of new experience to others.
8. Social service motivation.
9. Abilities and skills.

Questions pertaining to a trait were distributed among those pertaining to other traits to avoid the possible "coloring" of successive questions by the answer made to the first one or two of a series. This arrangement was not used in respect to abilities and skills as the
answer to one question would not color the answer to another question concerning an entirely different skill.

Rating was done by circling one of five digits\(^2\) (one through five) following a question, "3" being taken as the scale norm, the degree of rating being in direct proportion to the size of the digit circled. Preceding the questions in each section was an interpretive scale as follows:

Section I. On the items below you are to respond according to the following scale:

1 -- means almost never
2 -- means seldom
3 -- means sometimes
4 -- means usually
5 -- means nearly always

Section II. On the items in this section you are to rate yourself according to the scale below:

1 -- means much less so than most people you know
2 -- means a little less so than most people you know
3 -- means about the same as most people you know
4 -- means a little more so than most people you know
5 -- means much more so than most people you know.

Section III. In this section you are to respond to the items below on the basis of the degree to which you think you possess the different abilities

\(^2\)In the first half of Section III and in Section IV, an "0" was added for the rating of "no ability at all" and "never," respectively.
listed. You are to mark yourself according to the following scale:

0 -- means no ability at all.
1 -- means very little ability
2 -- means fair but below average
3 -- means about average for the groups you are in
4 -- means above average
5 -- means one of the best in your usual groups

Tabulation of Data

In order to record the data from these questionnaires, the writer made large charts from graph paper with squares of such size as to permit the easy writing of numbers, a sufficient number of sheets of paper being joined together horizontally to provide 170 squares, space for the persons' names, and space for the averages on all traits. One horizontal line was assigned to each person, and one horizontal line to each of the ratings of him made by others.

To facilitate the extraction of all questions pertaining to one trait at the same time, fenestrated overlays were made, one for each trait, with a separate column for each page in the questionnaire. On the charts,

---

3 The validity of the use of such categories for obtaining data has been established by Merl E. Bonney in studies with school children: "The Validity of Certain Techniques of Gathering Psychological Data with Special Reference to Personality Questionnaires," Journal of Social Psychology, XIII (1941), 103-121.
all questions pertaining to a particular trait were grouped together in numerical sequence in designated areas, and the circled digits (including "0's") were entered in the appropriate squares.

When this recording was completed, the total number of answers were counted for all possible answers from "0" through "5" first for self-ratings and then for ratings of others. Additional charts were made, one for self-rating and one for rating of others, and the percentage was figured for all answers from "0" through "5" for each item in the test.

Then the items receiving forty per cent or more on both self-ratings and ratings of others for answers of average or better, that is answers from "3" through "5," were selected and grouped according to the nine traits. This percentage was chosen because all items which fell at forty per cent or more were the items upon which there was the greatest agreement between the self-ratings and the ratings by others. This agreement of forty per cent or better is at least twice as great as would be expected from chance alone, since chance would allow for only twenty per cent agreement. This is true because the scale covered five points, therefore one point is twenty per cent. The higher degrees of agreement show that the
ratings must be more valid since there was agreement between the "self" and "others" ratings. This study is confined to a consideration of those items found to be most validly rated according to the above standard.
CHAPTER IV

ITEM ANALYSIS

After the items were tabulated according to the percentages of answers received for all possible answers from "0" through "5," seventy-nine items fell into the group having forty per cent or better on answers of "3," "4," and "5" on both self-rating and rating of others. There were four items receiving sixty per cent or more. Thirteen items received from fifty to fifty-nine per cent. Sixty-two items fell into the forty to forty-nine per cent group.

Two items in the forty to forty-nine per cent group received this rating in this category on both "4" and "5" answers. These items were "Are you in good spirits (optimistic, cheerful) when around others?" and "When you promise to help others do something, do you carry out your promise to the limit of your ability?" The first item is related to the trait of emotional stability and control. The second item is related to dependability. The high percentage for these items shows that, both in rating self and in rating others, the group considered
these traits to be very important in inter-personal relations.

Only eleven of the seventy-nine items in this forty per cent or better group had more than ten points difference between the self-rating and the rating of others. All of these totals were higher for self-ratings than for ratings by others.

The totals on ratings of "self" and "others" for answers of "3," "4," and "5" were listed for the seventy-nine high ranking items. Only five of these totals showed a difference of more than ten points. With one exception, the self-ratings were higher than the ratings of others. This item pertained to ability in managing groups. This means that popular individuals studied were less inclined to rate themselves higher in leadership ability than were their friends. Or is it possible that the students attributed leadership ability to those whom they admire for other reasons?

The total percentage for the following items was the same for "self" and "others" ratings:

Can you adapt yourself to the mood of an individual, or group you are with, even though you do not really feel as the others do?

When given a task to perform by a teacher or supervisor, do you carry it out to the best of your ability, even though you do not see any value to yourself in what you are asked to do?
When you promise to help others do something, do you carry out your promise to the limit of your ability?

Are your verbal statements to others true and accurate as far as you know?

Do you trust your associates to do the right thing by you (not suspicious)?

In talking to others, do you dramatize or obviously exaggerate things you have read or experienced just to make your account more interesting to your listeners?

When some very unexpected and shocking circumstances arise, such as reception of bad news, or a serious disappointment, do you adapt yourself to these facts without crying, demands for sympathy, or excessive discouragement?

When you are around people you don't like, do you nevertheless hide your antagonism toward them?

Do you participate in an activity agreed upon by the majority of your group (when no important principles are involved) even though you are not much interested in the kind of thing being done?

These items, with two exceptions, had a total of more than ninety per cent for better than average answers; that is, for answers of "3," "4," and "5." They are related to emotional stability, adaptability, and tolerance with one each of the less than ninety per cent totals falling under dependence on others and being a source of new experiences. This shows a high degree of agreement among the students studied regarding the importance of the first two traits. In the latter two traits, the answers showed the group considered it best to be average.
The totals for items with ten or less points difference in self-ratings and ratings of others showed the same tendency as was shown in items with more than ten points difference in that the self-ratings were higher than the ratings of others for fifty-five items. The ratings of others were higher than the self-ratings for fourteen items. These differences were not great, being only a few points on most items. However, one might be justified in taking the admonition to "be humble" with a grain of salt. It would seem wiser to believe that others think well of those who think well of themselves.

The table on the following page shows the percentage of the total number of items related to each trait that were represented in the "forty per cent or over" grouping.

This tabulation shows the greatest agreement on the traits of physical appearance, health and vigor, and on dependability. Apparently this is because they are traits that are easily observed. These traits have more overt indications upon which to base one's judgment.

Emotional stability is probably more difficult to judge, therefore there is much less agreement among the students regarding this trait. This may also be the explanation of the relatively low agreement on the trait
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Total Number of Items Related to Traits</th>
<th>40 Per Cent Group</th>
<th>50 Per Cent Group</th>
<th>60 Per Cent Group</th>
<th>Total Number of Items in 40% or Over Grouping</th>
<th>Total Per Cent in 40% or Over Grouping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical appearance, health, and vigor...</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emotional stability and control</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6 (31%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social aggressiveness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adaptability and tolerance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9 (47%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dependability</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dependence on others...</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being source of new experiences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4 (26%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social service motivation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8 (44%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Abilities and skills...</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4 (23%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
designated "being a source of new experiences to others." It might be expected that considerable agreement would be found on "ability and skills" since these can be observed quite well. However, it is probably difficult for many people to estimate just how good they or their friends are in various skills unless they are very exceptional in one extreme or the other.

Items Receiving 40 to 49 Per Cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Trait 1: PHYSICAL APPEARANCE, HEALTH AND VIGOR</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-I</td>
<td>From the standpoint of physical vigor, do you feel &quot;up to&quot; the requirements of your work?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-I</td>
<td>From the standpoint of physical vigor, do you feel &quot;up to&quot; your opportunities for social life?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-II</td>
<td>How do you compare with others of your own sex in regard to general personal appearance, i.e., in being good looking, handsome, or beautiful?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-II</td>
<td>Do you have a pleasing voice?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were sixty-two items receiving forty to forty-nine per cent on the average or better answers. All of the traits previously selected in making up the test
were represented in this group. There were eight items related to physical appearance, health and vigor. Four, or fifty per cent, of these items were in this group. The "4" answers for the health and vigor items showed that the group considered a better than average amount of physical vigor important in inter-personal relationships. Mere observation as well as other studies support this view as persons in ill health are usually too preoccupied with themselves to take much interest in others. In Roe's study, the students gave the high group 40.2 per cent on "5" answers for Item 28-I related to physical vigor.

The "3" answers for the "appearance" items showed the students considered it best not to vary too much from the average in respect to good looks. Also in the matter of clothes these popular students and their friends indicated they considered an average amount of attention to dress to be better than either carelessness or the other extreme of being over-dressed. The item related to having a pleasant voice received a rating high enough to show the students considered it important to have a voice that is at least average in pleasantness.
Trait 2: EMOTIONAL STABILITY AND CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-I</td>
<td>Can you lose in a game without being irritated or upset?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-I</td>
<td>Can your friends depend upon you to treat them very much the same all the time (as opposed to being &quot;huffy&quot; or distant at times)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-I</td>
<td>Are you in good spirits (optimistic, cheerful) when others are around?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-I</td>
<td>Can you keep from &quot;going to pieces&quot; or &quot;losing your head&quot; in emergency situations, such as accidents, or any kind of situation involving impending physical danger?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-I</td>
<td>Can you take well-intentioned criticism from teachers, supervisors, or others in positions of authority over you without showing resentment or anger?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-I</td>
<td>When you are disturbed or anxious over an unpleasant situation, do you &quot;rise above&quot; it rather quickly (as opposed to letting it &quot;get you down&quot;)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six or 31.6 per cent of the total number of nineteen items related to emotional stability and control were in this group. All six items received answers of "4" and "5" with item 87-I pertaining to cheerfulness receiving forty per cent on answers of both "4" and "5." Item 31-I regarding being a good loser received 47.3 per cent on "5" answers in Roe's "rating others" group
as well as a "5" answer for both "self" and "others" in this study.

Apparently the students really mean it when they say "be a good sport." With these answers, they show their high regard for an even, dependable mood of cheerfulness, the ability to take a moderate amount of criticism if it is meant in a friendly way, and the ability to "take it and keep smiling" when unpleasant situations arise.

Trait 4: SOCIAL AGGRESSIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45-I</td>
<td>In a social situation do you take the lead in promoting games, stunts, or projects?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-II</td>
<td>When you are in an informal social situation, do you introduce yourself to persons you do not know?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-II</td>
<td>Do you visit (call on) other people in their living quarters?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-II</td>
<td>In group situations, do you take the initiative in introducing people to others they do not know?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-I</td>
<td>Do you endeavor to make newcomers into your groups feel welcome?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-I</td>
<td>Do you get what is coming to you (as contrasted to letting others &quot;run over you&quot; or ignore your rights)?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The group indicated by a four to two majority that an average amount of social aggressiveness is desirable. The only "5" answer for this trait was for the item related to making newcomers welcome into the group. The "4" answer was for the item regarding "standing up for one's rights." This result is to be expected from mere observation. The extremely aggressive person is usually annoying to his associates. On the other hand, we do not admire or respect the person who "makes a floor mat of himself." While it is possible to take kindness to too great lengths, most persons feel grateful for thoughtfulness and consideration. This is especially true when they are strangers in a group.

Only 27.3 per cent of the total items related to this trait were represented in this group. This showed the students considered this trait of some importance in inter-personal relationships but did not consider it among the most important traits.

Trait 5: ADAPTABILITY AND TOLERANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-II</td>
<td>Do you pretend to be interested in some topics just to be sociable with certain individuals or groups you are with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-I</td>
<td>Do you react to the ordinary inconveniences of life with a sense of humor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-I</td>
<td>Are you tactful in dealing with people, so that you do not antagonize them or hurt their feelings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-I</td>
<td>When your usual activities are temporarily interrupted by others, do you adapt yourself to this fact without showing annoyance or irritability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-I</td>
<td>Are you friendly with people whose ideas about what is right and wrong differ from yours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-I</td>
<td>Can you adapt yourself to the mood of an individual or group you are with, even though you do not really feel as the others do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-I</td>
<td>When you have to associate with someone who does a lot of little things (care of personal toilet, household chores, etc.) differently than you do, can you adapt yourself to these differences without showing annoyance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-I</td>
<td>Are you just as friendly with those persons who differ from you in their views on social and economic questions (labor unions, strikes, social reforms, etc.) as you are with those who agree with you on such matters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-I</td>
<td>When things don't go to suit you in a group situation, do you make the best of it and go along with the others (as opposed to pouting or sulking)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight of the nine items in the adaptability and tolerance group were answered with "4's" showing that the group considered it well to possess this trait to a moderately high degree.
On the other hand, the absence of "5" answers shows the popular students avoided being "so broad they were flat." While they were able to make concessions in order to maintain group harmony, still they were capable of standing up for their own ideas.

The two items (52-I and 81-I) related to friendliness with those who differ with them in ideas both received "4" answers. This agrees with other studies that find popular, well-adjusted persons accept others as individuals in their own right and refrain from attempts to make them over to fit another pattern. Also they are friendly with persons outside their own group including those in less fortunate positions.

These nine items represent 47.4 per cent of the total number of items related to this trait. This was the third highest percentage representation in this group.

Trait 6: DEPENDABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38-I</td>
<td>When given a task to perform by a teacher or supervisor, do you carry it out to the best of your ability, even though you do not see any value to yourself in what you are asked to do?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-I</td>
<td>Do you fulfill an obligation (such as taking a part on a program, playing in a group game, etc.) even though you do not feel like it at the time due to a minor health ailment or to mood changes?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-I</td>
<td>When you have promised someone that you will do something for him, and it turns out to be more inconvenient or difficult to do it than you had expected, do you nevertheless fulfill your promise?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-I</td>
<td>When you promise to help others do something, do you carry out your promise to the limit of your ability?</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-I</td>
<td>When you promise to meet someone at a certain time, are you there promptly at the time agreed upon?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-I</td>
<td>When you are given a committee assignment, do you work hard at it in order to do the best job possible?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-I</td>
<td>When you make an agreement with a person in respect to a mutual obligation (such as keeping a room clean, paying your part of a bill, etc.) do you keep your agreement?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-I</td>
<td>Are your verbal statements to others true and accurate as far as you know?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-I</td>
<td>When a group of which you are a member has a problem before it, do you offer suggestions on how it might be met (as contrasted to letting the others work it out unassisted by you)?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependability received the highest ranking with nine of the fourteen items related to this trait represented in this grouping, that is 64.3 per cent of the total number. One item in the fifty to fifty-nine per cent group and two items in the sixty per cent or over group bring the number of items related to this trait in the high groups up to twelve or 85.7 per cent of the total. All
of these items were answered with "4's" and "5's." Item 62-I pertaining to carrying out promises to the limit of one's ability received forty per cent on both "4" and "5" answers. The "4" answers for the three items (47-I, 76-I, and 85-I) related to dependability in contributions to the group activities support findings on similar studies made by Bonney. He found an individual's standing in the group depends "far more on what he does than what he refrains from doing." On the other hand, the individual who goes to the extreme of trying to be the whole show is likely to run into difficulties with his group.

Trait 7: DEPENDENCE ON OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-I</td>
<td>Do you trust your associates to do the right thing by you (not suspicious)?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-I</td>
<td>Are you glad to have your friends or associates point out in a friendly manner ways of improving your work?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-I</td>
<td>When a conflict arises between you and some of your associates, are you willing to make concessions on the stand you have taken in order to promote harmony?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-II</td>
<td>Do you avoid talking about your own petty affairs, ailments, or troubles?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-II</td>
<td>Do you avoid harping on one subject which is of great interest to you but not of equal interest to others?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-II</td>
<td>Do you make confidants of some of your friends by telling them intimate details of your personal life?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-II</td>
<td>Do you ask your friends for advice and suggestions regarding your personal affairs (even though you do not always follow the assistance offered)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-II</td>
<td>Are you modest in regard to your abilities or past achievements?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the group answers, the middle of the road course is best in the matter of dependence on others. A moderately high degree of willingness to take friendly advice and make concessions when conflicts arise is desirable along with a trustful attitude toward one's associates. Roe's findings are in agreement with the writer's data on Item 18-I. This item pertaining to having a trustful attitude toward others received a 41.7 per cent rating on "5" answers in his "rating others" group. Terman and others have found that a trustful attitude is typical of persons who are highly successful in marital and other inter-personal relations.

In the matters of discussing one's own personal affairs, making confidants, and asking advice on the intimate details of one's personal life, it is best to avoid either extreme. The group was rated average in the matter
of avoiding harping on one pet subject and in modesty regarding their abilities and achievements. Naturally a person will talk of the things he is most interested in, but he should use care lest he over-do it. Too much or too little modesty are considered equally undesirable.

There were seventeen items related to this trait. Eight items or 41.2 per cent were in this group.

**Trait 8: BEING SOURCE OF NEW EXPERIENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-II</td>
<td>Can you see the funny side of situations?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-II</td>
<td>Do you amuse others by making wise-cracks and clever remarks?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-II</td>
<td>In talking to others, do you dramatize or obviously exaggerate things you have read or experienced to make your account more interesting to your listeners?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-II</td>
<td>Do you &quot;act a fool,&quot; &quot;cut up,&quot; or engage in nonsense when among friends?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers of average or better in the "being a source of new experiences" category were for items which emphasized the fact that the group put a high value on a sense of humor and playfulness of mind. Still the absence of "5" answers showed that even a sense of fun can be carried too far.
These four items are 26.7 per cent of the total number of items related to this trait.

**Trait 9: SOCIAL SERVICE MOTIVATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-I</td>
<td>Do you compliment others you know for their achievements?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-I</td>
<td>Are you friendly with all members of your usual groups regardless of how low their social status may be (not cliquish)?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-I</td>
<td>Do you try to console your friends when they are sad or depressed?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-I</td>
<td>Do you do your best in working on a group project, when you know that if success is attained the recognition will be given to the group as a whole rather than to you individually?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-I</td>
<td>When a friend of yours has a personal defect which you consider to be a serious handicap to him, do you try to do something to help him overcome it?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-I</td>
<td>When others have helped you carry out a task for which group approval is given, do you make sure to give the others recognition for their assistance?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-II</td>
<td>Do you speak well of others or praise them when they are not present (as contrasted with criticizing them)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-II</td>
<td>When you feel that some kind of unfairness is being done against members of your group, do you try to do something about it?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The "4" and "5" answers for seven of the eight items in the group pertaining to social service motivation show that there is a strong relationship between the possession of this trait and the ability to win friends. This is in agreement with the findings of other studies. Terman found a strong social service motivation to be typical of the happily married group in his study on marital happiness.\footnote{Lewis M. Terman, \textit{Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness}, p. 287.} It is interesting to note that the only "3" answer in this group was on the item related to praising or criticizing others when they were not present. Is this their way of saying they do not like the avid gossip, but the Polly Anna who "sees no evil, hears no evil, and speaks no evil" is equally unacceptable? This is in accord with Symonds\footnote{Percival M. Symonds, \textit{The Dynamics of Human Adjustment}, p. 571.} statement regarding acceptance of reality in his criterion of maturity in which he says, "The person who is well adjusted recognizes the reality and inevitability of the conditions and people to which he must adjust."

The eight items in this group represent 44.4 percent of the total items included for this trait.
Trait 10: ABILITIES (OFFICES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-III</td>
<td>Individual sport, usually not involving competition (swimming, archery, hunting, fishing, rowing, horseback riding, skating, bicycling, etc.) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-III</td>
<td>&quot;Sitting down&quot; games (bridge, checkers, chess, dominoes, poker, etc.) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-III</td>
<td>Planning social events and parties. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-III</td>
<td>Conducting a meeting (as in the capacity of chairman or president). 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the matter of abilities such as skill in planning, managing meetings and social events, and in active sports as well as "sitting down" games, the group rated average on the only four items represented. Since none of these items fell in the two higher groupings, the data in this study show that these abilities have relatively little importance in the matter of being liked. Similar studies among young children showed that they exhibited a surprising amount of discrimination in the matter of choosing the right person for a given task. A child might be chosen for a task because he could do it well and to the credit of the group. This did not necessarily mean that he would be high on the list of persons most liked. This shows that there is little relationship between the
number of activities an individual participates in and that individual's ability to win friends. Are we over-emphasizing activities in all of our child care and training plans?

These four items represent the smallest percentage in this grouping, being only 23.5 per cent of the total for this trait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Receiving 50 to 59</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait 1: PHYSICAL APPEARANCE, HEALTH, AND VIGOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-I</td>
<td>Do you have a feeling of buoyancy and well being?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-II</td>
<td>Do you dress as well as others of your own sex?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait 2: EMOTIONAL STABILITY AND CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-I</td>
<td>Do you overlook minor offenses committed against you when the event has &quot;blown over&quot;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait 4: SOCIAL AGRRESSIVENESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-I</td>
<td>When you go to any kind of meeting place or public gathering, do you invite one or more other persons to go with you? (If married, include husband or wife.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-II</td>
<td>When in an informal group, do you initiate conversations about topics of general interest to the persons present, such as: sports, politics, literature, school programs, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-II</td>
<td>Do you take up, and participate in, the interests of your friends in order to have more in common with them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trait 5: ADAPTABILITY AND TOLERANCE**

| 74-I | Are you just as friendly with persons who belong to a different political party from yours as you are with those who belong to your own party? | 5 |
| 24-II | Do you take up current fads in regard to clothing, hair styles, slang, wise-cracks, etc.? | 3 |

**Trait 6: DEPENDABILITY**

| 11-I | Are you loyal to your friends; do you stand up for them when they are not present? | 5 |

**Trait 7: DEPENDENCE ON OTHERS**

| 3-II | Do you ask favors of your friends? | 3 |

**Trait 8: BEING SOURCE OF NEW EXPERIENCES**

| 36-II | Do you surprise or shock your associates by making unusual remarks, or by stating stimulating points of view? | 3 |

**Trait 9: SOCIAL SERVICE MOTIVATION**

| 50-I | Do you express appreciation to others for their assistance or kindnesses to you? | 5 |
| 38-II | Do you help raise money by taking part in drives for social-service projects, such as for church functions, youth organizations, under-privileged children, etc.? | 3 |
All the personality traits were represented in this group, social aggressiveness being most frequently represented. This supports the findings of previous studies that indicate that "an individual is accepted by his group far more because of what he does than for what he refrains from doing."³

The trait "dependence on others" was represented only once with an answer of "3" for Item 3-II. This indicates that a show of absolute independence is not desirable for friends like to feel they are needed. On the other hand, a high degree of dependence is not desirable as it takes a strong personality to satisfy the friendship needs of another strong personality. Doubtless it is best to avoid extremes in this trait.

The above conclusions apply also to Item 36-II on being a source of new experiences. It is better to be average in this respect rather than to be too shocking or too dull.

The social-service motivation items received answers of "5" corroborating the findings of many other studies which have shown this trait to be important in the success of marital and other inter-personal relationships.

³Bonney, "Personality Traits of Socially Successful and Socially Unsuccessful Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIV (1943), 449-472.
The answers for the physical appearance, health, and vigor items indicate that it is important to be above the average in physical well-being. In the matter of dress, it is best not to stand out too much from one's group. A great degree of difference in dress sets one apart from one's fellows and is even likely to cause envy. The self-ratings and ratings of others agree on this matter.

Item 24-II under adaptability shows agreement with the above statement, as both groups agreed that it is best to avoid extremes in the matter of fads. However, a high degree of tolerance is shown to be desirable as it was answered with "5."

**Items Receiving 60 Per Cent or Over**

**Trait 6: DEPENDABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-I</td>
<td>Do you return borrowed materials and borrowed money?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-I</td>
<td>Can your friends trust you to keep confidences which they have shared with you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trait 9: SOCIAL SERVICE MOTIVATION**

| 32-II | Do you contribute money or materials to social-service projects, such as those promoted by churches, the Red Cross, or charity groups? | 3 |
33-II  Do you try to anticipate the wants (or needs) of others and endeavor to meet these wants without being asked to do so?

The four items in the sixty per cent or over group were related to dependability and social-service motivation, traits known from previous studies to be important in attracting friends. Item 5-I related to returning borrowed materials and money, receiving seventy-six per cent on self-ratings and seventy per cent on ratings of others for answer "5." Also it received 68.4 per cent on "5" answers in Roe's "rating others" group. This shows a high degree of validity for this item, particularly in view of the degree of agreement between the rating of "self" and "others." One would expect people to seek friends who would be depended upon to respect their property.

The "5" answers on the item related to ability to keep confidences is in line with what one would expect from observation. The fact that an individual is "two-faced" is often given as a reason for dislike.

The data showed only one point of difference in "rating self" and "others" on Item 32-II. The totals were the same on Item 33-II. Both of these ratings were
for answers of "3." This indicates that it is desirable to show an interest in others and consideration for their needs. On the other hand, to be over-solicitous is undesirable.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

From the data considered in this study, the following traits were found to be characteristic of socially successful students:

1. They were good-looking and well dressed but not to such an extreme as to be so different from the group that they were likely to arouse envy. They were above average in physical well-being and vigor.

2. Emotional stability and control was possessed to a high degree together with cheerfulness and agreeableness that could be depended upon from day to day, even in the face of trying situations.

3. They had a moderate amount of social aggressiveness that made itself evident in acts of kindness, thoughtfulness, and consideration. At the same time they seemed to realize that even kindness can be carried to too great lengths.

4. They were tolerant and adaptable to a high degree. These traits were evident in their acceptance of those who were different or had different ideas. Also they were able to accept disappointments and disagreeable
situations without a show of irritation or even with the ability to see the funny side.

5. One of the most important traits was dependability in matters small and large, such as returning borrowed objects, keeping promises, and carrying out assignments.

6. Relations with friends were marked by a moderate degree of dependence. They strike a happy medium between a cold aloofness and a clinging dependence.

7. They possessed a sense of humor and playfulness of mind, at the same time refraining from an effort to "play the clown" on any and all occasions.

8. A strong social-service motivation was typical.

9. They were moderately interested and skilled in both active and "sitting" games but not outstanding in this respect.
APPENDIX

QUESTIONS USED IN PERSONALITY RATING

Physical Appearance, Health and Vigor

Do you have a feeling of buoyancy and well-being?

From the standpoint of physical vigor, do you feel "up to" the requirements of your work?

From the standpoint of physical vigor, do you feel "up to" your opportunities for social life?

Are you a lively, "on the go" type of person?

Do you feel refreshed and "ready to go" when you wake up in the morning?

Do you dress as well as others of your own sex?

How do you compare with others of your own sex in regard to general appearance, i. e., in being good looking, handsome, and beautiful?

Do you have a pleasing voice?

Emotional Stability and Control

Can you keep from "going to pieces" or "losing your head" in emergency situations, such as accidents, or any kind of situation involving impending physical danger?

1 Trait headings were not used in the questionnaire, and related questions were not grouped together.

2 Questions were changed to third-person wording in the form of the scale used to rate others.
Can you take well-intentioned criticism from teachers, supervisors, or others in positions of authority over you without showing resentment or anger?

Are you calm and relaxed (not excitable and restless)?

When some very unexpected and shocking circumstance arises, such as reception of bad news, or a serious disappointment, do you adapt yourself to these facts without crying, making demands for sympathy, or excessive discouragement?

Can you accept well-intentioned criticism from your friends or co-workers without showing resentment or anger?

Can you "brush off" slights and other minor offenses to your ego (feelings not easily hurt)?

Can you lose in a game without being irritated or upset?

When you have apparently lost a point in an argument over a matter of little importance, do you let the matter drop (rather than returning to the point to try to prove that after all you were right)?

When you are irritated about something, do you avoid "taking out" your irritation on members of your family, or other associates, by some kind of unjustified attacks upon them?

When you are moved to anger, do you get it under control rather quickly (as contrasted with holding grudges or resentment over a long period of time)?

Can your friends depend upon you to treat them very much the same all the time (as opposed to being "huffy" or distant at times)?

Do you overlook minor offenses committed against you when the event has "blown over"?

Do you keep from showing anger when involved in a conflict with other persons?
Do you keep from showing grief when you are sad or depressed (not easily moved to tears)?

When you suffer a disappointment, do you "rise above" it rather quickly (as opposed to letting it "get you down")?

Can you stand to be kidded or teased without becoming irritated?

When you are disturbed or anxious over an unpleasant situation, do you "rise above" it rather quickly (as opposed to letting it "get you down")?

Do you think before you act when aroused to anger or fear (not impulsive)?

Are you in good spirits (optimistic, cheerful) when around others?

**Social Aggressiveness**

When you go to any kind of meeting place or public gathering, do you invite one or more other persons to go with you? (If married, include husband or wife.)

Do you endeavor to make newcomers into your group feel welcome?

Do you effectively resist any efforts of others to take advantage of you?

When a new game is introduced at a party or a picnic, are you one of the first ones to volunteer to learn how to play it?

When you are in an informal situation with one or more individuals, do you offer suggestions as to what might be done for entertainment, change or novelty?

In a social situation do you take the lead in promoting games, stunts, or projects?

Do you get what is coming to you (as contrasted to letting others "run over you" or ignore your rights)?
When volunteers are asked for in a social situation, for the purpose of playing a game, putting on a stunt, or demonstrating some procedure, do you volunteer?

In informal conversations with other persons, do you draw them out on things which are of particular interest to them?

When you are in an informal social situation, do you introduce yourself to persons you do not know?

Do you invite others to your living quarters (room, apartment, home) for companionship, or for some kind of entertainment?

Do you entertain groups in public performances, such as by taking part in plays, giving readings, putting on stunts and impersonations, etc.?

Do you stand up for what you think is right or true even when your views are contrary to those held by most other members of a particular group you are in?

Are you characterized by having a wide range of friends but with none of them meaning very much to you?

Do you take time out during your working hours to visit with friends?

Do you visit (call on) other people in their living quarters?

Do you establish friendly contacts with members of the opposite sex?

In group situations, do you take the initiative in introducing people to others they do not know?

When in an informal group, do you initiate conversations about topics of general interest to the persons present, such as: sport, politics, literature, school programs, etc.?

Do you take up, and participate in, the interests of your friends in order to have more in common with them?

Have you started any kind of club or project in your school or community?
(The following questions pertaining to frequency of attendance in group situations were not included in the scale for rating others.)

Sunday School.
Church worship services.
Church young people's society.
Social dances.
School club meetings for programs or business meetings, including sororities and fraternities.
Parties in school groups or clubs.
Parties in church groups or clubs.
Lectures (economics, politics, science, etc.).
Musical programs (including student performances, but not those in which you perform).
Picnics (in seasons when possible).
Sports events as a spectator (include both indoor and outdoor sports).
Picture shows.
Stage and dramatic productions (including student productions, but not those in which you perform)/

Tolerance and Adaptability

Are you friendly with associates who have weaknesses and faults which irritate you?

When you are around people you don't like, do you nevertheless hide your antagonism toward them?

When your personal plans are blocked due to such factors as a change in the weather, unexpected visitors, or illness in the family, do you adapt yourself to these facts without much fuss or irritability?
Do you react to the ordinary inconveniences of life with a sense of humor?

Are you tactful in dealing with people, so that you do not antagonize them or hurt their feelings?

When your usual activities are temporarily interrupted by others, do you adapt yourself to this fact without showing annoyance or irritability?

Do you get along quite well with all kinds of people (rather than just a few selected ones)?

Are you friendly with people whose ideas about what is right and wrong differ from yours?

Are you just as friendly with persons who belong to a different church from yours, as you are with those who belong to your own church?

Do you participate in an activity agreed upon by the majority of the group (when no important principles are involved) even though you are not much interested in the kind of thing being done?

Can you adapt yourself to the mood of an individual or group you are with, even thought you do not really feel as the others do?

When you have to associate with someone who does a lot of little things (care of personal toilet, household chores, etc.) differently than you do, can you adapt yourself to these differences without showing annoyance?

Have you modified for a few days or weeks at a time any of your personal habits (time of eating or sleeping, smoking, etc.) in order to accommodate a roommate or a friend?

Do you try to see the best side or the humorous side of a bad situation -- as when a trip, a picnic, or a party takes a bad turn and a lot of the people present are "feeling blue"?

Are you just as friendly with persons who belong to a different political party from yours as you are with those who belong to your own party?
Are you just as friendly with those persons who differ from you in their views on social and economic questions (labor unions, strikes, social reforms, etc.) as you are with those who agree with you on such matters?

When things don't go to suit you in a group situation, do you make the best of it and go along with the others (as opposed to pouting or sulking)?

Do you pretend to be interested in some topics just to be sociable with certain individuals or groups you are with?

Do you take up current fads in regard to clothing: hair styles, slang, wisecracks, etc.?

**Dependability**

Do you return borrowed materials and borrowed money?

Are you loyal to your friends; do you stand up for them when they are not present?

Can your friends trust you to keep confidences which they have shared with you?

When you are involved along with others in some kind of difficulty, do you accept your full share of responsibility (rather than trying to shift blame)?

Do you carry out an obligation when to do so means that you are prevented from going somewhere else to have a good time?

When given a task to perform by a teacher or supervisor, do you carry it out to the best of your ability, even though you do not see any value to yourself in what you are asked to do?

Do you fulfill an obligation (such as taking a part on a program, playing in a group game, etc.) even though you do not feel like it at the time due to a minor health ailment or to mood changes?

When you have promised someone that you will do something for him, and it turns out to be more inconvenient or
difficult to do it than you had expected, do you never-
theless fulfill your promise?

When you promise to help others do something, do
you carry out your promise to the limit of your ability?

When you promise to meet someone at a certain time,
are you there promptly at the time agreed upon?

When you are given a committee assignment, do you
work hard at it in order to do the best job possible?

When you make an agreement with a person in respect
to a mutual obligation (such as keeping a room clean,
paying your part of a bill, etc.) do you keep your agree-
ment?

Are your verbal statements to others true and accu-
rate as far as you know?

When a group of which you are a member has a problem
before it, do you offer suggestions on how it might be
met (as contrasted to letting the others work it out un-
assisted by you)?

Dependence on Others

When you have a task to perform which involves work-
ing with others (such as committee assignments) do you
make it a point to get others to help you, as contrasted
with doing nearly all the work yourself?

Are you a good listener when another person is talk-
ing to you?

Do you trust your associates to do the right thing
by you (not suspicious)?

If you find out that you have been wrong on some
point involved in a disagreement with one of your asso-
ciates, do you later admit to him that you were wrong?

When you disagree with a person, do you suggest
that he consider other viewpoints, as opposed to telling
him flatly that he is wrong?
Do you modify your ideas about how something should be done as a result of suggestions offered by your associates?

Would you rather work at something you are interested in with three or four other persons, as contrasted with doing it all by yourself?

Are you glad to have your friends or associates point out in a friendly manner ways of improving your work?

When a conflict arises between you and some of your associates, are you willing to make concessions on the stand you have taken in order to promote harmony?

Do you ask favors of your friends?

Do you ask your associates for advice and suggestions regarding your work (even though you do not always follow the assistance offered)?

Are you characterized by having a few intimate friends who mean a lot to you?

Do you avoid talking about your own petty affairs, ailments, or troubles?

Do you avoid harping on the one subject which is of great interest to you but not of equal interest to others?

Do you make confidants of some of your friends by telling them intimate details of your personal life?

Do you ask your friends for advice and suggestions regarding your personal affairs (even though you do not always follow the assistance offered)?

Are you modest in regard to your abilities or past achievements?

Being a Source of New Experience to Others

Can you relate experiences, or report things you have seen or read, in an interesting manner?
Is your ability to amuse others by humorous remarks, jokes, nonsense, etc., expressed only when you are with a few of your best friends (as contrasted to larger social groups)?

Can you think of a clever remark when you are kidded, or "put on the spot" about something you have done -- do you respond with a "snappy comeback"?

Do you amuse others by telling humorous stories?

Do you play pranks or practical jokes on others whom you know quite well?

Can you see the funny side of situations?

Do you tell jokes on yourself, or report embarrassing things you have done?

Do you have a stock of jokes, tricks, riddles, or stunts that you can draw upon to amuse others when opportunities arise?

Are you good at any one of the following: fortune telling, palmistry, hypnotism?

Are you good at one of the following: card tricks or parlor magic?

Do you amuse others by making wisecracks and clever remarks?

In talking to others, do you dramatize or obviously exaggerate things you have read or experienced just to make your account more interesting to your listeners?

Do you surprise or shock your associates by making unusual remarks, or by stating stimulating points of view?

Do you "kid" or tease others in a good-natured way?

Do you "act a fool," or "cut up," or engage in nonsense when among friends?
Social Service Motivation

Do you compliment others you know for their achievements?

Do you try to smooth out disagreements between two or more of your associates?

Are you friendly with all members of your usual groups regardless of how low their social status may be (not cliquish)?

Do you try to console your friends when they are sad or depressed?

Do you express appreciation to others for their assistance or kindnesses to you?

Do you do your best in working on a group or common project, when you know that if success is attained the recognition will be given to the group as a whole rather than to you individually?

When a friend of yours has a personal defect which you consider to be a serious handicap to him, do you try to do something to help him overcome it?

Do you get a lot of satisfaction out of the successes or achievements of your groups (in school, church, or community) even though you have contributed very little, or nothing, toward these successes?

If you do not like a person in one of your groups, do you nevertheless try to mix with him some just to understand him better, or to find out something about him you might like?

When others have helped you carry out a task for which group approval is given, do you make sure to give the others recognition for their assistance?

Do you go out of your way to render assistance to friends and associates by such acts as loaning materials, helping them find things, doing part of their work, etc.?
Do you give your time (without expectation of pay) to various kinds of social service work, such as teaching a Sunday School class, singing in a church choir, working with under-privileged children, etc.?

Do you contribute money or materials to social service projects, such as those promoted by churches, the Red Cross, or charity groups?

Do you try to anticipate the wants (or needs) of others and endeavor to meet these wants without being asked to do so?

Do people come to you to tell you about their troubles?

Do you help raise money by taking part in drives for social service projects, such as for church functions, youth organizations, under-privileged children, etc.?

Do you speak well of others or praise them when they are not present (as contrasted with criticizing them)?

When you feel that some kind of unfairness is being done against members of your group, do you try to do something about it?

Abilities and Skills

"Large muscle" group games (football, basketball, hockey, baseball, etc.).

Competitive "large muscle" sports not necessarily involving organized groups (track, tennis, boxing, wrestling, handball, etc.).

Competitive games not involving a high degree of "large muscle" activity (volley ball, golf, bowling, pool, ping-pong, horseshoes, squash, etc.).

Individual sports, usually not involving competition (swimming, archery, hunting, fishing, rowing, horseback riding, skating, bicycling, etc.).

"Sitting down" games (bridge, checkers, chess, dominoes, poker, etc.).
Participation in competitive musical contests.

Participation in competitive writing contests.

Participation in debate or other forms of competitive speaking contests.

Planning social events and parties.

Dramatics.

Writing for publication (include school publications).

Singing.

Instrumental music.

Management of a project (such as a school newspaper, athletic event, or program).

Conducting a meeting (as in the capacity of chairman or president).

Social dancing.
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