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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

This study was concerned with the possibility of raising a fourth grade pupil's social status. The techniques used were those that could be used in nearly any fourth grade schoolroom. Some of the questions for which answers were sought are: Can a child's peer status be changed by using special training techniques? What methods can be used in making this attempt? To what extent is it possible to help children improve their inter-personal skills? If a child's social status can be changed, can some children's status be changed more easily than others? Can status as defined by one criterion be changed more easily than status as defined by another? Is there a sex factor involved?

It was the aim of this study to help answer some of these questions. Among the aids and training techniques used were: giving the child a chance to contribute to the group, placing a child in a position where his accomplishments could be noticed, forming a pupil-controlled Hobby Club, holding group discussions on various subjects pertaining to friendship formation, and instigating several class
projects which offered an opportunity for dividing the class into sub-groups for work purposes.

Of course it is realized that no one study can hope to answer any one of these questions conclusively, particularly with the number of cases used here. However, a start can be made, and certain trends and tendencies can be observed and comparisons made with further studies.

Definition of Terms

Because of the fact that studies of this nature are relatively new, and some discrepancy exists as to how some terms are used by various authors, it was felt necessary to include quite a complete list of definitions. Some of these definitions are the equivalents of those given by Moreno and Jennings, and some terms as herein defined were first used in a graduate course in sociometry at North Texas State College.¹

Sociometry is a science which is concerned with the psychological properties of groups and the problems which these properties produce.

Sociometry is that part of sociometry which deals with the measurement and qualifications of these interpersonal relations. Also included are the experimental efforts to control these relations.

A sociometric test is any instrument used to measure the interpersonal organization of a group and reveals an

¹J. L. Moreno, Who Shall Survive, consult index.
H. H. Jennings, Leadership and Isolation, consult index.
individual's status in the eyes of his peers. This status should be measured with reference to a specific criterion which is important to the subjects.

An isolate is an individual who receives no positive choices in a given choosing situation. He may, however, be rejected.

A star is an individual who receives more than his proportionate share of votes. He is usually one of the leaders of the group as a whole or a leader of a sub-group.

Tele is the feeling projected from one individual to other individuals in the group. This feeling may be either positive or negative; that is, in the form of acceptance or rejection. It may be termed socio-tele if the situation is primarily a work situation or psyche-tele if the ties are personal and based on feelings of attraction.

Mutual friends are composed of persons having expressed a positive preference for each other in a choosing situation. Mutual friendships may vary in degree since the intensity of choices may vary.

An unreciprocated friendship is one in which one person expresses a positive preference for an individual who in turn does not return that choice or rejects him.

A mutual rejection would result if both individuals rejected each other in a choosing situation.

Mutual friendship scores are determined by the number of mutual friends the individual has in the group. A mathematical score may be arrived at by assigning a value to each
mutual friendship and totaling these values for the mutual friendship score.

Unrequited friendship scores are determined by how many unrequited friendships he had. The mathematical score can be arrived at in the same manner as the mutual score.

The group social index is a ratio between the total number of choices given in the group and the total that could have been given had everyone given everyone else a first choice. The individual's index is the ratio between the total votes he received and the total he would have received if everyone had given him a first choice.

Emotional expansiveness refers to the number of positive choices a person gives on a sociometric choice. A person choosing ten people would have more emotional expansiveness than a subject choosing one person.

A prestige score is a ratio between the total number of acceptance scores received from the upper quartile and the number that the individual might have received if everyone had given him a first choice.

A person's social contact range is composed of the number of other persons within the individual's group whom he has contacted.

A person's stimulus value is the amount of reaction he arouses from other individuals.

The socio-dynamic effect is the process of persistently
leaving out a number of persons in a group even though an
unlimited number of choices are allowed.

The social atom is the pattern of repulsion and attrac-
tions which exist around an individual with him as the nu-
scleus.

A sociogram is a pictorial or a diagrammatical repre-
sentation of the attractions and repulsions in a group.

An introverted group is a group most of whose choices
are within the group; that is, are given to other members of
the group.

An extroverted group is one in which most of the choices
go to individuals outside the group.

Significance of the Problem

The significance of the question, "Can social status be
changed?", is much greater than it might seem at first glance.
The question has a great many implications if viewed broadly.
For example if a person is actively disliked in his group,
can he hope to gain cooperation from them? It certainly
seems highly unlikely that he would. If his status cannot
be changed, then his chances for success seem meager to say
the least.

Most schools, churches, and other "uplift" groups have
assumed that a child's status can be changed, and many as-
sume that it can be taught just as they teach the multipli-
cation tables. Many books which have been written on
personality development and the cultivating of social and interpersonal skills give a set of rules which only need be followed, and the individual will become a leader of men. The ability to lead groups, to influence people, and to make people like you is made to sound as simple as walking to work in the morning.

Traditionally the schools have supposed that the child can be taught democracy and interpersonal skills as well as how to get along with others by reading about the development of these characteristics in books. They have failed to realize that many interpersonal patterns are built upon non-verbal behavior. The individual cannot always verbalize his behavior, and much that he can verbalize he cannot or will not act upon. As Sorokin says:

In brief the mere inculcation of ideas . . . is insufficient to elicit corresponding conduct. One may embrace these ideals intellectually, analyze them and develop their implications brilliantly and demonstrate their validity effectively; yet more often than not one fails to apply them in one's overt conduct. 2

Clinical psychology has recognized that mere intellectualizing of a problem does not solve it. Many times even insight into a problem does not solve it, for the insight may be so smothered by negative emotion that choice responses cannot be made.

The schools, and the writer was most concerned with them in this study, have for the last several years at least professed to be teaching the child how to live. Much emphasis has recently been placed on teaching the child how to live now, thus enabling him to live in the future. Certainly this concerns our problem since no one lives in isolation, and being able to raise one's status in the eyes of his peers is certainly desirable. Many years ago Dewey said:

In the first place the school must be a community life in all which that implies. Social perceptions and interests can be developed only in a genuinely social medium—one where there is give and take in the building up of a common experience. Informational statements about things can be acquired in relative isolation by any one who previously has had enough intercourse with others to have learned languages. But realization of the meaning of the linguistic signs is quite another matter.  

Most schools would prescribe heartily to the above statement as to what should be, but many teachers let their desire for tranquility cause them to suppress the child until he has no ability to act for himself or to even attempt to better his position in the group. The teacher finds it easier to treat the child as a machine, but, as Curran says:

... machines are not self-motivated personalities even though they are most orderly and precise in everything they do ... The democratic way of developing personal responsibility then will often temporarily be more disorderly than the mass way where everyone does what he is told without question.

---


Therefore, many schools give lip service to the ideals of what a democratic school should be and go right on in the traditional way. Many others who do attempt to be "progressive" go about it blindly and with only armchair psychology to support their techniques. They make no effort to measure the results of their activities, in fact seem to avoid any suggestion of proving their work. Their activity programs in which cooperation, leadership, and interpersonal skills are supposedly learned, degenerate into what appears to the neutral observer to be a brawl.

Many teachers seem to have the idea that social skills are best developed by letting the children alone, so much alone that no guidance or aid is given. This has led some critics to accuse the schools of teaching nothing, not even the fundamentals, let alone how to live with others. Accusations such as "sugar-coated curriculum", activities rather than learning, or lollipops instead of learning have been hurled at so-called progressive schools.

Thus some schools seem to have allowed the pendulum to swing too far the other way. Where the traditional school taught only academic skills, the new schools in their effort to teach social skills have often taught very little of anything. They have become so afraid of verbalization and rote memory that many times even instructions are not given because they are verbalizations. Activities are thought to
be a cure-all, a sort of panacea for all the school's and
the individual's ills.

As has already been indicated, these programs have very
little if any objective data to back up their procedures,
only generalizations. It sounds fine to say we learn by
doing, but by doing what? Also, do we learn what they pro-
pose to teach? Who should decide what we should do? Is
the mere fact that an activity is being engaged in, any
guarantee that social skills are going to be learned, and
if "learned", will they be practiced? Is there some strange
magic in activity alone that will solve all the problems?
After all how do we know activities work? Perhaps we are
supposed to know by two or three outstandong examples which
the teachers point out. Perhaps these would have benefited
in any program, or perhaps they benefited in spite of the
program. Besides, by what measuring stick did they benefit?

Many of these questions are embarrassing to the "pro-
gressive" schoolman and teacher for in many cases they can-
not answer the questions with any degree of certainty. The
need for objective measurement of results is obvious. Since
we live in a country governed by a democracy, the need for
testing our training techniques is all the more pressing.
If we expect children to grow up into responsible citizens
with the ability to improve their own lot and the country
as a whole, we should know whether the methods used are ef-
fective. Since under our type of government it is even more
important that people be able to make themselves heard and respected, it is felt that this study may be one step toward improving our training methods.

Purpose and Plan of the Study

This study then was an attempt to measure objectively the success or failure of efforts to improve the child's peer status. This was done by using a beginning and end test. The child's status was tested at the beginning of the experimental period and again at the close of the program. The changes in status were observed and analyzed. The efforts made to offer the child the opportunity to better his status and the guidance given were recorded. The child's response and the response of the group were recorded in anecdotal records, and this data was used to supplement that gathered by the testing program. The classroom teachers and the special teachers cooperated in the program, and the regular classroom teacher to a large extent retained control of the group. It seems quite reasonable to suppose that she would have more influence with the group than would a comparative stranger. The time elapsing between the tests was about six months.

It is hoped that as a result of this study some light has been thrown on the possibilities of affecting an individual's stimulus value, and if it were possible to affect it, by what means his social status was changed.
CHAPTER II

A BASIS FOR ACTION

In order that some basis for action might be found, the literature was reviewed to discover: (1) some of the methods used to measure social status and something concerning the reliability and validity of these methods, (2) some of the properties of groups as determined by sociometric techniques, (3) some of the factors which seem to influence friendship formation, (4) some of the traits which seem to help determine social status, and (5) some opinions and studies which may show tendencies as to whether status can be changed and if so by what techniques.

Methods of Measurement

Many different types of sociometric tests have been used with different sets of criteria and different scoring methods. For school children questions such as the following are often used: With whom would you like best to play after school? With whom would you like best to work on a committee? Whom would you like best to sit next to you? With whom would you like best to attend the movies or a party?, etc. Criteria such as leadership for a group activity, election for an office, choice of personal friends, etc., are also used for older groups and children.
The number of choices allowed may vary from one to an unlimited number though they are often from three to five. In most instances the subjects are asked to list their choices in order of preference; however, there are exceptions to this. The first choices may be weighted more heavily in scoring, or each descending choice may be scored one point less. In some testing situations each child is asked to respond to every other child in the room and rate him according to a pre-determined scale. It is this latter method which was used in this study. Some authorities feel that the number of choices given and returned should also be considered in determining the person's status.

Whatever the type of instrument used, Moreno gives the following criteria:

First every individual is included as a center of emotional response. Second this is not merely an academic response. Third the choice is always related to a definite criteria.\(^1\)

In other words the subject should feel that the test is not just a verbal response and should be given some reason for thinking so. For example if he were asked, "By whom would you like to sit?", his choice should be honored in practice if this is at all practical. A statement by the teacher such as, "We are giving you this test in order that we may be better able to help you make friends," may be helpful.

\(^1\)Moreno, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
The reliability of sociometric tests have been found to be consistently high. Zeleny says of his "Record":

The reliability of this part of the Record has been determined... correlations between acceptance on two administrations... in three trials [were] all over .91.  

In his "Record" the subjects were asked to respond to all others in the groups and to designate the degree of preference.

Jennings says:

As previously employed, the sociometric test was found to have an average reliability of .95 based on data given four successive weeks with a five choice allowance... Zeleny found at the college level using also five choices and one criteria, reliability coefficients ranging from .93 to .95 on re-administering such a sociometric test on successive days.  

Jennings's subjects were girls in the Hudson school, and they were asked to choose living partners. Zeleny's class was asked to choose a leader for discussion groups.

Thompson and Horrocks using 969 urban students ranging in age from eleven to eighteen years also found quite high reliabilities. In the eleven to fourteen year old group they found that over fifty per cent named the same person as best friends on a retest after two weeks. The fifteen to eighteen year old group named the same person in sixty to ninety per cent of the cases. Their subjects were asked to list their

---


three best friends, and as the authors point out, the reliability would have been higher if some other scoring method had been used. It might be rather difficult for the person to choose one particular person out of these three.\textsuperscript{4}

The validity of sociometric techniques have largely been determined by observation. The consensus of opinion seems to be that the more importance the student attaches to how the test results will be used the more valid the results will be. For example Flotow says:

As to the validity of the questions themselves, the questions dealing with the proximity of seating gave the best indication of strong mutual relationships.\textsuperscript{5}

Incidentally in his study the test results were used to change some of the seating arrangements.

Some General Group Characteristics

Group formation and the accompanying phenomena begin to occur at a very early age. According to Moreno this development can be divided into three periods. The first period is what he calls "organic isolation" and extends from birth to twenty to twenty-eight weeks. In this period the infant is entirely egocentric. A "horizontal difference" is evident


in the period from twenty-eight to forty or forty-two weeks. At this stage physical difference makes largely for psychological difference. This period is followed by a period of “vertical distance” which extends from the end of the previous period to death. It is in this latter stage that attention shifts to certain ones disproportionately.  

As the groups formed become more complex and certain, cleavages begin to form. Concerning these cleavages Moreno says:

The hetero-sexual cycle between the ages of four to eight is displaced by a homo-sexual cycle between the ages of eight to thirteen. Then a new hetero-sexual cycle begins apparently over-lapping a second homo-sexual cycle.

As a result of his studies in the public schools in grades one to eight Moreno says in his conclusions concerning the fourth grade:

The cleavage between sexes is almost entirely complete at this age level... the motivations indicate also the forming of groups in respect to various cooperative aims open or secret.

Also, racial cleavages begin to develop about the fifth grade. However, it is generally thought that children have no spontaneous aversion in respect to nationality differences. When a racial cleavage appears, it is largely due to direct or indirect parental influence. For example one

---

6Moreno, op. cit., p. 22.
7Ibid., p. 65.
8Ibid., p. 386.
often sees a white child playing with a colored child until the white child’s mother interferes.

Jennings distinguishes between two types of group development. These types she has called psyche-tele groups and socio-tele groups. The latter group is formed on a more or less work or skill basis. The first group is formed on a more personal basis; that is, formed by a group of people who “just like each other”. Some of the conclusions she draws from her study at the Hudson girls’ school follow.

1. There is very little overlap of choices between the two groups, either in choosing or being chosen.

2. Social structures built by socio-tele are usually larger.

3. Structures built by psyche-tele are smaller and have a greater degree of mutuality.

4. Some consistencies appear in the social atom of an individual, even if choices are made on both criterion.

5. Psyche-tele cannot be predicted from a socio-tele group: that is, because people work together, it does not follow that they have a high personal regard for each other.

6. A combination of the two patterns is a sensitive index to a person’s interaction.

7. The same individuals are not necessarily at the same level in both groups.

8. In socio-groups there is more of a tendency for the little-chosen to choose the over-chosen.
9. Psyche-tele expressions are much more stable than are socio-tele choices.

10. Psyche-tele groups do not combine spontaneously for any given purpose. Socio-tele groups may work together because a common goal is sought.

11. Psyche-groups appear to hold priority over socio-groups.

12. Psyche-groups keep the needs of the individual more in mind.9

Others have pointed out that work groups in which there were people who disliked each other did not function as efficiently as they might. Zelany suggests that incompatible flying partners might have more accidents even though one of the partners was of high social status and skill and would not ordinarily have had accidents if he had been permitted to fly with someone whom he liked.10 Also, standards of conduct have been found to be lower in groups in which the in-group feeling is low. Of course it is possible for in-group feeling to become so strong that there is no reaching out for new contacts and experiences.

Lewin, Lippitt, and White report on the results of an experiment showing the effects of democratic and autocratic leadership in a club composed of ten year old boys.


In the first experiment hostility was thirty times as frequent in the autocratic group as in the democratic group. Aggression (including both hostility and "joking hostility") was eight times as frequent. Much of the aggression was directed towards two successive scapegoats within the group. None of it was directed towards the autocrat. In the second experiment, one of the five autocracies showed the same aggressive reactions as was found in the first experiment. In the other four autocracies the boys showed an extremely non-aggressive, apathetic pattern of behavior.\textsuperscript{11}

Even though there is a great deal of give and take and change in a group, the individual's status will under normal conditions remain surprisingly constant. In this regard Jennings says, "... the subject is found to maintain to a high degree the relative position accorded him by the general population from one time to a time eight months later."\textsuperscript{12}

The findings of others have borne this fact out. As a result of his study with a class over a four year period (grades two to five inclusive) Bonney concludes:

When the great complexity of factors involved in social acceptance is considered, it is somewhat surprising that this factor should be found to be almost constant year by year as are intelligence and academic achievement.\textsuperscript{13}

This conclusion could be drawn even though pupil turnover caused the population to vary somewhat. The correlations


\textsuperscript{12}Helen H. Jennings, Leadership and Isolation, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{13}Merl E. Bonney, "The Constancy of Sociometric Scores and their Relationship to Teacher Judgements of Social Success and to Personality Self Ratings," Sociometry, VI (November, 1943), 414.
between status positions from year to year was found to be between .67 $\pm$ .05 and .84 $\pm$ .02.\(^{14}\)

Studies have also shown that though the pupil status remains quite constant, the teachers' ratings have by no means agree perfectly with the student choices. The correlations have been high but not perfect. Some of the explanations offered by Bonney for the discrepancies are:

1. The children have qualities which may not be acceptable in the eyes of the adult but may be acceptable in the eyes of his fellows.

2. Teachers do not discriminate between pupils' liking one another and admiring one another. For example a star athlete may be admired but not liked.

3. Teachers tend to over-rate academic factors: that is, because the child is bright in school, they feel he will stand high in social status.

4. Teachers do not distinguish between tolerations and acceptance.\(^{15}\)

The practical lesson that might be drawn from these conclusions is that there is a need and place for the sociometric tests in planning help for the students.

Friendship Formation

Since social status depends at least partially upon an

\(^{14}\)Ibid., p. 413.

\(^{15}\)Ibid., pp. 419-420.
individual's capacity to make friends, it was felt necessary to discover if possible some factors entering into friendship formation. There have been several studies made to discover some of these factors. Many of these studies have dealt more specifically with mutual friendships. As a result of his study in the public grade schools Moreno concluded that the percentage of mutual pairs is lowest in kindergarten, rises to a peak at twelve to thirteen years (about the seventh grade), and drops off slightly to age fifteen. The number of unchosen individuals was highest in kindergarten, reaches its lowest level in the fourth grade, and rises again to the eighth grade. Also, attractions between boys and girls is highest in kindergarten (ages four to seven) and is lowest in the fourth grade (age ten). These attractions rise again to the eighth grade (ages thirteen to fifteen years).\textsuperscript{16}

Many factors and conditions may affect the formation of friendships. Younger found in her study of high school friendships that:

The personality traits that have the greatest influence upon reciprocal friendship are those related to . . . "being a source of new experience to others" and . . . "social aggressiveness"—initiation of social contact and social events.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16} Moreno, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 46-47.

In a study very similar to this one, Averitt found that there was a substantial similarity between friends in social and emotional adjustments and no similarity in home and health adjustments. Also, the friends were similar in standards of honesty, helpfulness, sense of humor, and in loyalty. There was little similarity in the number of abilities possessed, and there was a correlation of only .459 between the friends' I.Q.'s (Intelligence Quotients) and .461 between their grades.18

In his study of mutual friendship on the elementary, high school, and college level Bonney concludes that:

1. Academic influences play a small part at all levels studied.

2. Intelligence plays a slightly larger role.

3. Common interests do not play a great part in the elementary grades, but they do seem to play a larger part in high school and college, at least in certain fields. In high school people with clerical interests seemed to choose one another as friends. At the college level science students seemed to show the same tendency.

4. Certain home background factors seemed to be significant.

5. Personality, as measured by self-rating scales, was of little significance.\(^{19}\)

Certain other conditions control friendship formation. After a survey involving 135 children in grades four to eight, Flotow says:

Another fact that seems to stand out clearly is that a pupil not having satisfactory relationships within his schoolroom will, whenever possible, cross the room boundaries and establish a mutual relationship with a pupil from another room.\(^{20}\)

As has already been indicated, sex cleavage has an effect upon friendship formation. In Moreno's study he found that from the first to the fifth grade boys chose more girls; in the fifth grade the girls chose more boys; and in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades the initiative was about equal.\(^{21}\) Also, an individual may reject another person on one criterion and choose him on another as Bonney found in his study of choices for a play and for a quiz kid program.\(^{22}\) Moreno also points out that this discrimination varies with age. He says:

The girls in Hudson, when given the opportunity to choose associates for home, work, etc., chose


\(^{20}\)Flotow, op. cit., p. 501.

\(^{21}\)Moreno, op. cit., p. 47.

frequently, and more often at younger levels the same person for all different functions.²³

This bears out a point mentioned by several other authorities: that is, as a person grows older, he makes finer discriminations in choosing his friends and associates. Perhaps the subject's rank in general social status may have something to do with the number of mutual relationships that he has. For example Fletow found in his study that the pupils who were in the second quartile in general social status had the greatest number of mutual friends. He also cites one instance of a girl in the first quartile who had no mutual friends in that quartile.²⁴

The fact that isolates exist in a group, cannot as a general rule be attributed to the fact that these isolates do not choose others. Often they choose a large number of others but receive no choices in return. Another misconception which often exists is that low children tend to stick together, but this is seldom so. Studies show that as a general rule the high group does tend to stick together, but members of the low group have few mutuals at their own level. Many of their choices seem to be wishful in nature, for they give many of the choices to high status individuals. Of course it is possible to find a group within a group, and

²³Moreno, op. cit., p. 66.
²⁴Fletow, op. cit., p. 500.
sometimes this will be a delinquent group and will receive no outside choices. However, often these groups break up of their own accord due to internal dissension. Many times these groups are primarily composed of boys for at the sex cleavage level boys seem to be more homogenous.

Some Traits Which Seem to Help Determine Status

Since an attempt was to be made to raise social status, it seemed desirable to discover some traits which might help determine status. Several studies have been conducted in which an analysis of the traits possessed by over-chosen persons was made. Jennings in her study asked the house mothers at the girls' training school to list some of the traits appearing most often in high status girls. Some of the positive traits listed were:

1. Behavior showing reticence regarding personal affairs—did not "cry on others' shoulders".
2. Cooperative behavior.
3. Behavior showing an evenness of disposition.
4. Behavior requiring no special attention.
5. Willingness to do more than was expected.
6. Behavior indicating previous planning.
7. Willingness to temporarily accept background roles for the good of the group.
8. Behavior showing ingenuity in changing the social adjustments of problem girls.
9. Behavior showing solicitude toward new girls.
10. Behavior showing solicitude toward the less capable girls.
11. Behavior showing they felt the house mothers were impartial.
12. Visits to the psychologist's office on the behalf of another.
13. Behavior showing insight into the behavior of others.

Some traits which the over-chosen possessed to a lesser extent than did the under-chosen were:

1. "Chip on the shoulder" attitude.
2. "Nagging, complaining" behavior.
3. Nervous, jumpy behavior.
4. Rebellious behavior.
5. Interrupting group behavior.
6. Passively interfering in group behavior.
7. Behavior indicating resentment of being criticized.
8. Attention-demanding behavior but not praise seeking.
9. Praise seeking by drawing attention to minor accomplishments.
10. Complaining about another's conduct toward her.
11. Behavior making a slight impression on the group.
12. Violating the conduct standards of the group.
13. Behavior causing others to consider them silly.

It was also interesting to note that such personal habits
as cleanliness, moody behavior, and sharing behavior had little discriminatory power. 25 This may very well be because these traits were so common in the group that everyone, regardless of status, possessed them.

Flotow found that dependability, cooperation, cleanliness, maturity, courtesy, and general helpfulness helped a person's social status. Chronic illness, instability, immaturity, excessive stubbornness, non-cooperation, non-dependability, uncleanliness, and a bad home background tended to detract from social status. 26 Also, he says, "There is also a definite tendency for those who were capable in some activity to have higher scores than those who were not capable." 27

Young and Cooper found that neither C. A. (chronological age), habitation in a broken home, socio-economic status, nor the number of brothers and sisters were significantly related to social status. 28 Height, weight, bodily proportion, mental characteristics, and the number of activities were not found to be significant. 29 Differences in voice


26 Flotow, op. cit., p. 504.

27 Ibid., p. 501.


29 Ibid., p. 523.
and clothes were not quite statistically significant, but differences in the pleasantness of facial expression was found to be significant. The popular children were more extroverted, had a high sense of personal worth, showed more feeling of belonging, expressed more acceptable social standards, and possessed superior school relations.\textsuperscript{30}

In the Toronto studies, Northway says they have:

\ldots worked out the correlations between social acceptance and such variables as C, A, H, A, I, Q, school achievement, subject achievement and found low positive, zero, or low negative coefficients for all of them. The same result has been found by other Toronto students using personality tests and interest inventories. And from the general literature I have discovered no significant correlate to sociometric status on the basis of any single measure.\textsuperscript{51}

After analyzing teacher evaluations and rating scales, observing children's behavior and analyzing approximately 100 research studies, studying the traits of thirty pairs of mutual friends, studying fifteen personality rating scales, and analyzing various other traits mentioned in the literature, Bonney lists the following traits. These traits were found prevalently in popular children and much less frequently in unpopular ones.

1. Physical health and vigor

2. Conformity and group identification

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., p. 531.

\textsuperscript{31}Mary L. Northway, "Personality and Sociometric Status; a Review of the Toronto Studies," \textit{Sociometry}, IX (May-August, 1946), 236.
3. Emotional stability and control

4. Arousing admiration

5. Social aggressiveness—The initiation of social contacts and social events

6. Adaptability and tolerance

7. Dependability—A sense of obligation in all personal and group relationships

8. Dependence on others for assistance and emotional support

9. Providing new experience for others

10. Social motivation and an attitude of good will toward others

In general then, studies agree fairly closely as to some of the traits which socially acceptable children possess. There are some slight disagreements as to the correlations between status and such factors as intelligence, personality scores, socio-economic background, school achievement, etc. However, most correlations that have been found are positive, but in no study reviewed did they reach .50. Many writers would agree with Northway when she says:

We are now ready to present the hypothesis that a child's acceptance in a social group is related to the degree and direction of his outgoing energy. The child showing little energy is never accepted. The child who puts forth energy is accepted unless he directs it in such a way that it interferes or frustrates the activities of others in the choosing group.


33Northway, op. cit., p. 237.
The Possibility of Changing Status

As has been indicated, there have been too few efforts made to change behavior and to measure that change with a beginning and end test. The same holds true for efforts to change social status. Many inferences have been drawn from sociometric studies, and some of these will be mentioned here. As far as has been discovered in the literature, nowhere can a report of a study coinciding with this one be found. However, there have been some studies conducted in which efforts have been made to change status as measured by slightly different techniques. Also, others have been conducted in which attempts have been made to change types of behavior which seem to affect status. Summaries of both types of these studies will be included in this section.

As a result of his studies in the grade schools Moreno suggests that from the fourth grade on—

... the organizations which young children and adolescents form among themselves, come more and more to compete in influence with organizations which adolescents form in relation to adults. The influence of adults upon children may be beginning to wane.34

In this connection, after his study on the school and social status, Gardner says, "Since distinctions in social status are less finely drawn among adolescents than among adults, friendships across class lines can more easily be formed

34 Moreno, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
Flotow says in this regard, "It has proved extremely difficult to effect good mutual relationships of maladjusted children in the upper grades." The practical lesson to be drawn from these statements is obvious—if the school, or any adult, desires to change social status, these attempts should be made as early as possible.

Some factors which seem to often be over-emphasized in attempts to change social status were shown to much less importance by Jennings. She says, "... there is no evidence that length of time individuals are together will either increase or decrease the extent of their positive choices for one another." She draws this conclusion after showing that if an individual had been in the girls' group a minimum of fifteen days, there was little evidence for saying that a longer time alone would cause her status to rise. The other factor, "opportunity to know", she also shows has a much smaller effect than is ordinarily thought. After placing low status girls at advantageous spots for getting acquainted, such as in the school beauty parlor, she says:

High opportunity to know and be known by others thus does not appear necessarily conducive to the individuals being chosen to a much greater extent than others who do not have such unusual opportunity. ... a


36Flotow, op. cit., p. 503.

37Helen H. Jennings, Leadership and Isolation, p. 52.
physical situation favorable to choice may not become a psychological situation favorable to choice unless the individuals involved are able to make it so . . . . Individuals to whom others are drawn to a greater extent than average, may be sought out or themselves make their own opportunities whether or not they are placed in prominent situations for contacting others.\textsuperscript{38}

Here again the lesson to be drawn is obvious. In order to help a child improve his status, more must be done than just placing him in an advantageous position. In other words, "assignment therapy" alone may not benefit him. Taking a child out of one group and placing him in another should probably be done as a sort of last resort when it has become evident that every effort towards adjustment has been made and failed. For example Moreno found that sometimes it was beneficial to take an over-aggressive leader out of a group.\textsuperscript{39} A group may also be "saturated" with one type of personality and yet may be able to make a good adjustment to a newcomer of another type.

Of course it is obvious that before anything can be done to help a child raise his status, the leader must have the child's confidence. Moreno says of one type of teacher:

\begin{quote}
\textit{They} appeared unable to touch emotionally the larger part of the population. It appears that this fact is the chief reason why the staff of institutions are often forced to resort to rigid discipline and particularly to inflict punishment if they want to impress their will
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{38}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 139.

\textsuperscript{39}Moreno, op. \textit{cit.}, p. 301.
upon a population, the majority of which escape their spontaneous influencing. 40

As to the approach used to help the child he says, "... we have found, however, that the group therapeutic approach is applicable only in mild cases of maladjustment." 41

Flotow indicates one possible approach when he says:

In this situation it was found that pupils who were able to engage in some group activity, improved in their social relations with the other pupils, not only with pupils of that particular group but with pupils of the entire room. 42

However, he gave no concrete evidence for this statement, and as far as could be discerned, it was based upon his observation only.

Kerstetter reports one of the first attempts made to change the social structure of a classroom by using a sociogram as a beginning and end measurement. The study covered a period of ten months, and her subjects were a class of thirty-two fifth grade children. The test criterion used was, "Near whom would you like to sit?" In the first choosing situation a limit of three choices was imposed, but after that the number of choices was unlimited. She used seven choosing situations and found the average number of choices to be 3.24. After the fourth choosing situation the class was also asked, "Near whom would you not like to sit?"

40 Ibid., p. 201.
41 Ibid., p. 34.
42 Flotow, op. cit., p. 502.
Upon examination of the first sociogram a marked sex cleavage could be noticed, and a closed sub-group of five boys could be distinguished. The results of the tests were used in arranging the seating of the five boys, and all other students were seated as closely to their choices as was practically possible. In the succeeding tests the sub-group of boys became more introverted and were always together in and out of school. By the fourth choosing situation, of a total of thirty-one rejections expressed by the whole group, eighteen were toward this sub-group. Also, this sub-group neither gave nor received any outside choices.

About a month before the end of the ten month period was up, therapeutic assignment was attempted in conjunction with the formation of a class club which in turn resulted in the formation of work groups. These groups were self-governed, and cooperation became the watchword of the groups. Discussions were held concerning world events, democratic leadership, etc. Of the five boys two were assigned to one group and three to another. On the final sociogram the two boys were no longer attached to the other three though they were still mutual as were the other three. For the first time in all the choosing situations, outside choices were directed toward the boys, and they also directed some toward others in the group. On this final testing a total of sixteen rejections were given, and only eight were directed toward
these five boys. At the close of this study the following statement is made:

Thus we see that this troublesome sub-group is beginning to break up under the stimulus of a new classroom and study situation and the corresponding alterations in the seating arrangements. . . . By providing a situation in the classroom which promoted the growth of each child it was possible to arouse interests in constructive rather than destructive activities.

Another effort to change the stratification of a class has been reported by Cook. The subjects were forty-four pupils in a tenth grade social studies class. The curriculum was of the "core" type, and there were many trips, opportunities for discussion, etc. The program was carried on over a two year period.

The general aims of the first year were mostly concerned with research and the second year with "democratizing" the group. The members' peer status was determined by using such things as the parents' club membership and education or indices. The student's reputation as to leadership qualities, etc., was determined by elections using the information gathered in regular guidance checkups, etc. The "best friends" questions were "hidden" among other questions in a regular extracurricular activities blank. The students were asked to list

---

43 Leona M. Kerstetter and Joseph Sargent, "Reassignment Therapy in the Classroom," Sociometry, III (July, 1940), pp. 293-306.

44 Ibid., p. 305.
best friends and also to list people whom they did not like and did not care to associate with.

The first year sociogram showed the customary stars, isolates, leaders, etc. A closed clique was observed as well as an over-all leader and another open group with a shifting leadership. The upper class children received more than their proportionate share of votes. Some problems were observed. Among these were a "crush" between two girls to the exclusion of other contacts, some sex problems, the autocratic nature of some leaders, and the tendency towards withdrawal on the part of some. Fifteen of these problem subjects were chosen for special work for the second year.

The first semester of the second year was devoted mostly to the individual guidance approach. The conferences were of the non-directive type and were from fifteen to thirty minutes long. From five to ten conferences were held with each child who had been chosen for special work. Of course these pupils were not told they had been singled out.

At the end of the first semester some changes could be observed. The autocratic over-all leader was less powerful; another person had been helped to assume more responsibility and had assumed a position of increased leadership; an isolate had been helped to make a mutual friend; and many others were more outreaching. The leader of the closed clique, a very "tough" boy, had been helped very little,
and neither had the "crush" between the two girls been broken. The writer concluded that the wrong approach had been used to help the leader of the closed clique. The boy's high prestige should have been channeled into constructive paths. Instead the attempt was made to break up the group, and the attempt failed.

In the second semester the emphasis was placed on group management, and an effort was made to emphasize an attitude of willing cooperation. Three main types of projects were used: fun parties, a brief attempt at role playing, and group war service activities such as collecting scrap. The role playing technique met with little success, because the principal attempted to make an assembly show of it.

At the end of the year the sociogram showed that the old autocratic leader had lost a great deal of power to the newly developed leader. The clique was still fairly intact but showed some signs of breaking up, and the average best friend choice increased from 2.4 to 4.51 per person.45

Cook closes his study with some statements well worth repeating:

With schools moving steadily toward social learning, a study of this sort has practical values. Dare one claim to have taught cooperation, to have democratized a classroom without pre and end-test measures? ... Moreover they will bring our all too often chaotic

activity programs under some kind of control, an imperative if we are to get anywhere in any sort of directive teaching.\textsuperscript{46}

In another experiment, using election to leadership of a discussion group as a criterion, Zeleny concluded that four weeks time was an insufficient time in which to raise social status as determined by that criterion. His subjects were twenty-seven college juniors and seniors in a sociology class. The class was divided into discussion groups which then chose their own leaders. Personal counseling was the training technique used.\textsuperscript{47} After analyzing the individual results he says:

However an able student who was reticent participated more and became recognized as a leader. A weak student attempted to participate more and actually lost ground.\textsuperscript{48}

An apparent lesson to be drawn from this latter statement is that care must be taken not to give the student a task incompatible with his ability. The fact that he fails, probably not only lowers his already low peer status, but it may make it more difficult to get him to accept any future responsibility.

Another study which has some bearing on the problem at hand is one conducted by Zeleny in which he evaluates the group discussion plan as opposed to the traditional recitation type class. The beginning and end tests used were not

\textsuperscript{46}Ibid., p. 260.

\textsuperscript{47}Leslie Day Zeleny, "Measurement of Sociational," American Sociological Review, VI (April, 1941), 175-188.

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., p. 186.
strictly sociometric, but some of the principles involved are applicable. His subjects were members of a college sociology class. He used a control group which was equated with the experimental group on the basis of age, I. Q., sex, and social status (as determined by home-background scales). Five different situations were used in which the size of the groups were varied; the discussion groups were rotated, etc. In all situations the discussion groups gained slightly more factual knowledge and scored a higher increase on a test measuring attitudes toward others. Also, these groups showed an average gain of 23.87 over the traditional class on the Bernreuter personality scale. Then, too, by far the largest percentage of the students who had undergone both kinds of instruction favored the group discussion method. They felt that it had helped them in developing self-confidence, leadership, cooperation, adaptability, and social responsibility, that it was conducive to more study effort, and that it was more interesting and thought provoking.49

Another study which used a personality self-rating scale as a beginning and end test was one conducted by Flory and others. The subjects used were fifth and sixth grade pupils, and the experiment extended over a two year period. The pupils who scored below the twenty-fifth percentile were chosen

for special help. Twenty-three students were selected on this basis. The techniques used for improvement were left up to the individual teachers and were not recorded.

At the end of the first year the average score for this group had improved twenty percentile points, and in the second year it improved ten more. Five of this group failed to gain or regressed, but others gained enough to bring the median score of this group up to the class median. It was concluded that these five students had personality maladjustments of such a nature that the classroom teachers could not effect a change.50

A study which throws some light on effectiveness of certain teaching procedures and thus has a bearing on this study is one made by McKeil. The experiment dealt with the attempts to teach the concept that there are many possible causes for behavior in children. A test was given in which there were twenty-five behavior situations listed. These situations were followed by five choices as to possible cause. All possible causes were to be checked. The first nine problem situations had to do with problems of eating, destruction, and lying and concerned children from two to ten years in age. The second section of eight problems had to do with different behavior problems, but the children concerned were of the

50 Charles D. Flory, Elizabeth Alded, and Madeline Simmons, "Classroom Teachers Improve the Personality Adjustment of their Pupils," Journal of Educational Research, XXXVIII (September, 1944), 1-8.
same age. The third section of eight problems had to do with the same type of situation as the first sections, but the children concerned were outside the two to ten age range.

The test was first given to 1,172 students, mostly freshmen and seniors in high school, and to a group of adults with low reading ability. The mean score on the test was found to be significantly higher for girls than for boys at both freshman and senior levels. The freshman girls who had had a unit on child care in home economics scored significantly higher than those who did not. However, this difference did not appear at the senior level. The mean for both senior groups was significantly higher than that for the freshmen even though many of them had taken no course in which the specific concept involved was taught.

Three pamphlets were written which illustrated the problems in the first part of the test used. These pamphlets were entitled "Ann Won't Eat Oatmeal", "Dick Is Destructive", and "John's Grades Cause Trouble". These were all of a low enough reading level to be classified as "easy" or "very easy".

A group of seventy-three home economics girls were used as an experimental group in which these pamphlets were used as a basis for discussion. One forty minute period was spent on each pamphlet. Thirty-three home economics students were used as a control group. All allowances were made for
differences in I. Q. Forty-three adults were given the pamphlets to read and eleven were used as a control group.

In the high school group the experimental group did significantly better on the retest on the first and last section of the test. These sections dealt with the same type of problems as were mentioned in the pamphlets. However, on the second section which necessitated the ability to generalize from one kind of problem to another, the increase was not significant. The adult group showed practically no gain on any part of the test. The conclusions drawn are that the instructional methods used in high school were not conducive to concept generalization from one type of problem to another, and the reading materials such as those used were altogether unsuitable for teaching the concept to adults.\textsuperscript{51} With the above material as a basis for action the following study was initiated.

CHAPTER III

THE FIRST TWO AND ONE HALF MONTHS OF THE STUDY

This chapter will be concerned with a description of the first two and one half months of study. The report of the study was divided in this manner, because this period took in the time from the beginning of the experiment up to the Christmas holidays. A description of the group at the beginning of the study will be presented; the methods used in determining initial status will be described; an analysis of the initial test results will be made; some of the socializing techniques used will be mentioned; and some of the trends at the end of this period will be noted.

A General Description of the Group

The group used for this study was a fourth grade group in the North Texas State College Demonstration School. There were twelve boys and seven girls in the group. Many of the pupils were children of professional people though some came from farms in the surrounding community. At the beginning of the study the age range of the group was from 107 months to 119 months. Three of the children in the group were new at the beginning of the school year but had been in the group
about three weeks when the initial sociometric tests were given. From evidence already noted this seems to be generally considered to be a sufficient length of time for the children to become acquainted. This would seem to be especially true with only nineteen in the group.

The Methods and Tests Used

The first step necessary in working toward an answer to the problem was to determine the status of the individual in the group. Several different measuring instruments were used so that their standings could be determined along several different dimensions besides social status. This was done in order that techniques for aid might be fitted to the individual. Also, anecdotal records were kept on each child to note his progress as the study advanced.

Some test results were already available in the children's individual files which were kept by the teachers. For example these records included grade placement scores on an achievement test given at the close of the preceding school year.\(^1\) The three new students were exceptions in this respect for their tests had been given at the beginning of the fall term. Also, one other boy re-took the test at that time.

The study really began on October 2, when the group was

\(^1\)T. L. Kelley, G. M. Ruch, and L. M. Terman, The Stanford Achievement Test, Primary Battery, Form O.
given the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale (see appendix). The scale is so constructed that the child can express three degrees of positive acceptance for others, a "Don't know them" and two degrees of rejection. The headings of the three positive degrees are: "My very, very best friends", "My other friends", and "Not my friends, but okay". The headings for the two degrees of rejection are: "Don't care for them" and "Dislike them". The choices were numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 in the order mentioned above.

Each child was given a list containing all the names of the children in the room and a copy of the Ohio Scale. The girls' names were listed first with the boys' following. The names were listed alphabetically according to the last names but with the first names first. This was done in order to aid the child in identifying the other members of the class. In introducing the test the teacher followed the instructions on the back fairly closely. She made a statement something like the following: "When you have difficulty with your studies, I try to help you. I also want to help you make friends, but in order to do this, I have to know how you feel about all the others in the room." Also, it was felt necessary to emphasize the fact that this was not a test, and there were no right and wrong answers and that no other student in the room would be allowed to see their papers.

2Prepared by the Euclid Elementary Teachers in cooperation with the College of Education, Ohio State University, The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale, for the Intermediate Grades, Form G-3.
The children were then asked to read the Ohio Scale with the teacher. After the complete scale had been read, the teacher went back and re-emphasized the main headings. It was found necessary to deviate from the printed instructions in that the whole scale was read before any one started marking. (This eliminated a great deal of confusion and inattention.) When the reading was completed, the children were instructed to put the number of one of the choices by each name on the list. It was found necessary to emphasize the fact that every name should have a number by it and only one. Also, they did not have to use all the numbers. For example if they knew everyone in the room well enough to judge them, they would not use any fours, or they might feel that they liked everyone and thus would not use any fives or sixes. However, this latter point should not be stressed lest the child take it in a suggestive light and feel that he should not reject anyone.

Each child was asked to place a seven by his own name. Some of the children said the teacher would then know whose paper it was since there were no other sevens. When this occurred, no issue was made of the point, and the teacher said the seven just kept them from having to write their name at the top of the paper. The teacher acted upon the assumption that it was best for her not to walk among the children while they were marking their papers. Also, care was taken not to allow the children to see each other's
paper. It was felt that these precautions helped to make the test more valid.

The results of this first choosing situation are shown in Table Number 1. Each child's total acceptance score was determined by scoring the choices received on the scale as follows: a number one on the Ohio Scale was scored as five points, a number two as three points, a number three as two points, a number four as zero points, a number five as a minus one point, and a number six as a minus three points. It was decided to weight the extreme positive and negative choice in this manner, because from other evidence it seems they are more constant and thus indicate a more decided choice.

In Table 1 the numbers listed are these converted scores. The vertical columns are the points given, and the horizontal ones are points received. Letters of the alphabet were substituted for the true names for obvious reasons. The seven girls are listed first. The colored squares represent different degrees of mutuality or rejection between two people. All the red squares represent a "very mutual" friendship; that is, one student gave another a number one (scored as five points) and received a number one in return. For example A gave G a number one, and in return G gave A a number one. The blue squares represent a "moderately mutual" friendship. If one student gave another a two (scored as three points) and received a two or a one in return, or if a pupil gave a one and received a two in return, these
### TABLE 1

RESULTS OF THE OHIO SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given October 2, 1947.

**Legend**

- **Score on Scale**
  - 1: ................................. 5
  - 2: ................................. 3
  - 3: ................................. 2
  - 4: ................................. 0
  - 5: ................................. -1
  - 6: ................................. -3

**Combinations in Terms of Converted Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Mutual</td>
<td>(5, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Mutual</td>
<td>(5, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Unreciprocated</td>
<td>(3, -1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually Unreciprocated</td>
<td>(-3, -3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unreciprocated</td>
<td>(5, -3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

bT R.... Total Received, T G.... Total Given, SIS.... Social Index Score, P S.... Prestige Score, MFS.... Mutual Friendship Score, UFS.... Unrequited Friendship Score.
combinations constituted a "moderately mutual" friendship. The yellow squares represent "moderately unreciprocated" friendships. If one student gave a two and received a five or six in return or he gave a five or six and received a one, this constituted a "very unreciprocated" friendship. A "mutually unreciprocated" relationship resulted when a student gave a five or six and received a five or six in return. These relationships are given in the legend on the table except that the combinations making for these relations are in terms of the converted scores rather than the choices of the scale.

Under the T R (total received) heading in the table all the pupils' acceptance scores are listed. This score is the algebraic sum of all the scores received by each pupil. In the TG column is listed the total score each child gave. In the S I S column is listed the "social index score" of each child. This score is a ratio between the total score received and the total he would have received if everyone had given him a first choice. In other words if a child were to receive all first choices, his "index score" would be one. The P S column contains each child's "prestige score". This score was computed by dividing the total score each child received from the upper quartile (the top five were used in this instance) by the total he would have received if all in this quartile had given him a first choice. Thus this score is a measure of the child's standing with the top quartile--if
all gave him a one, he would have a "prestige score" of one. For the purpose of computing these last two scores, choice five on the Ohio Scale was scored as four points and choice six was scored as six points. This was done in order that the total positive possible (five plus three plus two) could equal the total negative (six plus four). In the MFS column is listed each child's "mutual friendship score". This score was determined by assigning a value of three for each "very mutual" friendship the child had and a one for each "moderately mutual" friendship he had. The sum of these scores is his "mutual friendship score". The UFS column contains each child's "unrequited friendship score". This score was computed by assigning a value of three for each "very unreciprocated" friendship the child had and a one for each "moderately unreciprocated" friendship he had and totaling these scores. However, a child was counted as having an unreciprocated friendship only if he gave a positive choice and received a negative choice in return.

On October 10, the members of the group were asked to choose people in the room with whom they would like to work on committees, in work groups, etc. "Work with" was especially emphasized. They were told that this was to help the teacher place them on various committees which they would have from time to time. The instructions given were to list the names of as many people as they desired with at least five if possible. However, not all students listed five,
and one listed nine. These names were to be listed in order of preference.

The results of this choosing situation are shown in Table Number 2. The choices were scored as follows: a first choice counted five points, a second choice three points, a third choice two points, and a fourth and all other choices one point each. The numbers listed in the table are these assigned values. Here again the vertical columns are the scores given, and the horizontal are points received. The same letters of the alphabet represent the same cases as in Table 1. Since there was no opportunity for an expression of rejection and positive choices were determined differently, the mutuality and rejection relationships had to be defined differently. Any combination of a first, second, or third choice given and received was considered a "very mutual" relationship. A first, second, or third choice given, and a fourth to the final choice received, or vice versa, was considered a "moderately mutual" relationship. A "moderately unreciprocated" relationship resulted when a student gave a fourth to the final choice, and he received no choice in return. A "very unreciprocated" relation resulted when a first, second, or third choice was given, and no choice was received in return. The colors used to represent these various relationships are the same as used in Table 1, i.e., red for a very mutual relationship, etc.
TABLE 2

RESULTS OF THE COMMITTEE CHOOSING SITUATION*

| Case | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | Total Received |
| A    | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8              |
| B    | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 14             |
| C    | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5              |
| D    | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 14             |
| E    | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5              |
| F    | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 14             |
| G    | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7              |
| H    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| I    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| J    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| K    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| L    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| M    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| N    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| O    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| P    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| Q    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| R    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |
| S    | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13             |

*Given October 10, 1947.
The question asked was, "With whom would you like to work on a committee or in a group?"

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice Given</th>
<th>Value Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each choice thereafter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combinations in Terms of Converted Scores Number

Very Mutual
(3,3)(2,2)(5,5)(5,3)(5,2)(2,3) 15

Moderately Mutual
(1,5)(1,3)(1,2)(1,1) 19

Moderately Unreciprocated
(1,0) 35

Very Unreciprocated
(5,0)(3,0)(2,0) 13
The California Test of Personality was administered to the group on October 16.\textsuperscript{3} These scores (and the achievement test scores referred to previously) are listed in Table 3. The scores listed are total raw scores. The total possible raw score was 144.

The next choosing situation was an election (November 16) for president of a hobby club which was formed in connection with the study. The pupils were instructed to list five people, in order of preference, whom they preferred for president. These choices were scored in the same manner as the committee choices. This choosing situation was used largely as a validating test to see how closely the children followed their previous choices.

The California Test of Mental Maturity was given to the group on December 4.\textsuperscript{4} The scores are listed on Table 3. Also, about this time the teacher rating scales were completed. The Winnetka Scale for Rating School Behavior and Attitudes was used.\textsuperscript{5} These scores are also listed in Table 3. There were 150 points possible.

On December 16, a scale developed in a graduate class in sociometry at North Texas State College ("How I Feel

\textsuperscript{3} E. P. Thorpe, W. W. Clark, and E. W. Tieg, California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, Form A.

\textsuperscript{4} E. T. Sullivan, W. W. Clark, and E. W. Tieg, California Test of Mental Maturity, Elementary Series, S-form.

\textsuperscript{5} Dorothy Van Alstyne and the Winnetka Public School Faculty, Winnetka Scale for Rating School Behavior and Attitudes.
### Table 3

**Individual Scores on Other Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Measuring Instrument</th>
<th>Teacher Rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>I. Q.&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Raw scores (possible 144) as determined by the **California Test of Personality**.

<sup>b</sup>I. Q.'s as determined by the **California Test of Mental Maturity**.

<sup>c</sup>Grade Placement scores as determined by the **Stanford Achievement Test**.

<sup>d</sup>Raw scores (possible 150) as determined by using the **Winnetka Scale for Rating School Behavior and Attitudes**.
toward Others") was given. Its main headings were: "my best friends", "my other friends", "persons I don't know", "persons who are not my friends", and "persons I would not want to have as friends as long as they are like they are now". The choices were number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 in the order mentioned above. The choices were scored as follows: a number one was assigned a value of three points, a number two one point, a number three zero points, a number four a minus one, and a five a minus three. All other scores were computed for this choosing as for the Ohio Scale. Since this scale had only two positive choices as well as two possible rejections, the mutuality and rejection relationships had to be computed differently. They were figured as follows: a one choice given and received was considered a "very mutual" friendship; a one given and a two received, or vice versa, or a two given and received was considered a "moderately mutual" friendship; a one given and a five received, or vice versa, was defined as a "very unreciprocated" friendship; a one given and a four received, a five given and a two received, or a four given and a two received (or vice versa in each case) was defined as a "moderately unreciprocated" friendship; a five given and a five received or a five given and a four received, or vice versa, were defined as "mutually unreciprocated" relationships. Since

---

6Formulated in a graduate class in sociometry, North Texas State College, "How I Feel toward Others".
this test and the Ohio Scale were not identical, the results of the two testings could not be compared statistically, but certain trends could be noted. Therefore, this December 16 choosing was used as a sort of mid-way checkup in the study.

An Analysis of the Initial Test Results

As has been indicated, Table Number 1 shows the results of the first sociometric testing. The range in sociometric scores was from eighty-four to a minus twenty. The mean was 40.8; the median was 47.6; and the standard deviation was 24.5. The difference between the mean and median was undoubtedly caused by the one very low score.

The range in "social index scores" was from .93 to a -.6, and the range in "prestige scores" was from a plus one to a -.80. The "mutual friendship scores" varied from twenty-five to zero and the "unrequited friendship scores" from twelve to zero. The over-all group "social index score" (determined by dividing the sum of all the individual scores by the total which would have resulted if everyone in the group had given everyone else a plus one) was .33. As for the mutuality and rejection relationships, there were seventeen "very mutual" combinations, forty-six "moderately mutuals", twelve "moderately unreciprocated", seven "very unreciprocated", and four "mutual unreciprocations". There were no isolates (persons receiving no positive choices). However, there was one instance in which a boy received only four positive choices
(Case S) and another case in which a boy received only six positive choices (Case Q). One girl (Case D) was a definite star (group leader). Case I was the star among the boys, but there was another boy (Case P) who was almost as outstanding. There were two girls and three boys in the upper twenty-five per cent (upper five) and one girl and four boys in the lower twenty-five per cent (lower five).

The results of the committee choosing situation are not comparable statistically to the Ohio Scale since every child did not respond specifically to every other child. Obviously this would cause the totals to be lower. Referring to Table Number 2, it can be seen that the range was from thirty-eight to zero. The mean was 13.2; the median was 10.75; and the standard deviation was 8.64. There were fifteen "very mutual" relationships, nineteen "moderately mutual" relationships, thirty-five "moderately unreciprocated" relationships, and thirteen "very unreciprocated" relationships. There was one isolate, and eight persons received less than five positive choices. The group leader in this choosing situation was Case I, who had been the high boy on the Ohio Scale. The high girl on that scale was tied for second in this choosing situation.

There were two girls and three boys in the high five. The two girls were the same two who were high on the Ohio Scale. Two of the boys were the same with the third boy being displaced by a girl by two points.
The election for Hobby Club president was held about a month after the study was started and as has already been mentioned, was used largely for comparative purposes. Since the results were scored in the same manner as the committee choices and the mutuality-rejection relationships were determined in the same way, these two testings could be compared quite easily.

The range of the scores in the election was from zero to forty-nine. The mean was 9.4. There were nine "very mutual" relationships, eight "moderately mutual" relationships, nine "moderately unreciprocated" relationships, and twenty-two "very unreciprocated" relationships. The same boy was elected president who was high in the committee choosing situation. There were four isolates and ten cases in which pupils received less than five positive choices. Compared to the committee choosing there was some slight shift in the high five. There were four boys and only one girl in the top five. The other girl was replaced by a boy who had been tied for eighth high in both the other situations. Two of the other boys were the same ones who were high in the committee choosing, and the other who had been high in that situation was displaced by a boy who had been in the high five on the Ohio Scale. Four of the low five were the same in the election as in the committee choosing with one girl being replaced by another.

From these three sociometric testing situations certain
conclusions might be drawn. It seems that though there were some small shifts, those who were high according to one criterion, tended also to be high in other choosings. This was true at this age-level, but as other studies have indicated, there might have been more of a shift in rank at higher age levels: that is, an older person might not choose the same person for president as he would for a best friend. However, even at this age-level children show a more critical attitude as the criterion becomes more specific. This was indicated by the increase in isolates and rejections in the election as compared to the general committee choosing situation. Also, there was a corresponding decrease in mutuality relationships.

The statement that a child's rank in the group tends to stay about the same even though the criterion was different, is lent further weight by the correlations between the results of these three testing situations. These correlations were: between the Ohio Scale and the committee choosing .88, between the Ohio Scale and the election .68, and between the committee choosing and the election .75. The fact that there is not too great a relationship between a person's emotional expansiveness (positive choices given) and his acceptance by others, was shown by the correlation of .31 between scores

7These and all correlations in this study were determined by the rank method.
given and received on the Ohio Scale. In other words the person who received the most choices did not necessarily give the most choices.

Also, trends revealed in other studies were borne out by the correlations between acceptance and other such variables as personality rating scales. The correlations found in this study were: between Ohio Scale results and personality scores .25, between the Ohio Scale and I. Q. .18, between Ohio Scale and achievement test results .26, between Ohio Scale results and teacher rating results .78, and between the committee choices and personality scores .24.

The high five and low five in the Ohio Scale choosing situation were compared along these other dimensions so that further trends might be observed. It was found that on the average the high five in social acceptance were also higher in these other variables. The averages for the high five were: in personality scores 116.6, in I. Q.'s 110.8, in grade placement scores 3.86, and in teacher rating scores 132.6. The averages for the low five were: in personality score 98.8, in I. Q.'s 109, in grade placement scores 3.25, and in teacher rating scores 83.4. However, there were individual exceptions to the general trend, for one boy in the low five had the third highest I. Q. in the room. Thus it is not safe to say that because a person is intelligent, he will necessarily develop social skills. The same can be said for the other variables. Further analysis of the high
and low groups revealed that the high group had a much higher degree of mutuality among themselves. There were nine mutual relations (including both "very" and "moderately mutual" friendships) among the highs as compared to only one among the lows. There were no unreciprocated friendships (including both "very" and "moderately unreciprocated" relations) among the highs, and there was one among the lows. There were no mutual rejections in either group. As for relations between the high five and low five, there were no mutual relationships between highs and lows; there were two mutual rejections; and there were nine unreciprocations. It is important to notice in this latter case that in every instance the members of the high group did the rejecting in forming the unreciprocated friendships.

In order that any sex differences might be determined, a further analysis was made of all results, and means were determined for boys and girls. In all the tests given (both sociometric and to test other variables) except three, the girls' means were found to be superior. On the Ohio Scale the girls' mean was found to be forty-nine, and the boys' was thirty-five; on the teacher rating scale the girls' mean was 124, and the boys' was 106; on the personality scale the girls' mean was at the sixty-seventh centile, and the boys' was at the fifty-third centile; on the achievement test the girls' average was four, and the boys' was 3.7; the girls' average "social index score" was .5, and the boys' was .26;
the girls' average "mutual friendship score" was thirteen, and the boys' was nine; the girls' average "unrequited friendship score" was one, and the boys' was three. The three situations in which the boys excelled were the election for president, the committee choice, and in I. Q. The means were 10.8, 13.6, and 114 in the order mentioned above. The girls' means were 6.9, 12.4, and 110. It is interesting to note that the boys rated higher in I. Q. but lower in academic achievement. Also, the boys rated higher positions of leadership, yet rated themselves lower in personality. A "social index" was computed separately for the boys and girls in the class (using the Ohio Scale results), and it was found that the girls had an "index" of .76 as compared to .39 for the boys. This seems to indicate a greater amount of in-group feeling among the girls. However, a "social index score" computed on the basis of boys' choices for girls was higher than the one computed on the basis of girls' choices for boys. The first score was .33, and the second was .10. Therefore, in this group there seemed to be a stronger feeling extended from the boys to the girls than from the girls to the boys.

Some Techniques Used to Help Children Improve their Status

As has been indicated, the same individuals tended to be low in all the sociometric testing situations. A special attempt was made to help these children raise their status.
Of course it was hoped all children would be benefited, and the in-group feeling would be increased. It follows that the children chosen for special aid would not know that they were considered special cases. The five cases that were chosen were Cases E, J, N, Q, and S. A brief description of each of these cases follow. Some of the material included was taken from anecdotal records, teacher-pupil conferences, teacher-parent conferences, etc.

Case E was the only girl in the group. She was one of the new students and seemed to have difficulty adjusting to new situations. She had made only four "moderately mutual" friends by the time the Ohio Scale was given. Her I. Q. was 113, her personality score 122, her teacher rating score 108, and her grade placement score 4.2. It was evident from her I. Q. and grade placement score that she did not lack intelligence. The fact that the physical education teacher did not feel she knew E well enough to rate her even though E had been in her class for two months, indicates the type of person E was.

Case J was a boy who was the most intelligent of the five. His I. Q. was 133. His personality score was seventy, which may have indicated that he had some insight into his standing. He is a little inclined to be frail and is slightly inept on the playground. Indications were that J was over-protected by his mother. From the anecdotal records kept, several instances were observed in which J was very sullen
and "pouty" when he could not have his own way. He could be a discipline problem on occasion. His teacher rating score was 117, and his grade placement score was 3.5.

Case H was a very quiet, shy person who was subjected to a great deal of parental pressure concerning his academic standing. On more than one occasion he was so nervous, upset, and worried over the outcome of an examination that he spent a great deal of time crying while he was taking it. He was promoted to his present grade on condition at the insistence of his parents. He had quite a bit of difficulty with his reading and read with S who sits across the aisle. From the records kept it could be seen that this was not a consistent association and seemed to be more or less fostered by inferiority feelings on both their parts, for S was also deficient in reading. H's I. Q. was ninety-eight; his personality score was ninety-nine; his teacher rating score was sixty-seven; and his grade placement score was three. This latter test was taken at the beginning of this year to help determine whether he should pass conditionally.

Case Q was a boy who was much lower in social acceptance than any other (minus twenty). Q was a very aggressive individual who had the habit of making slighting remarks about his classmates. He apparently used this as a means of attracting attention, for he also made several attempts to show off in front of the class by making faces, etc. From all that could be determined, he got his way much of the time at
home. Several times in school when given a task to do, he did only part of it unless he just happened to feel like finishing it. For example when given a list of fifty words to spell, he spelled only ten and said he did not feel like finishing the remainder. He often refused to attempt new tasks. His I. Q. was eighty-nine; his personality score was eighty-eight; his teacher rating score was fifty-six; and his grade placement score was 2.6.

In many cases Case S was just the opposite. He was very quiet and withdrawn, and though he had been in the group three weeks when the Ohio Scale was given, he had not formed any mutual relationships, nor had he been rejected. He had difficulty reading and felt this fact keenly. The others in the class were very conscious of his weakness, and on different occasions members of the class made a point of calling attention to the fact that S could not read a poem, speak a piece, etc. He had made little effort to better his position, and when the teacher asked what he was interested in or what he liked to do, S said, "Nothing." His I. Q. was ninety-two; his personality score was 115; his teacher rating score was sixty-nine; and his grade placement score was 2.9.

Several different techniques were used to help these five children and to raise the group's status. Every effort was made to let these five contribute to the group. One boy brought his pet love birds to school, exhibited them, and talked about them. Others were given the opportunity to give
special reports and were sent on special errands with pupils of higher status. One boy who was low was made fire chief, because he sat close to the windows which were to be closed in case of fire. The teacher and the student teachers made special efforts to always allow low status pupils to recite first if they raised their hands. In all of these instances and in many others like them care was taken not to give a child a task beyond his ability.

Also, in an effort to gain greater access to the pupil's interests and afford more opportunities to help them, a Hobby Club was formed. This club met for a thirty minute period twice a week. During these meetings the children were given an opportunity to tell the group about their hobbies. Some brought stamp collections, rock collections, picture collections, etc. On the days when the pupils who were supposed to talk, forgot to bring their hobbies, group discussions were held. For example one day the students were asked to write what they liked about their friends and what they disliked about people whom they did not consider friends. The leader avoided making any suggestions, and the pupils were asked to put down exactly what they thought. The next time an open period occurred, a discussion was held concerning some of the statements given. It was hoped that this would give some children some insight into some of the reasons why they were disliked.

In connection with the Hobby Club various activities
were instigated. Some of them could not properly be called hobbies, yet the children were not critical of this fact. In one instance the adult leader chose one of the low boys to help take individual pictures of the members of the group (the leader's camera was used). He was chosen because his hobby was taking pictures. The boy was told to choose someone to help him, and he chose the boy with the highest status among the boys. When some of the pictures did not turn out, another low boy was chosen by the leader because he wanted to start a hobby. This boy also chose a high status person to help him. In both these instances the high status boys were glad to be chosen, for they had raised their hands and asked the low boys to choose them. Using the club organization as a basis, the teacher let the students plan a Christmas party. They arranged their own programs, planned their own games, etc. All students took some part and worked on some committee.3

Trends Indicated by the Scale Given on December 16

As has already been indicated, the Ohio Scale could not be compared statistically with the scale given on December 16, yet certain tendencies toward change could be detected. All scores were computed for this choosing which had been computed for the Ohio Scale (such as "social index scores", "prestige

3The teacher, Myrtle Nyegaard, was very cooperative in helping plan and carry out the techniques and aids used in connection with this study.
scores", etc.). Because the Ohio Scale was a six point scale and the "How I Feel toward Others" scale had only five points, these scores were slightly different. However, the average amount of difference in scores was determined between the two testings, and if a person deviated markedly from the average difference, this difference was considered to be indicative of a trend. For example if the average difference between "social index scores" was .09 from one choosing to the next, and if an individual's score deviated by .18, this was taken to mean he had improved his position more than the average. Also, changes in rank were noted.

The nineteen cases were briefly reviewed for marked changes. A brief summary of the cases follow. In the case of A her "social index" dropped more than the average, and she dropped two places in rank. She had been new at the beginning of the school year, and some seemed to have changed their attitude toward her because of a lackadaisical attitude. Cases B, C, and D maintained about the same position though C lost some status with the top five. E raised her rank from sixteenth to twelfth and increased her "prestige", "social index", and "mutual friendship scores" more than the average. Case F lost some ground but still remained high, and Case G remained at about the same level. Case H showed a definite loss in rank and in "social index score" and "prestige score". The teacher reported he had been becoming more aggressive, and the children seemed to be resenting
him more. Cases I and J stayed at about the same level though I seemed to strengthen his position somewhat. Case K increased his status markedly. His rank increased from eight and one half to third, and his other scores increased accordingly. The teacher reported he had a continued attitude of helpfulness in the classroom, and he had contributed several times in the Hobby Club and the accompanying discussions. L dropped three places in rank, and his other scores dropped a little more than average. Part of this change may have been due to his desire to "run things". Case M remained at about the same level. N seemed to be gaining some confidence. He increased his rank three places, and his other scores increased more than average. The teacher had endeavored to have some of the parental pressure removed, and his classroom attitude was considerably better. Case O improved somewhat, though Cases P, Q, and R showed little change. Case S seemed to have been helped some in that he now had two "very mutual" friends where before he had none.

Thus it seemed from these results that three of the low five had been helped. Cases E and N raised their rank, "social index score", "mutual friendship score", and lowered their "unrequited friendship score" more than average, and S was helped to make two friends. Cases J and Q seemed to have been helped little if any so far.
CHAPTER IV

THE FINAL THREE AND ONE HALF MONTHS OF THE STUDY

In the last three and one half months a slightly different approach was used to attempt to increase the in-group feeling and to attempt to raise the social status of the low individuals. In this chapter the techniques used will be discussed; the results of the final testings will be given; and these results will be compared with the results of the initial tests.

The Techniques Used

At the beginning of the second semester a new approach was planned. It was felt necessary to use another approach, because all group members were not participating in the activities which had been used during the first part of the study, and also, on many occasions only a few could participate at a time.

The class was divided into work groups varying in size from four to six pupils. These groups were indirectly chosen by the adult leader lest some child be left out of a group. An excuse for the leader choosing the groups had been afforded by the previous Hobby Club meetings. Members of the class
had indicated they were interested in certain hobbies such as picture taking, etc. These members were assigned to the same groups using those interests as a basis for assignment.

After the groups had been formed, leaders were chosen by the groups, and the class as a whole decided that new leaders should be chosen every two weeks. Also, a group discussion was held concerning the qualities a good leader should have and how he should act in the group. Some suggested ideas were brought out by the members of the class. For example one boy said the leader should "run" the group but not "boss" it. Another person said the leader should help the others in the group. However, there was not complete agreement as to the function of a group leader. One of the problem cases said no leader was going to tell him what to do and that the leader should just let everyone alone. A chorus of "No's" greeted this statement, but the boy still did not seem convinced that he should be led.

After the groups had been organized, an activity was planned which could be tied in with the regular classroom work. Fortunately about this time an industrial arts student teacher was to be working with this grade. Since the class was studying a unit on weather, it was decided that the class should make a weather calendar. The suggestion was made by the teacher and was eagerly adopted by the class. The calendar consisted of a large rectangularly shaped piece of plywood into which nails had been driven in rows. There was a
nail for each day of the month. On each nail was hung a square of cardboard upon which the date had been written. Also, a wooden figure was cut from plywood and was hung on the nails. These figures represented different types of weather and varied as the kind of day varied; for example a little gray lamb represented a gray day, a sailboat a windy day, etc. These figures were cut out with a coping saw, were smoothed, and then were painted with water colors. Since there were only sufficient tools for one group to be working at a time, the other groups worked on patterns for the figures to be cut out when it came their turn to work. After they had finished that, they functioned as reading groups reading about the weather, etc.

When this project was completed, another was instigated in connection with a unit on the West which was being studied. In fact several projects were involved since the teacher was very cooperative and used these work groups at other times than the original thirty minute periods set aside. However, the main project at these periods was one in which the students were to draw on what they had learned about the West and were to write a play. A part was to be put in this play for each member of the group; these parts were to be learned; and the play was to be given for the remainder of the class.

Some of the other projects were: making a dictionary of western terms, making a booklet of western songs, painting a landscape scene with the art teacher's help, and building a
log cabin. This latter project was carried on with the help of another industrial arts student who worked with one group three times a week for thirty minutes before school. The groups working rotated with one coming one morning, another the next, etc.

About midway through these projects a part of one period was used for a group discussion on how they could improve their groups. Suggestions such as following the rule of the majority, learning their parts better, etc., were given by various group members. Some of the troubles that had arisen in the groups were mentioned, and possible solutions were discussed.

These projects were climaxed by a party having a western theme. The fifth grade was invited, and the plays were given for them. Some of the songs which had been collected were sung, and the other projects were exhibited. Also, some of the children told western stories. The planning for the party was done entirely by student committees. The pupils raised the money for refreshments by selling candy and doughnuts in the halls at noon. The teacher had taken three of the low status boys into the principal's office to ask his permission to sell the candy, and the boys did all the explaining in asking the permission. The whole party proved to be a great success, and the children seemed to feel well rewarded for the efforts expended.

During the next regular activity period an effort at
role-playing was attempted. The situation used involved a committee working or writing a play. Some of the incidents that had been observed while the group members had been working on their play were used. Some success seemed to be experienced; however, it was unfortunate that the children were interested in having their pictures taken in their play costumes immediately following the role-playing session. Thus many of the children did not give their undivided attention. Yet some members recognized some of the incidents as having taken place in their work group and commented on the fact. When four more children were chosen to give a demonstration of how the problems should have been solved, most of the class agreed that the problems could best be settled in a democratic manner. For example when selecting a name for the play, they decided they should vote on names submitted and abide by the will of the majority.

The Final Sociometric Testings

On April 1, the Ohio Scale was re-administered to the group. The children were told that the adult leaders wanted to see if the children had made any new friends, if they felt the same way toward others, or if they now disliked some people whom they liked previously. The methods used in administering the test were essentially the same as those used in the initial administration.

After the pupils had finished rating all the others on
TABLE 4

RESULTS OF THE SECOND OHIO SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCALEa

| Case | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
|    |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |  3 |
|     |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |  5 |
|     |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |  6 |
|     |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |  7 |
|     |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |  8 |
|     |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |  9 |

aGiven April 1, 1942.

bT R...Total Received, T G...Total Given, SIS...Social Index Score, P S...Prestige Score, MFS...Mutual Friendship Score, UFS...Unrequited Friendship Score.

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score on Scale</th>
<th>Value Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combinations in Terms of Converted Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Mutual</th>
<th>(5, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Mutual</td>
<td>(5, 3), (3, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Unrecip</td>
<td>(3, -1), (3, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually Unrecip</td>
<td>(-3, -3), (-1, -3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unrecip</td>
<td>(5, -3), (5, -1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number: 30, 65, 14, 8, 10
the Ohio Scale, they were asked to list in order of preference the names of children with whom they would like to work on committees, etc. As in the first committee choosing situation no limit was set as to the number of names listed. The class was told that as nearly as possible these choices would be followed in forming new work groups for further projects.

The results of these choosing situations are shown in Tables Number 4 and 5. The method of scoring used was the same as that previously described for the corresponding choosing situations. Also, scores such as "social index scores" and mutuality and rejection relationships were determined in the same manner as previously described.

The range of acceptance scores on the second Ohio Scale testing was from eighty-four to one (see Table 4). The mean was 51.9; the median was fifty-four; and the standard deviation was 22.05. The range in "social index scores" was from .93 to -.32; the range in "prestige scores" was from .90 to -.32; the "mutual friendship scores" varied from forty-one to four; and the "unrequited friendship scores" varied from fourteen to zero. The girls' mean acceptance score was 63.59, and the boys' was 43.17.

There were thirty "very mutual" friendships, sixty-five "moderately mutual" friendships, fourteen "moderately unreciprocated" friendships, eight "mutually unreciprocated" friendships, and ten "very unreciprocated" friendships. The group
# Table 5

## Results of the Second Committee Choosing Situation

| Case | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | Total Received |
| A    | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 7              |
| B    | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 14             |
| C    | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 5              |
| D    | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 2             |
| E    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 6              |
| F    | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3             |
| G    | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 10             |
| H    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 2              |
| I    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 42             |
| J    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 0              |
| K    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 24             |
| L    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 8              |
| M    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 14             |
| N    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4              |
| O    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 25             |
| P    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 27             |
| Q    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 1              |
| R    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 6              |
| S    | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 1              |

*Given April 1, 1948.*

The question asked was, "With whom would you like to work on a committee or in a group?"

**Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice Given</th>
<th>Value Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each choice thereafter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combinations in Terms of Converted Scores**

- **Very Mutual**: (3, 3)(2, 2)(5, 5)(5, 3)(5, 2)(2, 3)...
- **Moderately Mutual**: (1, 5)(1, 3)(1, 2)(1, 1)...
- **Moderately Unreciprocated**: (1, 0)...
- **Very Unreciprocated**: (5, 0)(3, 0)(2, 0)...

Number of Combinations:

- Very Mutual: 9
- Moderately Mutual: 23
- Moderately Unreciprocated: 35
- Very Unreciprocated: 26
"social index" was .48; the "social index" based upon girls' choices for girls was .39; the "index" based upon boys' choices for boys was .41; the "index" based upon girls' choices for boys was .30. The boy-girl "index" was .60. It will be remembered that these indices were ratios between total acceptance received and the total that would have been received if everyone had given everyone else a first choice.

In the second committee choosing (see Table 5) the mean was 14.32; the median was eleven; and the standard deviation was 11.43. There were nine "very mutual" relationships, twenty-three "moderately mutual" relationships, thirty-five "moderately unreciprocated" relationships, and twenty-six "very unreciprocated" relationships. The girls' mean acceptance score was fifteen, and the boys' was 12.83.

Comparison of Initial and Final Test Results

Correlations between beginning and end test results revealed that, as a general rule, there was no marked shift in rank from one testing situation to the other though there were some quite marked individual changes. This was true for both sets of criterion used. However, the shift in rank which was observed was greater in the case of the Ohio Scale results than in the committee choosing. In the first instance the correlations between the first and second testings was .77, and in the latter instance the correlation was .86. Of course it is realized that a change in rank in itself was not sufficient basis for saying a child had gained or lost
status, for as one went up in rank another might go down without in reality losing status. Likewise, a person might go up in rank not because he had gained status, but because another had lost.

Four of the pupils who were high on the first testing were still high on the Ohio Scale with one boy being replaced by a boy who had tied for eighth on the first choosing. Three of the same persons were low who had been low in the first testing. The girl who had been low was replaced by a boy who had been tied for eighth, and the other boy was replaced by a boy who had been fourteenth in the first choosing.

In the second committee choosing four of the same people who were high remained high, and one boy was replaced by a boy who had been sixth in the first choosing. Three of the same pupils who had been low in the first choosing were still low with one girl being replaced by a boy who had been tied for eighth. The other girl was replaced by a boy who had been tied for thirteenth.

The correlation between the Ohio Scale scores and the committee choosing results was slightly higher in the final testings than it was initially (.93 as compared to .88), but the correlation between the Ohio Scale scores given and received dropped slightly from what it was in the first testing (from .31 to .26). The correlations between the Ohio Scale results and the personality scores increased somewhat
(from .25 to .35), but the correlation between the Ohio Scale scores and I. Q.'s dropped from .18 to .07, re-emphasizing the fact that these scores are not in themselves good indices to social acceptance.

In Table 6 some of the other changes observed are listed. The mean in both testing situations increased somewhat, but the Ohio Scale mean increased more markedly. The median followed this same pattern. The standard deviation in the Ohio Scale results showed a decrease and in the case of the committee choosing showed an increase. However, in the latter case this may not have been undesirable since this may indicate that choices for work companions were more widely distributed. Both the girls' mean and boys' mean increased on the Ohio Scale, but the girls' mean increased considerably more even though it had been higher initially. In the committee choosing situation the girls' mean increased while the boys' mean dropped very slightly. It was interesting to note that this change caused the girls to become superior to the boys in this situation. Previously the boys had had the higher mean.

The group "social index" increased as did the girl-girl "index", but the boy-boy "index" remained very nearly the same. The girl-boy "index" and the boy-girl "index" both increased, but the latter increased slightly more. The number of choices in the committee choosing situation increased somewhat, and the inter-sex choices increased quite markedly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Measurement</th>
<th>Committee Choices</th>
<th>Chic Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Test</td>
<td>Second Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls’ Mean</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys’ Mean</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Social Index</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl-Girl</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Index</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy-Boy Social Index</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Index</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Choices</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Inter-sex Choices</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Mutual Friendships</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Mutual Friendships</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Unreciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unreciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually Unreciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A minus indicates the difference is in favor of the second testing.
Also, as a general rule, the number of points given by each individual on the Ohio Scale increased markedly.

The mutuality-rejection relationships in committee choosing and on the Ohio Scale showed quite a marked difference in trend. In the committee choosing situation the total mutuality combinations remained almost the same (fifteen plus nineteen and nine plus twenty-three); the "moderately unreciprocated" friendships remained exactly the same; and the "very unreciprocated" friendships increased from thirteen to twenty-six. On the Ohio Scale there was a marked increase in both degrees of mutuality and a slight increase in "moderately unrequited" friendships, in "very unreciprocated" friendships, and in "mutually unreciprocated" friendships.

Of course some of the differences in results between the two types of tests were caused by inherent differences in the tests themselves. It will be remembered that in the committee choosing situation, the child was not asked to respond specifically to every other child as he was on the Ohio Scale. Therefore, a child may not have felt any actual feeling of rejection toward those he did not choose as work companions but just preferred to work with others. In this sense the Ohio Scale was probably the more discriminating instrument of the two.

From the Ohio Scale results it seemed evident that the group as a whole had been drawn closer together on a general friendship basis. Many shifts from a lower to a higher
positive or from a negative to a positive choice could be observed from the initial testing to the final one. It is true that there were a few instances in which individual pupils lost status, but by comparing Table 1 with Table 4 it can be seen that the instances in which the pupils gained status far outnumbered those instances in which the reverse was true.

In only two cases did the total acceptance scores of pupils drop, and in two others they remained exactly the same. In all other cases acceptance scores increased in amounts varying from one to forty-eight points. In one instance an individual's "social index score" remained the same, and in two others the "index score" dropped. In all other cases the "social index scores" increased in amounts varying from .01 to .63. In all but six cases the individual "prestige scores" raised in amounts ranging from .04 to 1.32. Part of the instances in which these scores did not rise, or dropped, was due to a change in the top five pupils which in turn caused a change in "prestige scores". Of course some of the rises may also have been partially due to this fact.

The "mutual friendship scores" in three instances remained the same, and in three instances they dropped. In the remaining cases the scores increased by amounts varying from three to twenty points. In all but three instances the "unrequited friendship scores" either decreased or remained the same. This latter point might indicate that the children
became more discriminating in their choices as to the possibility of their being returned and thus caused fewer unrequited relationships.

From the above comparison of results of the beginning and end testings certain trends seemed to stand out. The fact that more marked changes were observed on a friendship criterion than on the committee criterion seemed to indicate that a child's friendship status could be changed more easily than could his work status. Perhaps in the latter instance there was an element of skill involved which either the child did not have or had not been developed by the training methods used in this study. Thus as has already been indicated, a pupil might have some positive feeling for one but might prefer to work with another.

However, even in the committee choosing situation certain presumably desirable results could be observed. First, there were more choices between the boys and girls, and second, though there was still one outstanding boy in the group, just behind him were several other persons grouped more closely together than was the case on the first committee choosing. In other words more people had received a substantial amount of votes. However, it was true that these people were already quite well off and seemed to improve their advantage over the remainder of the group.

In order that a more comprehensive picture of the individual results might be gained, a brief review of the changes
in scores on the Ohio Scale follows. The differences in all
scores were noted in presenting this picture.

Case A's total acceptance score increased from thirty-
nine to forty-eight, and she gave sixteen more points than
she did in the first testing. Her "social index score" in-
creased .07; her "prestige score" increased .23; her "mutual
friendship score" increased six points; and her "unrequited
score" increased from zero to one. Case A's rank remained
at thirteen.

The total acceptance score of Case B increased eighteen
points; she gave nine points more; her "social index score"
increased .11; and her "prestige score" increased .04. Her
"mutual friendship score" increased from fourteen to twenty-
two, and her "unrequited friendship score" dropped from one
to zero. Case B's rank remained the same.

Case C remained at the same rank, received eight more
points, and gave two more. Her "social index score" in-
creased .09, and her "prestige score" increased .12. Her
"mutual friendship score" increased from eight to eighteen,
and her "unrequited friendship score" remained at zero.

Case D remained at the same rank of first. Her accept-
ance score was unchanged, but she gave six more points. Her
"social index score" did not change, and her "prestige score"
dropped slightly from 1.0 to .9. Her "mutual friendship
score" increased three points, and her "unrequited friend-
ship score" remained at zero.
Case E increased her total acceptance score forty-eight points, and she gave twenty more points. Her "social index score" increased from .06 to .69, and her "prestige score" increased from -.04 to .76. Her "mutual friendship score" increased from four to seventeen points, and her "unrequited friendship score" dropped from four to zero. Case E's rank increased from sixteenth to eighth.

Case F remained second high in rank; her total acceptance score increased from sixty-seven to eighty-two; she gave twenty-three more points; her "social index score" increased .20; and her "prestige score" increased .18. She increased her "mutual friendship score" sixteen points, and her "unrequited friendship score" remained at zero.

Case G retained the same rank she held in the first testing; her acceptance score increased seven points; but she gave two less points. Her "social index score" increased .02; her "prestige score" increased .04; and her "unrequited" and "mutual friendship scores" remained exactly the same.

Case H was the only case who showed a marked decrease in all scores. Part of this may have been due to the fact that shortly after mid-term he was taken out from under a doctor's care. He seemed to react aggressively to no longer being the center of attention. The children appeared to resent this aggressiveness. He dropped in rank from eight and one half to eighteen, and his total acceptance score dropped from forty-seven to four. He gave nine less points; his
"social index score" dropped from .46 to -.26; and his "prestige score" dropped from .24 to -.32. His "mutual friendship score" dropped from ten to four points, and his "unrequited friendship score" increased from one to fourteen.

Case I dropped two places in rank but increased his total acceptance one point. He gave twelve more points, increased his "social index score" .08, and increased his "prestige score" .24. His "mutual friendship score" dropped one point, and his "unrequited friendship rose one point.

Case J changed his status very little. His rank dropped two places, and his total acceptance score increased only one point. He gave twelve more points. His "social index score" increased .08, and his "prestige score" increased .24. His "mutual friendship score" dropped one point, and his "unrequited friendship score" increased one.

Case K raised his rank from eight and one half to fifth, and his total acceptance score increased twenty-two points. Case K gave one less point on the second testing. His "social index score" increased from .42 to .77, and his "prestige score" increased .25. His "mutual friendship score" increased six points, and his "unrequited score" dropped from three to zero.

Case L dropped in rank from sixth to eleven and one half, and his total acceptance score dropped from fifty-four to fifty. The number of points he gave dropped from forty-five to nineteen, and his "social index score" dropped .08.
His "prestige score" increased .12 points, and his "unrequited" and "mutual friendship scores" remained the same. Some of L's apparent loss in status may have been partially due to his desire to "run" things in the work groups.

Case M dropped four places in rank though he increased his total acceptance score by two points. He gave exactly the same number of points on both tests. His "social index score" increased .03 points, and his "prestige score" increased .09. His "mutual friendship score" remained at zero.

Case N moved up three places in rank, increased his total acceptance score twenty-seven points, and gave thirty-five more points in this testing than on the first Ohio Scale. His "social index" increased .42, and his "prestige score" increased 1.32. His "mutual friendship score" rose ten points, and his "unrequited friendship score" dropped two.

Case O improved his rank five and one half places; he increased his total acceptance score twenty-three points; and he gave forty-four more points. His "social index" increased from .41 to .73, and his "prestige score" improved .08. His "mutual friendship score" rose twenty points, and his "unrequited friendship score" remained at zero.

Case P moved up one place in rank and increased his total acceptance seventeen points. Also, he gave twelve more points. His "social index" increased .18, but his "prestige
score" dropped .10. His "mutual friendship score" increased six points, and his "unrequited friendship score" remained at zero.

Case Q remained last in rank though he improved his acceptance score by twenty-one points. He gave thirty-seven more points. His "social index score" and "prestige score" were still very low though the first improved .28 and the latter .68. His "mutual friendship score" increased four points, but his "unrequited friendship score" also increased two points.

Case R dropped one point in rank, and his total acceptance score remained exactly the same. He gave thirteen more points. His "social index score" increased .07, and his "prestige score" increased from .28 to .52. His "mutual friendship score" dropped two points, and his "unrequited friendship score" rose three points.

Case S raised his rank two places and increased his acceptance score eighteen points. He gave seventeen points less. His "social index score" increased .01, and his "prestige score" increased .42. His "mutual friendship score" increased from zero to five while his "unrequited friendship score" remained at zero.

From these brief summaries it could be seen that three of the five originally chosen for special aid seemed to have been helped. The other two were apparently helped only a very little if any. Case E improved all her scores very
markedly; Case N improved his noticeably; and Case S raised his somewhat. These latter two cases still seemed to need a great deal of help. Cases J and Q, though they improved some of their scores, were not helped to a very great extent. As will be remembered, Case J was a rather frail child inclined to be sulky if things did not go his way. From other data it was evident that he was an over-protected child. Case Q was also used to getting his way in the home and reacted very aggressively to any restraint. Both of these cases proved to be very uncooperative in the work groups.

Perhaps these children needed a more specialized type of treatment than this study afforded. Case H who dropped so markedly because of his aggressive reactions also needed some more specialized type of therapy. As for the permanency of the rise of the other children, no definite conclusion could be drawn, because there was no opportunity to give a re-test after another period of time. However, from what is known about personality changes it seems quite reasonable to assume that unless a program of aid is continuous, the child may very well lapse back into his former manner of adjustment.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

The findings concerning the possibility of changing the sociometric status of fourth graders in the North Texas State College Demonstration School using special aids and techniques, may be summarized as follows:

1. Trends concerning the low correlation between social status and such other variables as I. Q., personality scores, etc., as indicated in other studies, were borne out in this study.

2. Social status as defined by the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale changed more over a period of six months than it did as defined by a committee choosing situation.

3. In the committee choosing situation the total number of choices increased somewhat, and the number of inter-sex choices increased noticeably. Also, several students who had been quite high were grouped more closely together on the final choosing.

4. Rank as determined by either set of criteria did not change greatly, though there was a greater change in rank as determined by the Ohio Scale.
5. The girls raised their mean score in both situations more than the boys.

6. In-group feeling as determined by the Ohio Scale seemed to improve as was shown by the general rise in "social indices", "prestige scores", "mutual friendship scores", etc.

7. Three of the five children chosen for special aid seemed to have been helped to quite a great extent; the two others were helped to a much lesser degree if at all.

Conclusions

An analysis of the data in the study led to the following conclusions concerning the group used:

1. Status, as determined by a general friendship criterion, could be more easily changed than that determined by a "work-with" criterion.

2. Group rank as determined by either criterion was difficult to change markedly though there were individual exceptions.

3. The girls in this group seemed to benefit more by the training techniques used than did the boys.

4. The status of some individuals could not be changed to any great extent by the methods used in this study. It seemed that some of the pupils required some sort of individual treatment or therapy which would require personnel, time, and equipment not available in the average school. Also, the time necessary to change individual status may vary greatly from one pupil to another.
5. In this study it proved easier to aid those pupils who lacked confidence and had withdrawing tendencies than it was to help those who were actively aggressive and non-cooperative.
APPENDIX
DIRECTIONS: On a separate sheet you will find the name of every student in your class. We want you to put a number in front of every name. The number you put down should be the number of one of the following paragraphs.

"My very, very best friends." 1 I would like to have this person as one of my very, very best friends. I would like to spend a lot of time with this person and would enjoy going places with this person. I would tell some of my troubles and some of my secrets to this person and would do everything I could to help this person out of trouble. I will give a NUMBER ONE to my very, very best friends.

* * * * *

"My other friends." 2 I would enjoy working and being with this person. I would invite this person to a party, and would enjoy going on picnics with this person and our friends. I would like to talk and make and do things with this person. I would like to work with this person and I would like to be with this person often. I want this person to be one of my friends. I will give a NUMBER TWO to every person who is my friend.

* * * * *

"Not friends, but Okay." 3 I would be willing to be on a committee with this person or to be in the same club. It would be all right for this person to be on the same team with me or to live in my neighborhood. I would be in a play with this person. I would just as soon work with this person in school. This person is not one of my friends, but I think this person is all right. I will put a NUMBER THREE in front of the name of every person I think is all right.

* * * * *

"Don't know them." 4 I do not know this person very well. Maybe I would like this person, maybe I wouldn't. I don't know if I would like to be with this person. I will put a NUMBER FOUR in front of the name of every person I don't know very well.

* * * * *

"Don't care for them." 5 I say "hello" whenever I meet this person around school or on the street, but I do not enjoy being with this person. I might spend some time with this person if I didn't have anything else to do, but I would rather be with somebody else. I don't care for this person very much. I will give a NUMBER FIVE to people I don't care for very much.

* * * * *

"Dislike them." 6 I speak to this person only when it is necessary. I do not like to work with this person and would rather not talk to this person. I will give a NUMBER SIX to every person I do not like.

* * * * *

(Over)
DIRECTIONS FOR TEACHERS

1. Provide each student with a sheet of paper on which is listed the name of every student in the class -- OR -- Provide each student with a sheet of lined paper and, as you dictate, have the students write, in an orderly column, the name of every person in the class.

2. Then say: "When you have difficulty in arithmetic I try to help you. I help you with your writing, with your spelling, with reading and many other things. I also want to help you in making friends, in being good companions to other people. But to do this I must know how you feel about every boy and girl in this room and how each boy and girl feels about you. Hence, today we are asking you to tell us how you feel about the other boys and girls in this room. As soon as you have written how you feel about your classmates, all your papers will be shuffled so no one will know who filled out any certain paper.

3. "First, I want you to put the number FOUR in front of your own name. Do that now. Put a FOUR in front of your own name. If you are a girl, write GIRL at the top of your paper. If you are a boy, write BOY at the top of your paper."

4. Pause. Then say: "I am now going to read the first paragraph. Read quietly to yourself as I read aloud. If you don't know the meaning of any word, raise your hand, and I will try to help you to understand the words."

5. Teacher reads PARAGRAPH ONE. After a slight pause she says:

"If that fits any person in our room, put the number ONE in front of the name.
Put the number ONE in front of every name that it fits."

6. Pause for a minute or two while the children are writing. Then read paragraph TWO and say again:

"If that fits any person in our room, put the number TWO in front of the name.
Put the number TWO in front of every name that it fits."

Pause while students are writing. Then read the next paragraph and continue this way until all paragraphs have been read.

7. Have the students turn their papers FACE DOWN, when they have finished the task. Remind them, several times, that there should be a number in front of every name. Give them time to read the paragraphs over again to themselves. Help them out where they need help in interpreting words or phrases.

8. When the papers have been collected, shuffle them up in front of the class, and emphasize very much the point that you will not know how anybody marked the papers; that nobody can ever find out how they marked their papers.

TABULATING AND USING THE RESULTS:

You have received a CLASS SUMMARY SHEET for this Social Acceptance Scale. On the back of that sheet you will find directions for tabulating and using the results.
HOW I FEEL TOWARD OTHERS

DIRECTIONS. On another sheet of paper you have the names of all the persons in your group. You are asked to place a number to the left of each of these names. Each number you give to a name should be one of the numbers of the following paragraphs. Put a 6 to the left of your name.

1. **My best friends.** How can we tell our best friends from just ordinary friends? Below you will find listed some things which are generally true of our best friends.

   A. We want our best friends in our gang or our club.
   B. We tell our best friends some of our secrets and troubles.
   C. We have a good time with our best friends in games.
   D. We help out our best friends in any way we can without any thought of being paid back.

   Keeping the above points in mind, you are now asked to turn to your list and put a 1 to the left of the names of all those persons whom you consider to be your best friends.

2. **My other friends.** Besides our best friends all of us have other friends whom we accept and like fairly well.

   A. Whenever we meet these other friends we talk with them about things that have happened at school or in our town, but we don’t talk about our secrets or our troubles.
   B. We can play and work at school with these other friends and get along with them all right.
   C. We would invite these other friends to a party if we were going to invite a large number of guests.

   Keeping these points in mind, put a 2 to the left of the names of those persons on your list whom you regard as your other friends.

3. **Persons I don’t know.** There may be some persons in your group whom you don’t know well enough to know whether you like them or not. It may be that you have not been with them enough to tell anything about them.

   Put a 3 to the left of the names of those persons on your list whom you do not know.

4. **Persons who are not my friends.** All of us know some persons quite well, but we do not consider them to be our friends. We do not hold anything against them, but we just don’t care to be around them much.
A. We do not stop to talk with those people unless it is necessary to be polite.
B. We do not mind them being in a large group with us, but we do not have fun with them and we would rather not sit by them in school.

Put a 4 to the left of the names of those persons on your list whom you know well but do not consider to be among your friends.

5. Persons I would not want to have as friends as long as they are like they are now.

Nearly all of us find that there are at least a few people with whom we cannot get along well at all. It may be that these persons are regarded as good friends by others, but we can't get along with them. We rub each other the wrong way. As long as those persons are like they are, we shall avoid playing and working with them as much as possible.

Put a 5 to the left of the names of these persons on your list whom you would not want to have as a friend as long as they are like they are now.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Magazine Articles

Bonney, Merl E., "The Constancy of Sociometric Scores and Their Relationship to Teacher Judgements of Social Success and to Personality Self-Ratings," Sociometry, VI (November, 1943), 409-424.


Flory, Charles D., Alded, Elizabeth, and Simmons, Madeline, "Classroom Teachers Improve the Personality Adjustment of Their Pupils," Journal of Educational Research, XXXVIII (September, 1944), 1-8.


Havinghurst, R. J., and Janke, Leota L., "Relations between Ability and Social Status in a Midwestern Community I: Ten-year Old Children," The Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXV (September, 1944), 557-568.


Spence, Ralph B., "Psychodramas and Education," Sociometry, I (March, 1947), 31-34.


Young, Lyle L., and Cooper, Dan N., "Some Factors Associated with Popularity," The Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXV (December, 1944), 513-535.


Monographs


Standardized Tests

Euclid Elementary Teachers in cooperation with the College of Education, Ohio State University, The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale, for the Intermediate Grades, Form G-3, Columbus, Ohio, State Department of Education.


Thorpe, L. F., Clark, W. W., and Tieg, E. W., California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, Form A, Los Angeles, California, California Test Bureau, 1942.


Unpublished Material

"How I Feel toward Others," formulated in a graduate class in sociometry, North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, 1947.
