A STUDY OF PEER ACCEPTANCE IN A HETEROGENEOUS

SOCIO-ECONOMIC POPULATION

APPROVED:

Sidney Hamilton
Major Professor

George C Beamer
Minor Professor

Walt Blair
Director of the Department
of Education

Jack Johnson
Dean of the Graduate Division

A STUDY OF PEER ACCEPTANCE IN A HETEROGENEOUS SOCIO-ECONOMIC POPULATION

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State College in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Otto Robert Flocke, B.A.

168406

Denton, Texas

August, 1949

168406

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		iv
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS		v
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem and Its Purpose Significance and Origin of the Problem Sources of Data Method of Treatment Limitations Definition of Terms	
II.	RELATED READINGS	9
III.	METHOD OF TREATMENT	19
IV.	PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	24
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	46
	Conclusions Recommendations	
BIBLIOGRAPHY		49

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Analysis of Group Indices With Data for Obtaining the Index	34
2.	Analysis of the Intra-sex and Inter-sex Relationships of the Eight Classroom Groups . .	36
3.	Chi Square Showing Sex-Group Relations and Group Socialization	39
4.	A Tabulation Showing the Inter-Group and Intra-Group Indices for the Socio-Economic Levels in Each of the Eight Classrooms	41
5.	Chi Square Value Tabulated to Show the Chance Probabilities of Socio-Economic Factors in Socialization	43
6.	A Comparison of the Chance Probabilities of Academic Classifications and Socialization .	45

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure		Page
1.	A Sociometric Scattergram Showing Distribution of Ratings by Sex-Groups and Socio-Economic Groups for Group I.	26
2.	A Sociometric Scattergram Showing Distribution of Ratings by Sex-Groups and Socio-Economic Groups for Group II	27
3.	A Sociometric Scattergram Showing Distribution of Ratings by Sex-Groups and Socio-Economic Groups for Group III	28
4.	A Sociometric Scattergram Showing Distribution of Ratings by Sex-Groups and Socio-Economic Groups for Group IV.	29
5.	A Sociometric Scattergram Showing Distribution of Ratings by Sex-Groups and Socio-Economic Groups for Group V.	30
6.	A Sociometric Scattergram Showing Distribution of Ratings by Sex-Groups and Socio-Economic Groups for Group VI	31
7.	A Sociometric Scattergram Showing Distribution of Ratings by Sex-Groups and Socio-Economic Groups for Group VII	32
8.	A Sociometric Scattergram Showing Distribution of Ratings by Sex-Groups and Socio-Economic Groups for Group VIII.	33

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem and Its Purpose

Although many studies have dealt with the socialization of children, there still remains a number of questions to be answered through research. Good leadership has long been recognized as an essential in the betterment of any society, and no better place affords the opportunities for the development of this leadership than does the school.

Different social and economic levels within society present many similar behavior patterns as well as some which are different. It was desirable to compare social relationships among three socio-economic groups through sociometric data in order to investigate the change in total group socialization caused by socio-economic factors. The comparison was based on the social acceptance of each socio-economic group and its intra-social structure. Another comparison was made to determine the effects of inter-social relationships.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effect of socio-economic levels on the sociability of pupils of the Hillcrest High School in Dallas, Texas.

Students were grouped so that as near as possible an equal number of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors were in each home room. This policy was followed by the principal because he believed it would lessen the burden of the teachers; and at the same time, enable them to become more familiar with the individual pupil since no teacher would ever have a completely new group as a result of graduation. It has often been asserted that any administrative policy should be designed to benefit the pupils. With this in mind, a secondary purpose of the study was considered: namely, how such a policy would affect the socialization of the pupils.

Significance and Origin of the Problem

Today, as never before, the people of the world are struggling to improve living conditions based upon sound policies of peace. From all past experiences and sound philosophies, the existing need of a "natural leadership" is certainly understood. It has been proved time and again that the choice of such leadership should be based upon more than mere circumstantiality. In order that these leaders might be fitted for the propagation of a way of life which will prevent further destruction, it is imperative that we now determine the potential leaders of tomorrow and begin

the cultivation of the meaning and responsibility of true leadership. In seeking these individuals, society must first turn to the schools.

Peace for the individual is based upon sound emotional adjustment. Psychologists have come to agree that good social adjustment is necessary in order to have this emotional stability. Adult social adjustment is directly dependent upon adjustment in earlier life. When the individuals benefit, society is bettered.

In order to aid in this undertaking, it is necessary to understand the group. Sociometry is playing an important role in helping to understand the inter-personal structure of society. Through the study of sociometry, intra-group relationships and levels of prestige are more easily found. Any study within this area will be a contribution to the betterment of mankind.

Sources of Data

Data used in this study have come primarily from sociometric tests administered during the fall semester of 1948 to one hundred and sixty-one pupils of the Hillcrest High School in Dallas, Texas. As a result of absences, a number of pupils enrolled in that school were not used. The group used was composed of ninety-three boys and sixty-eight girls.

The entire group readily adhered to a natural division of three separate socio-economic levels. These groups were designated as Vickery, Preston, and Outsider in accordance with the area of Dallas in which they resided. Vickery described that group of pupils who lived in Vickery, a section of Dallas. The area was a relatively new settlement which has been established as a result of the shifting of population which occurred during World War II. The inhabitants of this area were, in general, the upper-middle-class population of Dallas, Texas. This area was described as the home of the more successful businessmen and bankers. Preston, another settlement of Dallas, was an old section and chiefly occupied by the upper-class population. This group has often been designated as the "silk-stocking" area. Resentment was believed to have existed between these two groups. Outsiders were those individuals who did not live in either Preston or Vickery. The result of this distribution of pupils was fifty-one in Vickery, sixty-two in Preston, and forty-eight in Outsiders.

The study included all eight of the home rooms in the Hillcrest High School. One room was composed of only eighth-grade pupils; all the other rooms were as equally distributed as possible according to all classifications. The eighth-grade class was intended to serve as a control group in

measuring the effects of combining groups at the various levels of classification on socialization. The first group was composed of eight pupils from Vickery, six from Preston and eight from Outsiders making a total of twenty-two. There were fourteen boys and eight girls. Group two was composed of seven from Vickery, ten from Preston and five from Outsiders. There were eleven boys and eleven girls, a total of twenty-two. In the third group Vickery contained seven, Preston nine and Outsiders three. There were eleven boys and eight girls with a total of nineteen pupils. In group four there were six from Vickery, six from Preston, three from Outsiders, with nine boys, and six girls making a total of fifteen. There were seven from Vickery, six from Preston, and seven from Outsiders making a total of twenty comprising group five in which there were ten boys and ten girls. In group six there were twenty-two; seven from Vickery, five from Preston, and ten from Outsiders with a total of thirteen boys and nine girls. Group seven was composed of nine from Vickery, five from Preston and six from Outsiders with ten boys and ten girls making a total of twenty. Group eight was composed of all eighth grade pupils consisting of fifteen boys and six girls which made a total of twenty-one. In group eight there were no pupils from Vickery, fifteen from Preston, and six from Outsiders.

Method of Treatment

A comparative analysis of the realtionships within the group studied will be made by computing group indices and comparing them by a chi square technique. The chi square technique was selected because it will permit an application of mathematical procedures to categories which are not strictly quantitative. The chi square technique will weight each group proportionately to every other group even though the size of the groups vary. "P" values will be determined from the chi squares in order to evaluate the probabilities of such score occurring by chance. If the "P" values are between .05 and .01, it will be assumed that the relationships exist beyond the element of chance and that the null hypothesis does not hold true. The null hypothesis assumes that no relationship exists between the two traits being considered. This comparison will give some insight into the socialization with its dependence on socio-economic status, sex, and academic classification.

Limitations

A number of limitations were encountered in this study. Only one factor was used as a criterion for determining socio-economic levels. A broader criterion would have been much more valid. However, the school year was terminating

and it was not deemed desirable to utilize more of the classroom teachers' time in the collection of data. For the same reason, the data on academic classification was also incomplete. Another important limitation which was encountered was the fact that this study was dependent upon a single testing of socialization. Even though the scale used was valid and reliable, several testing situations would have been more desirable. Another limitation was that too many students were omitted as a result of absences.

Definition of Terms

Sociometry.--Sociometry is the study of inter-group and intra-group relationships.

Sociometric tests.--Sociometric tests are those scales devised for the purpose of measuring relationships between and within groups.

Group index.--The group index is a numerical expression of the relationship within the group. It is designed to express the "in-group" feeling found within the group.

Intra-group.--Intra-group refers to that relationship existing within the designated group.

Inter-group.--Inter-group refers to that relationship existing between two groups.

Sociogram.--A sociogram is a pictorial representation of the structure of a group and the relationships of its members with each other.[1]

Intra-sex.--Intra-sex refers to the relationship existing within the same group.

Inter-sex.--Inter-sex refers to the relationship existing between the boys and the girls.

Rater.--A rater is the student who gives the rate on the sociometric scale.

Ratee.--A ratee is the student who is being rated on the sociometric scale.

---

[1]Tom Land, "A Comparative Sociometric Study of Negro and White Children" (Unpublished M.S. thesis, Department of Education, North Texas State Teachers College, 1948), p. 9.

CHAPTER II

RELATED READINGS

Do those children who come from superior socio-economic home backgrounds achieve a greater degree of social acceptance or recognition than do those who come from average or inferior homes? This is an important question in the understanding of the total matrix of factors entering into an individual's group status.

One would be led to believe that those individuals who come from homes in the upper income brackets are decidedly superior to those from lower level income groups in attaining social recognition in school groups since it is obvious that these individuals have numerous advantages in respect to spending money, clothes, family influence, and cultural stimulation. Though studies bear out this assumption, it is not done with a high degree of uniformity, and the relationship between social status and economic status is not as high as might be expected.

Young and Cooper[1] in a study of children in eleven

---

[1] L.L. Young and D.H. Cooper, "Some Factors Associated With Popularity", Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXV (December, 1944), 513-535.

public school classrooms in a suburban city in California did not find a statistically reliable difference between the socio-economic status of a group of forty-four very popular children. The socio-economic status was measured with the "Sims' Score Card for Socio-Economic Status"[2].

This negligible influence of socio-economic level finds some support in the very low correlation of coefficient of .21 reported by Hsia[3] as the index of relationship between results on the Chapman and Sims' "Socio-Economic Scale" and social success scores based on both pupil choices and teacher ratings. His subjects were 280 elementary school children in Queens, New York City.

More relationship than shown in these two studies was found in Hardy's[4] study of nearly 400 children in twelve public schools in Joliet, Illinois. She reports a coefficient of .46 between home and neighborhood ratings combined on the one hand and social acceptance scores on the other.

Most studies have shown trends a little lower than that reported by Hardy, nevertheless, high enough to indicate that

---

[2]V.M. Sims, "Sims' Score Card for Socio-Economic Status".

[3]Jui-Ching Hsia, A Study of the Sociability of Elementary School Children, pp. 23-27.

[4]M.C. Hardy, "Social Recognition at the Elementary School Age", Journal of Social Psychology, VIII(February, 1937), 365-384.

children from the better homes within a particular group have some advantages in winning social recognition from their associates. For example, Flocke[5] found a coefficient of .39 between socio-economic scores and social acceptance scores on ninety-two elementary school children in the Demonstration School attached to North Texas State Teachers College, Denton, Texas. In his study the socio-economic level was measured by "The Minnesota Home Status Index"[6]. This scale included items which measured home background in regard to: Children's Facilities, Economic Status, Cultural Status Sociality, Occupational Status, and Educational Status of Parents.

The factor of socio-economic level assumes greater importance when attention is turned to mutual friendships rather than to general social acceptance. The highest coefficient reported is .71 which was found by Jenkins[7] in a study of mutual friends in a population of over 200 junior high school children in Riverside, California. Socio-economic level in

---

[5] O.R. Flocke, "A Study of the Relationships Between 'The Minnesota Home Status Index' and Social Rank on the 'How I Feel Towards Others Scale'", (Unpublished graduate problems course, Department of Psychology, North Texas State Teachers College, 1947).

[6] A.M. Leahy, "The Minnesota Home Status Index".

[7] C.C. Jenkins, "Factors Involved In Children's Friendships", Journal of Educational Psychology, XXII(December, 1931), 440-448.

this study was determined by dividing the children into four groups on the basis of their fathers' occupations. These groups were: (1) unskilled and semi-skilled, (2) skilled labor, (3) semi-professional, and (4) professional. These are broad categories. No doubt the high coefficient obtained was partly due to the rather wide range of economic levels included in each of the major sub-divisions. Also, when only the father's occupation is used, there is no way to evaluate the role of social and cultural influence in the homes since it cannot be assumed that these influences closely parallel the fathers' occupational classifications.

An almost equal coefficient, .73, was reported by Dimock[8] in a study of thirty-eight pairs of adolescent boy friends, in which socio-economic level was measured by the "Sims' Score Card for Socio-Economic Status", a scale which does include social and cultural items. Furthermore, the above coefficient was the highest relationship found by Dimock out of twenty measures which he correlated with his pairs of friends.

The weakness of using only four large categories for classifying fathers' occupations as was done by Jenkins was alleviated in a study reported by Smith[9]. Using 103 high

---

[8] H.S. Dimock, Rediscovering the Adolescent, pp. 90-140.

[9] M. Smith, "Some Factors in Friendship Selection of High School Students", Sociometry, VII(August, 1944), 303-313.

school seniors as subjects, he divided them into nine categories on the basis of fathers' occupations. When the friendship choices of these young people were related to the occupational groupings, it was found that these choices fell within specific categories to an extent which was one-half as great as chance would allow. The tendency toward economic cohesiveness was a little greater when the friendship preferences were related to eight categories based on fathers' credit rating alone. Although these data are not directly comparable to the result found by Jenkins and Dimock, due to the difference in statistical method, the same point is emphasized.

A study by Neugarten [10] on fifth and sixth grade children supported the foregoing major point in showing that most mutual friendships are formed within fairly similar socio-economic levels.

Bonney[11] proports that there are obvious reasons why the majority of friendships are formed between individuals of approximately the same economic and cultural levels. Among these are such factors as similarity in material possessions, clothes, cleanliness, and manners. Also, there is the factor of

---

[10] B.L. Neugarten, "Social Class and Friendship Among School Children", American Journal of Sociology, LI(January, 1946), 305-313.

[11] M.E. Bonney, (Unpublished data gathered on home background and social acceptance in the Demonstration School of North Texas State Teachers College, Denton, Texas, 1948).

proximity of residence. Perhaps one of the strongest influences of all is that of parental pressure. Bonney believed that many parents, especially those in the upper income levels, use both direct and indirect means of influencing their children not to play with certain other children whose antecedents and present circumstances are considered inferior. No doubt most children reflect the class stereotypes of their parents.

Ill effects which may result from throwing together individuals who come from markedly different home backgrounds is emphasized in a study reported by Henkle and Kuhlen[12]. Their subjects were 163 boys in a summer camp in New York State, including twenty-eight boys who came from a much lower socio-economic level than the great majority of the rest of the group. These twenty-eight boys were sent to the camp by a social service organization in their city. The main purpose of this study was to measure by the use of standardized personality scales what changes, if any, would take place in personal and social adjustment of the boys as a result of two weeks of camping experience. The measuring instruments used were the Washburne "Social Adjustment

---

[12] M.W. Henkle and R.G. Kuhlen, "Changes in Social Adjustment in a Summer Camp: A Preliminary Report", Journal of Psychology, XV(April, 1943), 223-231.

Inventory"[13] for the boys twelve years of age or over, and the Rogers' "Test of Personality Adjustment" for those eleven years of age and under. These scales were administered at the beginning and at the end of the two week period.

The final analysis showed that the older boys registered small gains on the personality scale, but no statistically reliable gains were found for the younger boys. Of greatest interest, however, for the present study, was the finding that most of the twenty-eight underprivileged boys actually lost in personal and social adjustment on the basis of their own responses to the personality measuring instruments. This was especially true of the eighteen younger boys. They registered an average loss which was highly reliable statistically. Fifteen of the eighteen rated themselves lower at the end of the camping experience than at the beginning. How shall this result be accounted for?

The authors of this study answer the above question by saying that "these boys, (the underprivileged), do not appropriate equipment, and in spite of anonymity are 'spotted' by the others because they sleep in their underwear, do not have toothbrushes, and lack spending money. They watch the 'candy line' instead of being in it, and in sundry respects

---

[13] C. Rogers, "A Test of Personality Adjustment".

are conspicuous because of 'lacks'. Certainly the situation is such that feelings of inferiority and of being different from others might be expected to arise."[14]

These reports should not be interpreted as designating no crossing of the lines of socio-economic barriers. Most studies indicate some interaction between the levels. However, for the most part, the crossing over is very limited and would probably not be seen between the extremes of the groups.

Hollingshead[15] made a study of a community in the Middle West of some 10,000 inhabitants. His study was primarily concerned with the 369 boys and 366 girls between the ages of thirteen and nineteen who were in high school. The primary purpose of the study was to test the hypothesis that the social behavior of adolescents was related functionally to the position their families occupied in the social structure of the community. The social structure of the town was found to be stratified into five classes. These classifications were based upon the judgments made by residents of the community. After the preliminary judgments were made, Hollingshead further substantiated his classifications of each adolescent and

---

[14] M.W. Henkle and R.G. Kuhlen, "Changes in Social Adjustment in a Summer Camp: A Preliminary Report", Journal of Psychology, XV(April, 1943), 28.

[15] A.B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth.

and family by anecdotal records on the clubs, cliques, and peer relationships.

Further investigation by Hollingshead into the participation in extra-curricular activities in school revealed that the highest prestige group showed the greatest participation, and that the percentages dropped directly with the levels down to the lowest group. It also discovered that more girls than boys participated in the extra-curricular activities. Clique relationships within and between classes indicated that relations were stronger among peers and decreased at the classes became farther apart on the social scale. The boys and girls chose as their best friends members of their own class or of a class higher on the social scale.

Hollingshead selected chi square as the statistical method for testing the significance of the relationship between class positions and behavior of the adolescents because it enabled him to apply mathematical procedures to categories that were not strictly quantitative. It also weighted each case proportionately to every other case.

The fact that economic factors were significant and important in the determination of class position of any family or person was stressed by Warner, Meeker, and Eells.[16] They

---

[16] W.L. Warner, M. Meeker, and K.E. Eells, "Social Status in Education", The Phi Delta Kappan, XXX(December, 1948), 113-119.

agreed that economics alone were not enough to explain completely the phenomena of social class. "Something more than a large income is necessary for high social position. Money must be translated into socially approved behavior and possessions, and they in turn must be translated into intimate participation with, an acceptance by, members of a superior class."[17]

---

[17] Ibid, 116.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

This study was begun in a sociometric class of North Texas State Teachers College in 1947-1948. As a means of obtaining the social acceptance of each pupil, a newly devised sociometric test, "How I Feel Towards Others Scale",[1] was administered. The requirements of a good sociometric test are that it reaches and measures two-way relationships, that the participants in the situation are drawn to one another by one or more criteria: that a criterion is selected to which the participants are bound to respond at the moment of the test with a high degree of spontaneity; that the subjects are adequately motivated so that they may give sincere responses; and that the criterion selected for testing is strong, enduring, and definite: not weak, transitory, and indefinite.[2]

The new sociometry scale adequately met those standards laid down by Moreno. Merl E. Bonney and the class in

---

[1]Merl E. Bonney, "How I Feel Towards Others", (Unpublished sociometric scale, Dept. of Education, North Texas State Teachers College, 1947), (Mimeographed).

[2]J.L. Moreno, "Sociometry and the Cultural Order", Sociometry, VI(August, 1943), 327.

sociometry scrupulously considered the merits of this scale in the light of Moreno's suggestions and in comparison with comparable scales.[3]

The scale entitled "How I Feel Towards Others", was based upon five categories, each of which represented a degree of attraction to an individual or a repulsion from another individual. The first category included those persons who were considered as very very best friends. Within this group the rater was to place those friends to whom he would tell secrets and troubles; those individuals whom he would want in his secret gang or club, and those whom he would help but not expect favor in return. The second category was composed of those persons who were other friends, but not considered in the same light as group one. In this group were those individuals whom the rater enjoyed being with but to whom he would not tell his secrets and troubles nor want in his secret gang or club. The third category was for those individuals whom the rater did not know well enough to rate. Perhaps he knew their names and faces, but he did not believe he knew them sufficiently to say whether he liked or disliked them. The fourth category was designed to describe those students who were not his friends. In this category the rater was to consider those individuals whom he did not

---

[3]"The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale", Ohio University Press.

consider as friends and with whom he did not prefer to associate. If he met these pupils in the hall he would talk with them but for politeness sake only. The fifth category was reserved for those whom he would not want as friends as long as they were as they were then. This point was designed to include those students with whom the rater would not associate. Each category was assigned a number as 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. Each pupil was given a copy of the scale and a list of the names of students in his class. Each was asked to place a six beside his own name to identify the papers. Students also supplied their addresses so that they might be grouped in Vickery, Preston, or Outsiders. After these instructions were followed, the testees were asked to place one of the following numbers: 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 to the left of each of the names appearing on the list of names in his possession.

In order that as much rapport as possible might be established between the tester and testee, the home room teachers administered the scale to their own groups. The writer was present to assist in answering any questions which arose.

The following weighting system was employed: each first choice was allotted two positive points: each second choice

was allotted one positive point; each third choice was allotted zero value; each fourth choice was allotted one negative point; and each fifth choice was allotted two negative points.

The results of each class were tabulated on a sociogram which was devised by Earl Kooker and Raymond Christal in 1947-1948. The sociogram was so arranged that a picture of inter-group and intra-group relationship was readily seen. It also revealed how each inter-sex and intra-sex group rated the others and how socio-economic groups rated each other. A clear orofile of the relationships between the several academic classifications was shown.

By algebraically adding the received weighted scores of each pupil and dividing that score by the possible score he might have received, it was possible to determine an individual index for each. From this procedure, rank order positions within the various classes were readily determined. Group indices were determined in much the same manner. The points received within the group were added algebraically and divided by the possible score. These indices made it possible to compare the social structure of each group as well as the social acceptance of each individual within that group.

These data were statiscally arranged according to the method discussed in Chapter I so that the best possible

comparison among groups and individuals was permitted. Chi squares and indices were used in making these statistical comparisons.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The data collected to determine the significance of the socio-economic divisions and the methods employed in formulating the numerical divisions according to classification and their effect upon socialization of the whole group were gathered by administration of the "How I Feel Towards Others Scale" to one hundred and sixty-one pupils of the Hillcrest High School in Dallas, Texas.

All results from the "How I Feel Towards Others Scale" were tabulated into eight scattergrams. Since these figures served only as a point of reference for further analysis, it was deemed desirable to present them in consecutive order for the sake of coherence. These eight illustrations were placed on pages 26 through 33.

Numbers were used in lieu of names in order to respect the integrity of the students. These numbers served to identify the students. The letter "P" was placed after the numbers of those students who were from the Preston area. A "V" was placed after the number of those from Vickery, and an "O" followed the numbers of students from the Outsider group.

The numbers were arranged in sex groups to permit a showing of inter-sex and intra-sex relationships. In all cases the boys were assigned the smallest numbers and the girls had the largest numbers. The blank vertical and horizontal rows separate the groups.

In all cases those students who gave the rates were arranged across the table horizontally and those receiving the rates were arranged vertically. The upper areas of the sociograms denoted ratings for intra-sex relationships. The manner in which boys rated boys was seen in the upper left areas. Ratings girls gave girls were indicated in the upper right hand areas. Lower divisions showed inter-sex ratings. Boys' ratings for girls occupied the lower left hand sections and girls' ratings of boys occupied the lower right hand sectors. This arrangement readily showed the four inter-sex and intra-sex sub-groups used in the comparisons.

Raw scores were tabulated on the sociograms for the sake of uniformity. Much of the statistics was computed from raw score values. Weighted values were derived from these data by conversion in accordance with the system of weighting discussed in Chapter III. Each first choice was allotted two positive points: each second choice, one positive point; each third choice, zero value; each fourth choice, one negative point; and each fifth choice, two negative points.

Rater \ Ratee	V 1	V 2	V 3	V 4	V 5	V 6	V 7	V 8	P 9	P 10	P 11	P 12	O 13	O 14		P 15	P 16	O 17	O 18	O 19	O 20	O 21	O 22
V 1		1	2	5	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2		2	2	5	5	4	1	2	3
V 2	1		2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2		2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
V 3	2	2		2	3	2	4	3	2	3	3	3	2	5		2	2	4	2	2	5	2	3
V 4	2	2	2		4	2	4	2	2	2	2	3	2	4		2	2	2	1	2	5	2	3
V 5	1	2	2	4		2	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	1		2	3	4	2	1	4	3	3
V 6	1	2	4	4	2		4	2	2	2	2	5	2	2		2	3	4	2	1	2	2	3
V 7	1	2	4	4	1	2		2	3	2	3	3	3	1		2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3
V 8	1	2	2	1	1	1	1		3	1	2	1	3	1		2	3	3	2	1	1	2	3
P 9	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3		2	3	2	3	3		2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
P 10	2	2	3	2	2	1	4	2	2		1	2	3	2		2	3	5	3	1	1	2	3
P 11	2	2	3	2	2	1	1	2	2	1		2	3	2		2	3	2	3	1	1	2	3
P 12	1	2	2	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	2		3	2		2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3
O 13	2	2	2	3	3	2	4	2	3	3	4	2		2		2	3	1	2	2	2	2	3
O 14	2	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	2			2	3	4	1	4	2	3	2
P 15	2	3	2	2	4	3	4	2	3	3	4	2	2	1			3	1	1	2	1	2	3
P 16	2	2	4	3	4	3	4	4	2	4	5	2	3	3		2		3	2	2	4	4	2
O 17	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	2	3	4	2	2	3		2	3		1	2	4	2	3
O 18	2	3	4	1	3	3	4	3	2	3	5	3	2	1		2	2	1		2	2	2	2
O 19	2	3	4	1	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3		2	2	3	2		5	4	3
O 20	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	4	4	2	2	1		2	2	3	2	2		2	3
O 21	2	2	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	3		2	2	3	2	2	4		3
O 22	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	2	3	3	5	3	3	3		2	2	3	2	1	3	4	

Fig. 1--A sociometric scattergram showing distribution of ratings by sex-groups and socio-economic groups for Group I.

Rater \ Ratee	O 1	P 2	P 3	P 4	V 5	P 6	P 7	V 8	O 9	V 10	P 11		P 12	O 13	P 14	P 15	O 16	O 17	P 18	V 19	V 20	V 21	V 22
O 1		3	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	1	3		2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	4
P 2	2		1	3	1	3	1	1	2	3	3		3	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	3
P 3	2	1		2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2		2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
P 4	2	3	1		2	1	3	1	4	4	1		2	1	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	2
V 5	2	1	2	3		3	1	2	2	3	3		3	1	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	4	3
P 6	3	3	1	2	3		3	3	3	3	1		2	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	3	2
P 7	2	1	2	3	1	3		1	3	3	3		3	1	3	2	2	2	2	1	4	2	3
V 8	3	1	2	2	2	2	1		3	2	2		3	2	2	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	3
O 9	2	1	1	3	2	2	1	2		3	2		3	1	3	2	2	2	3	2	4	2	4
V 10	1	3	2	3	2	4	3	3	3		3		2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
P 11	3	3	1	1	3	1	5	2	2	3			2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	5	3	2
P 12	2	2	2	2	2	4	3	3	3	3	2			4	3	3	1	3	3	5	4	2	2
O 13	2	1	1	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	3		3		2	2	2	2	2	2	5	2	2
P 14	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3		3	1		1	3	3	2	3	3	1	3
P 15	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3		3	2	1		3	3	3	2	1	4	3
O 16	3	1	1	2	3	4	4	2	3	3	2		1	2	3	4		2	3	3	4	2	2
O 17	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	3		3	4	3	3	1		1	2	1	2	3
P 18	3	1	2	3	2	3	2	1	3	3	3		3	1	2	2	2	1		2	2	2	3
V 19	3	1	2	3	1	3	1	2	1	3	3		4	5	3	4	4	3	4		5	5	4
V 20	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3		4	2	3	2	3	3	2	4		3	3
V 21	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3		2	5	3	2	1	2	2	2	2		2
V 22	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	3		4	2	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	

Fig. 2--A sociometric scattergram showing distribution of ratings by sex-groups and socio-economic groups for Group II.

Rater \ Ratee	P 1	P 2	O 3	P 4	P 5	P 6	P 7	V 8	P 9	V 10	V 11		V 12	P 13	O 14	O 15	V 16	P 17	V 18	V 19
P 1		2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2		3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2
P 2	3		3	1	4	2	3	1	4	3	3		2	3	4	3	2	2	2	3
O 3	2	2		3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3		3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2
P 4	3	1	3		3	3	3	2	2	5	3		2	3	3	3	3	2	3	4
P 5	1	2	2	2		2	2	2	2	5	2		2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3
P 6	1	2	2	2	2		2	1	1	2	2		2	3	2	3	3	4	3	4
P 7	3	2	3	4	3	3		2	1	2	2		3	3	3	3	3	2	5	2
V 8	2	2	2	3	2	1	2		1	2	3		3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3
P 9	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1		2	3		3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
V 10	3	2	3	4	3	3	2	2	3		1		2	3	4	4	2	3	3	3
V 11	2	2	2	4	2	3	1	2	3	1			4	5	3	2	3	3	3	3
V 12	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	2	3			2	3	3	2	3	1	2
P 13	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3		2		2	1	2	2	3	3
O 14	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	2	5	3		2	2		2	2	2	3	2
O 15	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3		3	1	3		2	2	3	3
V 16	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	2		2	2	3	3		3	2	4
P 17	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3		2	4	2	2	3		2	1
V 18	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3		1	4	3	3	2	2		2
V 19	2	1	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2	1	2	3	1	2	

Fig. 3--A sociometric scattergram showing distribution of ratings by sex-groups and socio-economic groups for Group III.

Rater \ Ratee	O 1	V 2	P 3	P 4	V 5	V 6	P 7	P 8	O 9		O 10	V 11	P 12	P 13	V 14	V 15
O 1		2	2	2	1	2	5	2	5		3	2	3	3	2	3
V 2	1		3	2	1	2	2	2	3		2	2	3	2	2	2
P 3	3	3		2	3	3	3	2	2		3	2	2	3	2	3
P 4	1	2	1		2	2	1	2	2		3	3	2	2	1	1
V 5	2	1	3	2		2	3	2	2		2	2	3	2	2	1
V 6	1	2	1	2	1		2	2	2		2	2	3	2	2	1
P 7	2	2	2	2	2	4		2	5		2	2	3	2	2	3
P 8	3	2	1	3	3	3	3		4		3	3	2	3	2	3
O 9	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2			3	3	2	3	3	3
O 10	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	3			2	2	1	1	2
V 11	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	4		2		3	1	2	3
P 12	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2		3	2		3	2	3
P 13	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	2	2		1	2	3		3	2
V 14	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	5		2	2	1	1		1
V 15	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	4		2	2	3	4	2	

Fig. 4--A sociometric scattergram showing distribution of ratings by sex-groups and socio-economic group for Group IV.

Rater		Ratee 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
P	1		2	4	4	3	2	2	4	5	5		2	2	2	3	2	4	4	3	3	3
V	2	4		2	2	2	2	2	3	3	1		3	2	3	5	2	2	4	2	4	4
V	3	2	1		2	2	1	2	3	3	1		3	2	3	3	2	2	4	3	3	3
P	4	2	1	2		3	2	2	1	2	2		2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3
V	5	3	2	4	2		2	2	3	2	2		3	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	3
V	6	2	2	2	2	2		4	3	1	2		3	2	3	3	4	3	3	2	2	3
O	7	2	1	4	2	2	2		3	1	1		2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
P	8	2	1	2	1	2	2	2		3	2		2	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	3
P	9	5	2	4	2	2	2	1	3		2		3	2	3	1	4	3	3	3	3	4
O	10	5	1	4	3	2	2	1	3	2			3	3	3	1	4	3	3	2	3	2
O	11	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2			2	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	3
V	12	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	1		2		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
P	13	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3		3	2		5	1	2	2	3	2	3
V	14	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	3	1	4		3	2	3		1	3	2	2	1	1
P	15	4	2	4	2	2	3	3	3	5	2		3	3	3	1		2	2	1	2	2
O	16	3	1	4	2	2	3	2	1	3	5		4	1	3	4	1		2	4	2	3
O	17	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2		2	2	2	4	1	2		4	2	2
O	18	3	2	4	3	3	3	1	3	3	1		3	2	3	2	1	3	2		2	2
V	19	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	2	3	1	2	3	2	2		1
O	20	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	3	4	2		3	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	1	

Fig. 5-- A sociometric scattergram showing distribution of ratings by sex-groups and socio-economic groups for Group V.

Rater \ Ratee	V 1	V 2	V 3	V 4	P 5	O 6	O 7	O 8	O 9	O 10	O 11	O 12	O 13		V 14	V 15	V 16	P 17	P 18	P 19	P 20	O 21	O 22
V 1		1	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2		3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2
V 2	1		2	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	2		3	2	4	2	3	4	3	3	3
V 3	4	5		1	2	5	3	3	2	4	3	4	2		3	4	2	5	4	3	5	3	3
V 4	2	2	1		4	5	3	3	2	3	3	4	2		2	4	5	3	4	3	2	2	4
P 5	2	2	5	4		2	5	2	1	2	2	1	2		4	2	4	4	5	3	2	3	5
O 6	2	3	5	5	2		1	3	2	2	1	3	2		2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
O 7	2	3	2	2	4	1		2	2	2	2	1	1		5	3	2	5	3	2	5	2	4
O 8	1	1	2	3	3	3	2		3	3	3	1	2		3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2
O 9	2	2	4	3	3	3	3	2		4	2	4	2		3	2	4	2	4	3	3	3	3
O 10	2	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	3		2	4	2		2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2
O 11	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	3	1	2		2	2		3	2	4	2	4	2	2	3	4
O 12	2	1	2	1	3	2	1	1	3	2	2		2		2	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2
O 13	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	5	1			3	3	2	1	5	5	2	2	2
V 14	3	3	2	2	2	2	5	3	3	2	2	5	2			2	1	3	2	2	1	2	3
V 15	1	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	1	4	2	3	2		2		2	1	2	2	2	2	3
V 16	2	3	2	2	2	2	5	3	2	3	2	2	2		1	2		2	2	2	1	1	5
P 17	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	4	2	3	2		3	1	2		1	2	3	2	2
P 18	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2		3	2	1	2		2	2	1	1
P 19	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2		4	2	4	2	2		3	2	4
P 20	2	4	2	1	1	2	5	3	3	2	2	5	2		1	2	1	2	2	2		1	4
O 21	3	3	3	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2		2	3	1	2	2	2	1		2
O 22	2	3	2	2	2	2	4	3	2	2	2	3	2		2	2	2	2	2	4	2	2	

Fig. 6--A sociometric scattergram showing distribution of ratings by sex-groups and socio-economic groups for Group VI.

Rater	Ratee	O 1	P 2	V 3	V 4	V 5	O 6	V 7	P 8	O 9	V 10		V 11	O 12	P 13	V 14	V 15	O 16	O 17	V 18	P 19	P 20
O	1		3	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1		2	3	3	2	3	3	1	3	3	2
P	2	3		3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
V	3	1	3		2	2	2	3	2	2	2		2	4	3	2	3	2	1	3	2	3
V	4	1	2	2		1	2	1	3	2	1		2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3
V	5	2	3	2	2		2	2	2	1	1		2	2	3	1	3	2	1	2	3	2
O	6	2	2	2	3	3		2	2	1	2		2	2	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	2
V	7	3	1	3	1	1	2		2	2	2		3	3	2	1	1	3	3	1	3	3
P	8	2	3	2	3	1	2	2		1	2		2	3	3	2	3	3	1	3	2	3
O	9	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1		2		2	3	2	2	3	2	1	3	2	2
V	10	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2			2	2	3	2	1	3	3	2	2	1
V	11	2	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	1	2			2	2	1	2	2	1	3	3	4
O	12	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5		3		3	2	3	3	1	2	3	3
P	13	3	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	5	5		2	3		5	5	2	1	4	4	2
V	14	3	5	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	2		2	5	2		1	3	1	1	3	5
V	15	3	5	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	4		3	4	5	2		3	1	2	3	4
O	16	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	2	2	2		2	3	2	5	4		1	3	2	1
O	17	2	4	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	4		2	3	3	2	1	2		2	1	1
V	18	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	4		2	2	3	1	3	3	1		3	4
P	19	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3		2	3	4	3	3	1	1	2		1
P	20	2	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2		2	3	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	

Fig. 7--A sociometric scattergram showing distribution of ratings by sex-groups and socio-economic groups for Group VII.

Rater	Ratee	O 1	P 2	P 3	P 4	P 5	P 6	P 7	P 8	P 9	O 10	P 11	O 12	O 13	O 14	P 15		P 16	P 17	O 18	P 19	P 20	P 21
O	1		2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2		2	2	4	1	2	2
P	2	2		1	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1		2	2	2	1	2	2
P	3	1	1		1	2	2	1	1	3	1	5	1	1	2	1		2	3	3	2	2	3
P	4	1	5	2		4	1	2	5	3	1	2	2	2	2	4		1	2	2	1	1	2
P	5	2	2	5	5		2	2	2	2	5	2	1	1	3	2		4	5	2	4	4	5
P	6	1	2	2	1	2		2	5	2	1	2	1	1	2	2		2	2	2	2	2	2
P	7	1	2	1	5	2	2		1	2	2	2	1	1	3	2		5	5	3	4	3	5
P	8	1	2	2	5	4	2	1		2	1	3	1	1	3	2		4	3	2	2	3	3
P	9	1	5	3	5	2	2	3	2		2	1	1	1	2	5		5	3	2	2	2	3
O	10	1	2	5	2	2	2	3	2	3		5	1	1	2	2		2	2	2	1	2	2
P	11	1	2	4	2	1	2	4	2	1	2		1	1	2	2		2	2	2	1	2	2
O	12	2	2	1	5	2	1	2	2	2	1	4		2	2	3		4	2	3	1	2	2
O	13	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1		2	1		1	2	2	2	2	2
O	14	1	5	4	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	1	2		5		2	2	2	2	2	2
P	15	3	1	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	2	4	2	1	5			5	5	5	5	5	2
P	16	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	3	3			2	1	1	1	2
P	17	1	2	3	2	4	2	3	2	3	2	3	1	1	3	3		5		1	1	1	1
O	18	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3		4	2		1	1	2
P	19	1	4	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	4		5	4	1		1	4
P	20	3	5	1	1	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	5	2	5		1	4	1	1		4
P	21	3	2	5	2	4	2	3	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	5		5	1	1	1	1	

Fig. 6-- A sociometric scattergram showing distribution of ratings by sex-groups and socio-economic groups for Group VIII.

Total groups were compared on the basis of their group indices. This method was selected because it afforded a means of comparison which eliminated the error usually caused by the size of the group. Group indices were obtained by dividing the total number of weighted points actually given within the group by the number of points which were possible. Possible points were derived by using the formula: $N(N-1)x2$. N was the number of students in the group and two was the highest possible weighted score. The figures which were obtained for the eight groups were placed in Table 1.

TABLE 1

ANALYSIS OF GROUP INDICES WITH DATA FOR OBTAINING THE INDEX

Group	Number in Group	Actual Votes	Possible Votes	Group Index
I	22	227	924	0.24
II	22	253	924	.27
III	19	170	684	.25
IV	15	144	420	.34
V	20	212	760	.28
VI	22	234	924	.25
VII	20	206	760	.27
VIII	21	273	840	0.33

A slight variance in indices among the groups was expected since there was a difference in number within the group. However, Table 1 indicated that the variation of the index was not directly proportional to the size of the group. Group IV, which contained the fewest students, was by far the highest in acceptance. The control group, Group VIII, was found to be exceeded only by Group IV which had the highest index.

This finding was interpreted as an indication that more than one factor was affecting social acceptance within the groups. Excluding the control group and Group IV, the two highest groups, the range of group indices was .04. Since it was explained at the beginning of the thesis that the groups were of similar construction such a finding was expected. The question of whether these indices were high or low could not be answered at this point of the study for no other studies using the "How I Feel Towards Others Scale" with high school groups have been published.

In an endeavor to answer the above question, the second step was to look into the structure of the group and determine to what extent the ratings were based upon specific factors of structure. The first factor to be considered was that of sex. How important is sex in the socialization of these high school students? In order to solve this question

the sociograms were examined to determine inter-sex and intra-sex indices.

Four sub-groups were considered in each of the eight major groups. These sub-groups were (1) how the boys voted for boys, (2) how girls voted for girls, (3) how boys voted for girls, and (4) how girls voted for boys. Sub-group one and two were intra-sex groups and three and four were inter-sex groups. Each of the four sub-groups were considered as a group within itself and index scores were derived by the method used for the total indices. Results were placed in Table 2.

TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF THE INTRA-SEX AND INTER-SEX RELATIONSHIPS OF THE EIGHT CLASSROOM GROUPS

Group	Number of Boys	Number of Girls	Intra-sex		Inter-sex	
			Boy-Boy	Girl-Girl	Boy-Girl	Girl-Boy
I	14	8	0.33	0.30	0.08	0.25
II	11	11	.40	.17	.27	.26
III	11	8	.36	.39	.17	.09
IV	9	6	.29	.45	.38	.32
V	10	10	.34	.41	.19	.20
VI	13	9	.30	.59	.26	.05
VII	10	10	.50	.29	.02	.25
VIII	15	6	0.37	0.48	0.24	0.24

Table 2 showed the control group to be substantially above the average in most sub-groups. Since the group index for this section was nearly as high as the largest score, it appeared that the control group was better socially adjusted in all areas so far considered than the average group of this study.

It was readily seen that the intra-group scores were much higher than the inter-group scores. Two exceptions were found. Group II showed that the girls had less in-group feeling within their own group than they had with the opposite sex group. This group had an equal number of boys and girls. Group IV indicated that the boys had less in-group feeling within their own sex group than they had with the opposite sex group. There were more boys than girls in Group IV.

Wide ranges of variance were found in each sub-group. The least range, .21, was among the boys' ratings within their sex group; the next in range was the way in which the girls accepted the boys. The boys ratings for the girls was third in variance. The girls showed the greatest range, .42. Where the strongest intra-group scores were found very low scores in other sub-groups were also found. For example, the highest boy-boy relationship was seen in Group VII. The score was ten points above the mean. The girl-girl sub-group

of Group VI was eleven points above the second in rank. The boy-boy sub-group was second from the lowest. The girl-boy group was lowest and the boy-girl sub-group was above the mean. This would tend to indicate that intra-sex played an important role in the determination of the over-all in-group feeling.

At this point a question was raised as to the importance of the inter-sex groups: "What is the status of Group IV which has both of the first ranks in the inter-sex groups?"

In order to answer this question additional tabulation of data was desirable. The best available means found was a chi square test. It was assumed that no relationship existed between social acceptance and inter-sex and intra-sex ratings. Chi squares and the corresponding "P" was worked in accordance with the technique of G. Milton Smith[1]. According to the probabilities of the chi square theory the null hypothesis assumed in this instance would be void if the "P" values range between .05 and .01. The null hypothesis assumed here was that social acceptance was not dependent upon or related to inter-sex or intra-sex relationships. All chi square findings and the probabilities of such happening by chance alone were compiled in Table 3.

---

[1]G. Milton, A Student's Guide to Statistics, pp. 86-97.

TABLE 3

CHI SQUARE SHOWING SEX-GROUP RELATIONS AND GROUP SOCIALIZATION

Group	X^2	P
I	13.557	0.01
II	4.8171	.05-.02
III	26.526	.01
IV	.016	.90
V	15.061	.01
VI	75.475	.01
VII	20.412	.01
VIII	158.663	0.01

Table 3 indicated that only one group showed no relationship between sex and social acceptance in the total group, Group IV. Such findings substantiated the interpretation of Table 2. Of the remaining portion of Table 3 the only "P" which indicated other than the absolute rejection of the null hypothesis was that of Group II. Even though the null hypothesis was void in this case, the "P" value approached its acceptance. Group II was found to be second in rank on both sub-groups of the inter-sex groups of Table 2.

From these data it was concluded that sex groups and the strong in-group feeling within them played an important role

in determining the relationships within the total group. A strong intra-sex group feeling decreased the value of the whole, and a strong inter-sex group feeling increased the value of the whole.

In this study, it has been shown that more than one factor has intervened to cause dispersion of the total group socialization. The above part of the study showed that the total group social status was dependent to a great extent upon the intra-sex and inter-sex relationships. The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effect of socio-economic levels upon socialization of the group. The question which was raised at this point of the study was: "How was group socialization affected by the Vickery, Preston, and Outsider Groups?"

Data for answering this question were cumulated in the same manner as was that for previous questions. Indices were reckoned from the sociograms and tabulated in a table. Indices were computed on sub-groups composing the inter-groups and intra-groups. The intra-groups were those in which each group, socio-economic level, voted for itself. The inter-groups were those in which each socio-economic group voted for every other socio-economic group. The figures for these data which showed the inter-group and intra-group socio-economic relationships were placed in Table 4.

TABLE 4

A TABULATION SHOWING THE INTER-GROUP AND INTRA-GROUP INDICES FOR THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVELS IN EACH OF THE EIGHT CLASSROOMS

Ratings	Group							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Vickery	.36	.10	.32	.60	.30	.35	.46	...
Preston	.32	.32	.29	.40	.13	.33	.10	.21
Outsiders	.27	.43	.50	.08	.33	.35	.32	.65
Vickery gave Preston	.25	.28	.25	.33	.31	.21	.11	...
Vickery gave Outsiders	.14	.30	.12	.39	.33	.25	.21	...
Preston gave Vickery	.28	.20	.18	.38	.30	.21	.06	...
Preston gave Outsiders	.14	.32	.28	.33	.23	.16	.24	.37
Outsiders gave Vickery	.19	.21	.12	.33	.27	.17	.28	...
Outsiders gave Preston	.32	.33	.20	.19	.33	.25	.38	.50

The control group was composed of students from the Preston and Outsider groups: therefore, it was not expected to be greatly affected by the socio-economic levels. This belief was substantiated by the figures of Table 4. On the bases of earlier findings in this study it was easily understood how the high indices of the inter-group raised the total acceptance of this group. The two highest inter-group indices on the table were found in Group VIII.

Group IV was highest among the remaining groups with the exception of the ratings of Outsiders for themselves and their ratings for Preston. The high inter-group ratings lead to an easy explanation of why this group ranked highest in total acceptance. This led to the conclusion that Group IV was not too affected by the socio-economic levels.

Group V was second to Group IV. This group ranked about second in inter-group relations and second from bottom in intra-group ratings. Excluding the control group, Group V ranked second in the total group indices. This group was unaffected by the socio-economic factors.

Group II which was close to the mean of the total acceptance scores was also close to the mean on nearly all inter-group and intra-group scores in Table 4. Therefore, it did not appear to be too affected by the socio-economic factor.

The remaining groups tended to show rather low inter-group ratings. In some instances even the intra-group ratings were low. These findings were interpreted as an indication that socio-economic factors were entering the socialization pattern of the whole group.

In order to substantiate these findings chi squares were computed for each of the eight groups. The null hypothesis was assumed and to be abandoned only when "P" values were between .05 and .01. These data were placed in Table 5.

TABLE 5

CHI SQUARE VALUE TABULATED TO SHOW THE CHANCE PROBABILITIES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS IN SOCIALIZATION

Group	X^2	P
I	13.065	.01
II	5.603	.90-.10
III	30.130	.01
IV	8.560	.10-.05
V	4.274	.90-.10
VI	15.756	.01
VII	15.870	.01
VIII	.024	.90

Data from Table 5 indicated that Groups I, III, VI, and VII were not held to the null hypothesis because their "P" values were .01; therefore, these groups were affected by socio-economic factors. Consequently, the remaining groups had "P" values which indicated that the null hypothesis was not void and that they were not affected by the socio-economic factors.

At this point, the question of how the total in-group feeling was affected by the socio-economic factor was answered by indicating that its affects were seen in fifty percent of

the cases of this study. It appeared to be a factor of importance but not of so much importance as was supposed at the beginning of the study.

The final question of this study was: "How is group acceptance affected by the fact that these groups were composed of students from four different academic classifications?" The data at this point of the study were incomplete. The available data showed that many of the sub-groups of classifications were so small that it was not considered wise statistically to evaluate them with the index scores as was done on previous data. However, raw score values were large enough that chi square was deemed applicable in all cases.[2] Again, the null hypothesis was assumed. In cases where the "P" values were between .05 and .01 the hypothesis was considered void. That is to say, that socialization was considered dependent upon academic classifications in such cases. In groups where the null hypothesis was not considered void, academic classifications were not believed to affect socialization.

Since Group VIII was composed of all eighth grade students, it was not included in this part of the study. Data on Group VII were not complete so it was also omitted from

---

[2] Ibid, p. 87.

this consideration. All data were computed on academic classification and socialization and compiled in Table 6.

TABLE 6

A COMPARISON OF THE CHANCE PROBABILITIES OF ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATIONS AND SOCIALIZATION

Group	X^2	P
I	28.910	0.01
II	50.374	.01
III	30.130	.01
IV	27.412	.01
V	128.309	.01
VI	26.161	0.01

All "P" values were found to be 0.01. Therefore, it was concluded that the total group socialization in each of the six groups was affected by academic classifications.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

This study presented an investigation and analysis of three factors of socialization within the Hillcrest High School in Dallas, Texas during the Fall of 1948. Socio-economic levels, sex, and academic classifications were examined in order to determine their relative importance in socialization as measured by the "How I Feel Towards Others Scale".

From this study it was concluded that many factors affected total group socialization within the groups studied. Intra-sex and inter-sex socialization played an important role in the determination of the over-all in-group feeling. A strong intra-sex group relationship decreased the value of the in-group feeling of the whole group and a strong inter-sex group feeling increased the socialization pattern of the whole group. Fifty per cent of the total group scores were decreased to some extent by socio-economic levels. Therefore, socio-economic levels were important in the pattern of socialization, but not so important as was suspected at the

beginning of the study. A mixing of academic classifications in the various classrooms caused a decrease in group socialization in each of the six groups measured for this trait. Therefore, such a mixing of academic classifications was deemed undesirable.

The control group was high in group acceptance and was found relatively unaffected in all instances. There was only one academic classification and only two socio-economic levels. A strong inter-sex relationship was found. Such findings were interpreted as a substantiation of the above conclusions.

The conclusion drawn from the entire study was that the total group socialization was affected by the socio-economic levels, by academic classifications and by inter-sex and intra-sex relationships.

Recommendations

Several recommendations are made as a result of the foregoing study. In future research of this nature, variables should be limited so that as few as possible are considered at one time. This should be done by selecting groups for study which possess only one or two of these variables.

Educators should try to establish stronger inter-group relationships for the benefit of the total group socialization.

Since this study shows that mixing students of the various classifications lessened the total group socialization, it is recommended that not more than one academic classification be placed in a single classroom.

Before broad generalizations are made, it is recommended that more studies of this nature be made in many different localities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Dimock, H.S., Rediscovering the Adolescent, New York, Association Press, 1937.

Hollingshead, A.B., Elmtown's Youth, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.

Hsia, Jui-Ching, A Study of the Sociability of Elementary School Children, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.

Smith, G.M., A Simplified Guide to Statistics for Psychology and Education, New York, Rinehart and Company, 1946.

Articles

Hardy, M.C., "Social Recognition at the Elementary School Age", Journal of Social Psychology, VIII (February,1937), 365-384.

Henkle, M.W., and Kuhlen, R.G., "Changes in Social Adjustment in a Summer Camp: A Preliminary Report", Journal of Psychology, XV (April, 1943), 223-231.

Jenkins, C.C., "Factors Involved in Children's Friendships", Journal of Educational Psychology, XXII (December, 1931), 440-448.

Moreno, J.L., "Sociometry and the Cultural Order", Sociometry, VI (August, 1943), 327.

Neugarten, B.L., "Social Class and Friendship Among School Children", American Journal of Sociology, LI (January, 1946), 305-313.

Smith, M., "Some Factors in Friendship Selection of High School Students", Sociometry, VII (August, 1944), 330-310.

Warner, W.L., Meek, M., and Eells, K.E., "Social Status in Education", The Phi Delta Kappan, XXX (December, 1948), 113-119.

Young, L.L. and Cooper, D.H., "Some Factors Associated With Popularity", Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXV (December, 1944), 513-535.

Tests

Leahy, A.M., "The Minnesota Home Status Index", Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1936.

Rogers, C., "A Test of Personality Adjustment", New York, Association Press, 1931.

Sims, V.M., "Sims' Score Card For Socio-Economic Status", Bloomington, Illinois, Public School Publishing Company, 1927.

Unpublished Material

Bonney, M.E., "How I Feel Towards Others", Unpublished sociometric scale, Denton, Texas, Dept. of Education, North Texas State College, 1947. (Mimeographed).

Bonney, M.E., "Unorganized data gathered on home background and social acceptance in the Demonstration School of North Texas State College", Denton, 1948.

Flocke, O.R., "A Study of the Relationships Between the 'Minnesota Home Status Index' and Social Rank on the 'How I Feel Towards Others Scale'", A graduate problem course in North Texas State Teachers College, Denton, Texas, 1948.

Land, T., "A Comparative Sociometric Study of Negro and White Children", Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Psychology, North Texas State Teachers College, 1948.