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INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Psychologists have long recognized that if an individual is to achieve personal success and happiness he must be well liked and accepted by others, particularly by those within his own social group. Much has been written concerning this subject of social acceptance both in the popular literature and in more scientific publications. For the most part these efforts have been centered around those personal traits which contribute to popularity and those which contribute to unpopularity. All of the popular writers as well as many psychologists and educators have based their conclusions on theoretical assumptions. Probably the most promising scientific approach to this phase of interpersonal relations has been made in the field of Sociometry. This field, under the leadership of Dr. Moreno, has made great progress toward the development of a method of study which will yield a scientific analysis of the psychological relationships existing within groups and between individuals. The data presented in this paper is based, in part, on sociometric techniques.

If a measure of personality could be developed which would reliably differentiate between popular and unpopular individuals, according to specific personality traits or behavior characteristics, it would be of invaluable aid to psychologists, teachers,
and others who attempt to help people toward a better life adjustment. Through such an instrument it would be possible to objectively determine those aspects of an individual's personality most in need of attention. A number of rating scales for use with school children have been developed with this purpose in mind. However, most of these have only a priori validity. It is the purpose of this study to contribute some scientific data toward the construction of a more valid rating scale for use in the classroom situation.

**Procedures Used**

A brief explanation of the general procedure used in this study will be given, followed by a more detailed description of the methods employed.

Eight elementary school groups were selected from the Denton, Texas public schools, and the North Texas State College Demonstration during the spring semester of 1949. All data used were collected by students in a graduate course in sociometry. The four or five most popular and most unpopular members of each group as determined by the North Texas *How I Feel Toward Others* scale were used for this study. In all eight groups the pupils in these two extremes were rated by the teachers with the Integral Rating Scale, prepared by the University of California (Berkeley), Child Development Institute. In five of these eight groups the high and low members were also rated.

---

1See Appendix.
with this scale by student observers as part of the requirements of the sociometry class. In addition anecdotal records were kept by the student observers. It will be determined by statistical analysis which of those personality traits of the Integral Scale and which of those described in the anecdotal records reliably differentiate between the popular and the unpopular children, and the extent of the reliability.

The city of Denton, Texas, is located in an agricultural district and has a population of about 16,000. The children studied represent a relatively homogenous group in regard to socio-economic and cultural background. Although some differences exist, they are not very large, especially within the same school. The grades tested were three second grades, two fourth grades, two fifth grades, and one sixth grade. This included all the public schools of the city and one of the college demonstration schools, thus giving a fairly good representative sampling of the city's elementary school system. For the sake of convenience each of these various grade groups will be referred to by Roman numerals ranging from I through VIII.

Information concerning each of these groups may be obtained by consulting Table 1. The "Nos. Used" column refers to the number of children in each group with which this study is concerned. Half of that number represents the children who rated highest in each group in peer acceptance, and the other half represents those who rated lowest. This number was ten in all cases with the exception of Group II in which only eight were used. Groups
I through V were observed throughout the semester by members of the sociometry class, and they were rated by both the teachers and the student observers. Groups VI through VIII were rated only by the teachers.

**TABLE 1**

GRADE LEVEL, SIZE AND LOCATION OF GROUPS STUDIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>No. In Class</th>
<th>No. Used</th>
<th>Name of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Robert E. Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sam Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sam Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N. T. Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stonewall Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sam Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N. T. Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Robert E. Lee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two groups of popular and unpopular were fairly evenly distributed between boys and girls. In the high peer status group there were 19 boys and 20 girls; in the low peer status group there were 22 boys and 17 girls. Although there are some sex differences in these personality traits which contribute to social acceptance these have not been found to be very great by other investigators at the elementary school level. While it is admitted that some error may be introduced by ignoring sex differences it is felt that this loss will be compensated for by the gain in statistical reliability achieved through treating the group as a whole.
The North Texas How I Feel Toward Others scale was administered to all eight groups by the teachers under the guidance of the student observers. The test was given in the early part of the semester, and later retest reliability checks were made on several of the groups. The coefficients proved to be in the .80s and .90s. Since the position of the individuals in the high and low groups remained relatively constant the first test given was used in this study for the purpose of discovering those students who were at the extreme ends of the social acceptance or popularity scale.

The How I Feel Toward Others scale is a sociometric test designed to measure the quantity and quality of emotional interaction within a group. This test measures each individual’s feelings toward every other individual in the group on a five point scale ranging from "Best friend" through "People I do not want as friends as long as they remain like they are." This five point rating scale is then converted to an algebraic scale ranging from -2 to +2, thus expressing clearly the positive and negative feelings. These weighted scores are placed on a matrix chart which contains the scores which each individual received from every other individual. By inspecting the chart it is possible to determine each person’s relative position in the group in terms of social status or popularity and the degree of mutuality existing between any two members of the group. This study is primarily concerned with the pupil's relative status; however, mutuality will be considered in those cases in which it aids
in understanding an individual's position. In most cases the quality of votes received can be inferred from the quantity received.

The validity of the "How I Feel Toward Others" scale as a measure of the degree of social acceptance of members of a group must be assumed from the nature of the scale itself. Since it purports to measure feeling responses and since there is no way to establish the validity of one's feelings, we must assume that the responses made to this scale have face validity.

The Integral Scale consists of eight broad factors of personality which might contribute to social acceptance. These factors are Self-expressiveness, Attractiveness of appearance, Physical efficiency, Sociability, Social prestige, Social self-confidence, Attention seeking and affectation, and Freedom from emotional tension. In each case a brief description is given of the extremes of very good in that trait and very poor. The ratee is then rated along a continuum of from 1 to 7 for each of the eight traits. A rating of 1 would be very poor and a rating of 7 very good. This scale will be reproduced in Chapter 2.

The scale was originally designed for playground situations, but is easily adapted to most any social situation. Since the teachers as well as the student observers were more familiar with the pupils' classroom behavior than their behavior on the playground it was decided they should be rated according to the total school situation. In addition it was
felt that this would be more representative of the pupils' social behavior than would the original limitation.

The high and low pupils in sociometric status were rated on the Integral Scale toward the end of the school term. They were rated in all eight groups by the teachers, and in groups I through V by the student observers as well. Both the teachers and the student observers were carefully instructed as to how the scale should be used, with emphasis placed upon the importance of maintaining an objective attitude.

Throughout the school term anecdotal records were kept on the high and low members of groups I through V by the members of the sociometry class. The students were given instruction and individual aid in the making of these records by the instructor, M. E. Bonney. The students were told to record all significant behavior exactly as it happened without making any subjective inferences at the time. They were further told that the behavior recorded should be a representative sample of the individual's school life on the playground and in the classroom as well as special situations to which he might be subjected, such as class elections, field trips, etc. At the end of the school term the student observers were asked to make one or two page descriptions of each high and low member of their respective groups. These descriptions were to be based on the anecdotal records kept throughout the term and the over-all impression of each child studied. It was to be
a concise summary of the pupil's appearance, his behavior, and the attitudes of others toward him.

In this study an analysis of the above mentioned summaries will be made in an effort to determine which of the personality traits described therein reliably differentiate between the high and low groups in peer acceptance.

Related Studies

Many psychological studies have been made on the problem of social acceptability and personality traits. Most of these have used some sort of seismometric approach, and the chief purpose of all of them has been the determination of these personal traits which lead to popularity. Three of these studies have been selected for discussion. They represent three age levels; primary, intermediate, and adolescent.

A study made by M. E. Benney in 1938-1939 was composed of the second grades from 3 of the elementary schools in Denton, Texas. The social status of each child was determined by choosing situations, such as; children with whom to have picture taken, children they would prefer to go home with after school, and children to whom valentines were to be given. These choices were made in order of preference so that a quantitative score could be obtained for each child.

---

Much of this study is concerned with the relation of physical and environmental factors to social success; however, this discussion will be limited to the findings in regard to personality traits. Suffice it to say that the physical characteristics in particular proved to have little significance.

The personality traits were determined by the following method. The author of the study wrote down the outstanding traits of each child as they were described to him by the teachers of each group. Of the twenty traits described, the following ten clearly differentiated between the popular and unpopular children: Having a cheerful rather than a depressed disposition, being aggressive in social situations, being generous and considerate of others, being able and confident before the group, having an attractive personal appearance, being cooperative in group endeavors and having a sense of duty, having a contribution to make to the group, having a good sense of humor, an avoidance of fighting, quarreling, and over-bearing conduct. The trait which proved to be the most significant was "cooperative in group--good sense of duty."

The author concludes that a child may possess a negative trait and still be popular if he has enough desirable qualities to make up for it. The group does not react to isolated traits but rather to the total impression the individual makes.

Another study by the same author was conducted with three 4th grade groups from the same schools as the former study,
and was made during the school year 1941-1942. This study was limited entirely to the relation of personality traits to social success.

Two methods of investigation were employed. One was trait ratings on the part of both teachers and pupils. The other was pupil choices of friends, or Moreno's sociometric test. The rating scale used was a slight modification of the scale developed by Careline McCann Tryen. Some changes were made in the wording of the scale so as to make it more appropriate for 4th grade children. "The scale is composed of twenty traits each of which is paired with its opposite." Such as "daring-afraid", "leader-follower", etc. Each child was asked to rate three other pupils in his grade whom he regarded as friends. After this the classroom teachers rated all the pupils on the same scale. The sociometric status of the pupils was determined by choosing of work companions, classroom elections, number of valentines received, and several others. Also mutual friendships were determined by these methods.

The twenty traits were: quiet, talkative, attention getting, bossy, tidy, fights, daring, leader, active in games, sense of humor, friendly, welcomed, good-looking, enthusiastic, happy, laughter-jokes, at ease with adults, active in recitation, grown-up, elder friends. Critical ratios were determined

---

for the average composite ratings in these traits received by children in the highest and lowest quartiles on the basis of social acceptance and also on the basis of mutuality and un-reciprocation.

The upper fourth in social acceptance was found to be reliably superior to the lower fourth in the following ten traits: tidy, leadership, friendly, welcomed, good-looking, enthusiastic, happy, frequent laughter, at ease with adults, and active in recitations. Eight of the ten traits most closely associated with mutual friendships were the same as those which differentiated between upper and lower fourths. "Happy" and "At ease with adults" on the first list were replaced by "Quiet" and "Daring" on the second list. The unreciprocated list showed a marked lack of trait similarity.

The author draws the following conclusions from the data described above.

A child is well accepted in a group much more because of what he is and what he does which wins the admiration of others, than because of what he refrains from doing, or, in other words, strong positive personality traits are more important than negative virtues.... Popularity is not the superficial thing it is often thought to be, but is rather tied up with the most basic traits of personality and character.4

A study at the adolescent level similar to the two described above was conducted by Kuhlen and Lee during 1941-1942.5

4Ibid.

purpose of this study was to obtain measures of social accept-
ability at different ages through the adolescent period, and
also to get judgements from the associates of the subjects as
to their personal characteristics. The former was accomplished
through the use of Moreno's sociometric techniques, which in
this study consisted mostly of making first and second choices
for partners in specific activities. The latter was accomplished
through the use of a twenty point rating scale of paired oppo-
sites. Most of the traits in this scale were similar to those
in Bonney's 4th grade study, previously cited. Subjects in-
cluded over 100 children of each sex in each of grades 6, 9,
and 12.

The traits which gave a critical ratio greater than 3.00
between high and low in acceptability were: active in games,
enjoys jokes, friendly, initiates games and activities, will-
ing to take a chance, neat and clean, likes opposite sex, en-
joys joke on self, popular with others, cheerful and happy,
good looking, enthusiastic, and sociable for girls only. The
traits which did not give a significant critical ratio were:
restless, talkative, enjoys a fight, acts older than age, seeks
attention, bosses others, and sociable for boys only.

In regard to age differences the authors state:

The socially acceptable at the 12th grade tended to be
the active, socially aggressive extrovert more than was
ture of the sixth. Though related to acceptability at
all ages, being good-looking was not so closely related
at the 12th as at the sixth.\(^6\)

\(^6\)Ibid.
It seems to be the general conclusion of all these studies that although certain traits are more significant factors in social acceptability than others, it is the total personality which is of greatest importance.
CHAPTER I

THE INTEGRAL SCALE

This chapter consists of the presentation of the Integral Scale and an analysis of the results of its administration to the most popular and most unpopular members of eight school groups ranging from the second through the sixth grades. Below will be found a reproduction of this scale as it was used by the teachers and student observers of these groups. A rating of 1 constitutes the poorest rank for each trait and 7 the best.

**INTEGRAL SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Wherever a rating of 3, 4, or 5 is a function of opposed or inconsistent extreme behavior, please mark with the symbol _.

**I. Self-Expressiveness**

Very self-expressive; overtly active practically all the time including verbalization, gross movement, aggressive contact with physical environment; eager, animated facial expression and bodily movements.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

| Extremely unexpressive; very little overt movement; silent; stationary, indifferent attitude; idle; stolid listless expression. |
II. **Attractiveness of Appearance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely attractive and pleasing appearance including coloring, features, proportion of body, carriage, cleanliness, facial expression, becoming clothes, proper distribution of fat.</th>
<th>Very unattractive; unattractive coloring and features; poor carriage, asymmetrical proportions; unpleasing expression; unkempt; ill-fitting, inappropriate clothes, excessively fat or thin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. **Physical Efficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large, strong, well proportioned muscular physique; excellent coordination; facile, smooth movements; obviously assured and confident in physical competition.</th>
<th>Small, puny physique; flabby musculature; poor co-ordination; awkward, jerky or feminine movements; obviously feels incompetent and inadequate in physical competition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. **Sociability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large portion of time spent in social enterprise; good-natured, pleasant, thoroughly enjoys play, etc.; in general markedly successful in &quot;getting on&quot;; obviously popular and well liked (without necessarily implying leadership).</th>
<th>Seldom takes part in social enterprise; rather supercilious and negativistic; some tendency for others to ignore or shun him; in general not a social success.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTEGRAL SCALE (Continued)

V. Social Prestige

Marked prestige; initiates activity; others seek his approval; look to him to take lead or make decisions; in general has a marked effect on group.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

VI. Social Self-Confidence

Very assured social behavior with both adults and children; uninhibited, makes approaches; confident in games, etc.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

VII. Attention-Seeking and Affectation

No drive for attention; entirely matter-of-fact with adults and children, always unaffected in manner; in general seems to have developed no interest in or awareness of his effect on others.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

VIII. Freedom from Emotional Tensions

Seems entirely relaxed, cheerful, carefree; laughs or smiles frequently in real enjoyment.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
The first problem to be considered in the treatment of the data obtained from the administration of the Integral Scale is that of reliability. It is always difficult to establish the reliability of any rating scale of this sort. The usual methods of split-half and test-retest are unsatisfactory. The split-half method is out of the question chiefly because of the small number of items and also because each item covers a different phase of the total personality. If the general traits were divided into several sub-trait the split-half method could be employed between these sub-trait. If the test-retest method was used the same raters would have to rate the same ratees on two different occasions, and due to the small number of items it seems likely they would be influenced on the second occasion by the memory of their responses on the first. In addition any misunderstanding or bias on the part of the rater during the first rating would probably be repeated during the second. Due to these facts it was decided to determine the reliability of the scale through a comparison of the ratings of two raters on the same ratees. By this method individual bias and misinterpretation of the items would be greatly reduced. Unfortunately the factor of the small number of items will still operate to lower the reliability. Reliability by this method may be increased by increasing the number of raters. According to Guilford one should expect reliability coefficients
of .80 or better with 5 or more judges. Unfortunately, it was impossible to obtain more than 2 judges sufficiently well acquainted with the children to qualify.

By the above method the reliability of the scale becomes its consistency from one rater to another rather than from item to item or from one occasion to another. Actually this is a more rigid test of reliability than the other two. Several new uncontrollable factors enter into this type of reliability test, such as, differences between raters in training, acquaintance with the rates, intelligence, etc. The reliability coefficients obtained by this method are not directly comparable with those obtained by the usual methods; they should be expected to be considerably lower.

The product moment correlation coefficient as computed from a scatter diagram was used to determine reliability. Several other correlation methods were considered but had to be discarded as unsuitable for this data. Groups I through V only were used. In these groups each child on the extremes of the social acceptance scale was rated by both the teacher and the student observer. These two ratings were compared by plotting the teacher rating along the x axis and the observer

---


rating along the y axis. For each of the eight traits rated, the original continuum of from 1 through 7 was used on the scatter diagram thus giving an exact comparison between the two ratings. For the total scale the ratings were divided into 12 equal intervals of 4 points each. The coefficients obtained are presented in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**

**COMPARISON OF TEACHER AND OBSERVER RATINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Expressiveness</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness of Appearance</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Efficiency</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Prestige</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self-Confidence</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Seeking and Affectation</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom from Emotional Tensions</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note---N=48*

As may be observed by inspection of Table 2 agreement of teachers and observers was greater for the total scale than for any one of the 8 traits, with the exception of Social Prestige. Apparently the disagreements over specific traits tended to balance each other throughout the scale. It is reasonable to assume that this coefficient would have been even greater had there been more items, or more raters.
Most of the coefficients for the individual traits compare favorably with similar statistical treatments of other rating scales. A coefficient over .65, using two raters, should be considered good. Two of the traits fell below this criterion. They were Physical Efficiency and Attention Seeking and Affectation. There are several possible explanations for these low coefficients. In the case of Physical Efficiency it seems most likely due to insufficient observation on the part of the raters, since both the teachers and the student observers were better acquainted with the children's activities in the classroom than on the playground. The "halo effect" may also have been operative here. The raters may have been inclined to overlook the physical defects of some of the more likeable children.

The trait of Attention Seeking and Affectation proved to be the least reliable item of the scale. This trait would logically seem to be the most susceptible to the "halo effect", and its low reliability is probably due to this source of error. Among the most frequently listed factors contributing to the "halo effect" are judgements of interaction between the rater and the ratee, and lack of understanding of the traits rated. The first of these would certainly be true of Attention Seeking since the attention usually sought from the raters, thus involving their own personalities in the rating situation. This would be particularly true of the teacher raters. The

---

teachers would probably again be chiefly at fault in regard to the second factor. Since many teachers regard adult mannerisms in a child as desirable rather than undesirable they might find it difficult to rate down an individual exhibiting this trait. The attention-seeker and the individual who affects adult mannerisms is often much easier to control than the one who behaves more normally. Thus, the evaluations placed upon this trait by the teachers and by the student observers might differ considerably since the student observers were not particularly concerned with discipline. It is also possible that some of the raters may not have understood clearly what they were looking for, and therefore, may have rated the children on this trait according to their general impressions of them.

Another probable source of error which might affect both reliability and validity is the rater's knowledge of the sociometric status of the ratees. If this knowledge had been equal for all raters it would have had the effect of increasing reliability. However, it seems likely that the student observers would have been more consciously aware of sociometric status and therefore more definitely influenced by it. It would be impossible to estimate the extent of this error; however it should be possible to gain some indication of it by a comparison of the validity of ratings made by those aware of the sociometric status of the ratees with ratings made by those unaware of this. The results of this comparison may be found in Table 3. The comparisons are made between three groups; the student
observers who definitely were aware of sociometric status of
the children; the teacher raters of groups I-V who may or
may not have been aware of it; and the teacher raters of groups
VI-VIII who definitely were not aware of it. It must be re-
membered that other factors help to determine these differences
as well as the one in question. This is especially true of the
two groups of teacher raters. Groups I-V were selected for
study by the sociometric class because the teachers of these
groups were considered by the instructor to be superior. No
such selective factor was involved with the teachers of groups
VI-VIII. So while the differences found between these two
groups is no doubt due in part to knowledge of sociometric
status, it may also be partially accounted for by individual
differences between the teachers of the two groups. Differ-
ences between ratings by student-observers and the teachers of
both groups may also be partially attributed to differences in
training and points of view.

The critical ratios presented in Table 3, and also in
Tables 4 and 5, represent the extent to which the ratings for
each of the 8 traits and the total scale differentiate between
the children in the upper and lower extremes of social accept-
ance. As usual, a critical ratio of over 3.00 is considered
significant. The comparisons presented in Table 3 were made
primarily in an effort to determine the effect of knowledge of
sociometric status upon the reliability of the scale, and not
for a comparison of validity. The problem of validity will be considered later.

TABLE 3
COMPARISON OF CRITICAL RATIOS OBTAINED FROM THREE GROUPS OF Raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Critical Ratios</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups I-V</td>
<td>Groups VI-VIII</td>
<td>Groups I-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Expressiveness</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness of Appearance</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Efficiency</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Prestige</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self-Confidence</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Seeking and Affectation</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom from Emotional Tensions</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the critical ratios obtained from the student observers and the teachers of groups I-V will reveal some differences. The critical ratios between high and low groups for the student-observer ratings are higher in the traits of Self-Expressiveness, Social Prestige, Social Self-Confidence and the Total Scale. The critical ratios for the
teachers' ratings of groups I-V were higher than those of the student-observers for the traits of Attractiveness of Appearance, Sociability, and Freedom from Emotional Tensions. The differences between these two groups of raters for the traits of Physical Efficiency and Attention Seeking and Affectation are not great enough to be considered significant. It would seem reasonable that if degree of awareness of sociometric status was an important factor the differences found between these two groups of raters would have been consistent. These differences are probably due largely to factors other than knowledge of the sociometric position of the ratees.

A comparison of the critical ratios obtained from the teacher ratings of groups I-V and those of groups VI-VIII reveal consistent differences for every trait, with the exception of Self-Expressiveness. Since the critical ratios of groups I-V are consistently higher in every trait but one, it is quite probable that knowledge of sociometric status was a contributing factor. However, as has been pointed out earlier, it would be impossible to determine the extent of this influence due to other differences between the two groups of teacher raters, as well as differences in the groups rated.

The validity of the Integral Scale can be more definitely established than its reliability. A comparison was made between the ratings received by the most popular children with those received by the least popular. This comparison was made for each item of the scale and for the total score. The
critical ratios were obtained by use of the following formula:

\[ t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2_1 + \sum X^2_2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \left( \frac{N_1}{N_1 + N_2} + \frac{N_2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \right)}} \]

This formula was designed especially for independent groups having little or no positive correlation, but derived from the same population. Since the groups used are opposite extremes in social acceptance it seems likely they would have little correlation in other respects as well.

Since the purpose of this study is the construction of a rating scale for use in the classroom situation, the teacher judgements were used exclusively in the determination of validity. If a particular item as judged by the average classroom teacher does not reliably differentiate between popular and unpopular children it should not be considered valid for such a scale regardless of how valid it may be when judged by better trained observers.

Table 4 presents the critical ratios obtained by an analysis of the combined-ratings of all 8 groups. An inspection of this table will reveal that Social Prestige and Sociability are by far the most differentiating traits of the scale with critical ratios of 16.50 and 11.72 respectively. The trait of Social Prestige implies leadership ability while that of Sociability implies getting along well with people and the ability to make close personal friends. This latter trait is generally regarded as the sole criterion of popularity, yet according to this study the trait of Social Prestige is a more important factor. It is

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Expressiveness</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness of Appearance</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Efficiency</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Prestige</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self-Confidence</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Seeking and Affectation</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom from Emotional Tensions</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note—N=78

It is interesting to note that these two traits are not always present in the same degree. Some of the children who were very high in Social Prestige were only average or below in Sociability and vice versa. The high critical ratio of Social Prestige is due mostly to the ratings received by the unpopular group, the great majority of whom received a rating of 1 or 2 with only an occasional 3 or 4. There were quite a number of the unpopular group who received 3 or 4 in Sociability. While some of the popular group were rated low in Sociability none of the unpopular group were rated high in it. Apparently the possession of this trait at least assures one against extreme unpopularity.

Attractiveness of Appearance was the third most differentiating item with a critical ratio of 9.09. While some of the unpopular group were given above average ratings in this trait, none of the high group received a rating below average. It would seem that at least average attractiveness is essential.
Freedom from Emotional Tensions with a critical ratio of 8.54 may be described in much the same manner as Attractiveness of Appearance. While several of the unpopular group were rated high in this trait none of the popular group received a rating below 3.

Attention Seeking and Affectation would appear to be a valid item with a critical ratio of 5.79; however, its reliability proved to be quite low. This trait was probably difficult to judge except in obvious cases. This is borne out by the fact that most of the children received a rating of 3, 4, or 5. The factors probably responsible for this high validity and low reliability have been discussed under reliability.

Social Self-Confidence, as would be expected, is also a valid item with a critical ratio of 5.58. The complete range of from 1 to 7 may be found in both the popular and unpopular groups. It apparently should not be considered as an essential trait.

Physical Efficiency with a critical ratio of 3.22 is a valid item for all 6 groups combined, but not for groups VI-VIII considered separately (Table 3). Its reliability was also quite low. For these reasons it probably should not be accepted as a valid item.

Self-Expressiveness while fairly reliable did not reach the criterion for validity. Apparently it was accurately judged but simply has little effect upon social acceptance.
The very significant critical ratio of 11.13 for the total score supports the generally accepted belief of psychologists that it is the total personality of the individual which determines his degree of social acceptance rather than any single trait.

The critical ratios presented in Table 5 afford a comparison of the validity of the scale at 3 different grade levels. Group A is composed of 3 second grades (groups I, II, and VI), Group B of 2 fourth grades (groups III and VII), and Group C of 2 fifth grades and 1 sixth grade (groups IV, V and VIII). The possible effects of knowledge of sociometric status is equally distributed among these three groups.

Two consistent trends may be observed in Table 5. These involve the traits of Sociability and Attention Seeking and Affectation. There are two possible explanations of these increases in validity with grade level. It may be that these traits become more important factors in social acceptance at the higher grade levels, or the traits may be easier to judge in older children. Probably both factors are operative. With Sociability, the first of these seems to be the more prominent. As children grow older they become more familiar with the techniques of social intercourse and are therefore more sensitive to them. In the opinion of the writer the second of these factors is the more prominent in regard to the trait of Attention Seeking and Affectation. At the lower grade levels the need for attention, particularly adult attention, is greater
## Table 5

**Validity of Scale at Three Grade Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Critical Ratios</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A (N=28)</td>
<td>Group B (N=20)</td>
<td>Group C (N=30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Expressiveness</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness of Appearance</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Efficiency</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Prestige</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self-Confidence</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Seeking and Affectations</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom from Emotional Tensions</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And more prevalent than at the higher grade levels. So, at the second grade level it would not be a matter of judging whether or not a need for attention was present but rather the degree to which it was present. On the other hand, at the higher grade levels the child who demands adult attention and affects adult mannerisms is the exception rather than the rule. An excessive amount of this is no doubt disliked by the child’s peers at any grade level.
Group C was the only one of the three groups which yielded a significant critical ratio for Self-Expressiveness. The explanation of this seems to lie in the character of the unpopular children of Group C. In all 3 groups the popular children received about the same average rating, however the unpopular children of Group C were rated considerably lower on the average than was true of Groups A and B. It may be that the unpopular children have a tendency to retreat from the social environment more and more as they grow older.

Another outstanding deviation is the very high critical ratio for Social Prestige found in Group B. This seems most likely due to the nature of the group. Both classes composing Group B had been subjected to considerable socialization throughout the year. Emphasis was continually placed upon citizenship and leadership, and situations were deliberately created in which leadership roles might be played. While this was also true of at least one class in each of the other two groups it was not true of either Group A or C as a whole.

Finally it should be noted that there were very small differences between Groups A, B, and C in critical ratios for the total score. Although there are some wide differences between grade levels in regard to single traits, the total scale is about equally valid for all three groups. Again this testifies to the importance of the total personality configuration in achieving social acceptance.
Summary of Findings

The reliability of the Integral Scale was established by computing the product moment correlation coefficient between the ratings of the teachers of Groups I-V and the student-observers of these groups. Physical Efficiency and Attention Seeking and Affectation failed to meet the criterion of a correlation coefficient of .65. The factors which seemed most likely responsible for this failure were the "halo" effect and insufficient observation of the children on the playground.

Another source of error which may have affected both reliability and validity was knowledge of the sociometric status of the ratees. A comparison was made between ratings made by raters aware of sociometric status with those made by raters unaware of this. The results of this comparison indicated that knowledge of sociometric status probably did affect both reliability and validity, but it was impossible to determine to what extent since there were several other differences between these groups of raters which could easily have affected the results in the same direction.

The validity of the scale was established by the critical ratio method which determined the extent to which the ratings for each of the 8 traits and the total scale differentiated between the children in the upper and lower extremes of social acceptance. This was done first for all 8 groups combined, and then a comparison was made of the validity of the scale at three grade levels.
For the 3 groups combined only one trait, Self-Expressiveness with a critical ratio of 2.58, failed to meet the criterion. The rest of the traits of the scale are presented in order of their validity: Social Prestige (16.50); Sociability (11.72); Total Score (11.13); Attractiveness of Appearance (9.09); Freedom From Emotional Tensions (8.54); Attention Seeking and Affectation (5.79); Social Self-Confidence (5.58); and Physical Efficiency (3.22).

Some interesting differences were noted in the validity of the ratings at the different grade levels. There was a consistent increase in validity with grade level for the traits of Attention Seeking and Affectation and Sociability. The oldest age-group, composed of the 5th and 6th grades, was the only one of the three which yielded a significant critical ratio for Self-Expressiveness, and the middle group, composed of two 4th grades, was considerably higher than the other two for Social Prestige. There were very small differences between the three groups in the critical ratios of the total scores.

Throughout the analysis the traits of Social Prestige, and Sociability and the Total score proved to be the most clearly differentiating. Self-Expressiveness, Physical Efficiency, and Attention Seeking and Affectation are of doubtful value, at least in their present form.
CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF PERSONAL CHARACTERIZATIONS

Each of the groups from I through V was observed closely throughout the Spring semester of 1949 by a member of the sociometry class. Particularly close attention was paid by each student-observer to the most popular and most unpopular members of his group as determined by the How I Feel Toward Others Scale. During this period of observation the student kept anecdotal records on these children supplemented, at times, by reports of the teachers and other sources of information, such as achievement, intelligence and personality test data, school grades, home background, etc.. At the end of the semester each student-observer summarized his over-all impression of each child under his observation in a 1 to 2 page personal characterization based on these records and on his own subjective judgement and interpretation.

It was felt that an analysis of these personal characterizations would afford an additional insight into the differences between the popular and unpopular children studied since they represent a less rigidly structured approach than the Integral Scale. Of course, this departure from a structured situation will increase the error due to subjective judgement. Every effort will be made to keep this at a minimum by treating the

33
data as objectively as possible.

The children composing this part of the study were also rated on the Integral Scale; however, the numbers used are not the same in every group as they were in the former study. The total number of pupils rated on the Integral Scale for groups I-V was 48, and in this case the total number is 45. This difference in total number also makes the proportions of boy-girl and high-low slightly different. These proportions and the numbers used in each of the groups are presented in Table 6.

**TABLE 6**

**DISTRIBUTION OF SEXES IN THE HIGH AND LOW GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Popular</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unpopular</th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table was included because it is believed that sex distribution is an important factor in understanding some of the findings presented later in this chapter. There are more girls than boys in the popular group and more boys than girls in the unpopular group. Both of these weightings will influence the results in the same direction. There will be a tendency for the negative feminine traits to be somewhat submerged
by the masculine. This will be true to only a small degree since there are very few sex differences at this age level in those personal traits which help or hinder social accept-
ance.

It should be added that this sex distribution appears to be a common one since this same general trend has been observed in practically every group studied sociometrically.

An objective analysis of the personal characterizations presented some serious difficulties. Since the characterizations were written by five different people with no attempt at uniformity they naturally differed widely in approach, vocabulary, and thoroughness. Their length for each child described ranged from \( \frac{1}{2} \) page for one observer to 4 to 5 pages for another. Some were quite verbose while others were stated in very concise abbreviated language. Some explained at some length the basis for statements made while others presented conclusions only, and in a few cases actual behavior was described with no attempt made to reduce it to trait names. The necessity for some sort of common denominator soon became ap-
parent. The personal characterizations had to be reduced to some form which would be amenable to statistical treatment. The procedure described below was adopted to accomplish this.

The characterizations and anecdotal records were read through and a list was made of specific personality traits or behavior characteristics described or inferred. In order to avoid misinterpretation ambiguous descriptions were omitted.
This method is illustrated below by quotations from the personal characterizations followed by their subsequent reduction to specific traits. At least one quotation was taken from the contributions of each of the five student-observers. An effort was made to make the trait names as neutral as possible, so that they could be rated later as either positive or negative.

1. She identifies strongly with the group, and becomes extremely excited during elections or choosing situations. She seems to feel personally responsible for the success of any group activity whether she is personally involved or not. She often goes out of her way to include some of the rejects in group activities. She has a great deal of nervous energy and never sits still for more than a few minutes at a time.

   Group Identification
   Sensitivity to the Feelings of Others
   General Activity

2. Wilma is a rather quiet and shy little girl. She takes no part in things unless she has to. She almost never initiates activity and others do not look to her for approval. She never assumes a position of leadership unless it is forced upon her.

   Aggressive-withdrawing
   Initiative
   Prestige
   Assumes Responsibility

3. His movements are well coordinated and he is very adept at most situations involving muscular activity. His responses in the classroom are limited to the answering of direct questions from the teacher in as few words as possible and then his answers are usually wrong or irrelevant.

   Physical Efficiency
   Appropriateness of Response

4. She has an ever-inviting smile that is always waiting for almost anyone who wishes to be favored with it. Her emotional expansiveness is very far reaching as is shown on the friendship matrix charts and from personal observation of daily behavior.
Smiling and Cheerfulness
Affectionate

5. He plays fair in games, was rated as number 2 in the group as being a good worker. He is cooperative in working with the group.....He plays well in the games on the playground.

Sportsmanship
Cooperativeness

6. Children say that he is not honest; they claim that he has taken articles on a number of occasions.....He studies quite a lot and does not play any games. He does not participate in class discussions.

Honesty
Participation in Group Activities

7. Elleece is the most attractive girl in the class. She is very feminine in manner as well as physical appearance. She dresses well and very neatly, and keeps herself clean and her hair combed throughout the day.

Attractiveness of Appearance
Characteristics of Sex
Quality of Clothes
Neatness

8. Jimmy is moderately carefree and relaxed; at times he seems rather tense and rigid as though overwhelmed with some sort of anxiety. He laughs and smiles rather frequently in real enjoyment but is just as easily moved to scowls of anger when just the least bit of frustration is introduced.

Nervous Tension
Emotional Control

9. As a matter of fact Melvin's parents belong to a religious group which does not permit the members to attend movies.

Cultural Background

10. His most outstanding trait is mischievousness. He is always into something...playing during class, pestering somebody or destroying other peoples property.....He realizes his position to a certain extent and is not self-confident in his relations with others.....He often gets into mischief to get attention and will quiet down if ignored.
Direction of Activity
Self-confidence
Attention Seeking

11. Doris is quite obese and has a very poor distribution of body weight. Her shoulders are slightly humped giving her a bent-over appearance. When not smiling her expression is dull and uninteresting. She takes it badly if she does not get a chance to express her opinion and frequently criticizes or ridicules the responses of others.

Unusual Physical Characteristics
Facial Expressiveness
Criticalness

12. Serena is generous. She is talkative and sometimes bossy in getting the games going on the playground. She responds to classroom discussion, is spontaneous and alert.

Generosity
Bossiness
Alertness

13. The class finally had to elect him as host for the week because there was no one else to choose. This sudden power went to his head and he performed his duties in an authoritarian manner. He is never satisfied with the position assigned him on the playground and is always complaining that he is being discriminated against. His clothes are always too short and too tight, and more countrified than the clothes of the other boys.

Use of Authority
Conformity to Group Wishes
 Appropriateness of Clothes

14. He is courteous and well aware of the feelings of others. When the writer recently attended an open house sponsored by the classroom, Billy was the first one to provide a Coke with an apology for not having done so sooner.

Politeness and Courtesy
Several other traits were listed beside the 35 illustrated above but were later discarded because they were not mentioned frequently enough to be considered significant. The next problem was to develop some method of rating each pupil on the
listed traits in order to discover those traits which reliably
differentiated between the popular and unpopular children. At
first, it was hoped that the pupils could be rated as either
positive or negative for each trait so that the chi square
method could be used. However, this did not work out since
some of the traits would result in less than 5 for one of the
categories. This does not meet the requirements of a chi square
test. It was necessary to construct a 3 category rating scale
to which critical ratio could be applied. The results of the
rating scale developed are presented in Table 7.

The three categories of the scale are good, average, or
not mentioned, and poor. The good category was given a numeri-
cal weighting of 3, the middle category a weighting of 2, and
the poor category a weighting of 1. In this way numerical
scores for the popular and unpopular groups could be derived
for each trait which could then be subjected to the same sta-
tistical formula used for obtaining the critical ratios of
the Integral Scale.

It is admitted that the middle category is open to criti-
cism. Because a particular trait is not mentioned for an in-
dividual does not necessarily mean he was average for that
trait; it may have been an oversight on the part of the student-
observer. However, this should not have occurred very frequently.
If an individual was decidedly good or poor in a trait it seems
likely the observer would have noticed and recorded it. At any
rate, this source of error cannot be helped since a middle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Rating Score</th>
<th>Critical Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Direction of Activity</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conformity to Group Wishes</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assumption of Responsibility</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participation in Group Activity</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Group Identification</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Appropriateness of Response</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prestige</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cooperativeness</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sensitivity to Feelings of Others</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. General Activity</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sportmanship</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Self-Confidence</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Emotional Control</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Cultural Background</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Affectionate</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Honesty</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Smiling and Cheerfulness</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Politeness and Courtesy</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Appropriateness of Clothes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Quality of Clothes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Use of Authority</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Attention Seeking</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Initiative</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Aggressive-withdrawing</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Facial Expressiveness</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Characteristics of Sex</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Neatness</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Attractiveness of Appearance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Nervous Tension</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Unusual Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Physical Efficiency</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Alertness</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Criticalness</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Bossiness</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Generosity</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
category is necessary for proper statistical treatment of the data. A larger number of categories would have been desirable, but this would have necessitated a better acquaintance with the subjects than was afforded by the personal characterizations. It would also have been desirable to have had more than one rater, but, unfortunately, at the time this part of the study was made no other qualified judges were available.

After the scale had been constructed each of the 45 personal characterizations was carefully re-read and the individual described therein rated for each of the traits listed. Whenever there was any doubt as to how an individual should be rated for a particular trait he was placed in the middle category. Every effort was made to adhere strictly to the descriptions as they were written without making any personal inferences as to vaguely implied meanings.

It will be noticed by inspection of Table 7 that the personal traits are listed according to the magnitude of their critical ratios. Traits 1 through 20 are those which significantly differentiate between the popular and unpopular groups while those from 21 through 35 fail to meet the criterion of a critical ratio of 3.00. It will also be noticed that there is considerable over-lap between some of the traits. There would undoubtedly be found rather high correlations between these over-lapping traits, but such an extensive statistical analysis hardly seemed warranted by such a small number of cases. The failure of a few of the traits to meet the criterion
can probably be accounted for by this factor of over-lapping. This and other probable sources of error will be considered in the following discussions of the traits wherever it seems to be operative.

The distinction between Direction of Activity and General Activity seems to be an important one since the critical ratio of the former is nearly twice as high as the latter. This difference apparently lies in the nature of the activity of the unpopular group which in nearly every case was aimless, non-constructive or actually anti-social, and seemed to be motivated primarily by a need for attention or as an outlet for frustrated desires. Most of the popular group who rated high in the one also rated high in the other.

Conformity to Group Wishes does not necessarily imply submissiveness, but rather an acceptance of group decisions, once they had been made even though they may not have been in accord with the individual’s personal desires. Many of the unpopular group expressed their lack of conformity by dissatisfaction with positions assigned them on the playground and in work committees.

Assumption of Responsibility and Participation in Group Activities are self-explanatory and occupy about the position one would expect. Group Identification overlaps somewhat with these two, but some distinction should be made. Group identification implies a feeling of belongingness and a sense of responsibility and concern for the success of group undertakings.
The individual accepts group goals as his own. Some of the children who assumed responsibility and participated in group activities did so for the personal satisfaction derived rather than as a contribution to the group. Also a few of the unpopular children identified with the group but scored low on the other two traits due to timidity and lack of self-confidence.

Appropriateness of Response and Prestige overlap somewhat; however, there seems to be sufficient distinction to warrant the inclusion of both traits. Appropriateness of Response refers to both academic and social situations, and derives its high critical ratio from the fact that none of the unpopular group received a rating above average in it. Nearly all those who rated high for Appropriateness of Response also rated high in Prestige, but the converse was not true. The few individuals who rated high in Prestige but rated only average in Appropriateness of Response did rate high in several of the other significant traits. Probably Prestige should not be considered a trait in itself but rather the result of the possession of several other traits.

Slightly more than half of the popular group received a rating of average for Sensitivity to Feelings of Others, while none of the unpopular group received a rating of good for this trait, and about half of them were characterized by an absence of it. Probably, in most cases, this lack of sensitivity on the part of the unpopular group is a result of unpopularity rather than a cause of it. They are so concerned over their
own problems they find it difficult to extend sympathy to others. The opposite can be said for the popular group; they can afford to be sympathetic. The trait Affectionate can be described in much the same way, except that in this case more of the unpopular group received a rating of average.

Cultural Background requires some qualifying statements. An individual was rated good in this trait if his cultural background and moral standards conformed with the group norm, and poor if there was some marked deviation. The majority of cases in both groups fell in the middle category because the trait was not mentioned. In those cases in which the trait was mentioned the individual was described as either good or poor; while with the popular group 7 were rated as poor and 2 as good. Apparently this trait occurs only infrequently as a determiner of social acceptance, but when it does occur it could be of extreme importance in a negative way.

The trait of honesty deserves consideration due to its unusual distribution of scores. Three of the popular group were rated as good, 20 of them as average and none as poor; while none of the unpopular group were rated as good, 14 of them as average and 8 as poor. According to this evidence, exceptional honesty certainly could not be considered essential to social acceptance while definite dishonesty probably would prevent one from attaining it.

Smiling and Cheerfulness deserves mention because 5 of the popular group were rated as poor in this trait and 3 of
the unpopular group were rated as good. This would suggest that it is not essential to popularity even though the difference between the two groups is sufficient to derive a significant critical ratio.

The correlation between Appropriateness of Clothes and Quality of Clothes would be quite high, particularly in the popular group. There were a few differences in the unpopular group, but hardly enough to warrant the inclusion of both traits. Appropriateness of Clothes alone would have been adequate.

The rest of the significant traits will not be discussed here since they are fairly clear cut in meaning and in score distribution. Their positions explain them sufficiently.

Why some of the traits failed to meet the criterion is also important for an understanding of social acceptance. The 15 traits that comprise this group range in critical ratio from 2.97 to 0.00. It must be remembered that any one of these 35 traits might be an important factor in determining social acceptance for individual cases but these last 15 did not occur frequently enough to be considered statistically significant.

The failure of Use of Authority to meet the criterion seems to be due to lack of opportunity on the part of the unpopular group to exercise this trait; most of them fell in the middle category because the trait was not mentioned. Only 1 of the popular group was rated as poor, and 10 of them as good.

It was suggested in Chapter I that Attention Seeking was
of little importance at the lower grade levels. This factor was also brought out in this study. Nearly all of the popular group who received a rating of poor or average in this trait were from the second grade groups. There was a more even distribution of grade levels in the unpopular group. If the two second grade groups had been left out it would probably have resulted in a significant critical ratio for this trait.

Initiative, Facial Expressiveness, and Alertness probably all overlap to some extent with each other and with one or two of the significant traits such as General Activity and Participation in Group Activities. Facial Expressiveness might be an exception to this since 4 of the popular group were rated as poor for this trait. It is doubtful if it would have reached significance even without the factor of overlapping.

Characteristics of Sex, Neatness, and Physical Efficiency fail to meet the criterion due partly, at least, to the unequal distribution of the sexes. Characteristics of Sex and Physical Efficiency were of importance with the boys but not especially so with the girls, while just the opposite was true of neatness. If there had been more boys in the popular group and more girls in the unpopular group these traits would probably have resulted in higher critical ratios. It is also likely that neatness overlapped with Appropriateness of Clothes. Of course, the extent of these influences is impossible to estimate without more extensive analysis.
No explanation can be found for the position of the rest of the traits except that they simply are not, by themselves, important determiners of social acceptance. These traits are Aggressive-Withdrawing, Attractiveness of Appearance, Nervous Tension, Unusual Physical Characteristics, Criticalness, and Generosity.

**Summary of Findings**

The most common source of error occurring among the significant traits was that of overlapping. The best method of overcoming this would be to group those traits which appear to be closely related. Grouping the 20 traits would, of course, result in fewer items, which might reduce the reliability somewhat but would increase the validity. Grouping the traits would probably be necessary for the rating scale method, and the loss in reliability due to reduction of items could be counter-acted to some extent by increasing the points on the scale. This attempt at grouping the 20 significant traits is presented in Table 8. It must be emphasized that this grouping is done according to the subjective judgment of the writer and is based on very little objective data.

The four major divisions are presented in order of their importance, and the sub-divisions are listed in the same way as nearly as possible. The number to the left of each trait indicates its position according to the size of its critical ratio.
**TABLE 8**

GROUPING OF SIGNIFICANT TRAITS

A. Social Interaction

(10) General Activity  
( 1) Direction of Activity  
( 2) Conformity to Group Wishes  
( 6) Cooperativeness  
(11) Sportsmanship  
( 3) Assumption of Responsibility  
( 4) Participation in Group Activities  
( 5) Group Identification

B. Personal Ability

( 6) Appropriateness of Response  
( 7) Prestige  
(12) Self-Confidence

C. Character Traits

( 9) Sensitivity to Feelings of Others  
(16) Politeness and Courtesy  
(13) Emotional Control  
(17) Smiling and Cheerfulness  
(15) Affectionate  
(16) Honesty

D. Conformity to Group Standards

(14) Cultural Background  
(19) Appropriateness of Clothes  
(20) Quality of Clothes

Social Interaction includes those traits which seemed to be involved in relations between the individual and the group rather than between individuals; or on a social rather than a personal plane. The inclusion of Assumption of Responsibility
under this category might be criticized on the grounds that it would be better described as a personal ability. However, as it was used in this scale the trait did not imply ability to handle responsibility but simply the willingness to assume it.

Personal Ability implies the efficiency with which the child conducts himself in situations calling for individual performance. Prestige might be more appropriate under Social Interaction since it consists of the attitude of the group toward the individual, but since this attitude is invariably based upon some sort of personal ability or combination of abilities possessed by the individual it was included in this category. Prestige considered in this sense includes many abilities not by themselves sufficiently important to meet the criterion, such as physical efficiency, academic achievement, and many other more specialized talents.

Character Traits are those traits which are primarily involved in inter-individual relationships rather than between the individual and the group. These are the traits generally supposed to be so important in achieving social success. This may be true in regard to close personal friends, but according to this study they are only secondary toward the achievement of group popularity.

Conformity to Group Standards means the degree to which the individual fits into the norms for his particular group. The traits listed under this category are primarily of negative importance. Conformity would not help an individual a
great deal in achieving popularity but any marked deviations could hinder him considerably.

The validity of this grouping could only be determined by using Table 8 as a rating scale and subjecting the results to a statistical analysis similar to that used in Chapter I with the Integral Scale.

The findings regarding the 15 traits that failed to meet the criterion can be summarized briefly by dividing most of them roughly into 3 groups. The first concerns those which may have been influenced by the unequal distribution of sexes; these are Characteristics of Sex, Neatness, and Physical Efficiency. The second group consists of those traits which may have been influenced by the factor of overlapping; these are Initiative, Facial Expressiveness, and Alertness. The last group are those which simply appear to be unimportant as determiners of Social Acceptance; these consist of Aggressive-Withdrawing, Attractiveness of Appearance, Nervous Tension, Unusual Physical Characteristics, Criticalness, and Generosity. Attention Seeking was probably strongly influenced by age differences; and Use of Authority by the fact that most of the unpopular group lacked opportunity to express the trait. The extent of the influence of these factors would be impossible to determine without more extensive analysis which hardly seems justified with data of this sort.
CHAPTER III

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was the discovery of those personality traits which reliably differentiate between popular and unpopular children as a contribution toward the construction of a more valid rating scale for classroom use.

The children studied were the most popular and unpopular members of 8 elementary school groups ranging from the second through the sixth grades. The social status of the children studied was determined by the North Texas How I Feel Toward Others Scale, a type of sociometric test. Two methods of approach were employed to study the personality trait differences between these extreme groups. The children were rated on the Integral Scale by the teachers of their respective groups, and also by student-observers for five of these groups. The second approach consisted of an analysis of personal characterizations written by the student observers and based on anecdotal records collected throughout the semester.

The data obtained from the administration of the Integral Scale was tested both for reliability and validity, while the personal characterizations were analyzed for validity only. Reliability was defined as the agreement between two raters on the same rates, and validity as the extent to which the
personality traits differentiated between the popular and unpopular groups. The statistical methods employed were the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient for reliability and critical ratio for validity.

Two traits of the Integral Scale, Physical Efficiency and Attention Seeking and Affectation, did not prove to be reliable, and one trait, Self-Expressiveness, failed to meet the criterion of validity. The rest of the traits which proved to be both reliable and valid were: Attractiveness of Appearance, Sociability, Social Prestige, Social Self-Confidence, Freedom from Emotional Tensions, and the total score.

The traits described in the personal characterizations which met the criterion of validity were, in order of their significance: Direction of Activity, Conformity to Group Wishes, Assumption of Responsibility, Participation in Group Activities, Group Identification, Appropriateness of Response, Prestige, Cooperativeness, Sensitivity to Feelings of Others, General Activity, Sportsmanship, Self-confidence, Emotional Control, Cultural Background, Affectionate, Honesty, Smiling and Cheerfulness, Politeness and Courtesy, Appropriateness of Clothes, and Quality of Clothes. Those which failed to meet the criterion were: Use of Authority, Attention Seeking, Initiative, Aggressive-Withdrawing, Facial Expressiveness, Characteristics of Sex, Neatness, Attractiveness of Appearance (this implies physical attractiveness only, not dress or cleanliness), Nervous Tension, Unusual Physical Characteristics, Physical Efficiency, Alertness,
Criticalness, Bossiness, and Generosity.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based upon the writer's interpretation of the findings in Chapters I and II.

1. Ratings should be made without knowledge of the social status of the ratees as determined by sociometric type testing.

2. The rater should not attempt to rate an individual for any trait unless he has had ample opportunity to observe the ratee in situations in which that trait might be exercised.

3. The rater should be cautioned to guard against the "halo" effect, particularly when rating traits which are difficult to judge or which involve interaction between the rater and the ratee.

4. The basic personality traits, particularly those involved in social interaction, are of much greater significance than the more superficial aspects of personality such as self-expressiveness, physical efficiency, etc.

5. The individual is judged by his associates according to his total personality rather than single traits. He can afford to be poor in one significant trait if he has enough good qualities to make up for it.

These last two conclusions are in agreement with the findings of most other studies on this subject.
Recommendations

The recommendations given below for revisions of and additions to the Integral Scale are based upon the reliability and validity of the items of the scale, and the more significant traits of the personal characterizations not covered by these items. This revised scale would have to be administered and the results analyzed before it could be considered a valid measurement of social acceptability.

Self-Expressiveness would probably become a valid item if Direction of Activity was added to it. For the "good" extreme this addition could be "Activity is well directed and purposeful," and for the poor extreme "If active the activity is aimless, non-constructive, or actually anti-social."

Attractiveness of Appearance, Sociability, Social Prestige, and Social Self-Confidence should be left as they are.

Physical Efficiency should not be considered a significant item except for playground situations.

Attention-Seeking and Affectation should be judged carefully, and probably should not be considered very significant in the primary grades.

Freedom from Emotional Tensions should include Emotional Control.

The following additions to the scale are suggested:

1. Appropriateness of Response

| Handles authoritative roles well; volunteers information but does not insist upon | Misuses authority; asks irrelevant questions; answers out of turn; |
giving it; responses usually relevant and correct; generally does the right thing at the right time.

2. Sensitivity to Feelings of Others

Concern for others, sensitive to their feelings; sensitive to the feelings and wishes of the group and responsive to them. Usually polite and courteous.

Unconcerned over the welfare of others; disregards the feelings of individuals and generally unaware of or unresponsive to group feelings and wishes; often impolite and rude.

3. Identification With the Group

Takes pride in group achievements; participates readily in group activities; concerned over success of group projects whether personally involved or not.

Unconcerned over group achievements; participates in group activities only when to personal advantage; concerned with success of personal contributions but not with the project as a whole.

4. Cooperativeness

Works and plays well with others; gives credit to contributions of others; assumes responsibility but does not try to be bossy; can take orders as well as give them; conforms to group decisions once they are made.

Disliked by others as a work or play companion; fails to make expected contributions or tries to do it all; hogs all the credit for group projects; jealous of contributions of others and unduly critical of them; often conforms to group decisions grudgingly or not at all.
APPENDIX

HOW I FEEL TOWARD OTHERS

The teacher and the pupils should read this entire scale together.

To the pupils:

You have all taken a lot of tests in arithmetic, reading, and other subjects. You have been asked to take these tests so your teachers would know better how to help you in your studies. Now you are asked to tell how you feel toward other children in your room. This is not a test like the others you have taken. There are no right or wrong answers. All you need to do is to tell how you feel toward other children in your room. By doing this you will help the teacher to know which other children you get along with the best.

No child will be allowed to see another child's paper.

DIRECTIONS: On another sheet of paper you have the names of all the children in your room. As soon as we finish reading the directions you will be asked to place a number to the left of each of these names, including your own. The numbers which you will use are the numbers of the paragraphs listed below.

Do not put any numbers now. Please put your pencils down until you are told by your teacher to begin.

We must first read all the directions together, so you will be sure to know how to mark your list of names.

Number 1 is for: 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. You play with your best friends a lot and have fun with them.
B. You treat them nice, help them whenever you can, and share your things with them.
C. You go places with them and talk with them a lot.
D. You go to their homes and they come to your home quite often.

Number 2 is for: My Other Friends. Besides our best friends all of us have other friends whom we like fairly well.
A. You play with them sometimes, but you do not always have fun with them.
B. You are nice to them most of the time, but you seldom share your things with them.
C. Sometimes you go places with them, and talk with them, but not very often.
D. You seldom go to their homes, and they seldom come to your home.

Number 3 is for: Students I don't know. There may be some children on your list 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 much about them. You don't know how you really feel about these children. Put a 3 to the left of the names of these children whom you don't know well enough to rate.

Number 4 is for: Students I know but who are not my friends. All of us know some persons quite well but we do not consider them to be our friends.

A. You seldom play with them.
B. You do not get along very well with them when you are around them.
C. You do not talk to them or go places with them unless it is necessary to be polite.
D. You do not like some of the things they do, and the way they act at times.

Number 5 is for: Students I do not want to have as friends—as long as they are like they are now. Nearly all of us find there are a few persons we cannot get along with. These people may be all right in some ways, and may be regarded as good friends by others, but not by us.

A. You avoid playing with them, and you never choose them as partners for a game.
B. Sometimes you fuss, quarrel, and fight with them when you are around them.
C. You never go places with them and you never talk with them unless you have to.
D. You dislike very much some of the things they do, and the way they act at times.

Now let us go over the main headings.

What is number 1 for? (Students respond)
What is number 2 for? (Students respond)
What is number 3 for? (Students respond)
What is number 4 for? (Students respond)
What is number 5 for? (Students respond)
You do not have to use all these numbers. You may use any one of them as many times as you wish. All you need to do is show how you feel about each person on your list by putting one of the above numbers to the left of his name.

Be sure to put a number to the left of every name. Do not leave out any one.

Has everyone found his own name? If your name is not on the list, tell the teacher so she can have all the children add your name to their lists. As soon as you have found your name, or have written it in, put a 6 to the left of it.

If you have any questions, please ask them now.

When you have finished marking your list, turn your paper face down on your desk and leave it there until the teacher takes it up.

Go ahead now and place the other numbers (1-2-3-4-5) to the left of the rest of the names on your list.
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