

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

During the past fifty years, many investigators have studied the various phases of social acceptability. The mere bulk of these studies suggests its importance to psychologists. Blanchard (3) made a random selection of eighteen studies of social acceptance published from 1902 through 1946. Most of the studies were devoted to pupils of elementary age and most of them use the questionnaire method of determining acceptability. The matters most frequently studied, he found, are: (1) work groups, (2) play groups, (3) social groups, and (4) the influence of age and intelligence upon social acceptance.

A number of hypotheses about sociometric phenomena were presented by Northway (50) in 1946. In her various studies some of the hypotheses were tested experimentally. She hypothesizes (1) a person's acceptance score as measured in one group is a reliable index of what it will be in another similar group; (2) such changes in status as occur will affect the middle ranges of acceptance rather than the extremes; and (3) competition and emphasis on individual success decreases group cohesiveness, while the attempt to accomplish a common goal increases it. She suggests that the sociometric devices be used in investigating problems related to preference, prejudices, and individual differences in relation to success and failure.

The observation is made by Buhler (15) that each developmental stage in family life requires special social adjustment. She sees certain social types emerging at the pubescent period; these types

seen to be the outgrowth of the temporal position in the family and the child's interpretation of his social stimuli. She denoted the protective type, the popular child, the leader, the despot, and the socially unsuccessful child.

Methods of Determining Social Acceptability

Various methods of determining social acceptability have been devised and used. Kahlen and Lee (36) used the "Guess Who" technique, where polar extremes of personality characteristics were investigated. "Who is the most cheerful person in the class? and Who is seldom cheerful?" Pupil responses are the clues to personality traits possessed by different individuals.

A variation of the nomination method is the questionnaire of the type used by Stauber and Hunting (59) where acquaintanceship with social groups, occupations, races, religious and fraternal organizations is determined. Jastak (28) used a form of twenty questions in his study. Northway (43) lists four questions and tells how to score her test of social acceptability. An advantage of the nomination method of determining social acceptability is the ease with which it is used. Little time is required and it is possible to determine social acceptability without asking children to name children with whom they would not choose to associate. This procedure of making negative choices has been generally frowned upon by teachers on the basis that making negative choices may tend to direct and solidify social attitudes that may be unhealthy for the group in general and the rejected individuals in particular. Using the positive approach only, however, is a serious limitation of the nomination methods.

In order to offset this source of social prejudice and still obtain information on social rejections, Thompson and Powell (61) devised a series of seven point rating scales on which each child rated his degree of acceptance or rejection of every other child in the classroom. Although this technique is more complex it does secure more reliable results and distinguishes between a social rejection and a child who is not nominated or whom Thompson and Powell term a "nonentity".

Zeleny (68) proposes the use of a formula to determine acceptability. Social status may be shown by means of a ratio, he states, which is equal to the number of acceptances multiplied by the intensity of the acceptance, and that product divided by the total possible number of acceptances.

A study made by Bradway used a scale to measure social maturity (13). Hsia (25) used a sociability test made up of teachers ratings at two different times and pupil statements about other children. O'Rourke (52) had 8,000 elementary children make up lists of specific things which cause a person to be liked or disliked. A study was made by Young (66) employing various techniques: A school opinion poll, a citizenship test, and a seven point sociometric test; all devised by himself and used in addition to the Ohio Social Acceptability Scale and the Ohio Recognition Scale. He points out that none of these are standardized but claims that they go well beyond observations and eliminate the time lag when observations are used. Northway (43) uses a questionnaire and then makes a diagram of the relationships in the pattern of a target.

Smith (57), Newcomb (41), and Washburn and Hilgard (64) have used the five minute behavior observation technique. In this type of study several sessions of observation are provided. One of the shortcomings of this type of study is the time necessary for several observations spaced at intervals; another is the subjective nature of the study since the investigator must give his impression of the behavior that he sees.

A technique that has a very high reliability is the paired-comparison procedure used extensively by Koch (33,34,35). This is a laborious technique requiring each child in a group to make a choice between every possible paired combination of his associates. The limiting factor of this device is that it is probably too cumbersome to use in the ordinary classroom situation.

Social Acceptability and Specific Topic Questions Versus General Topic Questions

A study of social acceptability using specific topic questions was made by Kerr (32). An inspection of the distribution of sociometric choices shows that there was little variation in pupils sociometric status based on the criterion of a seating companion and on that of a work companion on a committee. However, there was considerable variation when the criteria were based on more specific activities, such as choosing companions for a cooking class.

These variations indicate the probability that skill had a large influence on the number of choices pupils received when specific criteria were applied.

The sociometric device has often been used in group studies

and rating scales. Gronlund (22) studied forty sixth grade classes including 1,258 pupils. In each class the pupils chose the five classmates they most preferred as seating companions, five play companions, and five work companions.

As shown in Table I, the findings indicate that sociometric status based on criteria of a general nature provides a fairly reliable index of the social acceptability of pupils in classroom groups. Gronlund states that many times, however, we wish to use the sociometric device for purposes other than that of determining social acceptability. For example, if a teacher were organizing groups for some specific purpose such as art, homemaking, or athletics, he will want to use a specific criterion relating to the activity, in which case generality would not be a factor.

TABLE I

Means and Standard Deviations of 240 Correlation Coefficients of Sociometric Status Scores on the Basis of Choices of Seating Companion, Play Companion, and Work Companion Made by Boys and Girls in Forty Sixth Grade Classes

Choices Correlated	Boys		Girls	
	Mean Correlation	Standard Deviation	Mean Correlation	Standard Deviation
Seating and Play	.80*	.13	.76*	.11
Play and Work	.76*	.12	.76*	.11
Seating and Work	.86*	.09	.89*	.07

*Significant beyond the 1% level.

Gronlund concludes that, pending further investigation, a general criterion should be selected when the sociometric technique is used to determine the social acceptability of pupils in the classroom groups.

Physical Ability and Social Adjustment

In an attempt to find the relationship between physical ability and social adjustment, Jones (30) took a sample of seventy eight boys in California and chose the ten strongest and the ten weakest. The strong boys were found to be superior in social prestige, personal adjustment, and freedom from tensions and fears. By their average inventory score on a revised and extended form of the Rogers Test of Personality, adjustment was found to be inferior in only one category--adjustment to school. The ten lowest in strength showed a pronounced tendency toward poor health, social difficulties, feelings of inferiority, and personal adjustment.

Mental Ability and Social Status

A Primary Abilities Test was administered to all the thirteen year olds in a midwestern community of 6,000, by Havighurst and Breese (24). They wished to determine the relationship between mental ability and social status. While girls seemed to do better than boys in most of the tests, children of higher social status tended to do better in all tests than did those of lower social position.

Personality and Popularity

Two studies of the relationship between personality and popularity or social success have been reported. Tests and attitude scales administered by Jenny (29) showed that the most acceptable boys in a summer camp were well adjusted, resourceful, and capable of leadership. Non-accepted boys tend to be problem cases and they manifest anti-social behavior. In this study the relation between intelligence, mental age, and chronological age and social acceptability was not clear. Here, again, the personality factor shows

up clearly.

Northway and Wigder (27) studied Rorschach patterns and their relation to sociometric status. Pupils were divided into three equal groups varying in sociometric status; extremely high, intermediate, and low. They were matched as to chronological age, intelligence, race, religion, and socio-economic background. The high group showed a greater sensitivity in sensing feelings of others and constant striving for approval of others. The disturbances in the low group seemed to be more serious. The recessive low group showed a tendency toward schizophrenic patterns, while the high group seemed disturbed with psycho-neurotic symptoms.

Social Position and Personality Adjustment

The California Test of Personality was administered to school children by Phillips and Vere (54). They were investigating the relation of positive and negative sociometric valuation to social and personal adjustment. Seven of the twelve sub-sections produced evidence of a relationship between one's social position among his peers and some aspects of personality adjustment as measured by the test.

Social Skills and Social Acceptance

A group of students was divided into socially accepted and socially unaccepted groups by Bretsch (14). He then investigated the social skills and activities of each group. He found that the group higher in social acceptance possessed skills such as dancing, playing cards, skating, skiing, and conversational ability. Certain solitary activities seemed to be favored by the less accepted group.

Age Factor and Social Acceptance

A sociometric test was given to sixth graders in order to find

those students who were socially accepted or rejected. This study by Bedoian (2) showed that the underage pupils had significantly higher social acceptance scores than at-age or over-age students. He observed also that the lowest scores in acceptability were obtained by over age pupils.

Most of the studies reported above attempted to relate only one variable to social acceptance. Since individuals do not react as parts of a whole it is well that studies have been done considering many factors.

Various Factors and Their Relation to Social Status

"The Peer Status of Sixth and Seventh Grade Children" was the subject of a study by Frances Laughlin (38) in 1954. This study was begun in the sixth grades of Port Arthur School in Texas. It continued through the seventh grade involving the same students. The factors considered were class membership, personality characteristics, mental ability, and academic achievement. Of these factors, it was found that personality characteristics were most closely associated with peer status. The report seems to indicate that a consistent personality pattern had been established by seventh grade. This would seem to emphasize the need of good group relationships in the lower grades.

A study by Davis (18) explored some correlates of a measure of social acceptance among peers for a group of early adolescents. His subjects were one hundred eighth grade boys in public school. Low but significant relationships were found between the sociometric rating and mental age or intelligence, adjustment, pubescence, achievement, in reading and attitudes toward school. Davis found no significant

relationships between sociometric status and age, socioeconomic class, or under or over achievement as predicted by mental age.

A paper was written by Feinberg (19) on the relation of background experiences to social acceptance. He points out that social acceptance is an important need of individuals, and that we should understand better the interrelationships. Background experiences are part of these. The need for popularity at the adolescent level is recognized by magazines for teenagers which attempt to give rules or suggestions, compliance to which will lead to social recognition.

The boys in the accepted group considered themselves successful in their social relations, tended to make friends rather quickly, and had more friends than most of the boys in their class. They felt that they played most games better than the average boy of the same age. A characteristic of the rejected boys was the admission that they had only one or two close friends, and they were only average in their ability to make friends. They considered their athletic ability to be about average, but thought that they could get along better with girls and shoot a gun.

Young and Cooper (66) studied 418 pupils in grades five to eight whose social status had been determined by a questionnaire. They could find no significant relationship of physical and mental characteristics, interest, and activities with popularity. Extroversion, a sense of personal worth, feelings of belonging, social standards, and school relations were significantly related to popularity. Popular and isolate children differed most in respect to personal appearance. Facial expression seemed more closely related with popularity than voice or appearance of clothing.

(A study of various factors related to social status on the second grade level found girls more popular than boys, that membership of a small rather than a large family group, and reading ability sometimes were related to higher social status. Ronney (4) found in this study that social status was unrelated to intelligence, number of dental cavities, tonsillar inflammation, basal metabolism and chronological age.)

Appraisal Studies

In evaluating the psychological and educational significance of social acceptability, Leeb (39) found acceptability related to scholastic achievement, and slightly to chronological age, mental age, and intelligence.

Northway (45) found little change in the social structure at the beginning and at the end of a four week camp trip, that there were few isolated campers, that new campers attained their position early, and that skills were factors influencing acceptability in activities for which they were required. Success in direct personal relationships seemed to be accompanied by high group acceptance.

In her summary of the Toronto Studies, Northway (46) declares that the child who shows little energy (the listless, the effortless, the uninterested, the recessive child) is lower in acceptability. The energetic child is high in acceptability unless the activity takes the direction of being annoying or inhibiting to the association.

An awareness of social status was the topic of a study by Ames (1). He states that correlations between scores on the Awareness of Social Acceptance Questionnaire and an adapted form of Spencer's Experience Appraisal show children are quite unaware of how well they

are liked by classmates, nor do they realize that social unacceptability is related to their feelings of unhappiness or conflict. He found no definite behavior patterns for the child who feels rejected or unaccepted.

The volume of these studies and their nature indicate the importance of finding the various characteristics of the socially accepted individual. It would seem that since many factors are interrelated, more studies exploring the global patterns should be initiated.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study was conducted in the eighth grades of the Sierra Junior High School in Bakersfield, California. There were twelve homerooms having an average of thirty six students.

The selection of the school was made on the basis of availability to the author, composition of the students (few Spanish, Oriental, and colored), and permanency of patrons. Permission to pursue the study was granted only if positive choices were expressed in the questionnaire to be used. This philosophy was in line with other methods used in the school.

The questionnaire was distributed to the students by their homeroom teacher. No briefing or structuring was done. Instructions were given to the teachers to encourage the class members to answer each question seriously and independently. Each student interpreted questions four (Whom do you think the class would choose as the most acceptable in most social situations?) and five (Whom would you choose for number four?) for himself, which eliminated the possibility of stereotyping the person to be chosen.

The questions were designed to force some choices across sex lines. The purpose of the questionnaire was to identify those students who were considered by their classmates to be the most acceptable in most situations. An opportunity was provided for each student to give his own choice as well as to choose whom he thought was most acceptable by the class. This was done to find out if his personal choice agreed with whom he thought the class as a whole would choose

as the most socially acceptable.

The subjects were the two students in each class who received the highest number of choices to the two pertinent questions*, and two who received no choices in any of the categories. This would have given forty eight subjects. Actually, fifty six were chosen because of ties or near ties.

The subjects, who will be referred to as the high group or low group in social acceptability, were compared in various aspects of behavior.

Frequencies for each student chosen were tabulated in each of the categories. In some cases the class was in agreement as to the answers to questions four and five, the only questions used to determine the socially accepted student, so that only one student was chosen as a socially accepted subject from each homeroom. In certain instances, three or four students were selected for the high group since several had received many choices. Low group subjects were randomly selected from those who were not chosen on any of the questions.

Two representative homeroom situations follow:

Patricia received seventeen individual choices for question five and sixteen choices for question four. No one else was close to this frequency - the next being Jerry with one choice for question five and two choices for question four. Only Patricia was chosen for study in the high group from this homeroom.

For the low groups, four boys and one girl received no choices so the girl was chosen and one boy was selected at random.

*A sample of the questionnaire is included in the appendix.

In one other homeroom Steven received thirteen choices for question four and six for question five. Kathy had eleven for number four and eight for number five. Joe had four for number four and eight for number five. Milly received one for number four and three for number five, and five other students received one choice for each question. Steven, Kathy, and Joe were chosen since they each received more choices.

For the low group in the same room two boys and two girls were not chosen in any category and so were considered socially unaccepted. One of the boys and one of the girls were selected at random.

As a further means of qualifying the high group subjects a rank table was compiled showing the frequency of choices without regard to homeroom. The subjects were the same as chosen previously by homeroom. This is Table III on page 20.

For the low group no further qualifying procedure was used. The highest number of non-accepted students in a classroom was eleven and the lowest was four. An attempt was made to obtain a proportionate number of socially unaccepted boys and girls. There were forty eight boys not chosen and sixteen were randomly selected for study. Thirty six girls were not chosen and twelve selected. In each case thirty three per cent of the total became subjects. The total number of subjects for the study was twelve and seven tenths per cent of the entire class.

TABLE II

Number of Subjects by Sex and Group

Sex	Socially Unaccepted	Socially Accepted	Totals
Boys	16	14	30
Girls	12	14	26
Totals	28	28	56

TABLE III

Frequency of Choices Determining
the Socially Accepted Subjects

Boys				Girls			
	<u>Question 4</u>	<u>Question 5</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Question 4</u>	<u>Question 5</u>	<u>Total</u>
Kenneth	21	10	31	Andrea C.	22	9	31
Steven	13	6	19	Juanna	26	21	47
Larry	11	8	19	Michele	17	19	36
Jimmy	11	6	17	Patricia	16	17	33
Tommy	11	6	17	Kathy	11	8	19
Donald	9	9	18	Sharon	11	5	16
Theron	7	5	12	Willette	6	3	9
Milton	6	6	12	Kay	5	2	7
John	6	6	12	Diana	4	8	12
Dwight	5	5	10	Vicki	4	2	6
Joe	4	8	12	Andrea D.	3	4	7
Samuel	4	5	9	Karen	3	5	8
Jerry	4	3	7	Ofelia	3	3	6

TABLE III - Continued

Boys			Girls		
	<u>Question 4</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Question 5</u>		<u>Question 4</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Question 5</u>
Edward	3	3 6	Margaret	2	5 7

Two forms were then prepared for each subject; one a questionnaire, the other a data sheet. Information for the questionnaire, which asked for such information as the number of brothers and sisters, temporal position in the family, marital relationship of parents, was obtained by means of a personal interview with each subject. Data sheet information, which included the rating scale, achievement test and intelligence test scores, and school grades, was taken from personal record cards at the school and the rating scale was completed by each teacher concerning the subjects in his homeroom. Samples of the data sheet and the questionnaire are included in the appendix.

Chi square on several of the variables were made between the high and low groups. A t-ratio was computed for the intelligence scores and the achievement test scores.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings of the study. This will be done by a brief analysis of the various factors included for study.

Family Relationships

Questions one and two of the questionnaire deal with siblings. This information was available for only twenty six of the high group and for twenty seven of the low group. It was found that the largest number of siblings was twelve and the smallest was one. There was no "only child" to be found among the subjects.

Chi square analysis of the brother-sister factor indicates that in this study no significant difference exists between this factor and social acceptability. Statistical tables for all factors are included in the appendix.

TABLE IV

Number of Siblings of Subjects
by Sex and Social Status

Sex	High Group	Sex	Low Group
14 males	15 brothers 20 sisters 35 total siblings	16 males	29 brothers 24 sisters 53 total siblings
12 females	10 brothers 17 sisters 27 total siblings	11 females	17 brothers 21 sisters 38 total siblings
26 total cases	25 brothers 37 sisters 62 total siblings	27 total cases	46 brothers 45 sisters 91 total siblings

From Table IV it may be seen that the high group has more sisters than brothers. Socially unaccepted girls also have more sisters than brothers, but the socially unaccepted boys have more brothers than sisters.

TABLE V

Summary of Table IV
Average Number of Siblings

Socially accepted group		Socially unaccepted group	
Boys	2.50 siblings 1.07 brothers 1.43 sisters	Boys	3.31 siblings 1.81 brothers 1.50 sisters
Girls	2.25 siblings .83 brothers 1.42 sisters	Girls	3.46 siblings 1.55 brothers 1.91 sisters
Average	2.38 siblings	Average	3.37 siblings

As Table V shows the socially accepted students have an average of one more sibling than the group low in acceptability. While this may appear important a t-ratio test of significance fails to allow rejection of the null statement. The t-ratio for this factor is .94.

Question three of the student questionnaire investigated temporal position in the family. Socially accepted children tend to be the middle born, while the low group subjects tend to be the oldest child. Chi square for this factor equals 6.05 which is significant at the five percent level of confidence.

TABLE VI

Percentage of Subjects in
Temporal Position

Group	Oldest	Middle	Youngest
Socially accepted boys	27%	54%	18%
Socially accepted girls	20%	50%	30%
Socially unaccepted boys	62%	12%	25%
Socially unaccepted girls	50%	50%(1 adopted)	0%

Marital status of parents

Marital status of parents was determined on topic five of the questionnaire. Are both parents living together, or are they divorced or separated? How was this question answered in this study? All socially accepted children were living with both parents. Only eleven per cent of the low group were not also living with both parents.

Residence Factors

Item four of the questionnaire was in regard to the distance of the home from school. No relation was found between social acceptability and this factor. The distance of each group from school ran the entire range from very near to school to those living so far away as to require school bus transportation.

Apparently, there was a far greater relation between social acceptance and the type of dwelling and the surrounding neighborhood. This information was obtained through observation and first hand knowledge of the city where the study was made. This was recorded for items seven and eight of the data sheet.

To the north of the school lie two rather "exclusive" sections of the city. A majority of the homes in these areas are well above

the city average for such factors as square footage, lot size, expensive design, roof gables, landscaping, inside conveniences and luxuries, type of materials used, finish work, and general appearance. It was from these two areas, Hillcrest and College Crest, that about eighty per cent of the socially accepted subjects live.

From the other three sides of the school come the students who compose the unaccepted group. Generally, these three sections have smaller and less expensive homes that would suggest to the observer that the occupants received average or less than average incomes.

For the purposes of this study "average" income was defined to be approximately \$4,000. There was only one low group subject who lived in a home that would compare with the average of the socially accepted group.

Economic Status

Economic status was the information called for on item twelve of the data sheet. By personal interview, by talking with the teachers, and by observation of the personal record card the investigator was able to determine with some accuracy the income of each family.

Five categories of income were used: ample, above average, average, below average, and barely sufficient. As stated before, average income was set at \$4,000. Table VII shows the percentage of students whose parents earn the income in each category.

The chi square test of significance for the information on Table VII was grouped into three categories: above average, average and below average. This computation indicates significance beyond the five per cent level of confidence.

TABLE VII
Percentage of Subjects whose Parents Earn Incomes of Specified Amount

<u>Group</u>	<u>Amount of Income</u>				
	Ample \$10,000 x	Average x Average \$8,000	Average \$4,000	Average - B.S. \$3,000	Average - B.S. \$2,000
Soc. Accepted:					
Total	22%	43%	31%	4%	0%
Boys	7%	47%	47%	0%	0%
Girls	38%	38%	15%	8%	0%
Soc. Unaccepted:					
Total	13%	22%	44%	8%	12%
Boys	20%	0%	60%	10%	10%
Girls	7%	43%	29%	7%	14%

From Table VII it may be seen that in the socially accepted group only four per cent of the incomes are below average, and sixty-five per cent are well above average. This is in comparison with socially unaccepted group of whom twenty per cent are below average and only thirty five percent are above.

Music Participation

Items six and seven were designed to study the musical participation factor. Subjects responded to these questions by stating which if any instrument they played or if they sang in public.

Table VIII shows the percentage of students who play instruments or sing in public. This factor is significant beyond the .01 level as shown by chi square computation.

TABLE VIII
Percentage of Students Playing Instruments or Singing

Socially accepted boys	50%	Socially accepted girls	100%
Socially unaccepted boys	30%	Socially unaccepted girls	50%

About seventy per cent of the socially accepted girls played the piano which was the most popular instrument. The range of instruments was about the same for both groups, but participation was much greater among the high group.

Hobbies and Spare Time Activity

In this area of the study, there seemed to be a little difference in interest and in the degree of interest between the two groups. It appears that the socially accepted students have a wider range of interests; they seem to be busier with their interests, and their hobbies seem to be the kind that more often involve money. For example, in the high group was often involved organized league games while the low group was engaged in low organizational games. The high group would be swimming in a public pool while the low group subjects would be swimming in a canal.

TABLE IX

Hobbies and Spare Time Activity Pursued by Each
Group Showing the Range of Interest
and Rank Order of Frequency of Mention

Socially Accepted Boys	Socially Unaccepted Boys
Sports	Play with the boys
Play baseball	"Mess" around
Play with the boys	Do farm work
Swim	Raise rabbits and pigeons
Scouting	Swim
Work in yard	Ride horses
Work	Sports
Build model cars from kits	Play baseball
Build model boats from kits	Build model cars from kits
Care of pets	Ride Bicycles
Collect sports pictures	Go to shows
Science projects	Collect rocks
Collect match books	Have paper route
Collect coins	Go camping
"Mess" around	
Read car books	

TABLE IX - Continued

Socially Accepted Boys	Socially Unaccepted Boys
Art work Dance lessons	
Socially Accepted Girls	Socially Unaccepted Girls
Sports Dance lessons Swimming Do house work Ride horses Spend time with family Collect coins Collect and mount butterflies Go Bowling	Do housework "Mess" around Swimming Dancing Waste time Watch television Gardening Work away from home Reading Baby sitting Work in flower garden Play with pets Ride horses Skating Take pictures Collect figurines

When the question of hobbies was raised during the interview, some of the subjects did not respond readily. The interviewer would then ask, "How do you spend your spare time?" It was in answer to that question that he received answers like those in the list, "waste time", "messing around," "play with the boys". These were the words used by the subjects.

The distinction between groups was not as clear cut as has been indicated in other studies. The socially accepted boys seem to have a greater range of interest and, judging by their remarks, spend more time in pursuit of their hobbies. The socially accepted girls, however, seemed to spend less time collecting things and more

time at sports or activities requiring money for the necessary materials or admission.

The unaccepted boys seemed to spend more time working and taking care of animals than in any other activity. The unaccepted girls seemed to do more work around the house, in gardening, and in baby sitting than any other activity. It appears that the unaccepted groups are earning some of their own spending money.

Offices Held and Honors Won

Items thirteen and fourteen of the questionnaire showed striking differences between the high and low groups in honors won and offices held. Among the high group were the student council representatives, sergeant of arms, home room presidents, student body president and vice president, yell leaders, homeroom secretaries, and Sierra Sam and Sierra Sue (elected by the students as the representative or typical boy and girl at the Sierra Junior High School).

Some of the low group subjects served as homeroom president, secretary, student council representative, or some minor room officer. Table X shows that the percentage of socially unaccepted students serving was much smaller than in the accepted group.

TABLE X

Percentage of Group Holding Offices or Winning
Honors in Art or Athletics

Socially Accepted		Socially Unaccepted	
Boys	86%	Boys	40%
Girls	100%	Girls	25%

With a chi square figure of 23.48, significant beyond the

.01 level, it must be safe to conclude that a greater number of socially acceptable students hold offices and win honors than among an equal number of socially unacceptable students.

Television and Movies

Table XI shows the amount of time spent watching television and the number of times at movies each month. There is little difference in the number of movies attended by each group. The low groups, however, spend about twice as much time watching television as do the high groups.

The null hypothesis regarding the information in Table XI is not rejected by the t-ratio of .95 for watching television and .11 for number of times at the movies per month. There are no significant correlations between these factors and social acceptability.

TABLE XI

Hours per Week Spent by Each Group Watching
Television and Times at Movies Per Month

Group	Watching Television hours per week	Movies per month
Soc. Acceptable Boys	7.9	1.33
Soc. Acceptable Girls	8.5	2.25
Soc. Unacceptable Boys	16.4	1.75
Soc. Unacceptable Girls	16.8	1.67

Reading Interest

Some studies have attempted to determine the amounts or types of reading engaged in by students who have been measured in social status. This factor was investigated in this study also. While it was difficult to get specific information it appeared that the top group boys and the bottom group girls read somewhat more than the other two groups.

Type of material read was also investigated. Tables XII and XIII list this information.

TABLE XII

Representative Reading Interests by Sex and Group

Socially Accepted		Socially Unaccepted	
Boys:		Boys:	
Sports books		Classics (Huck Finn)	
Biographies		Horse Stories	
Science and Science Fiction			
Sea stories			
Historical novels			
Adventure stories			
Girls:		Girls:	
Sports stories		Horse stories	
Animal stories		Animal stories	
Girl's books		Girl's books	
Mysteries		Classics	

TABLE XIII

Magazines Stated as Being Read by Sex and Group

Socially Accepted		Socially Unaccepted	
Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Post	Post	Post	Post
Life	True Story	Life	Life
Readers Digest	TV Guide	TV Guide	Readers Digest
Sports Car		Car magazines	American Girl
Sports magazines		Teen	Dig
Boy's Life		Comic books	
Time			
Science magazines			

Age

The mean age and the range of ages of socially unaccepted boys are positively skewed by one case. One boy was sixteen years and two months in age; otherwise there is little difference between any of the groups. Because of this one extreme case, the standard deviation for the unaccepted group is 12.49; while for the accepted students the standard deviation is 6.33. These standard deviation figures represent months. The semi-interquartile range partially accounts for the extreme case and it is seen that the quartile figure for accepted students is 1.75 while for the low group it is 2.25.

With the exception of the socially unaccepted boys, there is little variation in the range of ages. The youngest are all about thirteen years and one month. The oldest, with the exception of the boys in the low group, are all about fourteen years and three months. Although the median age is about the same, the non-accepted boys contain the youngest and the oldest, or tend to be more extreme in age compared to their peer group. Means, medians, and range are included in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

Age by Sex and Group

	High Boys	High Girls	Low Boys	Low Girls
Mean	13-9*	13-8	13-11	13-6
Median	13-8	13-10	13-9	13-5
Range	13-3 to 14-5	13-0 to 14-4	13-0 to 16-2	13-2 to 14-0
Extent of range	14 months	16 months	38 months	10 months

*These figures are to be read as: 13 years, 9 months.

Age

The mean age and the range of ages of socially unaccepted boys are positively skewed by one case. One boy was sixteen years and two months in age; otherwise there is little difference between any of the groups. Because of this one extreme case, the standard deviation for the unaccepted group is 12.49; while for the accepted students the standard deviation is 6.33. These standard deviation figures represent months. The semi-interquartile range partially accounts for the extreme case and it is seen that the quartile figure for accepted students is 1.75 while for the low group it is 2.25.

With the exception of the socially unaccepted boys, there is little variation in the range of ages. The youngest are all about thirteen years and one month. The oldest, with the exception of the boys in the low group, are all about fourteen years and three months. Although the median age is about the same, the non-accepted boys contain the youngest and the oldest, or tend to be more extreme in age compared to their peer group. Means, medians, and range are included in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

Age by Sex and Group

	High Boys	High Girls	Low Boys	Low Girls
Mean	13-9*	13-8	13-11	13-6
Median	13-8	13-10	13-9	13-5
Range	13-3 to 14-5	13-0 to 14-4	13-0 to 16-2	13-2 to 14-0
Extent of range	14 months	16 months	38 months	10 months

*These figures are to be read as: 13 years, 9 months.

Intelligence and School Achievement

Very little difference was evidenced in intelligence scores between the two groups. The range of I.Q. scores for the high group was from 79 to 134, a range of 55. This was the same as the range for the low group whose scores ranged from 83 to 138.

A t-ratio was computed of .57 for the two groups. On the basis of this study we could not say that there exists a significant relationship between social acceptability and intelligence scores. Each of the subject matter areas considered exhibited significant differences by the chi square analysis between the two groups in the factor of grade level expectation. In reading, language, and social studies the differences were significant beyond the five per cent level; and in arithmetic significance was attained beyond the one per cent level.

An analysis of the achievement test data reveals more apparent differences between the two groups as may be seen in Table XV.

TABLE XV

The Percentage of Subjects in Each Group That Are
Below Grade Level Expectation in Four
Subject Matter Areas

Subject	Socially Accepted	Socially Unaccepted
Reading Average	22%	45%
Boys	21%	56%
Girls	23%	31%
Arithmetic Average	7.4%	38%
Boys	7.1%	37%
Girls	7.7%	39%
Language Average	26%	55%
Boys	29%	69%
Girls	23%	39%

TABLE XV - Continued

Subject	Socially Accepted	Socially Unaccepted
Social Studies Average	33%	62%
Boys	29%	75%
Girls	38%	46%

Scholastic grading by present and past teachers was studied. It must be remembered that the grading system is somewhat subjective in its nature and that it is possible that teachers will assign the better marks to those students who are more experienced socially. The trend in this study is very noticeable and teacher prejudice probably does not account entirely for the differences shown in Table XVI.

TABLE XVI

Number of Subjects by Sex and Group Receiving Specified Letter Grades in Reading, Arithmetic, Language, and Social Studies by Present and Past Teacher

Group	Present Teacher				
	A's	B's	C's	D's	E's
Socially Accepted Boys	12	24	11	9	0
Socially Accepted Girls	24	19	8	1	0
Total	36	43	19	10	0
Socially Unaccepted Boys	2	14	27	13	9
Socially Unaccepted Girls	1	12	23	11	1
Total	3	26	50	24	12
Past Teacher					
Socially Accepted Boys	10	17	17	7	0
Socially Accepted Girls	11	20	16	4	1
Total	21	37	33	11	1
Socially Unaccepted Boys	2	10	19	16	3
Socially Unaccepted Girls	1	10	19	5	5
Total	3	20	38	21	8

Significant differences were noted in the grades received by the two groups. Chi square for this factor was 63.7, significant far beyond the one per cent level of confidence.

TABLE XVII

Scholastic Grading Summary by Percentage

Group	A's	B's	C's	D's	F's
Socially Accepted	33%	40%	18%	9%	0%
Socially Unaccepted	3%	23%	43%	21%	10%

The percentage summary in Table XVII shows that nearly seventy-five per cent of the top groups receives A's or B's, while only about twenty-five per cent of the bottom group receives the same grades.

Rating Scale of Traits

For this phase of the study, the homeroom teacher was asked to rate, on a scale of one to five, each subject who was a member of his homeroom.

Each group (i.e. top boys, top girls, bottom boys, bottom girls) was assigned a total number of points for each trait considered. A rating of one was one point, a rating of two was two points, etc. The total number of points was averaged by dividing by the number of cases contributing to the total. The average was computed to the nearest hundredth and that score was used as a weighted score with which to make the comparison. It may be noted that in most traits there is less difference between members of a group than there is between groups.

TABLE XVIII

Weighted Scores by Sex and Group For Each Trait on
the Rating Scale

Trait	Socially Accepted		Socially Unaccepted	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Shyness*	2.75	2.64	1.67	2.36
Aggressiveness	3.00	3.92	2.60	1.82
Cooperation	4.42	4.83	3.53	3.64
Stidiousness	4.18	4.67	2.80	2.91
Daydreaming*	3.08	3.50	2.07	2.20
Motivation	3.92	4.30	2.43	2.60
Leadership	4.00	4.30	1.79	1.60

*Indicates the absence of this trait

A weighted score for each subject was obtained for the seven traits of the rating scale and a t-ratio was computed. A significant figure of 5.28 for the t-ratio was computed, allowing rejection of the null statement for this factor.

Table XIX shows the differences between groups of the weighted scores. A summary of the traits is given in Table XX denoting the ranking of groups for each trait.

TABLE XIX

Weighted Score Differences Between Groups

Trait	low boys compared to high boys	low girls compared to high girls	High boys compared to high girls	Low boys compared to low girls
Shyness	1.08	- .28	- .11	.69
Aggressiveness	-.40	-2.10	-.92	.78
Cooperation	-.89	-1.19	-.41	-.11
Stidiousness	-1.38	-1.76	-.49	-.11
Daydreaming	1.01	1.30	.42	.13
Motivation	-1.49	-1.70	-.38	-.17
Leadership	-2.21	-2.70	-.30	.19

TABLE XI
Summary of Rating Scale

Trait	Group Rating			
	High			Low
Shyness*	Accepted boys	Accepted girls	Unaccepted girls	Unaccepted boys
Agressiveness	Accepted girls	Accepted boys	Unaccepted boys	Unaccepted girls
Cooperation	Accepted girls	Accepted boys	Unaccepted girls	Unaccepted boys
Stidiousness	Accepted girls	Accepted boys	Unaccepted girls	Unaccepted boys
Daydreaming*	Accepted girls	Accepted boys	Unaccepted girls	Unaccepted boys
Motivation	Accepted girls	Accepted boys	Unaccepted girls	Unaccepted boys
Leadership	Accepted girls	Accepted boys	Unaccepted boys	Unaccepted girls

Personal Appearance

Although judgment of personal appearance was also necessarily subjective, it will be noted that the interviews were held with subjects little known by the investigator and took place before knowledge of their social acceptability.

A comment was made on each questionnaire after the subject had left the room. Later, when the teachers were asked to complete the rating scale, they were asked to briefly comment on the physical appearance of the individual concerned.

In nearly every case the socially accepted students were described as "clean-cut", "pretty", "attractive", "neat", "shows self confidence", "speaks with assurance", and "shows enthusiasm".

This is in contrast to the unaccepted group who were described as "washed out", "no spark", "listless", "homely", "unattractive",

"plain", and "not pretty". Especially evident was the poor general impression left and an apprehension about being called to the office for the interview.

It would seem, on the basis of this study, that teenagers, in order to be popular and more socially acceptable to their peer group, must do what they can to make themselves more personally attractive. That girls recognize this, seemingly more than do boys is pointed up by the fact that girls more often read the magazines and books describing how this may be done.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The null hypothesis proposed in this study was that there are no significantly characteristic differences between the socially accepted child and the child who is socially unaccepted. A number of factors possibly contributing to social acceptance have been studied. Each factor has some bearing on the total personality. Certain of these factors are possessed in varying amounts by different individuals. The facts indicate that socially acceptable students as a group possess characteristics that are not possessed in the quantity by the group of socially unaccepted students. Since there are some significant differences we may now safely reject the null hypothesis.

Since some factors are not subject to the control of the socially unaccepted individual, they need to be understood and accepted. Over other factors he can exercise a certain amount of control. The student should be able to see and understand the various influences and try to control them by redirecting his thinking and attitudes, and harmonize his behavior with that expected from one who is socially accepted by his peers.

Family Relationships

The questions were raised during the planning of the study: What differences exist in the family situation between the socially accepted students and those who are not socially acceptable? Are there differences in the number of siblings and in the number of brothers and sisters?

The family is a miniature society in which there are three sets of relationships: Those between the parents, between the parents and the children, and between the siblings. One of the distinguishing features of the relations between siblings is their inclusive character.

A second aspect is the range of contacts included. Playing and working together, sharing the same toys, room, food, clothes, and in other ways the range is extreme. This suggests the third aspect, intimacy and frankness of contact.

How do these relationships affect each sibling? What is the effect on the oldest child, or the youngest, or the middle children?

According to Boesard (11) one of the distinct advantages of being a younger sibling is to be "tipped off" or "taught the ropes" by older children. This takes the form of practical information on how to meet life's problems.

This phase of the study seems to harmonise with Ronney (58) who came to the conclusion that there is a strong tendency for the more popular children to come from the smaller family units. Hardy (23) noted this trend also; best liked children had an average of two siblings, the average child had three, and the least liked had four or five.

One explanation for this is linked to the socioeconomic factor. With fewer children in the home there is more financial means with which to provide opportunities for each family member. Other researchers have found that social skill, various experiences, and other opportunities that money may help to provide have some influence on

the social acceptability of children. This factor is beyond control of the subject. However he can be helped to understand his feelings of likes or dislikes for them. If there is not a good relationship between siblings, that feeling may enter into his association with his peer society and account in part for his being unaccepted.

Temporal position is another factor over which he has no control, and if unhealthy feelings exist regarding it a change in attitude may be important if he is to grow socially mature.

Marital relationship of parents was the next topic studied. All socially accepted children were living with both parents. This was also true of all but eleven per cent of the unaccepted students. These percentage figures would surely change with a larger population and so probably do not indicate anything more than a trend. As was the case with siblings and temporal position nothing can be done by the subject about the relationship of the parents. While the child has no control over the home situation, he may be able to better control his emotions if they are not as healthy as they should be. His home environment may be more unpleasant than that of some of his peers, but it will not be improved by a sour attitude.

Residence Factors

Distance of the home from school may be an important factor in some communities. Especially might it be so if the school is the center of community social life. In such a circumstance a student may be at a disadvantage if he lives a considerable distance from the school. This was not the situation in the school community studied here, nor was there found to be any relation between social acceptance

and distance of residence from the school.

Greater relationship was noted between social status and location and type of residence. About eighty percent of the socially accepted subjects came from superior neighborhoods and dwellings that were well above average in valuation, appearance and conveniences. It was noted also that only about four percent of the unaccepted subjects came from the "superior" home. This finding is in harmony with Ronney (8,10) who found that the most popular children came from homes which were decidedly superior in cultural, social, and economic factors. Hardy (23) also reported wide differences between the surroundings of the best liked children and the other children.

Economic Status

It was observed that socially accepted boys tended to prefer prestige positions on the teams where they were members. This is also true of the fathers, for it was found that the fathers of the socially accepted subjects were members of the professions, management, or administration; usually considered prestige occupations. Facts were noted also that most of the socially accepted group had parents whose income was average or above. Only thirty-five per cent of the low group had parents earning more than average income.

Income is not the only characteristic for it was noted that some students who are high in social acceptability come from homes which have less than average income. Also some students who have had every advantage that money could buy are not socially accepted by their peer groups. Generally this factor is beyond the control of the unaccepted student. That they attempt to compensate for the lack

of income is indicated by the fact that the low group member seems more often to be working for his own spending money.

Hobbies and Spare Time Activity

Several authors (13,14,29,41,45,66) have made reference to the importance of developing the ability to "do things" that might bring an individual to the attention of his peer group in an acceptable manner. Some of these "things" should be of a tangible nature because students are socially acceptable more for their positive traits than for the negative virtues they may possess. It was suggested that these social skills might well include dancing, skating, or musical ability. Each individual, then, should strive to attain efficiency, poise, and competence. It may be in the area of art, music, athletics, or some hobby collection or construction. He should exercise this skill enough so that he is confident that he is average or better in this, at least. It is wisely said that nothing succeeds like success, and the socially unaccepted child needs to feel success at something so that he feels encouraged to try again.

Offices and Honors

Significant differences were noted in the factors of school offices held and other honors won. Young and Cooper (66) found extroversion is significantly related to popularity; so perhaps the socially unaccepted student has that status because he has not been interested in the group. Northway (47) describes the unaccepted child as being unambitious, listless, uninterested, and recessive. It would seem that it requires some energy and purposeful direction to be noticed and accepted by the group.