

A STUDY OF SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LEVEL OF
SELF-CONCEPT, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT
AND CLASSROOM ADJUSTMENT

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

Merl R. Bonney
Major Professor

Earl W. Hooker
Minor Professor

James H. Dougherty
Committee Member

Committee Member

Witt Bean
Dean of the School of Education

Robert B. Toulouse
Dean of the Graduate School

**A STUDY OF SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LEVEL OF
SELF-CONCEPT, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT
AND CLASSROOM ADJUSTMENT**

DISSERTATION

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

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Thelma Adams Reeder, B. A., M. A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1955

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Limitations of the Problem	
Sources and Availability of Data	
Procedures and Treatment of Data	
Definition of Terms	
II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF PERSONALITY MEASUREMENT	27
Problems Pertaining to the Individual	
Problems Pertaining to Group Relations	
Instruments Used for Personality Evaluation	
The Development of the Self-Concept as a Measure of the Personality	
Other Studies Related to this Problem	
III. RESULTS OF PRELIMINARY STUDIES	79
Study in Aubrey, Texas	
Study in Honolulu, Hawaii	
IV. THE SELF-CONCEPT AS RELATED TO CLASSROOM ADJUSTMENT	102
Preparation of a Self-Rating Scale	
Procedures in Testing	
Preparation of Data on Behavior Problems	
Selection of Matched Groups	
Statistical Treatment of Data	
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	135
APPENDIX	158
BIBLIOGRAPHY	199

LIST OF TABLES

Appendix A

Table	Page
I. Number of Rejects and Isolates, Distributed by Grades in the Aubrey Study	158
II. I.Q. Differences of Groups of High and Low Sociometric Status, Grades Six Through Ten, Aubrey Study	159
III. I.Q. Differences of Groups with High and Low Percentile Scores on <u>California Test of Personality</u>	159
IV. Between Group Differences on the <u>California Test of Personality</u>	160
V. Categories Used for Behavior Sampling in Three Areas	160
VI. Sentence Completion Test, I	163
VII. Sentence Completion Test, II	164
VIII. Unstructured Material from Sentence Completion Tests, Categories, Rank by Frequency	165
IX. Report of Sociometric Results on Criterion Class, Class B, Honolulu Study.	166
X. Comparison of Extreme Groups on the Sociometric Test	167
XI. Comparison of Upper and Lower Quartiles on the <u>California Test of Personality, Honolulu Study</u>	168
XII. Comparison of Upper and Lower Quartiles of I.Q. Scores, Honolulu Study	169
XIII. Comparison of Upper and Lower Quartiles on the <u>California Test of Personality, Honolulu Study</u>	170

XIV. Distribution of Total Adjustment Scores on the <u>California Test of Personality</u> , Upper and Lower Quartiles, on Basis of Sociometric Test Ratings	171
XV. Comparison of Total Adjustment Scores on the <u>California Test of Personality</u> , Upper and Lower Quartiles, on Basis of Sociometric Test Ratings	172
XVI. Comparison of Upper and Lower Quartiles in Sociometric Percentages, Using <u>California Test of Personality</u> as Criterion Test . . .	173
XVII. Comparison of Upper and Lower Quartiles in Achievement Grade Placement, Using <u>California Test of Personality</u> as Criterion Test	174

Appendix B

Tables Found in Test, Chapter IV

XVIII. Percentages of Ratings on All Categories, Self-Rating Scale	106
XIX. Behavior Problems, by Classes, Falling in Three Self-Concept Groups	113
XX. Frequencies of Self-Concept Groups in Six Behavior Categories	114
XXI. Frequencies in Sub-Categories of Aggressive and Withdrawing Behavior	116
XXII. Frequencies of Self-Concept Groups in Six Behavior Categories, Matched Groups	117
XXIII. Enrollment and Testing Figures for Sixteen Fifth Grade Classes	118
XXIV. Comparison of Results of Sociometric Tests, by Classes	120
XXV. Distribution of Quartile Rankings on Sociometric Tests, Matched Groups	121
XXVI. Distribution of I. Q. Scores for 525 Pupils, by Classes	123

Table	Page
XXVII. Variability of Class Means on California Achievement Test	124
XXVIII. Self-Rating Scale, Reliability Data	126
XXIX. Quartile Scores of Highs and Lows in Self-Concept Groups	128
XXX. Distribution of I.Q. of Highs and Lows, Possible Matchings	130
XXXI. Significance of Difference Between Means of Matched Groups in Four Areas	132

Tables Found in Appendix B

XXXII. Correlation of Test-Retest on Four Classes, Self-Rating Scale	175
XXXIII. Comparison of High and Low Self-Concept Groups on Sociometric Scores	179
XXXIV. Comparison of High and Low Self-Concept Groups on <u>California Achievement Test, Form CC</u>	181
XXXV. Comparison of High and Low Self-Concept Groups on <u>California Achievement Test, Form DD</u>	183
XXXVI. Comparison of High and Low Self-Concept Groups on Self-Rating Test	185

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The measurement of personality has been a difficult matter because it has been approached from so many different theoretical frames of reference. Interests, attitudes, and aptitudes have been measured, traits have been identified, and segments of the totality called personality have been under scrutiny from many different points of view. Behavior as a manifestation of the adaptation of the total personality within the environment has been observed and used as one basis for deciding what the personality must be. Each of these is an approach to the gestalt of the personality by examination or measurement of one of the segments of that personality.

It was the recent theory of Prescott Lecky(5) concerning the self-concept and the consequent development of the phenomenological field approach to the study of personality by Snygg and Combs(6) which has given us a new frame of reference in which to postulate a theory concerning the core of the personality. It is considered that other observed characteristics are simply manifestations of the quality of the total personality and, as such, contain specific

characteristics identifiable with that totality. The aim is that one wishes to find one measurable and quantifiable characteristic which will consistently be evidenced throughout all of a person's observable qualities and behavior.

It is theorized in this dissertation that the self-concept is that characteristic. Carl Rogers(6) has postulated that a person does not accept ideas at variance with what he considers to be true or characteristic about himself. This is evidenced by the fact that a counselee is not ready to accept therapy and work for a change until he has reorganized his "field" or self-concept so that the change is in the direction of the internalized self.

Many self rating scales are purported to be measuring the "real self." Many questionnaires are said to be reflecting the desire for making a good impression and thus to be reflecting the expected or "ideal self" as one would wish others to observe him. Ratings by one's peers, however, are often at variance with the person's evaluation of his own social stimulus score, or the ratings which he believes that others give him. The theory of this study and its related hypotheses have been developed from the literature and research concerning self-measurement and its validation against outside criteria.

Some of the literature proposes that a person knows himself best. Some of it also postulates that he has a certain amount of insight into his actual problems and that he is

realistic in his self-evaluations. It is hypothesized here that if this research finds consistency in a person's self-concept, in how he is regarded by his peers, in how he performs in the academic situation, and in whether his behavior characteristics are typical of good or bad adjustment, justification may be found in considering the measurement of the self-concept a representative and valid measure of the total personality.

Statement of the Problem

It is preliminary to the research of this study that self-concept and what it represents be defined and that a means be found of validating what it purports to measure. Lecky's definition(5, p. 3) of self-concept is as follows: "The individual defines for himself the nature of that totality which he is: the dynamic pattern of organization of each individual with particular reference to the ideas and attitudes which are its elements." Lecky relates this self-concept to the principle of unity by stating that the prime need of an organism is to maintain its mental organization as a unified whole; further, the ideas that are consistent with the patterns of the structure tend to be assimilated; ideas which are inconsistent with the organization of the person's self-concept are a threat and must, therefore, be resisted in order to maintain the dynamic configuration which the person considers to be his real self. This principle of the unity of the organism leads to the theory of

self-consistency which premises that the individual has a unique organization of ideas and attitudes which are acquired through experience and which control the highest intellectual functions and the behavioral manifestations of the organism.

It is the accepted hypothesis of this dissertation that the "maladjusted" have a poor self-concept, that they do not always have realistic insight into how they stand with their peer group, and that many of their patterns of behavior represent the attempt of the organism to defend itself against threat. In doing so, behavioral characteristics are manifested which are not in accordance with approved patterns of social behavior acceptable to teachers and children in the social milieu as defined by the average ~~or~~ usual classroom in the middle grades of a typical American school. Consequently these people are not acceptable to their peers and this factor alone creates more insecurity and more maladaptive behavior in an effort to compensate for the feelings of inadequacy and unworthiness and inferiority which bombard the person to the point of high emotionality and cause a decrease in the quality of intellectualization. It is in an effort to determine what compromises this structuring of personality that this research has found its principal purpose and has determined its methodology.

The well-adjusted person is often defined as one who is able to manage his own affairs and to cope with his daily

environment satisfactorily. There are many children in the middle grades who, because of behavior patterns and organizations of personality which do not make them highly chosen by their peers or other associates, become more and more "out of phase" with their social climate in the average classroom. These people are referred to, in common every-day terms, as the maladjusted. The maladjusted person for the purposes of this study can be defined, by comparison with the prior definition of a well-adjusted person, as one who does not manage his own affairs and cope with his environment satisfactorily. It is the hypothesis of this paper that he will manifest a poor or low self-concept in comparison with those who are judged to be well-adjusted in the classroom situation.

If there can be found some scientific basis for believing that maladjusted, unacceptable children present their striving or aggressive or withdrawing behavior patterns because of their efforts to maintain unity in the organization of their self-concept, it may be possible to work out ways of helping them to develop insight, to undergo therapeutic situational changes through the group activities accessible to them in their environment, and to reorganize their behavior patterns in accordance with a more realistic and acceptable self-concept. The need is manifested in many classrooms for such an insightful attack upon the problems of the maladjusted. Certainly a better understanding of the ideas which children have about themselves would be of value.

The first problem presented by this study is to adapt and validate a scale for the measurement of a person's ideas about himself. This scale has been revised from Brownfain's Self-Rating Inventory(3) because it has been widely used and has categories which seem to include most aspects of the total personality usually reflected in self-rating tests. In order to get a judgment outside of the peer group, the criteria used by Berger(1) and Sheerer(7) have been adapted and embodied into a rating scale so that teachers or other observers could rate a student whom they consider to be self-accepting or self-rejecting, i.e., children with a high self-concept and children with a low self-concept. It is also desirable to know whether children of the middle grades can rate each other objectively. A third scale, also a condensation of the Berger-Sheerer criteria has been developed for this purpose. It was planned to use three scales to select groups of "highs" and "lows" for further comparisons.

The securing of reliability data with the first draft of the self-rating scale was one step preliminary to the use of the self-rating instrument in the principal study. The revision of the wording in the self-rating scale was also necessary in order to be sure that fifth graders could read and comprehend the descriptive items.

An expected result of the comparison of the three ratings would be to determine whether children in the middle grades have social insight, i.e., whether their ratings of

self are consistent with peer ratings and/or teacher ratings and whether these findings are supported by the results from other aspects of personality adjustment such as sociometric measurements and behavior classifications.

The next problem as delineated here should be to examine the results of rating scales and tests, to select groups matched on I.Q. from among the "highs" and "lows" determined by agreement on two out of three ratings, and to evaluate the sociometric and achievement test results of the matched groups. The purpose of this step is to ascertain whether those pupils rated low on the above criteria and scales are also the isolates or fringeers according to sociometric measurements. It should show whether those rated high are also highly chosen on sociometric criteria. It is also important to this study to find whether there is a significant difference between groups so matched in their achievement on two different achievement tests.

It will further contribute to the research to find whether there is a relationship between low scores or ratings and classification of pupils making those scores or ratings by the teacher in charge, indicating whether she considers them maladjusted with reference to the total school situation. The inspection of the lists of children considered problems in classroom management will show whether they are predominantly children identified as having a high self-concept or a low one.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is two-fold: (1) to evaluate an instrument for measuring the self-concept of middle grade children; and (2) to determine the relationship of a middle-grade child's self-concept to his peer status, his classification by the teacher as a problem in behavior or classroom management, and to his academic achievement. For the purposes of this study, the self-concept is defined, not on the basis of a self-rating scale alone, but on the basis of that rating plus both teachers' ratings and peer ratings on comparative criteria.

The inter-relatedness of purpose is evident. To accomplish this two-fold purpose it is necessary that one hypothesize, on the basis of the body of theory developed in the review of the literature, that a person's self-concept is related to or reflected in his behavior patterns, his relationship with others, and his academic success. To achieve this purpose certain hypotheses are needed, with a wide sampling of middle grade populations to lend statistical significance to the testing of these hypotheses. They are stated as follows:

1. It is hypothesized that the person with a high self-concept will be:
 - a. High on sociometric measurements, using several criteria.

- b. Presenting behavior patterns characteristic of good classroom adjustment.
 - c. Achieving in accord with his potential in the academic situation.
2. It is hypothesized that the person with a low self-concept will be:
- a. Low on sociometric measurements using several criteria.
 - b. Presenting behavior patterns characteristic of poor classroom adjustment.
 - c. Achieving below his potential in the academic situation.

It thus becomes the purpose of this dissertation to test these hypotheses and to evaluate and interpret the results in order to find implications for improving: (1) the self-concept of the individuals within the classroom, (2) the interpersonal relationships within the groups in a class in the middle grades, and (3) the teacher's understanding of methods for identifying and helping the maladjusted child in the middle grades.

Limitations of the Problem

The subjects for this study were approximately 500 pupils from sixteen separate fifth grade classes. Nine of the classes were from the town of McKinney, Texas. Seven of the classes were from the city of Irving, Texas. It was

arranged for the pupils to be given several tests, beginning at mid-semester. The first test given was the California Achievement, Elementary, Form 06.

Second, the test chosen for a self-rating was the revision of the Brownfain criteria. (Appendix B.) The scores on the twenty categories of this test comprised the Self-Ratings raw score. Arrangement of pupils within each class, in rank order, with division into quartiles, identified the highs and lows for comparisons on two other ratings.

The third evaluation was a teacher nominations procedure, an adaptation of the Berger-Sheerer criteria. (See Appendix B.) The number of pupils selected by the teacher as being high was limited to one fourth of her class, the selection of persons nominated as low on the acceptance-rejection criteria being limited to the same number. Only nominations for the upper fourth and lower fourth were treated in this nominations technique.

The fourth evaluation was from the peer group. Nomination of five pupils high on comparative acceptance-rejection criteria, and an additional five designated as low on these same criteria comprised the total number selected by each pupil. The descriptive criteria used for this nominations form were also from the Berger-Sheerer items, but simplified and re-worded in the vocabulary of middle grade children. Although only the upper and lower quartiles were used for comparison with the other two ratings, it was

necessary to use frequencies, different scores, and tabulations for all students in each class to arrive at these quartile rankings.

The selection of the group designated as the "high self-concept group" was limited to those individuals securing two out of three fourth quartile rankings on the three rating techniques described above. In a like manner, those pupils designated as belonging to the "low self-concept group" were limited to those receiving two out of three first quartile rankings on these three techniques.

The intelligence test chosen for this research was the California Test of Mental Maturity, Elementary, Short Form. While scores for all pupils taking part in the study were tabulated for the individual classes, only those scores of pupils included in the extremes, the high self-concept group and the low self-concept group, were used in the matchings and further comparisons.

Sociometric tests were given on two criteria, including both work and play situations. The Bonney-Fessenden Sociograph was used for the individual classes, and the data thus secured comprised the basis for comparison of peer status of the individuals comprising the two final groups at the extremes in self-concept and matched on I.Q.

The classification of pupils as being behavior problems or problems in classroom management was accomplished by (1) the gathering of random data on individuals and types of

behavior considered as "problem", (2) the preparation of a form embodying these problem classifications, and (3) the naming of pupils from each class who were designated by the teacher of that class as falling into any or each of the problem classifications. The individuals named through this technique comprised a group further examined for their ranking in self-concept classifications.

The final test used was the California Achievement Test, Elementary, Form RP. Treatment was the tabulation of results for all classes, but statistical comparisons were limited to the scores for the final matched groups.

To estimate reliability for the Self-Rating Test, two classes were secured from the Bridgeport, Texas, schools in Wise County for test-retest data. Two classes of the original sixteen were also retested to find reliability coefficients. Retest intervals were from two weeks to three months.

The scope of the study gives weight to the possibility of making rather wide application of the findings of the research. Since classes selected for the study included both urban and small town schools, it is expected that the findings will represent a normal sampling of the population in the middle grades.

Sources and Availability of Data

This dissertation includes data from three sources: material from two pilot studies and a large sampling from

the middle grades in two nearby towns. The pilot studies furnish background material for showing the need of a simple test for measuring the self-concept and material concerning feelings of self-reference which middle grade children frequently have. The first pilot study was made in Denton County in the Aubrey Public Schools; the second pilot study was made in Manoa Housing School in Honolulu, Hawaii. The groups tested in the principal study are from the Public Schools at McKinney, Texas, and from two elementary schools in Irving, Texas.

Data for the present study were secured from approximately 500 students: some 300 of them were from the McKinney Public Schools and 200 from the Irving Public Schools. All students were in the fifth grade. This grade was selected because previous studies throughout several grades had marked the fifth as the earliest grade which could handle the concepts contained in the Self-Rating Scale objectively and with relatively little difficulty in understanding the vocabulary.

Specimen tests indicate the categories to be evaluated in order to obtain comparative data for the statistical analysis of testing materials.* Other sources of data for the evaluation of the findings of this study are to be found in the research of many people in the field who have become very interested, in the last few years, in finding valid

*See Appendix, p. 187.

instruments for the measurement of the total personality. Much of this literature points up various aspects of this dissertation. There have been several studies with children at this grade level, but the combination of ratings, sociometrics, and batteries of standardized tests in this investigation is both more complete and more significant to the area of the self-concept and its importance to the classroom adjustment of middle grade children.

The sociometric tests have made use of the Bonney-Yessen-gen Manual and Sociograph materials(6). Two separate criteria were used, including both work and play situations as a basis for making choices. The results from the tabulations on the Sociograph were used to determine quartile rankings for students in all classes.

The intelligence and achievement tests chosen were the well-known and widely standardized California Tests. The California Mental Maturity Test, Elementary, Short Form, was used to find intelligence scores. Two forms of the California Achievement Test, Elementary, Forms CC and DD, were employed, the same test having been used also in both pilot studies.

The form for the Self-Rating Test was adapted from the Brownstein Self-Rating Inventory, College level. The principal categories were kept, but the scaling was changed to a five-point descriptive form suitable for use at the fifth grade level. The criteria for the teachers' ratings and peer

ratings which were used with the Self-Rating Scale to select the high and low groups were adapted from the Berger(1) and Sheerer(7) criteria. The forms of all were mimeographed and given to each child individually, to each teacher in sufficient quantity to furnish a separate rating sheet for her twenty-five per cent of highs and twenty-five per cent of lows, and to each child for separate nominations of Self-Accepting and Self-Rejecting persons within each. Specimen forms of these tests will be found in the Appendix.

Material for the blank form used to designate those students classified as problems in classroom management of behavior problems was obtained through teacher conferences and suggestions and it included the material of Charlotte Buhler (4, pp. 52-83) using her principal categories of classification of problems of the emotionally disturbed. Separate copies of the classification sheet were given to each teacher for her selection of students falling into those several categories. A copy of this classification sheet is included in the Appendix.

There were sixteen classes used for the principal part of this dissertation. Class size ranged from twenty-seven to forty-six. Incomplete statistics caused the final number to drop from 539 to 472, with a mean class size of 29.5 students. The testing period was from January 25, 1955, through May 19, 1955. The first and last tests being the Achievement Tests so that a time interval comparative to the

semester's work could be arranged. Sixteen teachers, nine principals, one supervisor and one superintendent were interested participants in the research. These persons received charts and statistical reports pertinent to their needs in each school situation.

Final tabulations made statistics available on 472 pupils in sixteen fifth grades. This sampling was large enough to provide for 122 pupils designated as "high" and 110 classified as "lows", from which the final groups of sixty-seven paired comparisons were secured. Pairings were made on the basis of I.Q. These two final groups were used to test the significance of the differences between them in several areas.

Procedures and Treatment of Data

The first step in this research was the selection of schools for the experiment. Selection was made through personal contacts with one supervisor in McKinney, Texas, and with one of the principals in Irving, Texas. Both persons offered their situations voluntarily when in a discussion concerning the type of research to be done. Offers were accepted and other contacts made preliminary to setting up the scope of the problem. The final situations consisted of six schools in McKinney and two schools in Irving, with a total of sixteen fifth grade classes. Arrangements were made for the testing to start immediately after mid-semester in January.

Schedules were set up for the first round of testing and given to the individual teachers by the supervisor in McKinney and by the principals in Irving. The first test which was given was the California Achievement Test, Elementary, Form CC. Testing began in McKinney during the week of January 25, 1955, and was finished in six days. All testing was done by the researcher in this case to guarantee uniformity in test results. Testing followed immediately at Irving and was completed within seven days.

Schedules were made for the administration of the Self-Rating Scales, Teacher Ratings and Peer Ratings. The criterion tests in this investigation were (1) the revision of the Brownfain scale for measuring the Self-Concept, (2) teacher nominations for Self-Accepting and Self-Rejecting Persons, and (3) Pupil Nominations for Self-Accepting and Self-Rejecting Persons. The Self Concept test in this study was given the name, "How I Rate Myself". It has twenty categories with a five-point scale on each category for designation of that descriptive statement which would best represent how the individual feels about himself. These intervals begin with the most favorable rating and continue to the most unfavorable. The five scale points were weighted 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0. The highest possible score was eighty points and the lowest was zero. When the results from the sixteen classes were complete, each class was arranged with the pupils in

rank order, from highest score on the self-rating to the lowest. Each class roll was then put on a master sheet in this order and the upper and lower quartiles marked for further comparisons with the other ratings.

The peer ratings and teacher ratings were given at a different date to insure less carry over or influence from previous tests. The teachers' rating scale is in two different forms. One sheet is for nomination of the Self-Accepting Person; the second, for nomination of the Self-Rejecting Person. Teachers were asked to fill out a separate sheet for each student so nominated and to select a number of students equivalent to twenty-five per cent of the class in each instance. Blanks were left with the teachers and picked up at a later time to insure that they had plenty of time to consider the nominations. In most instances, check marks were placed by those of the twenty criteria which were used to determine the type of person selected for each of the two groups. These were the criteria adapted from the Berger-Sheerer(1, 7) experiments.

The peer ratings for use of the students were in two separate forms. One form was for the Self-Accepting Person while the second was for the Self-Rejecting Person. There were ten criteria for selection on each form. There were five blanks at the bottom of each page, and the students were asked to nominate five self-liking persons who would fit the criteria indicated and five self-disliking persons who were

described in the criteria for that form. Frequency tabulations were made for both forms and difference scores used to rank order within the class on the basis of these two nominations techniques. Both peer ratings and teacher ratings were placed on the master chart for the class which had already been made up for the self-ratings. The "4" was used to indicate upper quartile and the "1" to indicate lower quartile in each case.

The selection of a person as belonging to the group of pupils high in self-concept was determined by designation of those persons who received two "4's" out of three in quartile rankings. The selection of a person as belonging to the group of pupils low in self-concept was determined by designation of those people who received two "1's" out of three in quartile rankings. The number of pupils receiving two out of three or better upper quartile rankings was 122, the number receiving two out of three or better quartile rankings of lowest fourth was 110. These pupils were put on separate charts for further comparisons.

The California Test of Mental Maturity, Elementary, Short Form, was then given to all classes. I.Q.'s were determined by the usual method using the mental age and the chronological age. These scores were tabulated for all students. The intelligence scores for the groups high in self-concept and those low in self-concept were then placed on the

charts for purposes of obtaining matchings. For convenience, a frequency tabulation was made for both groups to determine the possible number of good matchings. When the rule of using scores with not less than ten per cent of the range as differences was followed, nearly equivalent means were obtained for both groups and sixty-seven pairs were matched.

The Bonney-Fessenden(2) Materials were used for the sociometric tests, some of them given around Valentine's Day and some around Easter, the criteria being set up for the work and play situations related to these holidays in order to give a live interest in making the selection. Voting was done on the small numbered slips and tabulated on two separate Sociographs, one for the work selections and one for the play selections. The votes received by each student were calculated for both criteria and added. Percentages of total possible votes were calculated for the matched groups. Results of these sociometric tests and the charts were given to the teachers of each class, with the result that much interest was aroused concerning findings and interpretations. The final percentages were placed on individual charts for the matched groups.

Conferences with teachers during the first two months of the semester brought much fruitful material concerning the types of behavior problems presented by pupils in each class. Suggestions were made as to classification and a specimen classification sheet was developed. This sheet contained six

categories related to the problems most frequently mentioned by the teachers as being most common in classroom management. Teachers were then asked to indicate which students in each class would be categorized by each of those classifications. No set number was designated; some teachers named five students, some named fifteen. In some of the classes, no one was named in some of the six categories. These results were developed into a frequency table with a total of 151 individual problems being designated. Since some students were mentioned in more than one category, a total of 122 pupils were named throughout the sixteen classes. Comparisons were then made with the pupils named in the high and low matched groups. Tabulation was made of frequencies with which these students from the matched groups and from others fell in each category.

The second Achievement Test was given during the last two weeks of the spring semester. These were given the same treatment as the first, with comparisons being made in differences in total achievement made by the matched groups of highs and lows.

The statistical treatment of the results from this extensive testing was as follows: (1) total results were tabulated for all sixteen classes, (2) total results were tabulated for sixty-seven pupils in the high group, (3) total results were tabulated for sixty-seven pupils in the low group, and (4) the means of these matched groups were evaluated for

their statistical significance and implications to teachers, counselors, and persons interested in child development.

Definition of Terms

1. Acceptance of self: the degree to which a person rates himself as high on the criteria of Self-Acceptance.
2. Aggressive: an adjective which applies to the pupil who evidences punishing or retributive behavior directed against children in his peer culture or adults.
3. Attitude: the feeling a person has for any particular situation or person.
4. Aptitude: that natural or native ability which a person shows in a new environmental set or situation.
5. Behavior pattern: a consistency in behavior response in similar situations.
6. Behavior problems: difficulties which arise out of the interpersonal relationships of pupils within the classroom with their peers or teachers.
7. Classroom management: the process of helping pupils to maintain maximum good adjustment under conditions found in the average classroom in the middle grades.
8. Criteria of sociometric choice: the setting up of situations or standards as a basis for judgment of how and in what relationships choices shall be made.
9. Congruency: the degree to which a person ranking himself high or upper fourth on the self-rating scale is also high in the ranking of others: his peers or his teachers or other adults. With reference to the person who ranks himself low on the self-rating scale, the congruency is the degree to which he is rated lower fourth in the rankings of others.
10. Disinterested: the quality of showing little interest, effort, or cooperation in classroom situations.
11. Discrepancy score: the difference between the evaluation which a person makes of himself as he thinks he is and the rating he gives of the person he would like to be.

12. Emotional expansiveness: the degree to which a person chooses his peers on any given criteria.
13. Empathy: the understanding of how other people feel.
14. Frame of reference: terminology from Snygg and Combs(2) referring to how a person looks at situations from his own individual point of view.
15. Gestalt: the perception of any stimulus or situation as a whole and in terms of a pre-existing organization; the organizational and integrative field of any interacting organism.
16. Inferiority feelings: a self-evaluation of not being a person of worth or of not being accepted by one's associates or peers.
17. Immature: an adjective describing a person whose behavior patterns are not in accordance with those of his peer group but similar to the behavior patterns of persons in younger peer group.
18. Ideal self: the personality as evidenced by a person's description of how he would like to be.
19. Maladjusted: a person whose interpersonal relations with the peer group and/or adults is such that he is not considered as conforming to peer or group standards.
20. Peer status: the rank of any person as he is chosen by his peers or any given criteria.
21. Perceived self: the personality as seen by others in the environmental milieu of the individual.
22. Realistic: a conception of ratings may be said to be realistic if a person can judge how other people feel toward him to a high degree.
23. Rejection of self: for the purpose of this study, rejection of self is said to be a person's rating of himself on the "How I Rate Myself" scale and falling in the lowest quartile will designate the person for further comparisons by the nominations process.
24. Real self: the total personality of a person as it is organized and operates within his environment.

25. Self-accepting: a person is said to be self-accepting when he rates himself high on the self-rating scale used in this study.
26. Self-concept: "An individual's self-definition of the totality that he is; the dynamic pattern of organization in that individual with particular reference to the ideas and attitudes which are its elements."(1, p. 3)
27. Self-confidence: that quality of self-definition which enables a person to make individual and purposive value judgments in new situations.
28. Self-consistency: that unique organization of ideas and attitudes which a person has which he has acquired through experience and which he maintains and enhances through predetermined selective processes.
29. Self-disliking: a person is said to be self-disliking when he works against the organization of the real or evident self because of dissatisfaction with his present organization.
30. Self-liking: a person may be said to be self-liking when his self-organization enables him to make value judgments in accordance with the demands put upon him in his environment and to maintain organization without undue pressure or threat.
31. Self-rejecting: a person may be said to be self-rejecting when he is so aware of his limitations that he is under threat from the environment and feels incapable of maintaining his organization.
32. Social climate: that environmental situation which completes the immediate and constant setting in which a person lives and has his mobility.
33. Social insight: that quality of knowing what other persons are thinking about one and how one's actions are being interpreted by others within his world.
34. Social reality: the actual response made to any individual within his social atom.
35. Social stimulus score: the number of choices received by a person in any specific situation on any specific criteria divided by the number of possible choices which he might have received if everyone in that situation had voted for him.

36. Social perception: that quality of seeing one's own actions and behavior as other persons see them.
37. Sociometric method: the method by which a person's expansiveness to choose and stimulus to receive choices within the framework of a specific situation is measured and evaluated.
38. Sociometric test: referring to various types of choice criteria set up to stimulate choice processes within the group situation.
39. Sociometry: the study of the measurement of group relationships by means of choice processes.
40. Spontaneity score: the outgoing qualities of a person as evidenced by his choosing other people on a given set of criteria, as in emotional expansiveness.
41. Therapy: institutional or situational treatment of a person with the view of bringing about a change.
42. Unrealistic: a person's conception of ratings may be said to be unrealistic if he cannot judge how other persons feel toward him to a high degree.
43. Validation: for purposes of this study, the validation of the self-rating scale will be done by means of testing how consistently it is supported by the findings on teacher and peer ratings.
44. Well-adjusted: a person whose interpersonal relations with the peer group and/or adults is such that he is considered as conforming to peer or group standards.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Berger, E. M., "The Relationship Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 778.
2. Bonney, Merl E. and Seth A. Fessenden, Sociograph for recording of results of Sociometric Tests, California Test Bureau (Los Angeles, Cal., 1955).
3. Brownfain, John J., "Stability of the Self-Concept as a Dimension of Personality," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 597-606.
4. Buhler, Charlotte and associates, Childhood Problems and the Teacher, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1952, pp. 82-83.
5. Lecky, Prescott, Self-Consistency, New York, The Island Press, 1951.
6. Rogers, Carl R., Client-Centered Therapy, New York, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1951, pp. 136-141.
7. Sheerer, Elizabeth F., "An Analysis of the Relationships Between Acceptance of and Respect for Self and Acceptance of and Respect for Others in Ten Counseling Cases," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (1949), 169-175.
8. Snygg, Donald and Arthur W. Combs, Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1949.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF PERSONALITY MEASUREMENT

The total personality of the human organism cannot be analyzed or quantified as are compounds in the chemistry laboratory. The quality and organization of that personality must be inferred from the behavioral manifestations which are its external evidence. The literature relating to the problem of this dissertation will be reviewed under the following categories:

1. Literature on the nature of personality.
2. Literature on behavior, its manifestations, and how behavior is evidenced in interpersonal relations.
3. Literature on methods and instruments for personality measurement and self-assessment.
4. Literature on self-concept and on self-consistency as representing the integrative potential of the individual.
5. Literature pertaining to other research which is closely related to the problems of this dissertation.

Theories and validated research contribute to the total body of information concerning what we mean by the personality, what it actually represents in its unity, and how its observable characteristics may be judged. Since many of the

recent experiments are presently focussed on self-ratings and the idea of measuring a self-concept, it is judged that the formulations from this study will contribute to the understanding of why and how each individual is unique. It is said that the person who best knows an individual is that person himself, consequently, the emphasis of this study will be upon a person's evaluation of himself and testing of the reality of that evaluation.

The need to belong is a powerful motivation in the lives of boys and girls in their growing-up processes. The frame of reference for any individual, according to Lecky(56) is his own ideas and attitudes concerning the self in relationship to his universe. When he begins to lose the "squawking Id" characteristics which Moreno(67) gives him and to develop his Ego, he begins to realize the constitutional patterning with which he is endowed and to integrate experiences in such a fashion that he becomes a unique totality. According to Ferguson(31) the constitutional determinants of personality form the framework upon which he must build his total personality through the social, role, and situational determinants which come to him through his experiences within his environment and through the organization of his personality around a "built" system of values. Stephens(93) believes that it is in the building of that system of values that he becomes the Ego or the "self" as the hub of his own universe, with the ground, as referred to by field psychologists, the external determinant

of the Super-Ego processes by which society attempts to mold or pattern his behavior according to its dichotomies. Since education is the carrier of culture, these dichotomies are imposed upon the child through educational acculturation.

We must take account of the many forces operating upon the child in our society. The child comes from the home with its varying degrees of protective upbringing into a school system which demands from all children a certain amount of conformity. Up to this point the child has developed a self-concept of being a certain kind of person. Now he is conscious of a groupness expectation; he, along with many other children of varying backgrounds, is expected to become a part of a collective "kind of persons" thing. From his first day in school on through the rest of his life he is striving with himself-- to be himself and at the same time to be like the others in his immediate social milieu. That the integrative forces often come in conflict with the pre-developed patterning of his self-concept is both inevitable and constant. He learns patterns of conformity and group expectations during the first few years in school-- or he does not learn them. If he succeeds in learning them he is, at the middle grades, a more or less ideal pupil, fitting in with group expectations, accepted both by his peers and by the teachers who have set in motion the patterning forces of education. This patterning is the mark of the culture; without it there would be no societies of men living together in harmony. Without standards

there would be no organized governments of free people working together for group goals and for the betterment of all mankind. The individuals who make up those societies of free people in a democracy are patterned in the classrooms of the nation. Unfortunately, in those school systems where the purpose seems to be to reach or surpass the national norms, much of the uniqueness of the individual is patterned out in the attempt to teach for the average child while the extremes become more and more "the other person's problem" or problems for specialists.

The goals of childhood, however, are seldom long-range goals. Although the child may be identifying from his very earliest years with the person whom he wishes to emulate or the person whom he will become, he is not often possessed of enough foresight or maturity to see group and societal pressures as a necessary means to a meaningful end. One's patterns of telling him what he shall become and how he shall become it are less meaningful to him than to the adults who teach him because adults and the pre-adolescent have very different frames of reference. And those who have forgotten what it is to be a child, who have achieved a place in society which is rewarding, have failed to look out at the world from the eyes of a person striving for a place of belonging and for a feeling of having achieved some measure of success. These two elements are necessary for the continued growth in the life history of an individual.

Those children who do not achieve a place of belonging or some measure of success are soon identified as problems or the maladjusted. In the book, Love Is Not Enough, by Bruno Bettelheim(9, pp. 133-169) rehabilitation of emotionally disturbed children has to start without any direct attack on the academic problem, at least at first. Rather than giving the child more of those elements in which he has failed, he must first have some measure of those two elements so necessary to his continued development: belongingness and success. It is through these two experiences that he becomes the kind of a person who can adapt to the academic situation. Without these two elements he has such a low self-concept that he is blocked or frustrated. His patterns of behavior are non-adjustive and he consequently lacks those social skills which assure him a place in his peer group and in his immediate school society. His frustration at not belonging and his aggressiveness at being unacceptable within his society may become misplaced, the routine of learning becoming symbolically the "worst enemy" of the child's total of ego-defensiveness. The academic success of others symbolizes to him his failure. Academic success becomes the thwarting process which robs him of status and makes him a fringer with the peer group and the "off brand" child to the teacher whose reluctant assistance he refuses because he has no resources within himself with which to bargain for status and success.

Personality integration must come about before this "worst enemy" is slain. The ego resources must be built up and the self-concept re-inforced so that any success the child has will be a real success which brings about self-respect at the same time that it brings him peer status and adult approval. Children with more adequate self-concepts may set specific tasks for themselves, but seriously disturbed children cannot do these things for themselves without the occurrence of destructive results, such as adding to the self-concept of being a person who is different and unacceptable. The child must be given leeway only in those areas where he is ready for freedom in expressing himself or in making some small success so that the result, leading to repeated failures, will not be "more of the same."

Teachers in corrective institutions with freedom to use less known methods have had much success with the emotionally disturbed child because they have been free from the pressures of administration and parents in their choice of techniques in handling the disturbed children. Bettelheim(8) says, "Because of the individual attention we give to each child, and because the task of learning is geared to the child's inclinations and is potentially enjoyable, most children, once their learning inhibitions are entirely removed, can easily make two or more years' academic progress in a single year's time." The child must have learned not only to accept himself as he is, but to strive to make the best use of his individual assets within

the limits of what society and his internalised self-concept may expect of him, and he must be independent of what an artificial norm may require. The report given in this article on how the child's ideas of himself and his place in society are reconciled to make for self-consistency is one of many reports on what is being done for the children with whom the other agencies of society, both home and school, have heretofore failed. The methodology presented here is to promote insight and to reconstruct the schema of the total self-concept to be consistent with what the child is able and willing to do with his potentials.

Hildreth(44, pp. 13-14) believes that much of the success which a child has in connection with his first learning experiences in the public schools depends on his readiness.

She says:

The more maturity a child shows at school entrance the more easily he will enter into school life and the more ready he will be for learning new skills. In general, a child is most ready to learn a new skill when he shows spontaneous interest in learning, when his interest is sustained over a period of time, and when he shows the ability to make progress in learning after a little practice in the skill. These principles apply at all levels of childhood learning and to any skills a child might attempt to learn, not solely to reading, writing, and number work.

The factors that make up mental maturity for beginners-- the capacity to think, to reason, to learn, to observe, to be curious, to remember, to follow directions, and to deal with ideas on a six-year level of understanding-- are essential to learning during the first grade. Evidence proves that success in first grade achievement is predictable to a large extent in terms of these factors. If the child's maturation

in mental traits is below the average for his age or if he is too young to have achieved sufficient maturity, more drill will not produce the requisite development.

The child who possesses self-control and self-reliance is better prepared than those children who lack these traits to pay attention, to listen to the teacher's directions, to make plans, to participate in group work, and to engage in social conversation in the group.

Some of the ideas mentioned here indicate what is expected of children before they even start to school. Readiness programs in kindergartens and first grades indicate that many are not prepared. It is only rationalization or begging the question to say that these things are not the job of the educational system. If education is defined as the carrier of the culture, then educators are obliged to take the children wherever they find them and to make up the deficit by more understanding of their problems, more planning for the children who do not have an even start when they enter school, and more help for those children whose development is arrested during their first years in the classroom.

To overcome lack of readiness at starting first grade, Patterson(75, pp. 15-20) says, "One study of mentally retarded boys revealed that when the pupils were given a prolonged program of pre-academic readiness instead of the customary formal drill program in the three R's, they presented fewer behavior problems in later academic situations than did children who had not received the benefit of this new-type program."

Lack of understanding on the part of teachers and parents of the growth cycles which alternately demand rest and fruitful activity may throw the child's total field out of focus and place demands upon him which are out of proportion to the potential at that particular point in his growth or developmental processes. From Breckenridge(14, pp. 20-21) one has a statement concerning the effects of such disbalance:

Children use their energy for two purposes: (1) for activity, or the daily program of work and play, and (2) for growth. When energy is being utilized rapidly for growth, there is little left for activity, and the child shows signs of fatigue which are relieved only when adequate change is made in his schedule to relieve him temporarily of some of the demands which he is, at other times in his life, able to meet. When growth slows up noticeably, emotional disturbances and social maladjustments may appear.

It is a common error in teaching that the child's lack of vitality or loss of energy is mistaken for antagonism to learning; when emphasized, the child may find a peg upon which to hang his frustration and aggression. The child who is retarded in physical development often lacks that physical or neurological maturity to utilize certain levels of experience common to children of his given chronological age.

The interplay of physical factors in the developmental processes gives rise to many ups and downs in the learning processes. It is from the report of Meacham(65) that we have the following contribution on some of the causes and effects in such matters:

Research on the association of growth and social and emotional disturbances is not at a point where one can readily ascribe causes or decide with certainty whether faulty growth produces the disturbances in feeling and behavior or whether environmental factors and emotional disturbances produce the faulty growth. Probably neither can be called antecedent or consequent. It is probable that both are inter-related and circular, and practical programs of treatment had best be pluralistic in methods of attack.

Breckenridge(14) offers suggestions for attacking:

We need to consider ways of adapting school work and social programs to the growth needs and interests of the two sexes as well as to the needs and interests of the individual children.

The social differentiation tugs relentlessly off on its own, impelled by the strongly-felt needs of the children themselves, but seldom consciously aided by school personnel, often, in fact, stubbornly resisted by school authorities.

The reactions of the individual to the groups in which he finds himself is in no one set pattern of responses. L. B. Murphy(71) found that the functioning of the children in groups of different sizes depends a good deal upon the child. A great deal also depends upon the patterns of behavior and feeling in the group. How much and what kind of equipment promotes or retards socialization seems still a matter of dispute. Some leaders are gifted in ability to stimulate cooperative behavior; others merely think they are gifted because they can dominate the situation by force or by the implication of force in such a way that they keep the children quiet. Other leaders seem by their very presence to stir up conflict of the undesirable sort.

Conflict, competition, and cooperation are all said to be characteristics of gangs: spontaneity makes working through situations possible for children in groups; their conflicts and aggressions can be channeled and they will be ready for the next step in development. The highest type of cooperation is learned, however. It is in his early years that a child learns "to take it" in group activity, to develop improved self-control, and to gain further insight into the needs and wishes of others. It could be said that along with the concept of "other" in relationship to needs of self is developed the concept of the "self" in relationship to the needs of others and to the totality of the child's environment.

In relationship to what makes children choose others of their peers and to identify with others in their peer culture, there have been several studies which showed that children tend to gravitate toward similarities in height and weight, developmental age, scholarship, extroversion, and physical achievement. One study by Gardner Murphy and others (70) claimed that children of obvious ability and prestige seemed to sustain the roles of leadership. Sheer propinquity, or chance nearness in school or neighborhood, proved in the study by Hartshorne and May(42) to be a determining factor of importance in choice of friends.

Hollingworth(46) in a study of extremely superior children found, however, that such children were not chosen as

leaders by average children as often as were moderately superior children. It is further agreed that the child who attempts to lead by domination is less strong a leader than the child who leads through understanding, skill, and the use of cooperating principles. Children who are genuine leaders, according to Figers(79) are those who have some self-discipline, some grasp of abstractions and recognition of social ideals, some awareness of other personalities, ability to pursue objectives consistently, and to subordinate immediate to more remote goals.

Furfey(38) has brought out that not all children of any given chronological age are of the same developmental age. Some of them do not fit into available groups of peers, and this produces a whole set of problems for such children. Many of these children suffer deep feelings of inferiority and may become moody, may retreat into fantasies, or other undesirable behavior. Many gifted, charming-to-know children fail to find congenial companionship in the available peer groups. The child who finds a place in a congenial group will have not only companionship and freedom from loneliness but also an opportunity to learn many of the lessons of give and take, of sympathy, self-control, and tolerance which serve him well through adolescence and on into adulthood. When these adjustments are made, there is much better progress made in the academic and in all phases of the social pursuits of the child,

and the experiences will be more meaningful in the development of the individual. The child who is, by whatever unfortunate reasons, cut off from his peers, is getting much less than half of his social education; that part of any individual's education which makes him want to be like others in a democratic society is the quality of satisfactory interpersonal relationships with other children, enough like himself that he desires to and is capable of identifying with them.

There are several approaches to the idea that the child with feelings of inferiority has not matured through all the stages of the developmental processes in the normal progression. For a number of years the child's self-concept or ideas of self-other relationships are in a stage of constant change and re-integration. Then one day this self-concept presents itself to him as a gestalt, that is, in his awareness of it. It is at that moment when his concept of who he is or who he is not over-shadows everything else. If "they don't want me" ideas predominate, if he considers himself as a "sissy" or a "dumb ox" or any other of the childhood stereotypes so hard to overcome, then the self-concept has crystallized for the time being, and everything in the child's experience is interpreted in terms of that concept. Everything is integrated into the gestalt of the total personality and in terms of the pre-existing organization of that gestalt. Only a series of successful and different experiences can force a re-integration and a re-definition of the self.

French(35) has several theories which postulate poor developmental processes for the introverted individual. Piaget(78) has made a very detailed study of the developmental processes of the child. He has shown by a careful study of the development of the thought and verbal expressions of the child at what ages the critical attitudes are introjected and how the stigma of incapacity begins in childhood role-playing. Lambert(82) does an excellent job of laying out the main rules of the child's emotional development and the successive stages through which he passes in her descriptions of the uses of the techniques of child psychoanalysis. Erikson (28) has a wealth of material on the growth of the ego and the ways in which children develop their own accepted identities. The chapter on the eight stages of man is very well done and contributes a great deal to the background of the study of the continuity and consistency in child development.

Otto Pollak and collaborators(80) have presented much that is usable by persons skilled in working with children in the methods of re-directing efforts for a more secure self-consistency through the methods of psychotherapy and the socio-dynamic processes.

For the classroom teacher, the book by Ruth Cunningham and associates(25) on Understanding Group Behavior of Boys and Girls is a storehouse of down-to-earth illustrations on ideas of self-reference and groupness ideas which boys and girls evidence when working with their peers in cooperative

situations. The works of Moreno(66, 67) are indicative of the newer trends and deeper understanding of what makes boys and girls get along together in peer groups. The sociometric methods developed by Bonney(12, 13) and Jennings(52) have contributed much to the body of known facts about the choice processes and status implications within peer groups.

Much of the material presented in these and following readings bears out the premise that the individual with a poor opinion of himself, with inferiority feelings, with a low self-concept, or however we express the situation, is a problem of great concern to classroom teachers and that methods of identifying and working with problem cases are the responsibility of teachers and specialists alike. How this self-concept makes much a difference is reflected in results of self-assessment and sociometric findings.

Findings of Bendig(6) indicate that personality and interest scales are predictive of achievement level when aptitude is statistically held constant. Berger(7) found a positive relationship between self-acceptance of self and acceptance of others. The criteria of the Berger study were used to formulate the scales used in two of the criterion tests of this dissertation.

Kerr(54) using Cattell's factor and cluster analysis techniques set up the following hypotheses: (1) the individual in normal society who is best informed about an individual's personality is that same individual, and (2) that

many traits of personality can be self-assessed with substantial validity. He found seventy-four per cent of the traits of the original fifty-six traits significant at the non-chance level. Thirty-seven were significant at the .01 level of significance. Individuals in this study who were more productive were able to describe themselves realistically as more productive; those who were less productive also were able to indicate that they did not consider themselves productive. In both cases, self-descriptions were realistic.

Items indicated by Lockman(58) as significant in successful and unsuccessful students were: (1) inferiority feelings, (2) ideas of self-incompetence in money making, (3) indecision, (4) frequent embarrassment in groups, (5) inability to apply one's self to school work, (6) lack of interest in school, and (7) poor handling of lecture material. These seven items all point to inadequacy, with a low self-concept. They point to a consistency between self-assessment and clinical findings as evidenced by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

It was the conclusion of Carroll(18) that self-ratings give a broader picture of the individual's personality since the ratings of roommates tend to point up superficial kinds of behavior and in terms of stereotypes.

Sheerer's purpose(90) was to develop a group instrument for the measurement of the self-acceptance and the acceptance

of others and to test the relationship between these two variables in a variety of groups using the developed instruments. She found that a definite relationship was established between self-acceptance and acceptance of others. She was followed by Berger(7) who constructed new scales of self-acceptance and acceptance of others, building largely from the Sheerer criteria. Berger found r 's from .36 to -.69. Phillips(76) also used the Sheerer criteria by converting the criterion descriptions into simple statements to form a questionnaire of fifty items, with half the items referring to self-attitudes and half the attitudes toward others. McIntyre(63) used this questionnaire in conjunction with a sociometric device to explore the Rogerian hypothesis that the self-accepting individual will tend to have better interpersonal relationships. McIntyre was unable to confirm this hypothesis but found an r of -.46 between scores of self-acceptance and acceptance of others on the Phillips instrument with a sample of 112 college students. These findings hold with the study of Stock(94) who found that knowledge of expressed attitudes which form the self-concept give basis for inference of attitudes toward others.

Wrightstone(96) in a study of adolescents in the New York City schools used teacher's observations, friendship nominations and questionnaires validated by analyses from psychologists, and descriptions by teachers and supervisors.

He found that behavior descriptions and ratings of pupil adjustment showed a high correlation with behavior descriptions derived from other data. His methodology was assessment of emotional and social adjustment of the pupils by combining data from a self-descriptive personality inventory and two sociometric techniques.

Gattell(22) found that psychoanalysts are concerned with finding the same things within the personality as are found by a factorization technique. The terminology used in the study is that "there exists a dynamic structure within personality called a super-ego." He refers to kinds of behavior, quantifiable in verbal and non-verbal terms, which go together. He states that factor analysis does not lose the uniqueness of the individual but rather that the individual is represented by a unique combination of traits.

Diller(26), Huntley(51), and Katz(53) held that attitudes toward others co-vary in a positive direction with attitudes toward the self and that the self-concept is related to and dependent upon the individual's value system. Huntley's method was to test the effect of induced success or failure upon attitudes toward the self and attitudes toward others. He found that the self-concept operates in a global fashion and that it is related to the value system of the individual. These studies are all pertinent to the question as to whether it is valuable to use personality self-assessment and how

that personality self-assessment is related to attitudes toward others.

Preliminary to the development of the self-concept theory used in this investigation is a brief review of the findings of researchers in the area of ego-psychology, since the self-concept appears to be a function of ego integrative mechanisms. Allport(2) has advanced the theory that ego satisfactions begin as emotional satisfactions. Piaget(77) follows this line of thought by his theory that sensorimotor intelligence is practical adaptation but that conceptual thought results through socialization of the intellect, cooperation with other persons resulting at verifying judgments and a communality of meanings. The inter-dependence of the search for truth and of socialization seems to be an important factor in the creation of intelligence through environmental stimuli.

Synovels(95) advanced the theory that the mechanisms of defense are called into play when goals become unrealistic or the aspiration level is so high and the self-concept so inadequate that it is a threat to the ego-- or the person's ability and integrity of purpose. Further, these defense mechanisms may account for differences between self-estimate and level of achievement.

Porter(81) stated that in any situation one is forced to deal with the "reality" that the other individual holds, no matter how much insight one may have into the errors of perception that the other person may be making.

Hopkins(48) states that the individual develops a conscious self which is the center or the nucleus of his personality. This self selects outside objects, regulates their conversion, determines the amount and direction of energy expended, and enhances itself during these activities. What an individual perceives himself to be and how he accepts what he sees and feels are exceedingly important in determining his direction of action.

Morris(68) discusses the person who gilds the false picture of himself and ignores, glosses over, and minimizes evidence to the contrary. When confronted with objective evidence he resorts to the device of determinism saying that a person can do anything he wants at any time. He usually recognizes no real problem and is difficult to help because he does not consider or admit that he needs any help.

Lynd(61) states that the human personality craves the sense of growth, of realization of personal powers, and that it suffers in an environment that denies growth or frustrates it erratically or for reasons other than the similar needs of others for growth. His nine criteria for cultural adequacy mention the need of the human personality for mutuality, for spontaneity, status, and autonomy.

Rotter(85) states that a person's behaviors, needs, and goals are not independent but belong in functionally related systems the nature of which is determined by experiential structuring. The factor which determines the selection of

mode of behavior is expectancy; that expectancy is developmentally and culturally defined. At the end of the process is a hierarchy of values by which the person lives, fulfills, and enhances his potentials, and collects the intrinsic rewards of association with and recognition by his peers.

According to Lecky(56, p. 3) "The prime need of an organism is to maintain its mental organization as a unified whole. The object of the integrative forces of the organism is to preserve unity, particularly on the highest psychic levels. All other needs may be conceived of as subsidiary to this primary motive. As with the concepts of mind or personality, unification cannot be observed or measured objectively but must be inferred from the patterns of organization."

The characteristics of a person on the highest levels of integration are determined by his style of life, i.e., the individual organization of ideas and attitudes which are acquired through experience and which control the highest intellectual functions. The essence of this organization of ideas and attitudes is its self-consistency. A person can only go in one direction at a time, or believe in one thing at a time. Inconsistency or ambivalence results in conflict or paralysis of action. The behavior expresses the effort to be consistent and unified in organization and action. Ideas which are consistent with past experience tend to be assimilated; those which are inconsistent tend to be rejected. This is particularly true of the person whose organization has had rigid

patterning with little opportunity for the exercise of initiative. He thus has no way to go nor any plan of action except along the lines of previous action.

If an inconsistent attitude presents itself with sufficient urgency, it may force re-organization of pre-existing attitudes in order to eliminate inconsistency and regain unity. If the person is capable of insight or if he has an autonomous Ego which is self-determining rather than totally under the control of the Super-Ego, he will be able to continue developing and reorganizing his experience patterns along continually broadening and enlightening avenues. It is along the rationale of this theory that one premises the self-directing person, with insight relative to his re-organizational capacities, with two-way communication between him and his environment. It is, therefore, the premise of this study that re-organization starts from the beginning; that beginning is the time of awareness of the individual of the self-concept which he has. Education holds up to the individual the "ideal self" without asking about the motive power of the individual or his willingness to accept molding into a stereotype through a process in which he has no opportunity to participate because he is not recognized as he is or as he sees himself.

Lecky(56) demonstrated on both theoretical and statistical grounds that inventories were not measures of neurotic tendency but simply those of negative attitudes in the various

areas of life. An average number of negative attitudes is within normal expectancy, but the presence of excessively high or low scores is distinctly differential of personality disorder. If it is recognized that the individual symptoms represent attitudes rather than true psychological traits, then they may be re-interpreted in terms of the organism's attempt to maintain its pattern of organization, which may be modified by removing inconsistent or untenable ideas or attitudes.

In order to understand the non-conforming behavior of boys or girls who are left out or do not belong to the groups in which they operate from day to day, one should look into Lecky's theory(36) of emotionality. He states:

The attempt to explain emotionality in terms of the attempt of the organism to re-inforce an action which meets with resistance and thus to maintain unification contains an important insight but does not deal adequately with the mass of experimental evidence indicating the magnitude of affective phenomena. Emotional reactions do re-inforce action tendencies of the organism but they must also be understood as primitive affective-impulsive responses which may be considered as mal-adaptive behaviors when they supplant higher intellectual problem-solving reactions. Modern psycho-somatic conceptions of the nature of emotion give a much more comprehensive picture.

Lecky believed that a thorough knowledge of the organization of ideas comprising an individual mind was sufficient for the understanding of the dynamic relationships of that mind and was content to leave to others speculations concerning the exact processes whereby these relationships are

accomplished. The theory of self-consistency propounded by Lecky is not said to explain anything in itself but suggests a method of synthesizing the results of scientific research in order to perceive the dynamic configurations of individual personalities.

The criteria of validity of inventories were criticized by Lecky with citation to several experiments which showed that inventories did not differentiate significantly between the normal and the abnormal. He believed that negative attitudes comprise the criteria which are most revealing of the abnormal person and that this might be conceived of in terms of degree rather than kind. Neurotic inventories are said to really measure the amount of negative behavior by isolating the individual items which show the highest correlations on the whole scale. Lecky also criticized the habit theory of neurosis, i.e., that if the child could be kept in a predominantly positive attitude for the first four or five years of life, the danger of later mal-adjustment would be negligible. In this connection, it is believed that over-positiveness, in itself, often covers mal-adjustments which go overlooked in the process of interpretation of the approach-withdrawal dichotomy. An over-rater would thus indicate a compensation mechanism in an attempt to deny those objective facts which he did not consider to be true concerning his own personality organization.

The theories presented in this study will bear out the developmental trends which say that a child develops best and with a minimum of conflict when new problems are presented at the proper time, when the preceding learning has been done, and when the maturing accompanying the learning process has brought about the emotional concomitants of assurance and a feeling of success. The child must develop his own repertoire of solutions. He tends to select and avoid situations on the basis of his estimate of his own abilities. Learning is an accompanying and unifying process whose goal is an attitude free from conflict. The subject must feel that he lives in a stable and intelligible environment in which he knows what to do and how to do it, and his attitude of confidence and certainty is supported by this conviction. It is at this point that we can say that learning and growth should be considered as both synonymous and parallel in the development of the child.

From the theories of Snygg and Combs(91) one finds much that should clarify the understanding as to how a person comes to regard himself as a "failure" or "incompetent" or to develop a sense of "un-belongingness." The phenomenal self is a term used by these authors to parallel the self-concept propounded by Lecky. They premise:

For the most of us, the phenomenal self we develop is a direct outgrowth of the cultural matrix of our parents and early guardians. The developmental trend is said to be from generalization

to differentiation. As continuing differentiations are made, the various aspects of the child's phenomenal field become more distinct. The earliest differentiations made by the infant in the definition of his field are those which are concerned with the separation of self from the rest of the field. The child's explorations of the factual, kinaesthetic nature result in a clearer and clearer differentiation between the physical self and the rest of the world. This differentiation of self from the field may never reach a state of being complete, even in the mature adult.

Because the individual is inseparable from his field, he must continue to feel that his relatedness can be a means of expansion or perpetuation of self or the total meaning of his zero position in the very center of his universe becomes meaningless and so does he.

In the literature from Saygg and Combs(91, p. 217) is found the case of Roger. This case parallels that of many of the retarded children in the middle grades in the usual academic situation, particularly in reading. It is very interesting in the account of what happened to Roger:

When Roger started to read in the first grade, the children laughed when he made a mistake and continued to laugh at his mistakes when none of his teachers corrected the other children. This occurred in more than the first grade. Roger at first laughed with them until he suddenly refused to read aloud any more. Since then he cannot even read silently. He dislikes school and has to practically be forced to go to school every day. His belief that he was born without a brain, and he sincerely believes this, excuses him from any thinking processes and so protects him from humiliation.

The account gives some of the developmental background with such expressions as "His parents make things easy for him" . . . "fear of failure" . . . "he gets almost hysterical" . . . "these have given him the idea that he is different" . . . "refused to let him take the bus to the city alone." The self-concept of incompetence has been rather permanently integrated.

The phenomenal self is the core of behavior. It is the self as the individual experiences. If it is the only self that a person knows: he must defend and maintain it no matter how inadequate it may be. The person must have a different concept of self in order to behave any differently. It is part of the purpose of this study to try to arrive at some verbal acknowledgement of the organization of ideas within the self-concept of individuals with an evaluation of the participation and achievement of those individuals in order to ascertain whether a person behaves or achieves in our educational system consistently with his organized self-concept.

In the light of the theory advanced in the preceding paragraph, two questions are postulated: (1) How is the self-concept developed? and (2) What influences changes in the organization of the self-concept?

How does the individual "grow" this self-concept of his? The organization of his field of experience is determined by (1) himself, his pattern of energy potential at birth, (2)

the development of an awareness of self-others, (3) the establishment of relationships in this self-other world, (4) the maintenance and enhancement of the self through the time-space and situational relationships within the field, (5) the completeness or incompleteness of the dynamic called "the self" through a continuous process of integration, (6) the building of a frame of reference through identification, introjection, and the preservation of balance between dependence and independence until autonomy or self-sufficiency is reached.

What influences changes in the organization of the self-concept? In the literature four headings seem to be indicated: (1) potential energy pattern of the individual or his constitutional endowment, (2) pressures from the field to force reorganization of the self-concept, (3) defenses of the individual to maintain the self-concept, and (4) integrative forces which modify and enhance the self-concept.

The identification of complexity or simplicity of personality with its identifying and distinguishing characteristics would be discussed in the article by Barron(3, p. 163). His definition of adjustment is "getting along in the world as it is, adequate degree of social conformity, capacity to adapt to a wide range of conditions, ability to fit in." The adaptability of a person is an important quality of the total personality. It is a most important quality of any person who is building a self-concept at the same time that he is taking

part in group activities in the classroom in the middle grades in a typical American school. In that classroom he is faced with two conflicting roles: the role of being himself and the role of fitting the stereotypes of the ideal pupil in an American school. Being an ideal pupil is often an antithesis to being a unique individual because of this inconsistency: being an ideal pupil demands a minimum of autonomy, being a unique individual demands a maximum of autonomy. When an individual finds over and over again from day to day that he does not fit the mold and that he will not become a part of the situation until he does conform, he either becomes a Roger and decides that he is not worth while or becomes a problem in management for the teacher. And if classroom teachers do not know what his ideas are about himself, they have a poor chance of helping him to build a better self-concept or of bringing into the organization of his personality a better system of values.

Articles referring to pressures from the culture or the immediate environmental situation which affect, determine, force, or otherwise cause change or re-organization in self-concept are:

1. Pressure to conform: Snygg and Combs(91)
2. Status implications:
 - a. Identification with parents: Brodbeck(15)
 - b. Likeness as a determinant of selection: Fiedler(33), Gustad(41).

- c. Group processes as determinants of roles and status: Crutchfield(24)
 - d. Group relations, perception of others: Fiedler(33), Lippitt(57), McGurdy(62), Mollander(45).
3. Effect of success: change in self-concept at overt and covert levels, in positive direction, in response to success: Biller(26).
 4. Effect of failure: change in self-concept, negative direction, at covert level: Biller(26).
 5. Effect of threat: dependence versus independence: Brown(16), Bells(4).
 6. Self-dislikes: Brodbeck(15).

Several articles refer to defensive mechanisms or resolutions by which the individual attempts to adjust his self-concept and his behavior:

1. Use of rationalization to explain discrepancy to self: Lorraine(60).
2. Suppression of spontaneity: Fromm(36).
3. Signs of depression in realization of discrepancies in selves: Bells(4), Shodorkoff(23).
4. The "hale" and its use in defending or maintaining the self-concept: Biller(26).
5. Hostility, aggression toward others: Fromm(36), Biller(26), Blair(10).

Several articles refer to the integrative forces of the self. Those forces which come from experience, the organized

personality, and from new stimulation from the environment are included:

1. Unresolved conflict situations in early socialising influences in the family: Brodbeck(15).
2. Lack of identification with parents: Brodbeck(15).
3. The perceptual processes: Rubenstein(87).
4. The individual's value system: Diller(26).
5. The attitude of self-worth: Diller(26).
6. The attitude of acceptance and its relationships to developing insight: Norman(74).
7. The attitude of self-love: Fromm(36).
8. Feelings of inferiority: Adler(1), Morney(49).
9. Insight and self-understanding:
 - a. Importance of self-understanding: Rogers(85).
 - b. Perception of responses of others: Faguiri(29).
 - c. Opportunity to evaluate self without threat to the Ego: Reeder
 - d. Attitudes toward others, co-varying with self-attitudes: Diller(26).

This synthesis of material from the readings on the self-concept brings to the theory developed in this dissertation much weight to conclude that the type of self-concept which a person has can well be equated with the total Ego strength.

There are many difficulties which arise out of the interactions of the individual with his environment. These

difficulties in the developmental processes may result in non-integration, in mal-adjustive behavior patterns, in un-socialization of the individual, in conflicts with others in interpersonal relations, in loss of ego strength or integrative powers, or in forms of neuroses. All are damaging to the individual and present problems to all persons who deal with that individual in his environmental milieu. Buhler(18) says that poor ideas concerning self result in several types of emotional disturbances and maladjustive behavior patterns. Blair(20) attributes many of the difficulties of the preadolescent to his antagonism toward authority resulting from his feelings of inadequacy in his relationships with authoritarian figures. Maslow(64) speaks of the authoritarian character structure as being based on the idea that one's safety lies in one's own strength and that strength consists primarily in the power to dominate. The inevitable result, then, of interpersonal relationships between authoritarian figures and children with weak self-concepts is to further accentuate that self-concept of inadequacy and helplessness.

Mewrer(69) states that the types of controls characteristic of the average classroom reinforce certain types of resistive behavior patterns. This places much of the responsibility for mis-guidance of certain types of problems on the lack of understanding of children's problems by the very professional people who work with them most closely.

Newberry(73) was concerned with the effect of failure or threat of failure to the evaluation of self. Lorraine(60) brought out that rationalization for failure was an attempt of the individual to adjust the self-concept under threat. Rogers(85) states that external evaluation may represent a threat to a person's concept of himself. Porter(81) states that no matter what errors of perception a person may have, we must deal with the reality of his frame of reference. Morris(68) deals with self-delusion as a defensive mechanism. Fenichel(30) feels that another threat to the self-concept may be a continuation of fear of parents when internalization was not complete and the super-ego ideas are re-projected into the environment. Holt(47) believes that all kinds of levels of aspiration may operate as a threat to a person's ability and integrity, bringing into play mechanisms to protect the self. Synonds(95) states that reaction formations are an effort of the ego to get confirmation more than to gain affection.

Klein(55) testing the generality of confidence under a situation of actual ego-involvement stated that confidence was related to the nature of the task. Confidence ratings at one time may be really ratings of accuracy or ability and related to the task, at another time they may be a measure of aspiration and thus related to the personality of the subject.

Redl(53) made reference to discipline problems in group situations: classroom teachers need not only more knowledge of the individual child, but also knowledge of group psychological controls. Group situational analysis would help the classroom teacher to find and work through many of her group and individual problems. Teachers need to know how leadership within the peer group operates. With this type of knowledge, they would be better able to manipulate groups successfully.

Howard(50) believed that the poor handling of aggression and hostility leads to social behavior patterns that are not acceptable but that when feelings are well handled provide the drives that lead to real accomplishment in a civilized world.

Piaget(77) proposed that an environment favorable to the development includes close adjustment of thought to that of others and the reciprocal formation of relationships of perspectives which insure the possibility of a cooperation between the child in the focus of all things which are real to him and the other constituents in the field. The processes of the emergent intelligence follow the same laws as other evolutionary processes. The development of reason follows the same laws, once social life and reflective thought have been formed.

Burrall(19), concerned with variability in the fifth grade, found that those children varying the most in achievement seem to be on the average the ones selected most

frequently by their classmates as desirable persons to work and play with. Those varying the most and those varying the least in achievement did not differ significantly with respect to personality test scores on the California Test of Personality.

Fields(34) stated that extreme groups in physical ability showed differences in personality scores on self-adjustment which were significant at the .01 level of confidence. His work was also at the fifth grade level.

Frankin(37) found that schizophrenic behavior is an expression of a maladaptation centering in a failure of the integrative capacity of the personality . . . a disintegration . . . resulting from frustration beyond the tolerance of the individual. This has its implications for a closer study of instances of withdrawing behavior on the part of children in the middle grades.

Kelen(97) found that the self-percept was evident in the case of stutterers: they were "overcompensatory" and had a halo of positive feelings, more so than normals. This would be in line with Symond's(95) ideas about defense mechanisms reflecting the difference between self-estimate and level of achievement. Schneiderman(89) stated that anxiety could be classified as a reaction to social pressures rather than primarily internal conflict, contributing to the possible role of repressed moral obligations in the etiology of neurosis.

Allport(2) describes the ego as the conflict region of the total personality. It is the region in which value judgments must be made. Those processes by which conflicts are resolved and by which the future is brought forward psychologically and integrated with the present can be called "ego processes." Both symbolic and non-symbolic behavior come about through substantially the same conditions; both are means of adaptation.

Those things which affect the self-concept will necessarily carry over into behavior and attitudes in group relations. In this instance, persons perceive their status in relation to their peers in proportion to two elements: their own need for recognition and status and acceptance by others and the opportunities afforded them to adapt to and practice roles in relationship to other group members.

Heggs(55) believed that self-insight means the degree to which a person understands his own situation and problems. He also stated that a child's self-insight has been found to be the best prediction of his later adjustment.

The problem of leadership roles within the peer culture of the pre-adolescent is a grave one. Blair(10) states that resistance to adult authority is one of the pre-adolescent's principal sources of difficulty and the cause of many of the instances of problem behavior. Howard(50) believes that when emotions are expressed in unrealistic ways that drives are

channeled into unsatisfying activities; the person is consequently never satisfied and the system is energized until the patterns of behavior become obsessive and maladaptive.

Redl(83) believes that the group climate is an important factor in the situational treatment of any maladjusted children. He mentions emotional inter-relationships between group members, identifications, relations to leaders, leadership techniques, group and individual purposes, conformity and/or discord between leader standards, cultural level of group goals, and private behavior codes of group members. If these things are important in the therapy with members of groups in Redl's work, they are equally as important to the teacher in any classroom from a standpoint of prevention.

Redl mentions five points worthy of notation here. These are points which are often indicated as causes of classroom climate disturbances.

1. One individual or several insist on group conflicting satisfactions.
2. The group leader insists upon group conflicting satisfactions.
3. The group, or considerable parts of it, are exposed to events producing emotional strain, conflict, or insecurity.
4. Mistakes in leadership techniques cause conflict.
5. Mistakes in the construction of the group patterns cause conflict.

All of these points may cause disruption of group endeavors and an arresting of the learning processes for either individuals or the whole group. Those who have developed ego stability will have problems when group interactions are disturbed; those who are unstable or who do not have ego resources will have their weaknesses accentuated and will become more and more deprived of group interrelationships.

Bettelheim(8) describes a situation which permits the child to develop a consistent frame of reference. The situation in which the child develops, he says, "should place emphasis on spontaneity and flexibility . . . not to be misconstrued as license or chaos . . . and should make questions of schedule or routine subservient to the relevance of highly individualized and spontaneous inter-personal relationships. Such circumstances would permit the emergence and development of the psychological instances, the internalization of controls, and the eventual integration of the child's personality."

Gitelson(39) states that "the intelligent use of authority provides both security and protective control . . . and has a valid place in the therapeutic scheme." It is premised here that any classroom should be therapeutic. When it is not it loses the effectiveness of any other purposes which it might have in the educative process.

Brodbeck(15) has stated that the personality variables of self-liking or self-disliking is acquired during early

socialisation experiences within the family. He believes that if the socialisation process has been successful, identification with parents should lead the individual to have (1) high positive attitudes toward the self, (2) high self-esteem, and (3) high self-confidence. He states that self-dislike is a result of parent-child conflictful relations. It becomes even more important, then, that there be other socialisation forces to counter-balance those negative influences from the family which send a self-disliking child to school.

Lippitt(57) states that leadership difficulties within the peer group may be worked through by role-playing techniques, removing the threat of putting a pupil directly on the spot for his ego-defensive behavior patterns.

Lorr(59) has brought out facts about rebellion and delinquency as follows: the unsocialised aggressive and the socialised delinquent were compared. The factor of rebellion was characteristic of both the unsocialised aggressive and the socialised delinquent but the direction or purposiveness of this rebellion differentiated. The factor of maladaptation tending toward disorganisation of the adaptive processes was more characteristic of the schisoid than of the aggressive. The delinquent could be rebellious, but some of his behavior patterns were adaptive. The schisoid behavior was more maladaptive. the fact that these results were found in special studies with special groups does not change the fact that in the public schools we are getting a larger and larger

percentage of pre-delinquent children and pre-schizoid children simply because we are getting a larger percentage of the children of the total population. If institutionalization is to be the answer, then diversion of funds to build many more institutions in proportion to schools would be the part of wisdom.

Hollander(43) found the attitudes toward authority which Naval Aviation Cadets brought with them to training tended to make a difference in their level of motivation in training.

Bogardus(11) states that any group is more than the sum of its parts, that groupality does not equal group mind but is the function of individuals within a field of group forces. Each unit of group behavior reflects the nature of both personality and groupality.

To draw together the many ideas related thus far in the review of literature is perhaps to over-simplify. However, it is promised that the core of the personality is composed of a person's ideas about himself or the self-concept. This self-concept is developed and molded through two forces, the family and the peer culture. The family is representative of the values and attitudes of the sub-culture; the peer culture is broader and more representative of the culture as a whole. Some of the difficulties which any person in the American culture has have come about through conflicts between the values of the sub-culture and the total culture; specifically the problems of the preadolescent are concerned with a

reconciliation of three elements: his ideas about himself, the demands of the family, and the demands of the peer group. In instances where the integration of inconsistencies is more complete and the value system of the individual is not in conflict with the actuality of the social milieu, the problem is one of continued integration. In instances where the social and adaptive skills of the individual are at variance with the social expectations or where the individual has not developed a measure of autonomy with which to handle himself in the peer culture, the school has the function of reconciliation of the integrative forces and therapy.

It is the consensus of several writers that the self-accepting person is also the person who accepts others. This would indicate that the tendency to disparage others arises out of a feeling of inferiority as an overcompensation, which is the theory advanced by Adler(1). According to Horney(49) a person who does not believe himself lovable is unable to love others. It is also proposed by Fromm(32) that failure to love the self is accompanied by a basic hostility toward others which arises out of the suppression of the individual's spontaneity of his real self. Sheerer(90) found a definite and substantial correlation between attitudes of acceptance and respect for self and attitudes of acceptance and respect for others. This study by Sheerer was followed by Phillips(76) who found much the same results.

It is of importance to this study that Fiedler(33) found the unconscious attitudes toward self as correlates of sociometric choice. He also found that a person has the tendency to assume a person whom he dislikes to be unlike himself; to assume a person whom he likes to be like himself. Rey(32) also found that acceptance of self was related to acceptance of others and that it had a relationship to therapy readiness.

Ghodorkoff(23) found evidence of a discrepancy score which is evidenced in high acceptance of self and low acceptance of others. It is believed that defensive mechanisms in some manner account for the negative correlations between self-estimates and achievement. Norman(74) also claims that the most highly accepted individuals do not have the greatest degree of self-insight or realistic perceptions of others. He says that "the more rejected the individual, the more he tends to over-estimate others." Bender(5) claims much projection in the perception of other people and in any first or role situation which calls for empathic participation.

Ellis(27) has done one of the most extensive studies on questionnaires as valid instruments for personality measurements. His work is very broad and his interpretation is not too favorable toward the paper and pencil personality questionnaires. He claims that they are of dubious value in distinguishing between groups of adjusted and mal-adjusted

individuals, and that they are of much less value in the diagnosis of individual adjustment or personality traits.

Normal(74), however, has another viewpoint. He found a positive significant correlation between the degree of acceptance of other individuals and insight into oneself, with some very interesting conclusions. He found that maximal insight, self-other identity, and realistic perception of others is not necessary for a high degree of acceptance. He found a significant relationship between acceptance by others and over-estimation of self. He also found that those with highest acceptance significantly over-estimate others in comparison to their peer's ratings of others, postulating that a high degree of acceptance is related to a generous appraisal of others because there is a generous appraisal of self.

Russell(88) has one of the most comprehensive studies on self-evaluation. His findings and synthesis of the results found by other authors in the field form the basis for extensive theoretical hypotheses. One finding which bears an important relationship to this study is from Navighurst(43) who has used Sociometric instruments with the California Test of Personality to find that teachers and peer ratings are more highly correlated than self-ratings. At the fifth grade level, for the girls, $r=.91$, for the boys, $r=.80$. Self and peer ratings; $r=.48$; self and teacher ratings, $r=.30$. He stated that the apparent inaccuracy of self-evaluation is due to a consistent error peculiar to the individual: a systematic

tendency to over-rate himself or under-rate himself according to the kind of delusion he has about himself.

Exploring the Regerian hypothesis(84) that the self-accepting individual will have better interpersonal relations, McIntyre(63) found positive correlations between scores of self-acceptance and acceptance of others. With the many researchers taking an interest in this subject, it is especially pertinent to the purposes and desires of educators to find some way of helping the so-called socially maladjusted middle grade child. The groupness of our society, the many demands made upon the individual for group participation, the constant living and developing in groups-- all these make it imperative that we find out about the children who are not adjusting to classroom climates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alder, Alfred, Understanding Human Nature, Greenberg, 1927.
2. Allport, Gordon W. and Phillip B. Rice, "The Law of Effect and Ego Psychology," selected papers from Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics, by G. Hobart Mowrer, New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1950, pp. 203-209.
3. Barron, F., "Complexity-Simplicity as a Personality Dimension," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVIII, 163.
4. Bells, Robert E., "Self-Concepts and Rorschach Signs of Depression," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (1954), No. 2.
5. Bender, I. E. and A. H. Kastorf, "On Measuring Generalized Empathic Ability," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVIII, 503-506.
6. Bendig, A. W. and J. L. Sprague, "The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey as a Predictor of Achievement Level and Achievement Fluctuations in Introductory Psychology," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII (Dec., 1954), No. 6, 409.
7. Berger, E. M., "The Relationship Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 778.
8. Bettelheim, Bruno and Emy Sylvester, "A Therapeutic Milieu," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XVIII (April, 1948), 191-206.
9. Bettelheim, Bruno, Love Is Not Enough, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1951, pp. 133-169.
10. Blair, A. Witt and William E. Burton, Growth and Development of the Preadolescent, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.

11. Bogardus, Emory S., "Group Behavior and Groupality," Sociology and Social Research, XXXVIII (July-August, 1952), No. 6, 401-403.
12. Bonney, Merl E., "Personality Traits of Socially Successful and Socially Unsuccessful Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIV (1943), 449-472.
13. _____, "Social Behavior Differences Between Second Grade Children of High and Low Sociometric Status," Journal of Educational Research, XLVIII (March, 1955), 482-493.
14. Breckenridge, Marian E. and E. Lee Vincent, Child Development, Philadelphia-London, W. Saunders Company, 1949, pp. 20-21.
15. Brodbeck, Arthur J. and Howard V. Parinutter, "Self-Bislake as a Determinant of Marked Ingroup-Outgroup Differences," The Journal of Psychology, XXXVIII (1954), 271-280.
16. Brown, Roger W., "A Determinant of the Relationships Between Rigidity and Authoritarianism," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVIII (1953), 469-476.
17. Brownstein, John J., "Stability of the Self-Concept as a Dimension of Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 597-606.
18. Buhler, Charlotte and associates, Childhood Problems and The Teacher, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1952, pp. 82-83.
19. Burrall, Lucille, "Variability in Achievement of Pupils at the Fifth Grade Level," California Journal of Educational Research, V (March, 1954), No. 2, 68-73.
20. Caldwell, O. and B. Wellman, "Characteristics of School Leaders," Journal of Educational Research, XIV, 1-3.
21. Carroll, John B., "Ratings on Traits Measured by a Factored Personality Inventory," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII, 626.
22. Cattell, R. B., "P Technique Factorisation and the Determinants of Individual Dynamic Structure," Journal of Clinical Psychology, VIII (1952).

23. Choderkoff, Bernard, "Adjustment and the Discrepancy Between the Perceived and the Ideal Self," Journal of Clinical Psychology, I (July, 1954), No. 3, 266-68.
24. Grutchfield, Richard, "Social Psychology and Group Processes," Annual Review of Psychology, V (1954).
25. Cunningham, Ruth and associates, Understanding Group Behavior of Boys and Girls, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.
26. Diller, Leonard, "Conscious and Unconscious Self-Attitudes After Success and Failure," Journal of Personality† XLIII (September, 1954), No. 1.
27. Ellis, Albert, "The Validity of Personality Questionnaires," Psychological Bulletin, XLIII (September, 1946), 387-440.
28. Erikson, Erik H., Childhood and Society, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1950.
29. Faguiri, Renato, "Relational Analysis: an Extension of Sociometric Method with Emphasis upon Social Perception," Sociometry, XV (1952), No. 3.
30. Fenichel, O., The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1954, p. 703.
31. Ferguson, Leonard W., Personality Measurement, New York, McRraw-Hill Book Company, 1952, p. 20.
32. Fey, William F., "Acceptance of Self and Others and Its Relation to Therapy Readiness," Journal of Clinical Psychology, X (1954), No. 3.
33. Fiedler, F. E., W. G. Warrington and F. J. Blaisdell, "Unconscious Attitudes as Correlates of Sociometric Choice in a Social Group," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII, 790.
34. Fields, Clarence Jerome, "A Comparative Study of the Relation of Certain Factors to the Reading Status of Extreme Groups of Pupils in the 5B Grade of the Baltimore Public Schools," unpublished doctor's dissertation, New York University, New York City, 1953.
35. French, Thomas M., The Integration of Behavior, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1952.

36. Fromm, Erick, The Forgotten Language, New York, Rinehart and Company, 1951.
37. Frankin, R. M. and Adolph Meyer, "Social Factors in Schizophrenia," Sociology-Social Research, XXXVIII (August, 1954), 6.
38. Furfey, P. E., "Recent Research on Children's Friendships," Education (March, 1934).
39. Gitelson, Maxwell, "Character Synthesis: The Psychotherapeutic Problem of Adolescence," The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XVIII (July, 1948), 422-431.
40. Green, G. H., "Insight and Group Adjustment," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943, pp. 29-61.
41. Gustaf, John W., "Vocational Interests and Socio-Economic Status," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII (1954), No. 5, 336-38.
42. Hartshorne, H. and M. May, Studies in the Nature of Character, Vol. I, Studies in Deceit, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1928.
43. Havighurst, R. J., M. A. Robinson and Don M. Robinson, "The Development of the Ideal Self in Childhood and Adolescence," Journal of Educational Research, XL (December, 1964), 241-57.
44. Hildreth, Gertrude, Readiness for School Beginners, New York, World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, 1950, pp. 13-14.
45. Hollander, E. P. and J. T. Blair, "Attitudes Toward Authoritarian Figures as Correlates of Motivation Among Naval Aviation Cadets," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII (February, 1954), No. 1, 21-25.
46. Hollingworth, L. S., Gifted Children: Their Nature and Nurture, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1926.
47. Holt, R. S., "Level of Aspiration: Ambition or Defense," Journal of Experimental Psychology, XXVI, 398-416.
48. Hopkins, L. Thomas, The Emerging Self, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1934.

49. Horney, Karen, Neurosis and Human Growth, New York, W. W. Norton Company, 1950.
50. Howard, Edgerton McC., "An Analysis of Adolescent Adjustment Problems," Mental Hygiene, XXV (July, 1941), 362-90.
51. Huntley, W., "Judgments of the Self Based on Expressive Behavior," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXV, 398-427.
52. Jennings, H. H., Leadership and Isolation, New York, Longmans, Green and Company, Inc., 1943.
53. Katz, I., "The Emotional Expression in Failure: A New Hypothesis," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLV, 329-49.
54. Kerr, W. A. and R. H. Van Zelst, "Personality Self-Assessment of Scientific and Technical Personnel," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII (June, 1954), No. 3, 145.
55. Klein, George S., and Nathan Schoenfeld, "The Influence of Ego-Involvement in Confidence," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXVI (April, 1941), 249-58.
56. Lecky, Prescott, Self-Consistency, New York, The Island Press, 1951.
57. Lippitt, Ronald, "Leadership Through Socially Integrated Groups," Sociatry, I (March, 1947), pp. 82-91.
58. Lockman, Robert, "Some Relationships Between the MMPI and Minnesota Personality Scale," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXIX (May, 1954), 211-17.
59. Lorr, Maurice and Richard Jenkins, "Patterns of Maladjustment in Children," Journal of Clinical Psychology, IX (January, 1953), 16-19.
60. Lorraine, Paul, "Rationalisation About Test Performance as a Function of Self-Concept," The Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII (August, 1954), No. 4, 264.
61. Lynd, Robert S., Knowledge For What? Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1939.
62. McGurdy, Harold G., and Herbert W. Eber, "Democratic versus Authoritarian: A Further Investigation of Group Problem Solving," Journal of Personality, XIII (December, 1953), 250-69.

63. McIntyre, Charles J., "Acceptance of Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII, 624-25.
64. Maslow, A. H., "The Authoritarian Character Structure," Journal of Social Psychology, S.P.S.S.I. Bulletin, XVIII (1943), 401-11.
65. Meacham, M. E., The Relationship of Affectivity to Various Measures of Growth in Children, Microfilm, Michigan University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 1941.
66. Moreno, J. L., "Sociometric Theory of Leadership and Isolation," in Who Shall Survive? Sociometry, XIII (1944), 224-37.
67. Moreno, J. L., A Seminar in Houston, Texas, Summer, 1951.
68. Morris, C., The Open Self, New York, Prentice-Hall, 1948, p. 79.
69. Mowrer, O. Hobart, "Gradient of Reinforcement and Persistent Non-Integrative Behavior," Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics, New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1950, pp. 7-8.
70. Murphy, Gardner and L. E. and T. M. Newcomb, Experimental Social Psychology, rev. ed., New York, Harper and Brothers, 1939.
71. Murphy, L.B., Social Behavior and Child Personality, New York, Columbia University Press, 1937.
72. Murray, H. A., Explorations in Personality, New York, Oxford Press, 1938.
73. Newberry, A., "A Study of Some of the Factors Involved in Academic Failure," unpublished, Kansas State College Library, 1947.
74. Norman, Ralph D., "The Inter-Relationships Among Acceptance-Rejection, Self-Other Identity, Insight into Self, and Realistic Perception of Others," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII, 194-196.
75. Patterson, Ruth Melcher, "Classroom Procedures in a Prolonged Pre-academic Program for Mentally Retarded Boys," Journal of Exceptional Children, IV (October, 1948), 15-20

76. Phillips, E. L., "Attitudes Toward Self and Others: A Brief Questionnaire Report," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII, 153-63.
77. Piaget, Jean, The Construction of Reality in the Child, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1954.
78. Piaget, Jean, The Language and Thought of the Child, London, Lund-Humphries, 1950.
79. Pigors, P., Leadership or Domination, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1935.
80. Poliak, Otto, Social Science and Psychotherapy for Children, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1952.
81. Porter, E. H. Jr., An Introduction to Therapeutic Counseling, New York, Houghton-Mifflin, 1950.
82. Ransbert, Madeleine, Children in Conflict, New York, International Universities Press, Inc., 1949.
83. Redl, Fritz, "Group Psychological Elements in Discipline Problems," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XIII (January, 1943), 77-78.
84. Rogers, Carl R., Client-Centered Therapy, New York, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1951, 560.
85. Rogers, Carl R., Bill I Kell and Helen McNeil, "The Role of Self-Understanding in the Prediction of Behavior," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII, 175-86.
86. Rotter, Julian B., Social Learning and Clinical Psychology, New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.
87. Rubenstein, Eli A., "Personality Integration and the Perceptive Process," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XI (January, 1954), No. 1, 23-29.
88. Russell, David H., "What Research Says About Self-Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (April, 1953).
89. Schneiderman, Leonard, "Anxiety and Social Sensitivity," Journal of Psychology, 1954, p. 39.

90. Sheerer, Elizabeth F., "An Analysis of the Relationships Between Acceptance of and Respect for Self and Acceptance of and Respect for Others in Ten Counseling Cases," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (1949), 169-75.
91. Snygg, Donald and Arthur W. Combs, Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1949.
92. Serckin, F. A., Society, Culture, and Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1947, pp. 301-302.
93. Stephens, J. M., Educational Psychology, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1951, pp. 35-42.
94. Stock, D., "The Self-Concept and Feelings Toward Others," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (1949), 176-81.
95. Synovels, P. M., The Ego and the Self, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951, p. 229.
96. Wrightstone, J. Wayne, "Assessing Pupil Adjustment by Self-Descriptive and Sociometric Techniques," from Growing Points in Educational Research, pp. 331-35.
97. Zelen, Seymour L., and Joseph G. Sheehan and James T. Bugental, "The Self-Percept in Stuttering," Journal of Clinical Psychology, I (1952), 91.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF PRELIMINARY STUDIES

Prior to the research of the investigation already described were the findings from two pilot studies which attempted to find some definite relationships between level of self-adjustment, social adjustment, sociometric status, and achievement. One preliminary study was made in the Aubrey Rural Schools and included the data from ten grades, grades one through ten. The second pilot study was made in the Mance Housing School in Honolulu, Hawaii, and included data from a two-year study of one class through the fourth and fifth grades with comparative statistics from three other classes in the same school. In the study in Aubrey, Texas, the author was the school counselor; in that in Honolulu, T. H., she was the teacher of the class upon which the two-year study was made. In both instances, testing was under her direction with other teachers and cooperating interns participating in group work and therapy with the individuals.

In both studies the principal purpose was to determine what measures of classroom management and group activity had a relationship to the self-attitudes of pupils: low in sociometric status and low in achievement. The same measuring instruments were used in both studies with comparable results.

In the second study, much new and unstructured material was used to arrive at a direct and applicable frame of reference for the final study. That frame of reference under scrutiny was the child's ideas about himself.

Findings of the Aubrey Study

During the year 1950-51 sociometric tests were given to approximately 250 students in the Aubrey Public Schools. These tests were given throughout all grades of the school, grades one through ten. The scale "How I Feel Toward Others," developed by Bonney(1), was the test used to measure sociometric status in grades four through ten. Separate criteria of work and play situations were set up for the first three grades. Results from these tests were used to corroborate or to check teacher judgments as to which students needed help in social adjustment within the class groups and to point the way for further personal help through individual therapy and counseling.

In the fall semester, other tests were given to find: (1) the academic status of the students, (2) self-adjustment and social-adjustment as reflected in the California Test of Personality, and (3) the reading readiness of children in the first grade as well as their comparative standing on the Finnner-Gunningham Primary Abilities Scale. The California Test of Mental Maturity was given in the upper grades, four through ten. Mental Maturity Tests were given to the primary grades later in the year.

In the primary grades, efforts were made to discover the causes of difficulties which many of the isolates and the rejects were having in getting along with their classmates. Results from the sociometric tests showed almost one-third in these classes who received no choices (Table I, Appendix A). It is postulated here that semi-isolation in some rural communities may have a bearing on the slowness of many children in responding to the socializing influences of the public schools.

As part of the total program in helping those children who were rejected or left out of the play activities, there were extra game periods worked into the schedule, with two high school girls assisting in the program. Much of the non-conforming behavior and aggression of some of these younger students who did not know how to play with or get along with others was handled during these planned and supervised play periods. The primary teachers reported that the children were much more receptive to learning after having had organized play periods with special attention being paid to those children most in need of help.

Music teachers for both semesters during this year made efforts to find musical talent which could be utilized to give some of the more timid children status in the group. Those whose coordination had earned them the criticism of being "awkward" and often rejected by the class members in

group activities were given musical drills, marching to music, musical play activity, and rhythm band activity. Several of the children who were seldom chosen or not chosen at all on the first sociometric test were chosen or more highly chosen on the retest during the spring semester. The isolates were fewer in number, the rejects were also fewer in number. The proportion of rejects and isolates in the primary grades dropped from one-third of all students to one-eighth. There was a substantial scattering of mutuality throughout the groups in the primary grades, but the dynamics of the choice process, however, according to Moreno(4) was substantiated by the over-all results: the highly chosen were still highly chosen.

In the middle grades, retests on sociometric instruments gave much the same results as in the primary grades: there was more mutuality on the retest, but the most highly chosen were still highly chosen on the second test.

Data from the results from several measurements on a large group were formulated into a report. This report gave results on some eighty-nine students who came from three separate groups. There were a few students in groups A and B who were dropped because of incomplete data. Final report was made on a group of twenty-one students in the sixth grade, group A; a group of twenty students in the seventh grade, group B; and a group of forty-eight students from the

eighth, ninth, and tenth grades, group C. This large group was studied together because of the inter-relationships of groups.

These three groups were listed separately in order of rank on the sociometric test "How I Feel Toward Others." The three groups were put on separate sheets and each was divided into quartiles, as shown in Table II, Appendix A. The upper quartiles and the lower quartiles were then used as the basis for comparisons in intelligence and sociometric rank, personality adjustment scores and sociometric rank, and intelligence and personality adjustment scores.

There were twenty-three students in the upper quartiles and twenty-three students in the lower quartiles. The mean I.Q. of the whole group of eighty-nine was 97.9. The mean I.Q. of the twenty-three students in the upper quartiles was 101 while the mean I.Q. of the twenty-three in the lower quartiles was 93.3. The group from the upper quartiles had a Standard Deviation of 14.4 while the group from the lower quartiles had a Standard Deviation of 12.9. The group from the fourth quartile was an average of 3.1 above the mean for the whole group while those from the first quartile had an average of 4.6 below the mean for the whole group. As in other studies, it was substantiated that the highly chosen on the sociometric ratings are above the mean of the group in intelligence while the least chosen are considerably below the mean for the group.

An arbitrary grouping was made on the California Test of Personality. There were fifty-five cases which ranked below the 30th percentile on self-adjustment. This was called Group I. There were thirty-four cases which ranked 30th percentile or above. This was called Group II. These two groups were compared for intelligence quotients in Table III, Appendix A. Group II had a mean of 101.5 on intelligence scores whereas Group I had a mean of 95.7. Group II averaged 3.6 above the mean for the whole group, Group I averaging 2.2 below it. These differences were significant at the .01 level of confidence.

It is considered significant to note here that in Group I-- those below 30 P on self-adjustment-- there were thirty-three with I.Q.'s below 100, with a mean of 88.5. In Group II-- those 30 P or above on self-adjustment-- there were only sixteen with I.Q.'s below 100, with a mean of 86.8. In percentages, Group I had 60 per cent below 100 in intelligence whereas Group II had 47 per cent below 100. The difference between the means of the two groups was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

To point up some within group comparisons (Table IV, Appendix A), it was found that in Group I there were twenty-two pupils who had I.Q.'s above 100. The mean of their I.Q.'s was 107. The mean I. Q. of those thirty-three whose I.Q.'s were below 100 was 88.5. The difference between the means was 18.5.

In Group II there were eighteen who had I.Q.'s above 100. The mean of their I.Q.'s was 115. The mean I.Q. of those sixteen whose I.Q.'s were below 100 was 86.8. The difference between the means was 28.2. There was no significant difference between the means of the two groups whose I.Q.'s were below 100, but the means of the two groups with I.Q.'s above 100 showed a difference significant at the .01 level.

Although there were more students within this particular experiment who were found in the lower I.Q. group and also had a lower rank on self-adjustment, there were also to be found several cases with measured I.Q.'s as high as 116 who ranked as low as 5 F on the self-adjustment section of the California Test of Personality Adjustment. Such discrepancies held with the theory that having a high I.Q. does not preclude conflict and feelings of inferiority.

A more intensive study was made of those cases in which there were marked discrepancies between ratings on self-adjustment and sociometric status and/or discrepancies between ratings on self-adjustment and intelligence scores. These cases were singled out for individual counseling and special group work. Of the eleven cases studied and receiving group and individual therapy, eight had improved their sociometric status on the retest in the spring; three were still rejects.

The principal conclusion of this study is that the tests used do not show evidence of consistency in the ratings on

self-adjustment and social adjustment on the California Test of Personality and on the sociometric findings. Nor is the I.Q. a discriminating factor in self-adjustment ratings except in the group comprised of those I.Q.'s above 100. The I.Q., however, still continues to be a factor correlated with sociometric choice. A need for a simple, objective instrument which will tap only attitudes of self-reference is indicated to discriminate between highly chosen children and those low in social stimulus.

Findings of the Honolulu Study

The Honolulu study was done with the purpose of getting inside the frame of reference of the emotionally disturbed preadolescents. Four steps were taken in the research:

1. Cases were selected as maladjusted and classified as falling into the following classes or types:
 - a. Pupils aggressive toward their peers.
 - b. Those showing withdrawing behavior.
 - c. Pupils antagonistic to the teacher or other adults.
 - d. Those bringing the home to school with them.
2. Testing was done with the California Mental Maturity Test, The California Achievement Test, and the California Test of Personality at the fifth grade level.
3. Results were studied for the whole group. Those pupils selected as maladjusted were studied through

three techniques:

- a. Behavior sampling reports of three or more judges.
 - b. Sociometric data.
 - c. Results of structured and unstructured projective techniques analyzed for both groups and individuals.
4. Results from the projectives, the California Test of Personality and the Sociometric Tests, were compared for the most disturbed individuals.

The rationale behind the study is based on the theory later advanced by Hopkins(3) in his book on The Emerging Self. Learning is a by-product of continuously integrative development. When a child stops learning he has met a barrier which is, for the time being, unsurmountable. For the purpose of this study, these barriers are (1) himself, (2) the teacher or other adult figure, (3) the peer relations, (4) the task, and (5) the product of the situation in which the child finds himself.

Subjects were identified both before and during the research. The identification of any child as maladjusted or as a case of "problem behavior" was made by (a) the principal, (b) the teacher in charge, (c) one or more observer-participants working with the group on a part-time basis. Truancy, aggressive behavior on the schoolground, resistance to rules and adult authority, disinterest in the classroom activities, leadership rivalry, continual quarreling over "things",

uncooperativeness on either work or play projects, or rejection by the peer group were criteria of selection of cases for the study. The most significant behavior patterns in the groups studied-- the fourth grade B during the year 1952-53 and the fifth grades during the year 1953-54-- were aggressiveness toward the peer group and patterns of reaction to authority or peer leadership. Perhaps even more significant than the resistance to adult authority were the symptoms of rivalry for group status. At least, the one single and most frequent occurring incident manifested in overt behavior was the "howling" or "squawking" or "fighting" over fair play, favoritism, sportsmanship, and "who should be first."

Time sampling studies were made on fourteen cases during the first year, 1952-53, while many of these students were in fourth grade. These studies were made at four different periods of the day: (1) during the thirty-minute period preceding the beginning of the school day, (2) during the "sharing" or rest period at the noon hour, (3) on the playground, and (4) immediately following times of disruption of the regular class period. (See Table V). Two of these pupils were principally classified as truant and disinterested. Five were so disturbed that it was dangerous to both the other pupils and themselves to cause any pressure to conform to any sort of classroom routine. These seven were removed from the classroom, given private tutoring at home by a visiting

teacher and brought back one by one into the regular classroom during a seven weeks' interval.

The two whose problem was predominantly disinterest, retardation, and truancy were returned within a ten-day interval, for social service in Honolulu is both effective and fast. Parents, social welfare workers, a counselor, three workers from the University, and school personnel cooperated on the project. Four of the remaining five were brought back with some success in personality adjustment. The seventh pupil of this most seriously disturbed group received treatment at the Psychological Clinic during the spring semester and into the summer. He did not return to the classroom that semester but continued to be tutored at home by the visiting teacher. His prognosis was not considered favorable as his classification, at the age of eleven, was "Psychopathic personality." He did enter another school, a church school, the second year, but continued to be a serious problem and continued his treatment at the Clinic.

There were seven other problems in this class of thirty-six students which were handled in the classroom situation without temporary withdrawal. Much of their difficulty was based either in cruel or neglectful treatment at home, inability to stand any further deprivation or pressure, or "scapegoat" status within the peer group. A more permissive atmosphere, an equalization of opportunity for self-expression, a use of play periods or "sharing" periods at the times most

opportune-- all these contributed to the lessening of the pressures of the total situation. It might be mentioned here that two regular teachers and five substitutes had been disposed of by the group up until Easter of 1953. Whatever method had been used, the results were not toward more conformity but toward a stronger resistance to any authority or pressure to conform. The last ten weeks of the semester following the Easter vacation was aimed at bringing about the therapeutic milieu recommended by Bettelheim(2) with academic achievement secondary to therapeutic results.

For the new school year, according to recommendations, made on the basis of sociometric tests, the class was divided according to cliques within the sociometric framework, strong leaders whose rivalry created additional problems being separated, since there were two fourth grades and would be two fifth grade classes the following year. The school had used formerly the criteria of chronological age for division of classes, but in this instance the policy was waived. It should be mentioned here that there was strong leadership within the group; the principal idea was not to break up strong mutual friendships but to change the structure of the groups within the classroom so that the groups remaining would be potential combination for harmony. Three groups of boys were designated for Room B while a group of thirteen girls in which there were no rivalries was designated to add

to the twenty-three boys. (It should be said here that the proportion of boys to girls in the fourth and fifth grades of this school was 2-1.) Eleven of the pupils studied in the first year continued in Room B; one went to a church school, one moved to another town, the third, a very strong, but superior group leader, was sent to Room A along with five boys who definitely belonged in his group. One of these was later to be returned to Room B because of his antagonism toward the teacher of Room A. With the groupings made according to sociometric results, there was opportunity for further study and therapy with several of the individuals who needed it.

The group for the second year, 1953-54, was composed of one large group of girls whose relationships were very harmonious, although two of them had been rejects the year before. The twenty-three boys selected according to structuring by sociograms, were divided into three groups, with some mutuality and some choosing across the clique lines. Two of the groups were strong groups: one was headed by Gerald, whose insecurity of the year before was fading under group stimulation and status as a recognized leader in all activities, both on the playground and in the classroom. The second group was headed by David, whose personality and leadership were principally in a negative direction. His following was six boys one day and none the next, and it was indicated that it was because of his poor sportsmanship once he had control over others in

his group. The third group really had no "groupness." Four of the boys were isolates or rejects. Two were two grades retarded and consequently had serious scholastic problems. The fifth boy was an enigma. The last seven boys, along with three of the girls, were ten of the case studies out of fourteen for the year 1953-54. The two leaders of the other two groups, Gerald and David, were chosen because of the dynamic quality of their leadership.

In these groups it was not uncommon to have fights breaking out in the classroom even well into the second year of the study. No corporal punishment was used either by the principal or the teacher during the entire period of study. The "no corporal punishment" was a matter of administrative policy on the part of the principal and it was adhered to by the classroom teacher whose purpose was therapeutic rather than disciplinary.

From the behavior sampling reports, those patterns of behavior most characteristic of nine of the boys of the group of twelve was aggressive action toward another individual. Causes of such incidents were verbalized by the boys as . . . "he cheats" . . . "he really doesn't want me to play on his team" . . . "he won't let anyone else have a turn" . . . "he has to do everything all the time" . . . "he's a bad sport" . . . "he's got my stuff" . . . "he's a stealer" . . . and many other choice instances of name-calling. Two significances

are found here: the characteristic of possessing the inherent right to property and opportunity and the quality of criticizing the other person who infringes on those rights. These little Americans in Honolulu, of all racial extractions, are steeped in the dogma of "personal rights" and are well prepared, by parental counsel and classroom teaching, to maintain and enhance the individual personality. The difficulty seems to be that they have not learned how to protect their own rights without running over the other fellow. This is the dire task of citizens everywhere but a rather heavy burden on the shoulders of the preadolescent when his only security is in his own aggressiveness.

Soon after the start of the new school year, 1953-54, sociometric tests were given. The test by Bunney(1), "How I Feel Toward Others" was used. The results showed some mutuality, some choosing across the sex lines by the girls and by the boys within the "group that was not a group." There was still no groupness among the seven boys who comprised it because rejects and isolates still do not choose each other and share no mutuality, especially in their maladjustments. The only persons these fellows can envy is the "guy" at the top of the heap, and how well they watch every move a leader makes-- waiting, perhaps, for him to make a mistake. The reject feels his rejection strongly and puts the "Indian sign" on everyone.

There was strong rejection from the rest of the boys and from some of the girls for six of those seven boys in the "not-group." The seventh member, Paul G., received on three consecutive sociometric tests, on several criteria, the highest number of votes of anyone in the room. His social stimulus value was rooted in his personality characteristics. His classmates described him as friendly, a good sport, helpful, always sharing, and they included him in all plans for cooperative effort within the classroom. Gerald and David, the two group leaders, were "boys' boys" but Paul was chosen by everyone in the class. He was not often chosen on the playground, but this was a matter of his own choice. He did not often feel like playing with the rest of the boys. Nor did he take part in games with the girls as several of the "un-grouped" boys did. His sequence of playground behavior was usually in the following order: (1) run toward a group, (2) attract their attention, (3) pull some individual or two or three away from the group, and (4) go off and leave them. It can be explained briefly here that Paul, along with two other children in his family, was the victim of brutality at home, and while this was not all of his trouble, certainly it was basic to the fact that he considered all adults as enemies with whom to curry favor-- but whom he could never trust.

While Paul was highly chosen all the year, Alan was not chosen at all until toward the end of the second year when

he chose one person and one person chose him. But that person was not the same whom he had chosen. Alan remained amenable to adult approval or disapproval but was seldom chosen by his peers for anything. There was one exception: Alan was chosen as song leader, and he loved it. He had a very pleasant voice and could and did lead the group in songs much of the time. He did not give the children much trouble but neither did his participation in the music cause the children to choose him more frequently. There was one thing in common with these two boys whose reactions were so different: both were deathly afraid of their fathers and protected by their mothers from the fathers' wrath whenever possible.

Mason and Dennis were retarded. Wayne was both rejected and retarded. Wayne brought his home to school with him every morning. Paul and Alan were out of phase with adults. Lily Mae, Lillian, and Diane were out of phase with the peer groups and withdrawn. Paul M. was a habitual truant and Billy H., who enrolled later, was implicated in a "missing property" contest for some five weeks until he had won enough group acceptance to give him something else to do. Gary was looking for someone to dominate and Daniel was so easily led that they made it a two-some.

Some of these new cases were brought in at mid-semester when one group of five girls and a group of five boys, chosen on the basis of sociometric tests, was sent to Room A, while

several students were brought in from Room C to make a fourth-fifth grade combination. Several from the new group were immature and "low on the sociometric totem pole." The number of case histories was added to, but for the purposes of this study will not be further reported individually but rather placed in other categories and classifications.

It was decided that too little was known, by the teachers in charge, of the feelings that the students actually had concerning themselves and others. Several projective tests, sentence completion form, were then used along with the administration of the California Test of Personality for the second time soon after the mixing of classes to make the fourth-fifth grade combination. These sentence completion tests were aimed at finding out more about specific attitudes toward adults, toward personality characteristics of both adults and peers, and toward clarification of the students' ideas of self-reference. The material which came from these tests was categorized as follows:

1. Criteria of peer leadership.
2. Authority, resistance to, attitudes toward.
3. Family relationships.
4. Competition.
5. Feelings of inferiority.
6. A child's standards of fair play.
7. Judgment of friends and their characteristics.

8. Relationships to adults.
9. Motivation.
10. Signs of success.

(Samples of these tests with frequency categories will be found in Tables VI, VII, and VIII of this study.)

The standing of the pupils in this class of thirty-six was found on the last sociometric test of the year given the middle of May. Results are shown in Table IX, Appendix A. Those pupils who had been selected for case study were scattered throughout the four quartiles. The upper quartile and the lower quartile were set apart, with nine pupils falling in each quartile. Their standings on the sociometric test were calculated in percentages of the total possible score on the "How I Feel Toward Others" scale. Among the boys were several instances of as many as seven strongly mutual choices. There were no instances of any pupil being totally rejected, but there was one instance of a student mentioned before, Alan, whose score was .01 of possible scoring. The maximum score in percentages was .50 of possible scoring. The mean of the high quartile was .43 and the mean of the low quartile was .11. The *t* score on this as a criterion of division of groups, was 11.74. See Table X, Appendix C. This was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

The scores on the California Test of Personality were found for these groups and the results compared, as shown in

Table XI, Appendix A. In the upper quartile was found one boy who rated himself at the 10 P on both personal and social adjustment. Three of the pupils in the lower quartile rated themselves as high as the 40 P on the Personality Test. The higher group was more variable, having a Standard Deviation of 20.7 percentile points, while the lower group had a Standard Deviation of 14.6 percentile points. It was found that the t score calculated for the difference in the means of these two groups was 2.76, with 16 degrees of freedom. This difference is significant at the .02 level of confidence.

The two groups at the extremes of the sociometric ranking were compared on I.Q. scores. The mean of the highs was 101, the mean of the lows was 82. (Table XII, Appendix A) The Standard Deviation of the highs was 4.3 I.Q. points while the Standard Deviation of the lows was 12.2 I.Q. points. The variability of the combined group(s) was 9.1. The resultant t was 4.41, which was significant at better than the .001 level of confidence.

The two groups at the extremes of the sociometric ranking were compared on Achievement Grade Placement at the end of the year. The mean of the highs was a grade placement of 5.3 while the mean of the lows was 4.3. The Standard Deviation of the highs was .86 G. P. while the Standard Deviation of the lows was .88 G. P. The variability of the two combined groups was .875 G. P. The resultant t ratio was 2.43 for

16 degrees of freedom and was significant at the .05 level of confidence. (See Table XIII)

The two groups at the extremes of the sociometric ranking in this particular class-- Class B-- were compared on their scores on the California Test of Personality with the two matched groups which were taken from the larger group of four classes. The purpose of this comparison was to determine whether the extremes in Class B were any more variable in their Personality Self-Ratings than were the extremes made up from all four classes. In the larger groups each quartile (See Table XIV) had an N of 32. The mean of the highs on the California Test of Personality was 58.4 while the mean of the lows was 13.2. The Standard Deviation of the highs was 10.32 percentile points; the Standard Deviation of the lows was 6.8 percentile points. The Critical Ratio was 3.53, which was found to be significant at better than the .001 level of confidence. This is shown in Table XV. Thus the difference between highs and lows in the larger group was more significant than for the smaller group, since the t ratio for the smaller groups, with 16 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.76, significant at the .02 level.

When the California Test of Personality was used as the criterion for ranking from high to low and finding the differences between the upper and lower quartiles, the findings were not significant. (See Table XVI, Appendix A) The t for the difference between the highs and lows on the Sociometric

Test was 1.24, lacking in significance at the .10 level of confidence. Neither did the t for the difference between the means of the highs and lows on Achievement Grade Placement which was .46 approach significance at the .10 level of Confidence. (Table XVII)

The important findings from this study are pertinent to further research in this area: (1) Sociometric instruments do differentiate between those with high and those with low I.Q.'s; between those with high ratings on the California Test of Personality and those with low ratings; between high achievers and low achievers, and (2) a short self-rating instrument is needed which will make these same differentiations and which will be usable to the classroom teacher with a minimum effort at analysis of the child's personality difficulties. The third finding, which came from the sentence completion material, is that a child's attitudes toward himself and toward others in his immediate environment have a significant bearing on personality disturbance, conflict with the peer group, and on the integrative forces of his personality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bonney, Merl E., "How I Feel Toward Others," A Sociometric Test, unpublished.
2. Bettelheim, Bruno and Emy Sylvester, "A Therapeutic Milieu," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XVIII (April, 1948), 191-206.
3. Hopkins, L. Thomas, The Emerging Self, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.
4. Moreno, J. L., Who Shall Survive, New York, Beacon House, 1934.

CHAPTER IV

THE SELF-CONCEPT AS RELATED TO CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

This research began with the preparation of scales for ratings during the fall semester of 1954-55. The actual testing began on January 25, 1955, and continued through May 25, 1955. During this four-months period sixteen fifth grade classes were tested, using seven different instruments. Two other fifth grades were used for reliability data on the self-rating scale. Each class was met from seven to eight times at different intervals, with several make-up periods. There were an average of six conference periods with each of the teachers of these classes.

The procedures of the research, the preliminary preparation of testing instruments, and the statistical treatment of data are discussed in this chapter under the following heads:

1. Preparation of Rating Scales:
 - a. Background and Findings of Source Instruments.
 - b. Preparation of a Self-Rating Scale.
 - c. Preparation of a Teacher's Rating Scale.
 - d. Preparation of a Peer Rating Scale.
2. Preparation of Data on Behavior Problems:

- a. Background of Criteria.
 - b. Conference with Teachers.
 - c. Preparation of Behavior Classification Forms.
3. Administration of Tests:
- a. Reliability Data.
 - b. Self-Ratings.
 - c. Sociometric Tests.
 - d. Mental Maturity Tests.
 - e. Achievement Tests.
4. Statistical Treatment of Data:
- a. Reliability of Self-Rating Test.
 - b. Results of Individual Class Testing.
 - c. Criterion of Selection of Highs and Lows.
 - d. Matching of Highs and Lows on Basis of I.Q.
 - e. Comparisons of Matched Groups.

Preparation of Rating Scales

The theory that an individual is the one best qualified to rate himself was the primary reason for using a self-rating as one of the criterion tests of this study. The self-concept is referred to by Brownstein(7) as the system of central meanings that a person has about himself and his relations to the world about him. In his study he had students rate themselves four different ways, each reflecting a different self, according to how he had been directed to make the rating. The four selves thus rated were: (1) the private

self, (2) the positive self, (3) the negative self, and (4) the social self. The ratings from these four definitions of the self were compared for stability and for discrepancy. The differences between the ratings for the positive and the negative selves gave a measure of stability; the discrepancy between the private and the social selves gave an index of social conflict. From the comparisons of these four self-ratings Brownfain advanced the theory that consistency in self-ratings gives a measure of the total self-concept, positing a relationship between self-concept and total adjustment.

Brownfain's test had twenty-five categories with an eight point scale on each category. Such categories as intelligence, physical attractiveness, generosity, cheerfulness, sportsmanship, dependability, prestige, flexibility, etc., were to be found on the scale. A person in rating himself could score himself a maximum of 8 along the point scale or he could give himself as low as 1. Since the test was re-administered three times in the Brownfain study, the scale was extended at both ends, giving a total range from 0 through 9. The scale was easy to administer, to understand, and to score.

The twenty-five categories of the Brownfain instrument were studied. His scale had been given at the college level while this dissertation studies fifth grades. Four steps

were completed in the adaptation of this test to fifth grade.

1. Twenty of the categories were considered applicable to the age and comprehension level of fifth grade.
2. Each category was explained in five descriptive statements; phrased in the second person, and arranged from "a" as the most favorable to "e" as the least.
3. A trial of the preliminary form of the test was given to eighty-nine students and weightings of the items determined from the percentages of students marking each item.
4. The test was reworded to be appropriate for the reading level of fifth grade and copies mimeographed for approximately 750 pupils.

The categories which were retained were worded in two ways: (1) some were single terms, like "cheerfulness" or "popularity", (2) some were phrased in question form to facilitate comprehension by the pupil, as in the category "Are you dependable?" Such terms as emotional maturity were changed into questions like "Are you being your age?" with the descriptive ratings making differentiations in degrees of maturity rather than expecting the pupils to make a scale-point differentiation on such a quality. (Conversions of categories are shown in Appendix C.)

The table which follows shows the percentages of persons marking each of the categories and the consequent weightings.

TABLE XVIII
PERCENTAGE OF RATINGS ON ALL CATEGORIES,
SELF-RATING SCALE

Descriptive Statement	Percentage Marking	Weighting
a. Most Favorable	.15	4
b. Better than Average	.32	3
c. Average	.45	2
d. Less than Average	.06	1
e. Least Favorable	.007	0

Questions regarding definition of terms or clarification of wording were considered during the administration to the first sampling of classes. Directions were changed to bring about a clearer understanding of the task of self-rating and to insure greater objectivity.

To set up a scale for teachers' ratings of the students the general criterion of "self-acceptance" was used. The work of Berger(1) gave a number of criteria of self-acceptance and several of acceptance of others. The criteria of self-acceptance were as follows:

1. Relies on internalised values.
2. Capacity to cope with life.
3. Responsibility for his acts.
4. Accepts praise and criticism objectively.
5. Accepts feelings, limitations, etc., without distortion.

6. Is a person of worth, equal to others.
7. Does not expect others to reject him whether he gives reasons or not.
8. Does not think himself as different from others.
9. Is not shy or self-conscious.

Several of these criteria are related to the items on the Self-Rating Scale; therefore, the teachers would be rating the children on much the same criteria. It is concluded that it would be well to include the criteria of acceptance of others. Those which Berger thought significant were:

1. Does not hate or condemn others whose behavior is different from his own.
2. Does not try to dominate others.
3. Does not assume responsibility for others.
4. Does not deny worth of others; does not feel above or below them.
5. Shows desire to serve others.
6. Has an active interest in others and a desire for mutually satisfactory relations.
7. Advances own welfare without impinging on rights of others.

From these criteria were developed twenty points which were aimed at making it possible for the teacher to rate the pupil on many of the same general qualities on which he had rated himself. The material was made into a score sheet,

with directions at the top, a blank for the individual's name, and blanks in front of each category so that check marks might be placed by those items considered most characteristic of the person being rated. (See Appendix G)

When this was done, the next problem was to convert the categories to negative descriptions so that pupils at the low end of the scale could be described in similar categories. The negative statements were phrased and the second blank was arranged in the same manner as the first. The first blank was called "Nominations on Criteria of Self-Acceptance;" the second was "Nominations on Criteria of Self-Rejection." When the parallel forms were completed, copies were mimeographed so that each teacher would have enough of each form for one fourth of her class.

The categories used in the Teacher's Rating Scale for Self-Acceptance and Self-Rejection were cut in half, e.g., the number of the items was halved, with changes in wording to facilitate understanding by fifth grade pupils. Comparative forms were prepared for (I) Nominations for Self-Accepting Persons, and (II) Nominations for Self-Rejecting Persons. Preliminary directions on all forms included definition of terms and instructions to select as many as five persons in the class who would fit the specific descriptions. Blanks were added at the bottom of each form and the mimeographed sheets containing the names of all students in the room were available for each individual pupil to facilitate nominations.

Enough copies of both forms were mimeographed for pupils taking part in the project.

Because of the theory that the "halo" and over-compensation often influence a person's self-ratings, three rating scales were used to select the pupils designated as high in self-concept. The corroboration of self-ratings by teachers' ratings and peer ratings was for the purpose of minimizing these effects. The selection of a person for the group high in self-concept was based on the criterion of two out of three ratings as upper quartile. Teacher nominations were only for upper and lower quartiles; pupil nominations were ranked according to frequency tabulations on both forms with difference scores determining the final ranking.

Preparation of Data on Behavior Problems

It is the thesis of this dissertation that children with a poor self-concept have patterns of behavior which are maladaptive and that their relationships with their peers and with adults are not satisfying. This thesis is substantiated by Brownfain(7) in the statement that "So intimate is the relationship between self and the social environment that it may be asserted that there is no maladjustment of personality that is not somehow reflected in maladjustment in interpersonal relations."

Northway(10) in her discussion of children found in the lowest quartile of acceptability stated that "In all these

children, failure in the establishment of adequate social relationship is the common factor. Social learning has been inadequate to meet social situations." She classified the children found in the lower quartile in three categories: (1) recessive, (2) socially uninterested, and (3) socially ineffective.

Bonney(4) has made a study of the traits of children socially successful and socially unsuccessful. He found several traits which differentiated between these two types of children: daring, aggressiveness, sympathetic response, friendliness, good looking, happy, enthusiastic, welcomed, laughter, and active in recitations. The syndromes were manifested: the first that of the strong, aggressive person with such personality traits as leadership, enthusiasm, daring, active participation in recitations. The second syndrome is that of having a pleasing appearance, a cheerful disposition, and friendly attitudes. These same traits may be found also associated with mutual friendships. It is his thesis that enough leeway should be allowed in group control to permit the development of some daring and initiative and some socially approved aggressiveness, while the attitudes and kinds of behavior essential to friendliness must also be developed.

Blair(2) found that resistance to adult authority was a strong characteristic of the preadolescent. This characteristic is mentioned very often in discussions with classroom teachers, and, for the most part, they do not consider

it in the same light as students of child development. It is a very common finding that authority for authority's sake is the backbone of classroom "control."

During the four months in which testing was going on, there were opportunities for conferences with teachers on cases of most concern to them. Questions concerning the test results, requests for help or advice as to how to deal with some personality problem in the classroom-- these were very frequent since all cooperating teachers knew the purpose and the extent of the study. Types of problems mentioned were tallied on each round of testing for each individual teacher. The categories were unstructured for the first few weeks. Then the teachers were frequently asked questions concerning the following three areas:

1. What is your most serious problem in classroom management?
2. Which children are your most serious behavior problems?
3. How would you classify the behavior problem of these particular children?

This material was again tallied and placed in categories. The most frequently mentioned categories were: (1) aggressive behavior toward other children, (2) un-cooperativeness in classroom group work, (3) withdrawing behavior, (4) immaturity or inability to handle academic work, (5) poor home background, (6) disinterest.

Toward the end of the semester, several weeks after Teachers' Ratings had been collected, a form including the above classifications was given to each teacher. On this form she was asked to write the names of pupils in her classroom who fell into each particular classification. The six areas were identified on the new classification sheet as:

1. Aggressive behavior, with three sub-categories.
2. Withdrawing behavior, with four sub-categories.
3. Disinterested.
4. Immature.
5. Disliked.
6. Dislikes others.

The number of pupils designated as problems in classroom management varied from three in one class to as many as sixteen. Some of the classes showed students in only one or two of the six principal categories. Others showed some pupils in all of the categories, but with no specific group trend to indicate concentration of problems in any one area.

When the early identifications had been made in teacher conferences, only a few pupils had been mentioned, these falling mostly in the lower quartiles on the sociometric results. However, when the classification sheets were filled out toward the last of the year, many of the cases identified on those forms fell in the middle quartiles on both the sociometric rankings and in the self-ratings.

The total number of pupils named in this classroom management phase of the study was 122. The number of problem cases identified, however, was 151, since some pupils were mentioned in two, three, or four of the categories. It can be seen from Table XIX that sixty-four of the pupils mentioned were in the low self-concept group, whereas only seven pupils classified as having a high self-concept were indicated as being problems in classroom management. It is significant, nevertheless, that fifty-one of the pupils mentioned came from the two middle quartiles according to self-concept, only seven having been previously mentioned in the individual conferences with the classroom teachers. This reflects a difference between informal and structured gathering of data.

TABLE XIX

**BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS, BY CLASSES, FALLING
IN THREE SELF-CONCEPT GROUPS**

Class No.	Self-Concept Groups			Total
	High	Middle	Low	
I.		8	3	11
II.	1	5	4	10
III.			7	7
IV.		1	4	5
V.		1	7	8
VI.		2	4	6
VII.		4	2	6

TABLE XIX--Continued

Class No.	Self-Concept Groups			Total
	High	Middle	Low	
VIII.		5	2	7
IX.	1		2	3
X.	3	6	7	16
XI.		4	5	9
XII.	1	4	6	11
XIII.	1	1	3	5
XIV.		3	1	4
XV.		2	2	4
XVI.		5	5	10
Totals	7	51	64	122

Table XX, which follows, shows the frequencies of cases in each of the six problem areas for the self-concept groups. Fifty-nine per cent of the 151 problems were attributed to pupils designated as belonging to the low self-concept group

TABLE XX
FREQUENCIES OF SELF-CONCEPT GROUPS IN
SIX BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES

Behavior Category	Self-Concept Groups			Total
	High	Middle	Low	
Aggressive	2	13	19	34
Withdrawing	3	21	21	45

TABLE XI--Continued

Behavior Category	Self-Concept Groups			Total
	High	Middle	Low	
Disinterested	1	5	14	19
Immature	1	6	17	24
Disliked by Others	1	8	17	26
Dislikes Others		2	1	3
Total Problems	7	33	89	151
Total No. Pupils	7	51	64	122

It can be seen from this table that the two areas with the highest frequencies are those showing aggressive behavior and withdrawing behavior. The breakdown in sub-headings for these two categories is shown in Table XXI.

A greater number of those characterized with aggressive behavior were in the low group. In those characterized with withdrawing behavior, there was an equal number of lows and middles, with only three in the high self-concept group. One interpretation of this might hold with the findings of Bonney(4) that aggressiveness is more often interpreted as problem behavior while the development of daring and the characteristic of initiative are over-looked in favor of what he calls "negative virtues."

TABLE XXI
FREQUENCIES IN SUB-CATEGORIES OF AGGRESSIVE
AND WITHDRAWING BEHAVIOR

1. Aggressive Behavior:	Number
a. Generalized (Toward everyone)	17
b. Toward Specific Individuals	12
c. Toward Adults	5
Total Instances, Aggressive Behavior . . .	34
2. Withdrawing Behavior:	
a. Generalized: (In most or all situations). .	12
b. In Specific Situations	14
c. In Peer Groups	12
d. From Adult Association	7
Total Instances, Withdrawing Behavior . . .	45

It can also be noted here that of the sixty-four pupils mentioned in the behavior classification form as belonging to the group of 110 students having a low self-concept, thirty-seven of them were included in the final matched groups, Table XXII.

Only five pupils out of sixty-seven in the matched high self-concept group or 7 per cent were classified as behavior problems; thirty-seven or 55 per cent of the low self-concept group were thus classified. The difference is significant, the ratio 7-1 in favor of the lows.

Three of the problem areas have greater frequencies: Aggressive, Withdrawing, and Immature. There were more problems listed than pupils, several pupils being mentioned in two categories. Although teachers do not consistently

TABLE XXII
FREQUENCIES OF SELF-CONCEPT GROUPS IN SIX BEHAVIOR
CATEGORIES, MATCHED GROUPS

Behavior Category	High Self-Concept Group (N=67)	Low Self-Concept Group (N=67)	Total
Aggressive	2	10	12
Withdrawing	2	13	15
Disinterested	0	6	6
Immature	0	10	10
Disliked by Others	1	8	9
Dislikes Others	0	1	1
Total Problems	5	48	53
Total Number Pupils	5	37	42

classify pupils with a low self-concept as behavior problems, there occurs here a greater proportion of that group who fall into such classification than of the high self-concept group.

Administration of Tests

Sixteen fifth grades were given two forms of the California Achievement Test; Form CC at mid-semester, whereas Form DD was administered at the close of the school year. The California Test of Mental Maturity, Elementary, Short Form, was given to all sixteen classes. Three rating scales and two Sociometric Tests were also given. Two of the original

sixteen classes and two other classes separate from the principal study participated in the validity study. Enrollment, the total number of pupils tested on each instrument and the number remaining with complete statistics for the final analysis are shown in Table XXIII. Enrollment varied from small classes with a total enrollment during the semester of forty-six each.

TABLE XXIII

ENROLLMENT AND TESTING FIGURES FOR SIXTEEN FIFTH GRADES

Class No.	Ratings			Socio-metric	CAT I*	CAT II*	CTMM**	Enrollment	Total
	Self	Teacher	Peer						
I.	38	20***	38	38	37	31	36	38	31
II.	43	22	43	43	43	34	44	46	33
III.	46	22	46	46	43	34	45	46	33
IV.	33	16	33	33	33	29	33	33	29
V.	33	16	33	33	33	29	33	33	29
VI.	32	16	32	32	32	31	31	32	31
VII.	33	16	33	33	33	32	33	33	32
VIII.	32	16	32	32	32	29	32	32	29
IX.	33	16	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
X.	33	16	33	33	33	29	34	23	32
XI.	30	16	30	30	30	27	27	30	27
XII.	30	16	30	30	30	27	29	30	27
XIII.	31	16	31	31	31	26	28	31	26
XIV.	33	16	33	33	33	29	33	33	29
XV.	29	14	29	29	29	26	29	29	26
XVI.	27	14	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Total	536	268	536	536	532	473	525	529	472

* California Achievement Test.

** California Test of Mental Maturity.

*** Number equal to upper and lower quartiles only.

The total N for the sixteen classes was 539, according to enrollment during the semester. Drop-outs and absenteeism

during the last administration of Achievement Tests was responsible for incomplete data on sixty-seven pupils, making the total number available for study equal to 472.

Classes I and IV from the principal research were used with two other classes for Test-Retest data on the Reliability Study. N's were 35, 33, 32, and 28 respectively, making a total number of 128 for this part of the experiment.

The cooperating teachers were interested in the results of the testing from two viewpoints: (1) the results of the Achievement Tests and Mental Maturity Tests were made available to them within a few days after testing, and (2) only two of them had worked with sociometric instruments before and they were consequently both curious and interested concerning the results and use of such instruments. In some of the schools there had been no testing program prior to this research. In others, the testing contributed to the evaluation of results from the regular elementary testing program.

The first Sociometric Test results were recorded on the new Bonney-Fessenden Sociograph. This was easily understood, saved a great deal of time over any other available methods of showing results of sociometric tests, and made the grouping of pupils within the class easy to identify and instantly available. Much surprise was shown in many instances in which the teacher had one idea concerning the status of the pupil within the group and the children themselves

had a totally different one. A small percentage of the children were isolates, only twelve out of 536 receiving no choices.

Table XXIV shows the number of isolates, the distribution of mutuality within the separate classes, and the number of children having no mutual choices.

TABLE XXIV
COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF SOCIOMETRIC TESTS, BY CLASSES

Class No.	Enrollment	Per Cent Isolates	Per Cent One Vote	Per Cent No Mutual	Total Mutuals	Average Mutuals
I.	38	.00	.08	.15	68 ^a	1.7
II.	43	.04	.02	.26	68	1.5
III.	46	.02	.04	.54	44	.95
IV.	33	.00	.03	.12	64	1.9
V.	33	.06	.00	.16	71	2.1
VI.	32	.00	.03	.25	48.5	1.5
VII.	33	.00	.06	.28	51.5	1.5
VIII.	32	.03	.00	.32	38.5	1.2
IX.	33	.03	.15	.35	33.5	1.0
X.	33	.00	.00	.31	45.5	1.3
XI.	30	.03	.13	.40	38	1.2
XII.	30	.06	.10	.40	39.5	1.3
XIII.	31	.03	.00	.26	52	1.6
XIV.	33	.00	.06	.35	43	1.3
XV.	29	.00	.03	.20	55.5	1.9
XVI.	27	.04	.04	.20	52	1.9
Total	536	.022	.048	.29	612.5	1.5

^aSum of mutuals on both criteria divided by 2N = Av. Mut.

An inspection of the mutual choices in the sixteen classes revealed that 35 per cent of all students received no mutual choices. The distribution of mutuality holds with the theory that the socially strong child is generally attracted to others who are likewise socially strong.

In the matched groups used for comparison there were no highs who had a lowest quartile rating on sociometric status. There was only one low in the matched groups who had an upper quartile rating on the sociometric tests, as shown in the following table.

TABLE XXV
DISTRIBUTION OF QUARTILE RANKINGS ON SOCIO-METRIC TESTS, MATCHED GROUPS

Group	Quartile				Total
	4	3	2	1	
Highs	47	16	4	0	67
Lows	1	10	22	34	67

Since the sociometric tests were not the basis for selection of high and low groups, this is strong indication of a relationship between sociometric status and self-rating and/or level of self-concept. Although a few pupils rate themselves unrealistically, for the majority of them there is a reflection of both insight and objectivity in the fact that they do not see themselves at too extreme status from the way that others see them.

There was an indication that those in the high self-concept group came closer to rating themselves as others rated them on the sociometric tests. Only four individuals had more than one quartile difference in ratings, while 16 per cent of the lows had a large difference.

There was a great deal of difference in the classes used in this project. Nine of the classes came from a small town in a rural agrarian and mill economy, whereas seven were from a small town suburban to both industrial district and metropolis. There were wide differences between mean I.Q.'s of classes within the two areas as well as between the mean total I.Q.'s of the suburban and agrarian communities. More specifically, as shown in Table XXVI, four of the classes had a mean I.Q. lower than 100. The classes are reported in the same order and with the same Roman numerals as in other reports. One class with an N of 29 had a mean I.Q. of 112, while several classes were at the 107 mean. Two classes, those with the largest enrollment and in the sociometric class of the least privileged, had mean I.Q.'s of 86 and 89.5 for N's of 44 and 45. The variability of class size and mean I.Q. is not considered to cause distortion or leading of statistics in a group this large as the mean for the whole group of 525 students on whom Mental Maturity tests were taken was 101.7. This is comparable with national norms on similar populations. The fact that the sampling is wide and includes such varied populations reinforces the study rather than weakens it.

It can be seen from these results that the sampling was adequate and that it does not differ significantly from the normal population which has similar means for the types of communities used in this experiment.

TABLE XXVI
DISTRIBUTION OF I.Q. SCORES FOR 525 PUPILS
BY CLASSES

Class No.	California Mental Maturity(N)	Intelligence Scores			Mean I.Q.
		Below 90	90-110	Above 110	
I.	36	9	18	9	102
II.	44	21	16	7	89.5
III.	45	23	19	3	86
IV.	33	6	18	9	102
V.	33	5	24	4	99
VI.	31	8	17	6	103
VII.	33	11	12	10	98.8
VIII.	32	2	20	10	104.5
IX.	32	6	13	13	107
X.	33	5	15	13	107
XI.	27	3	13	11	107
XII.	29	6	9	14	109.5
XIII.	28	8	10	10	101
XIV.	33	5	13	15	107
XV.	29	3	8	18	112
XVI.	27	3	12	12	107
Totals	525	124	237	164	101.7

As Table XXVII shows, the range in the means as measured in grade placement points was 1.7 in both administrations of the California Achievement Test.

TABLE XXVII
VARIABILITY OF CLASS MEANS ON CALIFORNIA
ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Class No.	Enrollment	Tested CAT-CC	Class Means	Tested CAT-DD	Class Means
I.	38	37	5.2	31	5.9
II.	46	43	5.5	34	6.0
III.	46	43	4.5	34	4.9
IV.	33	33	5.7	29	6.2
V.	33	33	5.8	29	6.1
VI.	32	32	5.5	31	6.0
VII.	33	33	5.6	32	6.2
VIII.	32	32	5.6	29	6.6
IX.	33	33	5.9	29	6.0
X.	33	33	5.6	33	6.2
XI.	30	30	5.8	27	6.6
XII.	30	30	5.9	27	6.5
XIII.	31	31	5.9	26	6.0
XIV.	33	33	5.9	29	6.5
XV.	29	29	6.2	26	6.6
XVI.	27	27	6.1	27	6.6
Totals Mean of T.	539	532	5.6	473	6.1

It is from these results of the tests administered to the sixteen classes that selections were made for further study. Each individual class was considered only for total results and within-class quartile groupings. It is in the statistical treatment of data that further comparisons will be made.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Four steps were necessary in the consideration of the results of the testing in the classes. First, data on the reliability of the Self-Rating instrument were analyzed. Second, the criterion of "two out of three" ratings was applied to the results of the three rating tests, with two groups available for further treatment. Third, from these two groups were selected criterion groups of "highs" and "lows" on the basis of matching of I.Q.'s. Fourth, these criterion groups were compared to see what significant differences existed between them.

Two of the groups taking part in the reliability study were from another school not taking part in the principal project. These two classes had N's of 32 and 26 respectively. The criterion self-rating, "How I Rate Myself," was given both classes early in the semester. It was re-administered exactly two weeks later. The results of the test-re-test comparisons yielded coefficients of .932 and .843. Complete data will be found in Table XXXII in Appendix B.

Two other classes which were used for reliability data were classes I and IV which took part in the principal research. The self-rating test was administered early in the semester. Approximately three months later the retest was given. The two classes had N's of 33 and 35 respectively. The two classes yielded reliability coefficients of .735 and .865 after a three months' interval. These coefficients furnished evidence of constancy in self-ratings on this particular criterion test. It should be noted here that there was a slight change in the means of all four groups on the retest--and all in the same direction, that of a slightly lower mean than on the first test. The results are shown in the following table.

TABLE XXVIII
SELF-RATING SCALE, RELIABILITY DATA

Class Number	N	Mean of Test	Mean of Retest	r
XVII.	32	44	43	.932
XVIII.	28	44	43	.843
IV.	33	48	46	.735
I.	35	47	46	.865

The data indicate that a pupil has the tendency to rate himself consistently from one self-rating test to the next. The reliability coefficients are indicative of a constancy in self-ratings on successive administrations of the test

not only over a short time interval of two weeks but over the longer interval of three months. The test, "How I Rate Myself" has been found, then, in this research, to be a reliable instrument for use as a criterion test for measuring the self-concept.

Because of the results which others had in the use of self-ratings and the different selves reflected, it was decided that for this research the other two criteria for the designation of the person having a high self-concept would be teachers' ratings and peer ratings. In this manner there was a check on the "halo" or the tendency to over-rate.

Although self-ratings were secured on 536 pupils, only 472 remained for whom complete statistics were secured. Some drop-outs, some new pupils, some absenteeism during the last testing on the second achievement test were responsible for many being dropped from the final comparative groups. Each class was listed on a separate page with the order of that of the score on the self-rating. In the second column were placed the pupils' self-rating scores. In the third column was placed the 4 for the teacher's designation of that pupil as fourth quartile or high in self-acceptance. The designations for 1 or low quartile as low in self-acceptance were also placed opposite the self-rating score. In the fourth column was placed the 4 or the 1 as the score secured by a particular pupil on the peer ratings of self-acceptance or self-rejection. The upper and lower quartiles were ruled

off, each containing a number of pupils equal to one fourth of the class. Pupils receiving two out of three ratings as "high" were so designated, as were the lows. Table XXIX shows the quartile sources of the groups in all classes.

TABLE XXIX
QUARTILE SOURCE OF HIGHS AND LOWS IN
SELF-CONCEPT GROUPS

Class No.	N	Highs Selected From				Total	Lows Selected From				Total
		Q4*		Q3-Q2	Q1		Q1*	Q2-Q3	Q4		
		3er.	2er.	-	-		3er.	2er.	-	-	
I.	31	1	1	4	0	66	1	2	2	1	66
II.	33	2	4	6	0	12	1	4	0	0	5
III.	34	7	1	1	0	9	2	6	2	0	10
IV.	29	2	3	3	0	8	3	4	1	1	9
V.	29	4	2	1	0	7	2	0	4	0	6
VI.	31	1	4	0	0	5	4	3	1	0	8
VII.	32	2	1	3	1	7	1	3	1	1	8
VIII.	29	1	3	1	3	8	2	1	2	1	6
IX.	29	0	3	2	2	9	2	2	2	1	7
X.	33	2	2	3	0	7	2	3	2	0	7
XI.	27	2	2	3	0	7	3	0	2	0	5
XII.	27	4	2	3	0	9	3	2	3	0	8
XIII.	26	3	1	2	1	7	2	3	2	0	7
XIV.	29	2	2	4	0	8	2	2	2	1	7
XV.	26	2	0	3	1	6	1	4	2	0	6
XVI.	27	3	1	2	0	6	4	0	0	1	5
Total	472	38	34	41	8	121	35	41	27	7	110

*Some selected on basis of two criteria, some on three.

A careful study of the table shows that thirty-eight of those selected for the group of "highs" came from the fourth quartile of the self-rating and also had a Q4 rating on both teachers' ratings and peer ratings. Thirty-four of those who

fell in the fourth quartile of the self-rating had one other rating of Q 4 to designate them for the "high" group. This made a total of seventy-two or 59 per cent of the "highs" who came from the fourth quartile on the self-rating scale. Forty-one of these "highs" came from the middle quartiles and eight fell in the discrepancy section, those receiving two ratings of Q 4 but rating themselves as Q 1 on the self-rating.

The table also reflects some consistency in the fact that thirty-five of the "lows" came from the Q 1 according to self-ratings and were so designated on the basis of all three criteria. Forty-one of these came from the Q 1 on self-ratings and were thus selected on the basis of two criteria. This was 69 per cent of the whole group of "lows" who fell in the upper quartile on self-ratings. There were, in addition, twenty-seven of these "lows" who came from the middle quartiles. Seven were in the discrepancy quadrant, receiving two ratings as being "low" but rating themselves in the upper quartile on the self-ratings. This is the phenomenon discussed earlier-- that of the "over-compensatory" self-rating-- an effort to disguise the reality of being unacceptable to one's peers.

The 121 pupils who were designated as having a high self-concept on the basis of ratings on two out of three criterion tests were at this point listed separately with the I.Q. as measured on the California Test of Mental Maturity.

The 110 pupils who were considered to have a low self-concept on the basis of these ratings were listed with their I.Q.'s as shown on the results of this same mental test. The range in I.Q. points was from 74 to 142 for the high group. For the low group, the range was 57 to 142. Table XXX shows the distribution of I.Q.'s, indicating the possible matchings.

TABLE XXX
DISTRIBUTION OF I.Q.'S OF "HIGHS" AND "LOWS",
POSSIBLE MATCHINGS

Interval	Number of Highs	Number of Lows	Possible Matchings
140-144	2	1	
135-139	1		
130-134	3		
125-129	14		18
120-124	16	5	
115-119	15	6	
110-114	16	6	
105-109	19	7	
100-104	12	13	
95- 99	9	9	45
90- 94	9	17	
85- 89	1	16	
80- 84	3	11	
75- 79		10	4
70- 74	1	5	
65- 69		1	
60- 64		1	
55- 59		2	
Totals	121	110	67

As indicated in the preceding table there were sixty-seven matched pairs of pupils. The high group was composed of sixty-seven pupils designated as having a high self-concept

with a mean I.Q. of 104. The low group was composed of sixty-seven selected as having a low self-concept with a mean I.Q. of 103. The differences in paired scores were never more than five I.Q. points, with the differences not significantly in one direction. Many of the scores were paired with exact duplicate I.Q.'s. The means of these two groups were compared by means of the C.R. technique and they were not found to be significantly different, since the Critical Ratio was .49 and the two groups could come from the same population 60 per cent of the time.

When the I.Q. factor was controlled it was considered that the two groups were comparable for the other factors. The individuals comprising the two groups were placed on charts in parallel form, with results of five tests for evaluation: (1) California Achievement Test, Form GG; (2) the California Achievement Test, Form DE; (3) Percentages on Sociometric Tests; (4) scores on the criterion test of Self-Rating; and (5) classification as a behavior problem by the classroom teacher. The statistical technique for the first four areas was the C.R. Means, Standard Deviations, were found for the groups and Critical Ratios calculated for the differences in the means of the paired groups. Complete statistics for these comparisons may be found in Tables XXXIII through XXXVI in Appendix B. The brief summary of the comparisons follows in Table XXII.

TABLE XXXI
SIGNIFICANCES OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS
OF MATCHED GROUPS

Test	Mean	Standard Deviation	Critical Ratio	Level of Confidence
I. G.A.T. ^{****} (SC)				
High	6.0 [*]	.654	6.25	Beyond .000003
Low	5.2	.822		
II. G.A.T. ^{****} (PD)				
High	6.6 [*]	.575	7.37	Beyond .00003
Low	5.7	.850		
III. Socio- metrics				
High	.313 ^{**}	.128	13.2	Beyond .00003
Low	.088	.066		
IV. Self- Ratings				
High	38 ^{***}	10.09	9.82	Beyond .00003
Low	41	9.83		

^{*} Score given in Grade Placement Points.

^{**} Score given in Percentage of Possible Scores.

^{***} Raw Score on Self-Rating Scale.

^{****} California Achievement Test.

With reference to the fifth area in which these groups were compared, it was found that 52 per cent of the low group were classified as behavior problems, whereas only

7 per cent of the high group were mentioned in the Classification of Behavior Problems by the classroom teachers, the ratio being seven to one in favor of the lows.

Two points are of importance here in summarization: (1) the means of the matched groups were 104 I.Q. points for the highs and 103 for the lows. The two groups were not significantly different on I.Q., that being the control factor. (2) On all factors not controlled-- level of self-concept as measured by the self-rating scale, achievement as measured on two successive achievement tests, and status on sociometric tests on the basis of two different criteria-- the two matched groups were significantly different with critical ratios found to be beyond the .00003 level of confidence and in favor of the high self-concept group. In the behavior problem area, the low self-concept group was thus classified seven times more frequently than the high group. Therefore, all differences bear out the hypotheses that children with a high self-concept achieve higher, have a higher sociometric status, rate themselves higher, and are classified as behavior problems less frequently than children with a low self-concept.

SIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Berger, E. M., "The Relationship Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 778.
2. Blair, A. Witt and William M. Burton, Growth and Development of the Preadolescent, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.
3. Bonney, Marl E., "The Constancy of Sociometric Scores and Their Relationship to Teacher Judgments of Social Success and to Personality Self-Ratings," Sociometry, VI (1943), 409-24.
4. _____, "Personality Traits of Socially Successful and Socially Unsuccessful Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIV (1943), 449-72.
5. _____, "Popular and Unpopular Children, A Sociometric Study," Monograph of the American Sociometric Association, IX, Beacon, New York, 1947.
6. _____, "Relationship Between Social Success, Family Size, Socio-Economic Background, and Intelligence Among School Children in Grades III to V," Sociometry, VII (1944), 24-39.
7. Brownfain, John J., "Stability of the Self-Concept as a Dimension of Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 597-606.
8. Buhler, Charlotte, Childhood Problems and the Teacher, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1952.
9. Moreno, J. L., "Sociometry in the Classroom," Sociometry, VI (1943), 425-28.
10. Northway, M. L., "Outsiders: A Study of the Personality Patterns of Children Least Acceptable to Their Age Mates," Sociometry, VII (1944), 10-24.
11. Sheerer, Elizabeth F., "An Analysis of the Relationships Between Acceptance of and Respect for Self and Acceptance of and Respect for Others in Ten Counseling Cases," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (1949), 169-75.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, INTERPRETATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

To summarize the research reported in this dissertation, conclusions of the study will be contrasted with the findings of others on these points:

1. The self-concept as a representative measure of the total personality.
2. Consistency in self-ratings.
3. Discrepancies as symptomatic of maladjustment.
4. Sociometric tests as discriminating between:
 - a. High and low I.Q.'s.
 - b. High and low achievement.
 - c. Behavior traits of socially successful and socially unsuccessful children.
5. Personality Self-Rating as a representative measure of the total personality.
6. "How I Rate Myself" as a discriminating test.
7. Behavior characteristics of Highs and Lows.
8. Teacher Ratings and behavior classifications.
9. Utilization of leadership and group dynamics in the classroom.
10. Relationship of Self-Concept to motivation, learning, and classroom adjustment.

The self-concept is the name given by Lecky(13) to that organization of ideas and attitudes concerning the self. Rogers(20) follows this theory by his thesis that a person will not accept ideas at variance with what he considers to be true or characteristic about himself. Snygg and Combs(24) believe that observed characteristics are manifestations of the quality of the total personality and, as such, contain specific characteristics identifiable with that totality.

On the basis of these theories which postulate that observed behavior is indicative of the personality structure, i.e., ideas and attitudes concerning the self, the Honolulu study found that children identified as maladjusted, as behavior problems, or as problems in discipline or classroom management had ideas concerning themselves which reflected feelings of inadequacy, inferiority, unbelongingness; furthermore, they consider themselves either as different or as being treated differently from other children in the group.

Sheerer(22) found a consistency in relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others and Berger(1) found much the same results with correlations between .36 and .69. Phillips(17) utilized the same techniques and much of the same criteria securing similar results. Similarly, Rogers(20) hypothesized that the self-accepting individual tends to have better interpersonal relations. McIntyre(14) found $r = .46$ between self-acceptance and acceptance of others, while Diller(7), Katz(11), and Muntley(10) held that attitudes toward

others co-vary in a positive direction with attitudes toward self and that the self-concept is related to the value system of the individual.

Such findings are corroborated by the McKinney-Irving study in that it found a positive relationship between self-acceptance and ratings by others as being a self-accepting person but it also indicated that such consistency varied greatly from class to class, inconsistency or non-agreement being highest in classes with the more authoritarian teachers.

Symonds(25) proposed that defense mechanisms operate when a person's self-concept is so inadequate that it becomes a threat to the Ego. The internal conflict manifests itself in over-ratings or in some other compensatory mechanism. This study confirms such a theory, for the eight highs and seven lows with discrepancy self-ratings, i.e., self-ratings in the extreme quartile from teacher and peer agreement, manifested twenty points difference of I.Q. means of the two small groups. Those with the lower mean I.Q. rated themselves high and six out of the seven appeared in the behavior classification data as a designated problem. Furthermore, all seven received lower sociometric ratings than the highs with discrepancy self-ratings, inasmuch as in that group there were seven out of eight who had sociometric ratings of upper quartile.

The conclusions to be drawn from these summarizations are that discrepancies in ratings must be judged on an

individual basis and that the self-rating test can be used to furnish cues to indicate why a person in good status with both peers and adults still feels inadequate and inferior.

Sociometric Tests have been found by Bonney(3), Moreno (15), and Northway(16) to be useful in discriminating between children with high and low I.Q., between high and low achievers, and between children with desirable and undesirable behavior characteristics. When on the basis of sociometric tests, the upper and lower quartiles have been compared, there is always an appreciable and significant difference in I.Q.'s between the extremes, with the difference in favor of the children with the higher sociometric status.

In the Aubrey study, when the upper and lower quartiles were compared on I.Q., there was a significant difference in the mean I.Q. for the two groups: 101 for highs and 93.3 for the lows. In the Honolulu study, there was an even greater difference. The mean of the highs on the basis of sociometric rankings was 101; the mean of the lows, 82. In the McKinney-Irving study the differences, whether according to highs and lows on self-concept or sociometric instruments, were always significantly in the direction of the highs, the means sometimes varying as much as fifteen I.Q. points.

In a like manner, all findings in all three studies were to the effect that those in the upper quartiles, selected on the basis of sociometric tests, rated significantly higher

on achievement grade placement than did those in the lowest quartile, with the confidence level from .05 in the Honolulu study to .001 in the McKinney-Irving sampling.

When the sociometric test was used as criterion for selection of highs and lows, it also differentiated between the upper and lower quartiles on the self-ratings on the California Test of Personality; the means of the high and low groups being 58.4 and 13.2 respectively for the larger group of four classes in the Honolulu study. This figured a C.R. of 3.53, significant at the .001 level of confidence. In the smaller group in that study, the t was 2.76, significant at the .02 level.

In the matched groups in the McKinney-Irving investigation, there was a consistency in sociometric ratings and self-ratings: there were no highs who had a lowest quartile rating on the sociometric test; as a matter of fact, there was only one low who had an upper quartile sociometric rating. This is, consequently, a strong indication of a relationship between sociometric status and self-rating and/or level of self-concept.

It is equally significant to note that of the 122 individuals classified as behavior problems in any category, only six were given upper quartile ratings on the sociometric results; there was not consistency with teacher and peer ratings on any of these six. But certainly having less than

5 per cent of the behavior problems coming from pupils with high sociometric status is in itself significant. A few discrepancies occur, however, in groups this size.

Ranking low on a sociometric instrument does not absolutely preclude having a high I.Q., nor does it always indicate lower achievement for any one particular individual. Such cases are rare, however, and group comparisons are predictive of group trends, with the chance statistically for or against the specific individual. Ranking high in the sociometric test does not obviate the possibility of being classified as a behavior problem. Here, again, the percentage of such cases is barely 5 per cent. Nevertheless, in the studies reported in this dissertation, sociometric tests were high in discriminating value.

Only in the Honolulu study were comparisons made between using sociometric tests as criterion for selection of high and low groups and the use of a personality test alone as that criterion. In this one section of the study, the personality test was not found to discriminate significantly at the .10 level, but the sociometric test was useful in differentiating between highs and lows, with the t at the .05 level of confidence or better.

Kerr(12) found that many traits of personality can be self-assessed with substantial validity. Chodorkoff(6) believes that defensive mechanisms account for negative correlations between self-estimates and achievement. Russell(21)

states that most persons can rate themselves; those who cannot show evidence of a personality factor of self-defense or self-delusion for purposes peculiar to the individual and to his specific problem. The very fact that there is a discrepancy between self-ratings and ratings by others should be the beginning of an investigation of individual cases and specific cues.

In this research at McKinney and Irving, the self-rating alone was not considered as a basis for differentiation between highs and lows, as the avoidance of making the selection on only one criterion strengthened the findings. The two original groups of high (N=121) and low (N=110) had the discrepancies mentioned before: eight highs and seven lows whose self-ratings were in the extreme quartile from the other ratings. In the matched groups (N=67) there were three discrepancies among the self-ratings of the highs and six among the lows. However, since the proportion of discrepancies is low in all cases, the test, "How I Rate Myself", was useful in discriminating between high and low achievers, between pupils high or low in sociometric status, and between children with various types of behavior patterns. For the purposes of this particular study it was not planned that the self-rating scale alone would be used to differentiate between pupils high or low in other factors, but it was intended first to validate the self-rating scale against other criterion ratings. It is therefore premised that the use of

one test for purposes of selection of groups for comparison of other factors is not wise unless it has been first found that it correlates highly with other discriminating selective instruments and can, in itself, be validated through acceptable methods.

The academic and social success or failure of children with either high self-concepts or low self-concepts is often dependent on the types of behavior patterns which they manifest. Teachers often have a stereotype in mind of the ideal pupil: respectful, obedient, non-aggressive, amenable both to authority and suggestion, wide awake, eager to learn, and able to subordinate present goals to planning for the future. Hopkins(9), Blair(2), Huhler(5), and Redl(19) hold with the theory that the purposes of teachers and pupils are often not the same.

The peer group in the middle grades, according to the findings of Bonney(4), finds the qualities of a pleasing personality, neatness, intelligence, happiness, sympathetic response, friendliness-- all these to be traits which differentiated between the socially successful and socially unsuccessful children. But he also found another syndrome-- that of the daring, aggressive, enthusiastic, and active person-- and these qualities which are often looked upon with wariness by the classroom teacher are the qualities which differentiate the leaders and most highly chosen from all the others.

Indeed, the findings of the Honolulu study held with those of Bonney. The leaders of those groups had that second syndrome in addition to the first group of traits or characteristics. The children verbalized their criteria of judgment by referring to the fellow who "does lots of things" . . . "makes me follow the rules" . . . "lets me have a turn" . . . "is not afraid" . . . "is a good sport" . . . "is fair" . . . "is peppy" . . . "helps other people" . . . "understanding" . . . all the qualities of understanding, skill, the use of cooperating principles.

Channeling of aggressiveness into cooperative effort, the use of energies toward the building of positive group relations, and, as Bonney says, "The development of some daring and initiative, and some socially approved aggressiveness at the same time that attitudes and kinds of behavior essential to friendliness"-- all these need to be encouraged.

The McKinney-Irving study showed a distribution of pupils in several areas of problem behavior rather than having them concentrated in any one category. In order of frequency, the problem areas were: (1) withdrawing behavior, (2) aggressive behavior, (3) disliked by others, (4) immature, (5) disinterested, and (6) dislikes others. Only 4 per cent of all problems came from pupils designated as from the group high in self-concept.

That socially approved behavior is judged consistently by both teachers and peers is found by Navighurst(8). He

reported consistency in teachers and peer ratings with $r = .91$ and $r = .80$ for boys and girls respectively. Between self-ratings and peer ratings, he reported $r = .48$; between self and teacher's ratings, $r = .30$. The McKinney-Irving study reflects a greater consistency between teacher and peer ratings than between self-ratings and ratings by others. In the samplings (N-121, N-110) there was agreement in 72 per cent of the highs and in 62 per cent of the lows, while there was 32 per cent agreement on all three criteria for both groups.

The utilization of the dynamics of group processes and leadership is no easy matter, but it is a gold mine for the teacher with insight into the child's frame of reference and a thorough knowledge and analysis of the group structures within the classroom. The teacher alone can help to build ego-structure but slowly and in the crowded classroom individualized attention is at a premium. But the structuring and testing and re-structuring of groups within the class framework can minimize disciplinary controls and multiply the chances of building strong, adequate self-concepts by the number of interpersonal relations which the group dynamics can bring about. Sherif's(23) definition of "groupness" is when the members comprising a "bunch" assume relative status positions within that group. This is not a paradox to the improvement of status for isolates and maladjusted children with poor self-concepts and low aspiration level. It is simply to say that the status positions should not

crystallize and freeze out some of the members. A possible answer to Moreno's(15) ideas concerning the sociodynamic effect is the spreading of mutuality by helping all the children in a classroom to have desirable and acceptable patterns of behavior and socially accepted personalities.

The principal implication for the classroom teacher is to study first the children whom she teaches, their personal frames of reference, their interpersonal relationships, their group status; then to use that knowledge to build adequate wholesome personalities; and finally, to continue the creation of intelligence through the educative process.

In evaluating the results of this research, this frame of reference should be made clear. In the American culture, all learning is social learning. Bodily processes, it is true, follow the patterns of growth potential of the individual. But this quality which is called intelligence is inseparable from the total personality, even as the characteristic or trait of academic aptitude. Some authors have posited varieties of intelligence, such as social intelligence, etc. These, again, cannot be separable elements. If one is to hold consistently with the frame of reference of the gestaltist he must state that intelligence is that higher level of adaptation found in the human organism and not a separate or separable entity.

If this is to be the first premise, one must agree with Piaget(18) that it is the purpose of education to create

intelligence from the intricate integrative capacity within the children who are taught in the classrooms of the nation.

If our job is to create intelligence, then the implication for the classroom teacher is that an integrative capacity is in every child. We can then understand maladaptive behavior patterns not as manifestations of an inferior product but as the inevitable result of incomplete or arrested interaction of an individual within or because of a noxious environment. According to Lecky(13) a person will resist the assimilation of patterns of social behavior which he does not consider characteristic of his self-definition until he has had enough experience and has gained enough insight to modify his organization of ideas concerning himself and can re-define that self.

The use of sociometric instruments will give the classroom teacher one valid and consistent gauge of whether the individual's relations with others in his environment is harmonious to his fulfillment as a real and adequate person. With the bringing of sociometry into the classroom the teacher has a new test of tolerance for social allergies.

The self-rating scale is another valuable ally of the classroom teacher. This instrument is worthwhile not because it renders a score with which one can determine a pupil's quartile rank in his class, not because it can show a neat profile to project over a national or class norm, but

realistically because it can identify how the child feels about himself and explain some of the reasons for his status in the group-- if one studies the separate items.

The literature gives some basis for believing that mal-adjusted, unacceptable children present their striving, aggressive, or withdrawing behavior patterns because of their efforts to maintain unity in the organization of their self-concept. It is the task, then, of the classroom teacher to work out ways of helping them to develop insight, to undergo therapeutic situational changes through the group activities accessible to them in their everyday environment, and to re-organize their behavior patterns in accordance with a more realistic and acceptable self-concept.

The need is reflected in many classrooms for an understanding of group behavior, what "groupness" actually is, when and how several individuals actually become a group, and when that group is a working unit for setting up and accomplishing of group goals. Personal goals are seldom pursued in isolation, at least not at the middle grade level. Teachers' goals and children's goals and purposes are seldom the same. In some classrooms the teacher's goal is to pour knowledge into the receptive vessels. The child's goal is to "unfold himself" . . . "to maintain and enhance the organization of his personality." When the teacher's goal becomes the creation of a classroom climate in which the child can pursue

his goals, then it can be expected that many of the day-to-day purposes will be synonymous for both teacher and child. Interest and motivation come easier for the teacher who understands what children believe about themselves.

This viewpoint is not to the left of traditional education nor to the right of progressive education. It is simply based on the premise that following the course of normal developmental trends in the lives of children and understanding the many unique patternings which go to make up the non-existent "average child" will save retardation, frustration, and emotional maladjustment for all of the children whose principal conformity is the quality of being different.

Perhaps a re-definition of the term normal could clarify the situation. To say that there is no such thing as an abnormal child would be to overlook the mental defective. But to say that there are varying degrees of normality and that these degrees are relative to the exposure of the child to ego-satisfying experiences would simply delimit normality to a matter of degree, not kind. Even the strongest person becomes thwarted under conditions of repeated failure. The process of learning is not divorced from emotional involvement. Problems occurring almost everyday in any classroom certify to the fact that children are very much emotionally involved in what they are doing. Children learn what they feel, and in this instance if one is teaching "the whole

child" one cannot expect him to park his feelings outside while he comes to school. Nor can one deny that the school is to the average middle grade child his whole social atom as far as the peer culture is concerned. The changing patterns of American life are making the school the place where the child is in association with his age mates or with adults in a cooperative relationship and where he learns his permanent patterns of social behavior.

The utilization of the dynamics of group processes within the classroom will give to the isolate more of a sense of belongingness. Using group processes to spread the social stimulus effect and mutuality will help all of the children; it is not calculated simply for the retarded and the maladjusted. Even the strongest leader will gain more of a sense of "teammess" and cliques will be utilized for cooperativeness rather than rivalry.

A child does bring his scheme of values to school with him from his home. Deficit in home learnings need not remain a problem but should be made up. From this research it has been shown that the utilization of what the educative processes have to offer is in proportion to a child's self-concept and his status with the group. Bonney(4) and Northway(16) have shown that unacceptable patterns of social behavior are largely responsible for this group status. This research found a very large proportion of children with low self-concepts classified as behavior problems. Since all learning is social

learning, it remains the responsibility of the school to develop acceptable social behavior characteristics as prerequisite to the learning of fundamentals, facts, and subject matter skills.

The deficit in learning which becomes evident when the child first comes to school is, then, a deficit in social learning. Whether the deficit occurs as an outgrowth of the changing patterns of our society, whether the characteristics of the structure of American home life are at fault, or whether the identifications which children make are slow in becoming introjected into the patterns of behavior which they manifest in the social life of the educative setting, many children are lacking in attributes which give them satisfactory interpersonal relationships in the classroom. The ideas of self-reference which make up the self-concept of a child are his only means of explaining, either to himself or others, who he is, what he is doing, and why he behaves as he does. The strongest expressions proffered by the children in the Honolulu Study were those with which they defined themselves and explained their relationships to their families and their peers.

The implication to the classroom teacher is plain: she is not dealing with a stereotyped or hypothetical "Bill" who evidences withdrawing behavior when he refuses to play with the other children and goes off into a corner to himself. She is dealing with one, Billy J. Jones, youngest of a family

of five, who feels left out because there is never enough of anything at home when it finally gets to him: left-over affection, left-over clothes, left-over attention, scolding because he made poor grades and the more successful sibling made high ones-- who thinks he is no good.

Hopkins(9) outlines the school's responsibilities to the individual. He states that what an individual perceives himself to be and how he accepts what he sees and feels are exceedingly important in determining his direction of action. He believes that when outside persons wish to modify behaviors emanating from an individual, they should help him study and improve his process rather than criticize or repair his specific actions, for these are only symptoms of his underlying energy organization. The way each individual sees and accepts himself and the way others see and accept his actions are the internal and external aspects of the quality of the self.

The more free the individual is to use thoughtfully his biological growth process in a sympathetic environment, the higher will be his resulting maturity and that of others associated with him. As the child perceives himself in relation to his operation in his life situation, he will select those directional behaviors which he considers most characteristic of the kind of a person that he is. Improvement, whether it be in learning or behavior, will come about through increasing the quality of the differentiations which the individual effects through continuous growth and integration.

If any child is retarded or isolate or unbelonging, the changing of his self-concept is basic to his change or improvement. Whatever his I.Q., whether it be high or low, the self-concept of adequacy is built upon satisfying experiences proportionate to his integrative capacity at that particular time and place. The changing of behavior patterns which are maladaptive and the substitution of more acceptable ones will come about through the type of group experiences which the child has. It is valuable to "load the dice" in the direction of his success by giving him individual attention, but all this is dependent upon the insight and ingenuity of the classroom teacher with whom a child is in daily contact. The attendance in a remedial program year after year will produce relatively little success unless the child's basic concept of self is changed to include the feeling of adequacy and self-worth.

Since the child does not learn well in isolation, his skills in any area are dependent upon his social skills and his handling of his interpersonal relations. It is both easy and tempting to the classroom teacher to allow or to encourage the skillful leader to continue to lead. But rotation of leadership is advisable when the less privileged child has prepared for his leadership role in a situation commensurate with his ability to do it.

Manipulation of groupings, shifting and wise utilisation of the skills of the more aggressive and dominant children,

and the provision of wide opportunity for satisfactory and successful work experiences for the child with the less acceptable social traits--all these can set the stage for a series of successes for the "unbelonging" child. These experiences will help him to formulate a better self-definition; when he has done so, his behavior patterns will be more socially acceptable and his group status will be improved. Only then will he be susceptible to motivation to achieve and to make full use of his actual potential. He cannot use what he does not think he possesses.

Conclusions

This research has found significant differences in the achievement, peer status, and classroom adjustment for two groups matched on I.Q. but different on self-concept. It was hypothesized that children with a high self-concept and those with a low self-concept would be different in three areas: (1) results of sociometric measurements, (2) behavior characteristics, and (3) achievement on measurements of academic progress.

The results of testing were evaluated by means of selection of highs and lows on the basis of two out of three ratings, by selection of two groups matched on I.Q. for controlled comparisons, and by evaluation of the differences between the means of these matched groups by the Critical Ratio technique. In four areas-- differences in achievement on two

successive achievement tests, differences in sociometric status, and differences in self-ratings-- the critical ratios of the differences between the means were all significant beyond the .00003 level of confidence in favor of the high group. In the fifth area, classification as a problem in classroom management, the difference was heavily in favor of the low group, since individuals comprising that group appeared on the problem behavior classification in a ratio of 7-1 to the individuals comprising the high group. It is therefore concluded that:

1. The self-concept as measured by a self-rating scale is said to be realistic when it is corroborated by teachers' and peer ratings.
2. The child with a high self-concept receives a higher group status as measured by the sociometric tests than does the child with a low self-concept.
3. The child with a high self-concept achieves higher in proportion to his potential, as measured on an intelligence test, than does the child with a low self-concept.
4. The child with a high self-concept is classified as a behavior problem less frequently than is the child with a low self-concept.
5. The child with a high self-concept presents behavior characteristics which make him more socially

acceptable than the child with a low self-concept.

6. The improvement of the self-concept is pre-requisite to the improvement of group status, behavior, and achievement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Berger, E. M., "The Relationship Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 778.
2. Blair, A. Witt and William H. Burton, Growth and Development of the Preadolescent, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.
3. Bonney, Merl E., "The Constancy of Sociometric Scores and Their Relationship to Teacher Judgments of Social Success and to Personality Self-Ratings," Sociometry, VI (1943), 409-24.
4. _____, "Personality Traits of Socially Successful and Socially Unsuccessful Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIV (1943), 449-72.
5. Buhler, Charlotte and associates, Childhood Problems and the Teacher, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1952, pp. 82-83.
6. Chodorkoff, Bernard, "Adjustment and Discrepancy Between the Perceived and Ideal Self," Journal of Clinical Psychology, X (July, 1954), No. 3, 266-68.
7. Diller, Leonard, "Conscious and Unconscious Self-Attitudes after Success and Failure," Journal of Personality, XXIII (September, 1954), No. 1.
8. Havighurst, R. J., M. A. and Don Robinson, "The Development of the Ideal Self in Childhood and Adolescence," Journal of Educational Research, XL (December, 1946).
9. Hopkins, L. Thomas, The Emerging Self, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.
10. Huntley, W., "Judgments of the Self Based on Expressive Behavior," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXV, 398-427.
11. Katz, I., "The Emotional Expression in Failure: A New Hypothesis," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLV, 329-49.

12. Kerr, W. A. and R. H. Van Zelst, "Personality Self-Assessment of Scientific and Technical Personnel," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII (June, 1954), No. 3, 145.
13. Lecky, Prescott, Self-Consistency, New York, The Island Press, 1951.
14. McIntyre, Charles J., "Acceptance of Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII, 624-25.
15. Moreno, J. L., "Sociometry in the Classroom," Sociometry, VI (1943), 425-28.
16. Northway, M. L., "Outsiders: A Study of the Personality Patterns of Children Least Acceptable to Their Age Mates," Sociometry, VII (1944), 10-24.
17. Phillips, E. L., "Attitudes Toward Self and Others: Brief Questionnaire Report," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII, 153-63.
18. Piaget, Jean, Origins of Intelligence in Children, International Universities Press, 1952.
19. Redl, Frits, Controls From Within, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1952.
20. Rogers, Carl, Client Centered Therapy, New York, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1951, p. 560.
21. Russell, David H., "What Research Says About Self-Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (April, 1953).
22. Sheerer, Elizabeth F., "An Analysis of the Relationships Between Acceptance of and Respect for Self Acceptance of and Respect for Others in the Ten Counseling Cases," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (1949), 169-75.
23. Sherif, Muzaffer, Panel Discussion on Group Relations, Southwestern Psychological Association, Oklahoma City, 1954.
24. Snygg, Donald and Arthur W. Combs, Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1947, pp. 301-302.
25. Symonds, P. M., The Ego and the Self, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951, p. 229.

APPENDIX A

TABLES REFERRED TO IN

CHAPTER III

TABLE I
NUMBER OF REJECTS AND ISOLATES, DISTRIBUTED
BY GRADES IN THE AUBREY STUDY

Grade	Enrollment	Number of Rejects	Number of Isolates
1	33	0	10
2	28	0	8
3	16	0	6
Total Primary	77		24
4	18	4	3
5	22	3	3
Total 4 and 5	40	7	6
6	21	6	3
7	20	4	2
8	23	5	1
9	17	3	2
10	8	1	0
Total 6 to 10	89	19	8

TABLE II

I.Q. DIFFERENCES OF GROUPS OF HIGH AND LOW
 SOCIOMETRIC STATUS, GRADES SIX
 THROUGH TEN, AUBREY STUDY

Group	N	Mean I.Q.	S.D.	Deviation from Total
High	23	101.0	14.4	+3.1
Low	23	93.3	12.9	-4.6

TABLE III

I.Q. DIFFERENCES OF GROUPS WITH HIGH AND LOW
 PERCENTILE SCORES ON CALIFORNIA TEST
 OF PERSONALITY

Group	N	Mean I.Q.	Deviation from Total
I. Low (Below 30 P)	55	95.7	-2.2
II. High (30 P, above)	34	101.5	+3.6
Difference between means		5.8	
C.R. = 2.792, significant at .01 level of confidence.			

TABLE IV
BETWEEN GROUP DIFFERENCES ON THE CALIFORNIA
TEST OF PERSONALITY

Group	I.Q. Below 100		C.I. Above 100		Whole Group	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
I. Low (Below 30 P)	33	88.5	22	107	55	95.7
II. High (Above 30 P)	16	86.8	18	115	34	101.5
Difference Between Means		1.7			8.0	
C.R.'s		.685			2,837	
Level of Confidence				.01		

TABLE V
CATEGORIES USED FOR BEHAVIOR SAMPLING
IN THREE AREAS

I. Observation of Behavior on Playground:

1. Good sportsmanship
2. Friendly, helpful
3. Seeking adult attention
4. Aggressive behavior toward same sex
5. Aggressive behavior toward opposite sex
6. Aggressive behavior toward adults
7. Playing alone
8. Playing with same sex

TABLE V--Continued

9. Playing with opposite sex
 10. Withdrawing from group play
 11. Fighting over property
 12. Fighting over rules
 13. Fighting over leadership
 14. Fighting over "whose turn"
 15. Cooperative with group
- II. Observation of Behavior in Classroom:
1. Works best with group
 2. Works best alone
 3. Cannot work with group
 4. Works best with one other individual
 5. Follows directions
 6. Cannot follow directions
 7. Resents directions
 8. Short attention span
 9. Dependent on others
 10. Works adequately alone or with group
- III. Observation of Behavior at Sharing or Leisure Period:
1. Likes to talk in sharing period
 2. Listens well in sharing period
 3. Distracts attention
 4. Nervous, cannot rest quietly or sit still
 5. Must be "boss" in sharing periods

TABLE V--Continued

6. Seeks adult attention during leisure periods
7. Withdraws from group during leisure periods
8. Appropriates property of others
9. Resents leadership in sharing activities

TABLE VI

I. SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

1. My mother is _____.
2. A little brother (or sister) _____.
3. I think my father _____.
4. A large animal _____.
5. My pet is _____.
6. My friend often _____.
7. People often think that I _____
_____.
8. Most people treat me _____.
9. My father does not _____.
10. I think girls _____.
11. I think that boys _____.
12. My teacher is _____.
13. To be a good friend a person must _____
_____.
14. To be a good leader a person must _____.
15. Most teachers are _____.
16. The boys in our room are _____.
17. I think people who steal _____.
18. The girls in our room are _____.
19. People who play fair _____.
20. A person who cheats _____.

TABLE VII

II. SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

1. I think swimming _____.
 2. Most teachers are _____.
 3. When I get mad _____.
 4. My friend _____ is a good sport be-
cause he _____.
 5. Sometimes I feel _____.
 6. When my mother scolds me _____.
 7. When I go to sleep at night _____.
 8. I am afraid of _____.
 9. When I get in a hurry _____.
 10. When I get good grades _____.
 11. I think that war _____.
 12. In a game I _____.
 13. My parents think that I _____.
 14. My teacher thinks that _____.
 15. A good father _____.
 16. I wish my family _____.
 17. When I am punished _____.
 18. If I had money _____.
 19. When I grow up _____.
 20. When I have done something wrong _____.
-

TABLE VIII

UNSTRUCTURED MATERIAL FROM SENTENCE COMPLETION
TESTS, CATEGORIES, RANK BY FREQUENCY

1. Ideas about being deprived	5
2. Ideas about being inferior in intelligence	2
3. Ideas about being inferior in games	3
4. Being considered dishonest	12
5. Being considered immature, sissy, etc.	13
6. Being considered inadequate by adults	6
7. Ideas about being considered different than other children, by peers, by adults	4
8. Ideas about being a poor student in school	1
9. Being considered a good, or poor group member	8
10. Being considered a good, or poor family member	9
11. Ideas of what the parents think of one	7
12. Ideas about what one would do with opportunity	10
13. Ideas about sportsmanship or leadership	11
14. Expressing desire to improve or be different	14
15. Criticism of behavior of others	15

TABLE IX

REPORT OF SOCIOMETRIC RESULTS ON CRITERION CLASS
CLASS B, HONOLULU STUDY

Pupil No.	Name	Total Votes	Per Cent of Possible	d	d ²
1	Carol Ing	35	.50	.22	.0484
2	Gerold Kanoe	34	.48	.20	.0400
3	Calvin Miller	33	.47	.19	.0361
4	Myron Akana	33	.47	.19	.0361
5	Lloyd Vista	32	.45	.17	.0289
6	Jean Martin	27	.38	.10	.0100
7	Lillian McNicholls	27	.38	.10	.0100
8	Theresa Kepilino	26	.37	.09	.0081
9	Alexander Okimoto	26	.37	.09	.0081
10	Alfonso Chamiso	25	.35	.07	.0049
11	Vineis Frietas	24	.34	.06	.0036
12	Susan Inamura	24	.34	.06	.0036
13	Vicki Sabate	24	.34	.06	.0036
14	Mary Lou Copeland	23	.33	.05	.0025
15	Gary Hoopili	23	.33	.05	.0025
16	David Watni	21	.30	.02	.0004
17	Diane Matsuura	21	.30	.02	.0004
18	Dennis Uyeda	20	.28	.00	.0000
19	Alfred Samson	20	.28	.00	.0000
20	Ralph Reese	20	.28	.00	.0000
21	Paul Costa	20	.28	.00	.0000
22	Patrioia Murakami	19	.27	-.01	.0001
23	Marian Kaneshiro	19	.27	-.01	.0001
24	Dennis Ribordy	18	.25	-.03	.0009
25	Charles Sousa	17	.24	-.04	.0016
26	David Dupont	15	.21	-.07	.0049
27	Loretta Drummond	14	.20	-.08	.0064
28	Lilly Veloria	13	.18	-.10	.0100
29	Robert Kong	13	.18	-.10	.0100
30	Mason Rosa	12	.17	-.11	.0121
31	Eddie Fukemisu	11	.15	-.13	.0169
32	Samuel Pang Chew	8	.11	-.17	.0289
33	Paul Harigman	5	.07	-.21	.0441
34	Wayne Burkett	5	.07	-.21	.0441
35	Billy Hoopii	4	.05	-.23	.0529
36	Alan Akana	1	.01	-.27	.0729
	Mean		.28		$\Sigma = .5531$

$$S.D. = \sqrt{\frac{.5531}{36}} = \sqrt{.015363} = .124$$

TABLE X
COMPARISON OF EXTREME GROUPS ON THE
SOCIOMETRIC TEST

Pupil No.	Sociometric Score	d	d ²
1	.50	-.07	.0049
2	.48	+.05	.0025
3	.47	+.04	.0016
4	.47	+.04	.0016
5	.45	+.02	.0004
6	.38	-.05	.0025
7	.38	-.05	.0025
8	.37	-.06	.0036
9	.37	-.06	.0036
Mean	.43		$\sum d^2$.0232
28	.18	+.07	.0049
29	.18	+.07	.0049
30	.17	+.06	.0036
31	.15	+.04	.0016
32	.11	.00	.0000
33	.07	-.04	.0016
34	.07	-.04	.0016
35	.05	-.06	.0036
36	.01	-.10	.0100
Mean	.11		$\sum d^2$.0318

$$M_1 = .43; M_2 = .11 \quad S.D._1 = .053; S.D._2 = .063$$

$$\sum \frac{d_1^2}{n_1} = .0232 \quad \sum \frac{d_2^2}{n_2} = .0318$$

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{.0232 + .0318}{9 + 9 - 2}} = .058$$

$$t = \frac{.43 - .11}{.058 (.47)} = \frac{.32}{.02726}$$

t = 11.74 Significant beyond the .001 level

TABLE XI
COMPARISON OF UPPER AND LOWER QUANTILES ON THE
CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY,
HONOLULU STUDY

Upper Q Sociometric Pupil No.	Adjustment			d	d ²
	Personal	Social	Total		
1	40	30	40	- 4	16
2	70	90	80	=36	1296
3	40	30	40	- 4	16
4	50	90	60	+16	256
5	10	10	10	-34	1156
6	30	30	30	-14	196
7	50	40	50	+ 6	36
8	50	40	50	+ 6	36
9	20	60	40	- 4	16
Mean	44			Σ d ² 3024	
Lower Q Sociometric Pupil No.					
28	10	10	10	-12	144
29	40	30	40	+18	324
30	60	20	40	+18	324
31	50	30	40	+18	324
32	20	20	20	- 2	4
33	10	20	20	- 2	4
34	10	10	10	-12	144
35	5	2	5	-17	289
36	20	20	20	- 2	4
Mean	22			Σ d ² 1561	

$$M_1 = 44; M_2 = 22$$

$$S.D._1 = 20.7; S.D._2 = 14.6$$

$$\Sigma \frac{d_1^2}{n_1} = 3024$$

$$\Sigma \frac{d_2^2}{n_2} = 1561$$

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{3024 + 1561}{9 + 9 - 2}}$$

$$= 16.9$$

$$t = \frac{44 - 22}{16.9 (.47)}$$

$$\frac{22}{7.943}$$

= 2.76 Significant at better than .02 level.

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF UPPER AND LOWER QUANTILES ON
I.Q. SCORES, HONOLULU STUDY

Upper Q on Sociometric Test			
Pupil No.	I.Q. Score	d	d ²
1	101	0	0
2	105	+4	16
3	100	-1	1
4	105	+4	16
5	92	-9	81
6	102	+1	1
7	98	-3	9
8	101	0	0
9	106	+5	25
Mean	101		$\sum d^2$ 149
Lower Q on Sociometric Test			
28	72	-10	100
29	102	+20	400
30	66	-16	256
31	84	+ 2	4
32	78	- 4	16
33	76	- 6	36
34	100	+18	324
35	76	- 6	36
36	87	+ 5	25
Mean	82		$\sum d^2$ 1197

$$M_1 = 101; M_2 = 82$$

$$S.D._1 = 4.3; S.D._2 = 12.2$$

$$\sum \frac{d_1^2}{n_1} = 149$$

$$\sum \frac{d_2^2}{n_2} = 1197$$

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{149 + 1197}{9 + 9 - 2}} = 9.1$$

$$t = \frac{101 - 82}{9.1 (.47)} = \frac{19}{4.307}$$

t = 4.41 Significant beyond the .001 level.

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF UPPER AND LOWER QUANTILES ON
ACHIEVEMENT SCORES, HONOLULU STUDY

Upper Q Sociometric Test Pupil No.	Achievement G.P.	d	d ²
1	4.9	-.4	.16
2	6.5	+1.2	1.44
3	5.2	-.1	.01
4	6.1	+.8	.64
5	4.7	-.6	.36
6	4.9	-.4	.16
7	4.2	-1.1	1.21
8	4.7	-.6	.36
9	6.6	+1.3	1.69
Mean	5.3		Σd^2 6.03
Lower Q Sociometric Test			
28	3.5	-.8	.64
29	6.0	+1.7	2.89
30	3.6	-.7	.49
31	4.1	-.2	.04
32	4.9	+.6	.36
33	3.4	-.9	.81
34	4.8	+.5	.25
35	3.6	-.7	.49
36	4.8	+.5	.25
Mean	4.3		Σd^2 6.22

$$M_1 = 5.3; M_2 = 4.3$$

$$S.D._1 = .86; S.D._2 = .88$$

$$\Sigma \frac{d_1^2}{n_1} = 6.03$$

$$\Sigma \frac{d_2^2}{n_2} = 6.22$$

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{6.03 + 6.22}{9 + 9 - 2}}$$

$$= .875$$

$$t = \frac{5.3 - 4.3}{.875 (.47)}$$

$$= \frac{1.0}{.41125}$$

t = 2.43 Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE XIV

**DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL ADJUSTMENT SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA
TEST OF PERSONALITY, UPPER AND LOWER QUANTILES,
ON BASIS OF SOCIOMETRIC TEST RATINGS**

Upper Quartile on Sociometric		
Score	f	fd
80	5	400
70	2	140
60	8	480
50	17	850
Totals	32	1870
Mean		58.4
Lower Quartile on Sociometric		
Score	f	fd
20	15	300
10	10	100
5	4	20
2	1	2
1	2	2
Totals	32	424
Mean		13.2

TABLE XV

**COMPARISON OF TOTAL ADJUSTMENT SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA
TEST OF PERSONALITY, UPPER AND LOWER QUANTILES,
ON BASIS OF SOCIOMETRIC TEST RATINGS**

Q 4 Score	f	d	d ²	fd ²
* 80	5	21.6	466.56	2332.80
70	2	11.6	134.56	269.12
60	8	1.6	2.56	20.48
Totals	32			3821.92
Q 1				
20	15	6.8	46.24	693.60
10	10	3.2	10.24	102.40
5	4	8.2	67.24	268.96
2	1	11.2	125.44	125.82
Totals	32			1483.22

*
Percentile

$$M_1 = 58.4 ; M_2 = 13.2$$

$$S.D._1 = 10.32 \quad S.D._2 = 6.80$$

$$\sum fd_1^2 = 3821.92$$

$$\sum fd_2^2 = 1483.22$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 C.R. &= \frac{58.4 - 13.2}{\sqrt{\frac{10.92^2}{32} + \frac{6.8^2}{32}}} \\
 &= \frac{45.2}{\sqrt{165.75}} \\
 &= \frac{45.2}{12.8}
 \end{aligned}$$

C.R. = 3.53 Significant at the .0004 level
of confidence.

TABLE XVI

COMPARISON OF UPPER AND LOWER QUANTILES, CLASS B,
IN SOCIOMETRIC PERCENTAGES, USING CALIFORNIA
TEST OF PERSONALITY AS CRITERION TEST

N = 9		Upper Quartile on Total Adjustment		
C.T.P. Score	Sociometric	d	d ²	
80	.48	+.17	.0289	
60	.47	+.16	.0256	
50	.25	-.06	.0036	
50	.30	-.01	.0001	
50	.37	+.06	.0036	
50	.27	-.04	.0016	
40	.15	-.16	.0256	
40	.17	-.14	.0196	
40	.37	+.06	.0036	
Totals	2.83		.1122	
Mean	.31	S.D. = .11		
N = 9		Lower Quartile on Total Adjustment		
C.T.P. Score	Sociometric	d	d ²	
20	.21	-.02	.0004	
20	.01	-.22	.0484	
10	.33	+.10	.0100	
10	.07	-.16	.0256	
10	.33	+.10	.0100	
10	.45	+.22	.0484	
5	.35	+.12	.0144	
5	.05	-.18	.0324	
2	.28	+.05	.0025	
Totals	2.08		.1921	
Mean	.23	S.D. = .15		

$$t = \frac{.31 - .23}{.137 (.47)} = \frac{.08}{.06439} = 1.24$$

TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF UPPER AND LOWER QUARTILES, CLASS B, IN
ACHIEVEMENT GRADE PLACEMENT, USING CALIFORNIA
TEST OF PERSONALITY AS CRITERION TEST

Upper Quartile on Total Adjustment			
C.T.P. Score	Achievement G.P.	d	d ²
80	6.5	+1.6	2.56
60	6.1	+1.2	1.44
50	3.5	-1.4	1.96
50	4.8	- .1	.01
50	4.7	- .2	.04
50	4.1	- .8	.64
40	4.1	- .8	.64
40	3.6	-1.3	1.69
40	6.6	+1.7	2.89
Totals	44.1		11.87
Mean	4.9	S.D. = 1.21	
Lower Quartile on Total Adjustment			
C.T.P. Score	Achievement G.P.	d	d ²
20	4.9	+ .2	.04
20	4.8	+ .1	.01
10	5.3	+ .6	.36
10	4.8	+ .1	.01
10	5.5	+ .8	.64
10	4.7	.0	.00
5	4.1	- .6	.36
5	3.6	-1.1	1.21
2	5.2	+ .5	.25
Totals	42.9		1.88
Mean	4.7	S.D. = .48	

$$t = \frac{4.9 - 4.7}{.927 (.47)} = \frac{.2}{.4357} = .46.$$

APPENDIX B

TABLES SHOWING BACKGROUND DATA

FOR CHAPTER IV

TABLE XXXII

CORRELATION OF TEST-RETEST ON FOUR CLASSES,
SELF-RATING SCALE

Class I (N=35)

Pupil No.	Self-Rating I	x	x ²	Self-Rating II	y	y ²	xy
1	67	+20	400	77	+31	961	620
2	64	+17	289	66	+20	400	340
3	62	+15	225	50	+ 4	16	60
4	61	+14	196	57	+11	121	154
5	60	+13	169	49	+ 3	9	39
6	59	+12	144	65	+19	361	228
7	56	+ 9	81	53	+ 7	49	63
8	55	+ 8	64	55	+ 9	81	72
9	55	+ 8	64	55	+ 9	81	72
10	54	+ 7	49	54	+ 8	64	56
11	54	+ 7	49	58	+12	144	84
12	53	+ 6	36	48	+ 2	4	12
13	50	+ 3	9	51	+ 5	25	15
14	48	+ 1	1	34	-12	144	- 12
15	48	+ 1	1	54	+ 8	64	8
16	48	+ 1	1	52	+ 6	36	6
17	47	0	0	40	- 6	36	0
18	46	- 1	1	40	- 6	36	6
19	45	- 2	4	40	- 6	36	12
20	45	- 2	4	55	+ 9	81	- 18
21	44	- 3	9	41	- 5	25	15
22	42	- 5	25	45	- 1	1	5
23	42	- 5	25	39	- 7	49	35
24	41	- 6	36	40	- 6	36	36
25	41	- 6	36	45	- 1	1	6
26	40	- 7	49	46	0	0	0
27	40	- 7	49	45	- 1	1	7
28	38	- 9	81	40	- 6	36	54
29	36	-11	121	42	- 4	16	44
30	35	-12	144	37	- 9	81	108
31	32	-15	225	35	-11	121	165
32	32	-15	225	26	-20	400	300
33	29	-18	324	26	-20	400	360
34	22	-25	625	20	-26	676	650
35	47	0	0	41	- 5	25	0
Totals	1638		3761	1621		4617	3632 - 30 3602
Mean Using	46.8 47			46.3 46			

TABLE XXXII--Continued

Class IV (N=33)

Pupil No.	Self-Rating I	x	x ²	Self-Rating II	y	y ²	xy
1	76	+28	784	66	+20	400	560
2	65	+17	289	62	+16	256	272
3	64	+16	256	60	+14	196	224
4	62	+14	196	65	+19	361	266
5	58	+10	100	41	- 5	25	- 50
6	57	+ 9	81	46	0	0	0
7	56	+ 8	64	47	+ 1	1	8
8	54	+ 6	36	49	+ 3	9	18
9	53	+ 5	25	51	+ 5	25	25
10	53	+ 5	25	51	+ 5	25	25
11	52	+ 4	16	37	- 9	81	- 36
12	50	+ 2	4	41	- 5	25	- 10
13	50	+ 2	4	49	+ 3	9	6
14	48	0	0	57	+11	121	0
15	47	- 1	1	47	+ 1	1	- 1
16	46	- 2	4	35	-11	121	22
17	45	- 3	9	38	- 8	64	24
18	45	- 3	9	34	-12	144	36
19	45	- 3	9	49	+ 3	9	- 9
20	44	- 4	16	41	- 5	25	20
21	44	- 4	16	56	+10	100	- 40
22	44	- 4	16	43	- 3	9	12
23	43	- 5	25	49	+ 3	9	- 15
24	43	- 5	25	53	+ 7	49	- 35
25	47	- 1	1	51	+ 5	25	- 5
26	47	- 1	1	47	+ 1	1	- 1
27	35	-13	169	42	- 4	16	52
28	40	- 8	64	40	- 6	36	48
29	40	- 8	64	36	-10	100	80
30	39	- 9	81	42	- 4	16	36
31	30	-18	324	34	-12	144	216
32	27	-21	441	24	-22	484	462
33	35	-13	169	37	- 9	81	117
Totals	1584		3324	1520		2968	2529 - 202 2327
Mean	48.0			46.0			

TABLE XIXII--Continued

Class XVII (N=32)

Pupil No.	Self-Rating I	x	x ²	Self-Rating II	y	y ²	xy
1	66	+22	484	63	+20	400	440
2	62	+18	324	53	+10	100	180
3	60	+16	256	58	+15	225	240
4	59	+15	225	55	+12	144	180
5	58	+14	196	54	+11	121	154
6	57	+13	169	52	+ 9	81	117
7	55	+11	121	53	+10	100	110
8	55	+11	121	54	+11	121	121
9	54	+10	100	47	+ 4	16	40
10	53	+ 9	81	45	+ 2	4	18
11	48	+ 4	16	45	+ 2	4	8
12	46	+ 2	4	47	+ 4	16	8
13	46	+ 2	4	45	+ 2	4	4
14	45	+ 1	1	44	+ 1	1	1
15	45	+ 1	1	39	- 4	16	- 4
16	45	+ 1	1	43	0	0	0
17	44	0	0	44	+ 1	1	0
18	43	- 1	1	59	+16	256	- 16
19	42	- 2	4	42	- 1	1	2
20	41	- 3	9	36	- 7	49	21
21	41	- 3	9	41	- 2	4	6
22	39	- 5	25	33	-10	100	50
23	38	- 6	36	39	- 4	16	24
24	37	- 7	49	33	-10	100	70
25	35	- 9	81	43	0	0	0
26	31	-13	169	37	- 6	36	78
27	30	-14	196	35	- 8	64	112
28	28	-16	256	32	-11	121	176
29	27	-17	289	36	- 7	49	119
30	26	-18	324	26	-17	289	306
31	22	-22	484	28	-15	225	330
32	17	-27	729	18	-25	625	675
T'ls	1395		4765	1379		3289	3590 - 20 3570
Mean Using	43.7 44			43.0 43			

TABLE XXXII--Continued

Class XVIII (N=28)

Pupil	Self-Rating I	x	x ²	Self-Rating II	y	y ²	xy
1	58	+14	169	55	+12	144	168
2	56	+12	144	42	- 1	1	- 12
3	56	+12	144	48	+ 5	25	60
4	59	+15	225	69	+26	676	390
5	52	+ 8	64	44	+ 1	1	8
6	51	+ 7	49	43	0	0	0
7	50	+ 6	36	53	+10	100	60
8	50	+ 6	36	59	+16	256	96
9	49	+ 5	25	51	+ 8	64	40
10	49	+ 5	25	49	+ 6	36	30
11	49	+ 5	25	51	+ 8	64	40
12	47	+ 3	9	46	+ 3	9	9
13	47	+ 3	9	49	+ 6	36	18
14	46	+ 2	4	54	+11	121	22
15	46	+ 2	4	42	- 1	1	- 2
16	45	+ 1	1	35	- 8	64	- 8
17	42	- 2	4	37	- 6	36	12
18	41	- 3	9	40	- 3	9	9
19	41	- 3	9	45	+ 2	4	- 6
20	41	- 3	9	34	- 9	81	27
21	41	- 3	9	46	+ 3	9	- 9
22	39	- 5	25	45	+ 2	4	- 10
23	39	- 5	25	35	- 8	64	40
24	38	- 6	36	34	- 9	81	54
25	37	- 7	49	33	-10	100	70
26	30	-14	196	30	-13	169	182
27	18	-26	676	13	-30	900	780
28	15	-29	841	22	-21	441	609
Totals	1232		2884	1204		3496	2724 - 47 2677
Mean	44.0			43.0			

Correlation Coefficients- Four Classes

Class No.	N	M ₁	M ₂	r	Interval
I	35	47	46	.864	three months
IV	33	48	46	.741	
XVII	32	44	43	.932	two weeks
XVIII	28	44	43	.843	two weeks

TABLE XXXIII
COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW SELF-CONCEPT GROUPS
ON SOCIOMETRIC SCORES

High Self-Concept Group				Low Self-Concept Group			
I.Q.	\bar{x}	d	d^2	I.Q.	\bar{x}	d	d^2
142	.600	+.287	.082369	142	.071	-.017	.000289
124	.180	-.133	.017689	123	.384	+.296	.087616
123	.173	-.140	.019600	123	.057	-.031	.000961
122	.250	-.063	.003969	122	.036	-.052	.002704
121	.400	+.087	.007569	122	.040	-.048	.002304
119	.196	-.117	.013689	120	.080	-.008	.000064
117	.173	-.140	.019600	118	.160	+.072	.005184
118	.196	-.117	.013689	118	.154	+.066	.004356
115	.577	+.264	.069696	117	.100	+.012	.000144
116	.200	-.113	.012769	117	.019	+.021	.000441
116	.250	-.063	.003969	116	.062	-.026	.000676
115	.080	-.233	.054289	115	.147	-.041	.001681
114	.211	-.102	.010404	114	.036	-.052	.002704
113	.300	-.013	.000169	114	.120	+.032	.001024
112	.338	+.025	.000625	113	.116	+.028	.000784
112	.428	+.115	.013225	111	.100	+.012	.000144
112	.464	+.151	.022801	111	.050	-.038	.001444
109	.161	-.152	.023104	110	.053	-.035	.001225
107	.357	+.044	.001936	108	.100	+.012	.000144
106	.375	+.062	.003844	108	.050	-.038	.001444
107	.269	-.044	.001936	107	.089	+.001	.000001
107	.535	+.222	.049284	107	.089	+.001	.000001
107	.172	-.141	.019881	107	.057	-.031	.000961
105	.316	+.003	.000009	106	.269	+.181	.032761
106	.406	+.093	.008649	105	.071	-.017	.000289
106	.323	-.081	.006561	104	.116	+.028	.000784
105	.116	-.197	.038809	103	.057	-.031	.000961
105	.312	-.001	.000001	103	.214	+.126	.015876
105	.288	-.025	.000625	103	.053	-.035	.001225
105	.517	+.204	.041616	102	.033	-.053	.003025
103	.596	+.283	.080089	102	.031	-.057	.003249
105	.607	+.294	.086436	102	.100	+.012	.000144
103	.290	-.023	.000529	102	.071	-.017	.000289
105	.265	-.048	.002304	102	.260	+.172	.029584
105	.265	-.048	.002304	100	.125	+.037	.001369
104	.307	-.006	.000036	100	.107	+.019	.000361
104	.469	+.156	.024336	100	.017	-.071	.005041
104	.333	+.020	.000400	100	.083	-.005	.000025
103	.375	+.162	.026244	99	.214	+.126	.015876
103	.250	-.063	.003969	99	.019	-.069	.004761

TABLE XXXIII--Continued

High Self-Concept Group				Low Self-Concept Group			
I.Q.	\bar{x}	d	d ²	I.Q.	\bar{x}	d	d ²
102	.528	+.215	.046225	99	.107	+.019	.000361
102	.357	+.044	.001936	98	.047	-.041	.001681
100	.333	+.020	.000400	97	.125	+.037	.001369
100	.518	+.205	.042025	96	.220	+.132	.017424
99	.285	-.028	.000784	96	.017	-.071	.005041
99	.538	+.225	.050625	95	.053	-.035	.001225
99	.134	-.179	.032041	95	.017	-.071	.005041
99	.303	-.010	.000100	94	.161	+.073	.005329
98	.258	-.055	.003025	94	.100	+.012	.000144
97	.230	-.083	.006889	94	.017	-.071	.005041
96	.220	-.093	.008649	94	.057	-.031	.000961
95	.250	-.063	.003969	93	.088	.030	.000900
94	.321	+.008	.000064	93	.033	-.055	.003025
95	.091	-.222	.049284	93	.016	-.072	.005184
94	.232	-.081	.006561	93	.031	-.057	.003249
94	.383	+.070	.004900	92	.096	+.008	.000064
93	.303	-.010	.000100	92	.088	.000	.000000
93	.303	-.010	.000100	92	.129	+.031	.000961
92	.363	+.050	.002500	92	.091	+.003	.000009
92	.272	-.041	.001681	92	.129	+.031	.000961
90	.142	-.171	.029241	90	.053	-.035	.001225
89	.306	-.007	.000049	91	.107	+.019	.000361
84	.216	-.097	.009409	89	.080	-.008	.000064
81	.439	+.126	.015876	85	.071	-.017	.000289
80	.250	-.063	.003969	84	.066	-.022	.000484
80	.322	+.009	.000081	80	.017	-.071	.005041
74	.234	-.079	.006241	78	.096	+.008	.000064
6941	20.960		1.093347	6876	4.000		.296514
104	.313			103	.088		

S.D. = .128, S.E._{m1} = .015S.D. = .066, S.E._{m2} = .0081G.R. = $\frac{.131}{.088}$ = $\frac{.313}{.088}$

$$\frac{\sqrt{\frac{.225^2}{.00029061}}}{.017} = \frac{.225}{.017}$$

$$\sqrt{.000225 + .00006561} = 13.2 \text{ significant at beyond the .00003 level of confidence}$$

TABLE XXXIV

**COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW SELF-CONCEPT GROUPS
ON CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST, FORM CC**

High Self-Concept Group				Low Self-Concept Group			
I.Q.	G.P.	d	d ²	I.Q.	G.P.	d	d ²
142	7.7	+1.7	2.89	142	7.2	+2.0	4.00
124	7.0	+1.0	1.20	123	6.7	+1.5	2.25
123	6.7	+ .7	.49	123	6.4	+1.2	1.44
122	7.0	+1.0	1.00	122	6.4	+1.2	1.44
121	7.2	+1.2	1.44	122	6.2	+1.0	1.00
119	6.9	+ .9	.81	120	5.9	+ .7	.49
117	6.6	+ .6	.36	118	6.6	+1.4	1.96
118	6.2	+ .2	.04	118	6.1	+ .9	.81
115	6.4	+ .4	.16	117	5.6	+ .4	.16
116	6.5	+ .5	.25	117	6.1	+ .9	.81
116	6.5	+ .5	.25	116	5.5	+ .3	.09
115	6.4	+ .4	.16	115	5.3	+ .1	.01
114	6.3	+ .3	.09	114	5.6	+ .4	.16
113	6.9	+ .9	.81	114	6.5	+1.3	1.69
112	5.9	- .1	.01	113	4.1	-1.1	1.21
112	6.5	+ .5	.25	111	6.1	+ .9	.81
112	6.5	+ .5	.25	111	5.1	- .1	.01
109	6.2	+ .2	.04	110	5.8	+ .6	.36
106	5.8	- .2	.04	108	5.8	+ .6	.36
107	5.9	- .1	.01	107	5.8	+ .6	.36
107	6.7	+ .7	.49	107	5.7	+ .5	.25
105	5.6	- .4	.16	106	5.2	.0	.00
106	6.2	+ .2	.04	105	5.9	+ .7	.49
106	6.8	+ .8	.64	104	4.8	- .4	.16
105	6.2	+ .2	.04	103	4.6	- .6	.36
105	7.2	+1.2	1.44	103	5.1	- .1	.01
105	5.9	- .1	.01	103	3.9	-1.3	1.69
105	5.9	- .1	.01	102	5.8	+ .6	.36
103	5.6	- .4	.16	102	5.2	.0	.00
105	5.9	- .1	.01	102	5.5	+ .3	.09
103	5.5	- .5	.25	102	4.1	-1.1	1.21
105	7.2	-1.2	1.44	102	5.8	+ .6	.36
105	6.2	+ .2	.04	100	5.8	+ .6	.36
104	5.7	- .3	.09	100	5.1	- .1	.01
104	5.7	- .3	.09	100	5.1	- .1	.01
104	5.8	- .2	.04	100	4.3	- .9	.81
103	6.4	+ .4	.16	99	5.0	- .2	.04
103	6.2	+ .2	.04	99	5.5	+ .3	.09
102	5.9	- .1	.01	99	5.0	- .2	.04
102	6.6	+ .6	.36	98	5.6	+ .4	.16

TABLE XXXIV--Continued

High Self-Concept Group				Low Self-Concept Group			
I.Q.	G.P.	d	d ²	I.Q.	G.P.	d	d ²
100	5.7	- .3	.09	97	5.0	- .2	.04
100	6.0	0	0	96	5.1	- .1	.01
99	6.2	= .2	.04	96	5.9	+ .7	.49
99	6.6	+ .6	.36	95	4.4	- .8	.64
99	5.6	= .4	.16	95	4.4	- .8	.64
99	5.5	= .5	.25	94	5.0	- .2	.04
98	5.9	- .1	.01	94	4.4	- .8	.64
97	6.0	0	.00	94	4.8	- .4	.16
96	5.5	- .5	.25	94	4.4	- .8	.64
95	5.0	-1.0	1.00	93	4.6	- .6	.36
94	5.0	-1.0	1.00	93	5.3	+ .1	.01
93	4.6	-1.4	1.96	93	4.2	-1.0	1.00
94	5.9	- .1	.01	93	5.6	+ .4	.16
94	6.3	+ .3	.09	92	5.4	+ .2	.04
93	5.2	- .8	.64	92	4.7	- .5	.25
93	4.8	-1.2	1.44	92	4.0	-1.2	1.44
92	5.6	- .4	.16	92	5.1	- .1	.01
90	6.0	0	.00	90	3.9	-1.3	1.69
89	5.0	-1.0	1.00	91	3.7	-1.5	2.25
84	5.5	- .5	.25	89	4.5	- .7	.49
81	5.6	- .4	.16	85	4.7	- .5	.25
80	5.1	- .9	.81	84	4.4	- .8	.64
80	5.2	- .8	.64	80	3.4	-1.8	3.24
74	5.1	- .9	.81	78	3.8	-1.4	1.96
6941	402.8		28.78	6876	346.8		45.30
M 104	6.0			103	5.2		

S.D. = .65, S.E._M = .08

S.D. = .822, S.E._M = .10

C.R. = $M_1 - M_2 = \frac{6.0 - 5.2}{\sqrt{\frac{.01}{104} + \frac{.0064}{103}}}$

$\sqrt{\frac{.01}{104} + \frac{.0064}{103}}$

C.R. = $\frac{.8}{.128} = 6.25$, significant beyond .00003 level of confidence.

TABLE XXV

COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW SELF-CONCEPT GROUPS
ON CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST, FORM DD

High Self-Concept Group				Low Self-Concept Group			
I.Q.	G.P.	d	d ²	I.Q.	G.P.	d	d ²
142	8.0	+1.4	1.96	142	7.2	+1.5	2.25
124	7.4	+ .8	.64	123	7.3	+1.6	2.56
123	7.2	+ .6	.36	123	7.1	+1.4	1.96
122	7.2	+ .6	.36	122	7.0	+1.3	1.69
121	7.3	+ .7	.49	122	6.8	+1.1	1.21
119	6.7	+ .1	.01	120	6.4	+ .7	.49
117	7.8	+1.2	1.44	118	6.7	+1.0	1.00
118	6.8	+ .2	.04	118	6.7	+1.0	1.00
115	6.9	+ .3	.09	117	6.1	+ .4	.16
116	7.0	+ .4	.16	117	6.1	+ .4	.16
116	7.0	+ .4	.16	116	6.3	+ .6	.36
115	6.4	- .2	.04	115	6.0	+ .3	.09
114	6.9	+ .3	.09	114	5.9	+ .2	.04
113	6.9	+ .3	.09	114	7.0	+1.3	1.69
112	6.7	+ .1	.01	113	4.7	-1.0	1.00
112	7.0	+ .4	.16	111	6.4	+ .7	.49
112	7.2	+ .6	.36	111	5.8	+ .1	.01
109	6.6	.0	.00	110	6.6	+ .9	.81
107	6.4	- .2	.04	108	5.1	- .6	.36
106	6.9	+ .3	.09	108	6.2	+ .5	.25
107	6.6	.0	.00	107	6.4	+ .7	.49
107	6.7	+ .1	.01	107	5.9	+ .2	.04
107	7.1	+ .5	.25	107	5.5	- .2	.04
105	6.5	- .1	.01	106	5.6	- .1	.01
106	6.9	+ .3	.09	105	6.5	+ .8	.64
106	7.2	+ .6	.36	104	5.2	- .5	.25
105	6.6	.0	.00	103	4.5	-1.2	1.44
105	6.5	- .1	.01	103	5.9	+ .2	.04
105	6.1	- .5	.25	103	5.5	- .2	.04
105	6.8	+ .2	.04	102	6.2	+ .5	.25
103	7.1	+ .5	.25	102	6.1	+ .4	.16
105	6.8	+ .2	.04	102	6.0	+ .3	.09
103	6.3	- .3	.09	102	4.4	-1.3	1.69
105	7.9	+1.3	1.69	102	6.1	+ .4	.16
105	6.3	- .3	.09	100	5.7	.0	.00
104	6.7	+ .1	.01	100	5.9	+ .2	.04
104	6.4	- .2	.04	100	5.4	- .3	.09
104c	6.5	- .1	.01	100	4.3	- .4	1.96
103	7.2	+ .6	.36	99	6.2	+ .5	.25
103	6.3	- .3	.09	99	6.3	+ .6	.36

TABLE XXV--Continued

High Self-Concept Group				Low Self-Concept Group			
I.Q.	G.P.	d	d ²	I.Q.	G.P.	d	d ²
102	6.7	+ .1	.01	99	5.3	- .4	.16
102	7.0	+ .4	.16	98	5.4	- .3	.09
100	7.1	+ .5	.25	97	6.0	+ .3	.09
100	6.3	- .3	.09	96	4.9	- .8	.64
99	6.6	.0	.00	96	6.4	+ .7	.49
99	7.6	+1.0	1.00	95	5.4	- .3	.09
99	6.7	+ .1	.01	95	5.6	- .1	.01
99	6.2	- .4	.16	94	5.5	- .2	.04
98	6.5	- .1	.01	94	4.7	-1.0	1.00
97	6.3	- .3	.09	94	5.9	+ .2	.04
96	5.7	- .9	.81	94	5.1	- .6	.36
95	5.5	-1.1	1.21	93	4.5	-1.2	1.44
94	6.1	- .5	.25	93	4.9	- .8	.64
95	5.2	-1.4	1.96	93	5.0	- .7	.49
94	6.5	- .1	.01	93	6.0	+ .3	.09
94	6.4	- .2	.04	92	6.2	+ .5	.25
93	6.8	+ .2	.04	92	5.4	- .3	.09
93	5.2	- .4	.16	92	5.2	- .5	.25
92	6.0	- .6	.36	92	4.0	-1.7	2.89
92	6.1	- .5	.25	92	5.9	+ .2	.04
90	6.2	- .4	.16	90	3.8	-1.9	3.61
89	5.8	- .8	.64	91	4.6	-1.1	1.21
84	5.7	- .9	.81	89	5.0	- .7	.49
81	6.0	- .6	.36	85	4.3	-1.4	1.96
80	5.7	- .9	.81	84	4.5	-1.2	1.44
80	6.0	- .6	.36	80	3.8	-1.9	3.61
74	6.2	- .4	.16	78	4.5	-1.2	1.44
6941	442.9		22.25	6876	378.8		48.57
M 104	6.6			103	5.7		

S.D. = .575, S.E._{m1} = .070 S.D. = .850, S.E._{m2} = .10

C.R. = $\frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S.E._{m1}^2 + S.E._{m2}^2}{2}}}$ = $\frac{6.6 - 5.7}{\sqrt{\frac{.01 + .0049}{2}}}$

C. R. = $\frac{.9}{.122}$ = 7.37, significant beyond .00003 level of significance.

TABLE XXXVI
COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW SELF-CONCEPT GROUPS
ON SELF-RATING TEST

High Self-Concept Group				Low Self-Concept Group			
I.Q.	Score	d	d ²	I.Q.	Score	d	d ²
142	54	- 4	36	142	39	- 2	4
124	40	-18	324	123	56	+13	225
123	48	-10	100	123	61	+20	400
122	58	0	0	122	51	+10	100
121	73	+15	225	122	39	- 2	4
119	62	+ 4	16	120	37	- 4	16
117	49	- 9	81	118	40	- 1	1
118	57	- 1	1	118	47	+ 6	36
115	50	- 8	64	117	67	+26	676
116	42	-16	256	117	28	-13	169
116	61	+ 3	9	116	52	+11	121
115	45	-13	169	115	57	+16	256
114	43	-15	225	114	53	+12	144
113	52	- 6	36	114	42	+ 1	1
112	68	+10	100	113	30	-11	121
112	35	-23	529	111	37	- 4	16
112	41	-17	289	111	37	- 4	16
109	73	+15	225	110	48	+ 7	49
107	58	0	0	108	36	- 5	25
106	62	+ 4	16	108	29	-12	144
107	56	- 2	4	107	28	-13	169
107	46	-12	144	107	44	+ 3	9
107	66	+ 8	64	107	56	+15	225
105	79	+11	121	106	38	- 3	9
106	56	- 2	4	105	39	- 2	4
106	62	+ 4	16	104	32	- 9	81
105	69	+11	121	103	38	- 3	9
105	69	+11	121	103	40	- 1	1
105	60	+ 2	4	103	47	+ 6	36
105	45	-13	169	102	41	0	0
103	67	+ 9	81	102	23	-18	324
105	44	-14	196	102	44	+ 3	9
103	50	- 8	64	102	27	-14	196
105	59	+ 1	1	102	39	- 2	4
105	67	+ 9	81	100	39	- 2	4
104	64	+ 6	36	100	46	+ 5	25
104	68	+10	100	100	46	+ 5	25
104	41	-17	289	100	47	+ 5	36
103	69	+11	121	99	58	+17	289
103	61	+ 3	9	99	49	+ 8	64

TABLE XXXVI--Continued

High Self-Concept Group				Low Self Concept Group			
I.Q.	Score	d	d ²	I.Q.	Score	d	d ²
102	34	-24	576	99	62	+21	441
102	56	- 2	4	98	47	+ 6	36
100	65	+ 7	49	97	39	- 2	4
100	66	+ 8	64	96	29	-12	144
99	64	+ 6	36	96	40	- 1	1
99	55	- 3	9	95	34	- 7	49
99	61	+ 3	9	95	41	0	0
99	67	+ 9	81	94	32	- 9	81
98	50	- 8	64	94	34	- 7	49
97	56	- 2	4	94	54	+13	169
96	42	-16	256	94	37	- 4	16
95	60	+ 2	4	93	34	- 7	49
94	53	- 5	25	93	28	-13	169
95	67	+ 9	81	93	28	-13	169
94	63	+ 5	25	93	40	- 1	1
94	70	+12	144	92	39	- 2	4
93	65	+ 7	49	92	48	+ 7	49
93	65	+ 7	49	92	40	- 1	1
92	64	+ 6	36	92	45	+ 4	16
92	65	+ 7	49	92	41	0	0
90	74	+16	256	90	55	+14	196
89	57	- 1	1	91	42	+ 1	1
84	70	+12	144	89	35	- 6	36
81	73	+15	225	85	27	-14	196
80	47	-11	121	84	30	- 9	81
80	53	- 5	25	80	20	-21	441
74	58	0	0	78	35	- 6	36
6941	3899		6833	6876	2765		6478
104	58			103	41		

S.D. = 10.09, S.E._m = 1.24

S.D. = 9.83, S.E._m = 1.21

C.R. = $\frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S.E.^2_{m1} + S.E.^2_{m2}}{2}}}$

= $\frac{58 - 41}{\sqrt{\frac{1.24^2 + 1.21^2}{2}}}$

C.R. = $\frac{17}{\sqrt{3.0017}}$

= 9.82. significant beyond .00003 level of confidence.

APPENDIX C

COPIES OF TESTS

ADAPTED FOR CHAPTER IV

**CATEGORIES OF THE BROWNFAIN SELF-RATING
SCALE AND THE ADAPTATIONS**

The Brownfain Scale	The Adaptation
1. Intelligence	1. Intelligence
2. Emotional maturity	2. Are you being your age?
3. General Culture	
4. Social Poise	3. How attractive or nice looking are you?
5. Physical Attractiveness	
6. Neatness	
7. Sociability	4. Generosity (sharing)
8. Generosity	5. Manners and people
9. Manners	6. Cheerfulness
10. Cheerfulness	
11. Consistency	7. Sincerity
12. Sincerity	8. Initiative: doing things yourself
13. Initiative	9. Trustfulness
14. Trustfulness	10. Flexibility (opposite of stubbornness)
15. Flexibility	11. Sportsmanship
16. Sportsmanship	12. Are you like other boys or girls in your group?
17. Individuality	13. Do you like both boys and girls?
18. Interest in opposite sex	14. Self-understanding
19. Self-understanding	15. Are you dependable?
20. Dependability	16. Do you understand other people?
21. Understanding of others	17. Do you like yourself as you are?
22. Self-acceptance	18. Popularity
23. Popularity	19. Are you an important group member?
24. Prestige	20. Are you a worth-while person?
25. Over-all adjustment	

HOW DO YOU RATE YOURSELF?**1. Intelligence:**

- a. You think you are one of the smartest (or most intelligent) pupils in your class.
- b. You think you are more intelligent than most children in the room.
- c. You believe that you are as smart as most of the children in the room.
- d. You do not think you are quite as quick in learning as most of the children in the group.
- e. You have a harder time learning than the rest of the children in the group.

2. Are you being your age?

- a. You are more grown-up than the other children in your age group.
- b. You are more like children of older groups in the way that you behave, and like to play with older children.
- c. You are as grown-up in your behavior as the rest of the boys and girls in your group.
- d. You act younger than most of the children in your group, and you like to play with younger children.
- e. All of the children in your group act too old for you; you feel that you are younger in your behavior than any of them.

3. Manners and people:

- a. You act nicely and politely when with other people at parties, or with your age group, and can always find something to do or say.
- b. You think you can meet and talk to people better than most boys and girls and act very nicely.
- c. Your manners in meeting and talking to people are as good as those of many of the boys and girls of your group.
- d. You are sometimes embarrassed or shy in meeting and talking with people and your behavior is sometimes not as nice as it should be.
- e. You think that you are very awkward and clumsy when in a group and you do not like to be expected to act just right in a crowd.

4. How attractive or nice looking are you?

- a. You are probably one of the most attractive boys or girls in your age group.
- b. You are more attractive than most of the children of your group.
- c. You are as attractive as the other boys or girls around your age.

- d. Are you not as attractive as the other boys or girls in some ways:
- e. You are probably one of the most homely or plain looking boys or girls of your age group.

5. Generosity:

- a. You share your things, your possessions, and your money with others more than any other boy or girl of your age group does.
- b. You share with other people more than most of the boys and girls.
- c. You share with others as much as the other boys or girls do.
- d. You do not share with others as much as most of the boys or girls do.
- e. You do not like to share your things with other boys or girls and so you do not share unless you are made to do so.

6. Cheerfulness:

- a. You are always cheerful and happy about things and believe that things will turn out well for you.
- b. You are more cheerful than most of the children in your group.
- c. You are about as cheerful as the average boy or girl of your age.
- d. You are unhappy and disappointed about things more than most of the boys and girls of your age group.
- e. You think that things usually turn out bad with you, and you are almost always gloomy or sad or unhappy.

7. Sincerity:

- a. You always mean what you say and do what you say and keep your promises.
- b. You mean what you say most of the time and are truthful or sincere.
- c. You sometimes tease and say things you do not mean or fail to keep your promises sometimes.
- d. You fail to keep your promises very often because you do not like having things to do more than most of the boys or girls.
- e. You do not keep promises or mean what you say because you do not like to keep promises.

8. Initiative: Are you your own self-starter?

- a. You make up your mind and do things without being forced to.
- b. You do things yourself most of the time because you feel you do not have to be told how to do things much of the time.

- c. You can do some things by yourself but part of the time need to be reminded or told to do them.
- d. You need help in deciding things or doing things most of the time.
- e. You do not like to have to decide for yourself; you always like for others to decide for you or tell you what to do.

9. Trustfulness:

- a. You always trust and believe other people because other people can be trusted.
- b. You believe most of the time that other people want to do right.
- c. You believe that other people can be trusted part of the time, but part of the time they cannot be trusted.
- d. You believe that other people cannot be trusted very often.
- e. You do not believe that other people can ever be trusted not to cheat you or to break their promises.

10. Flexibility (Is it easy for you to change your mind or are you stubborn?)

- a. You are always willing to change your mind when others show you a need for it.
- b. You often like for other people to suggest things to do, and you do not mind changing your plans or changing your mind.
- c. You can make up your mind about things, but you consider the rights and ideas of others to be important enough to change sometimes.
- d. You do not like for other people to try to get you to change your mind; you do not change it very often.
- e. When your mind is made up, nobody can change it.

11. Sportsmanship:

- a. You are always a good sport about things that happen.
- b. You are often a good sport when you think things have been fair or the other person has had a good chance to win.
- c. You are willing to win part of the time; you know that others also have the right to their chance of winning part of the time.
- d. You do not like to lose; it hurts your feelings even if you know that things were quite fair.
- e. You do not ever like to lose; you think that you should always win and that others are to blame when you lose.

12. Are you like other boys or girls in your age group?
- If the way you feel is different from other people, you are not afraid to say so.
 - You sometimes feel differently from other people but don't want them to know it.
 - You believe and act just like the other members of your group and think your ways are like those of the others.
 - You would often rather do something different but are afraid of losing friends if you show you feel differently.
 - If your group has decided something you do not like, you never speak up or let them know that you do not like it.
13. Self-understanding:
- You believe that people like the way you act, the way you are.
 - You can tell sometimes when you have displeased people.
 - You can tell sometimes when people do not like what you are doing; you can usually change your ways of behaving if it is for the good of the group.
 - You sometimes do things that you feel that you have a right to do and you do not know whether other people like it or not.
 - People sometimes dislike or disapprove of you or the things you do without having any reason for it at all.
14. Do You like both boys and girls?
- You like to be in groups with boys and girls in both work and play situations.
 - You like to be with both boys and girls more than most of the pupils do.
 - It does not make too much difference whether you are in a group with both boys and girls.
 - You would rather be in groups of your own sex most of the time.
 - You do not like to be in either work or play groups with the opposite sex.
15. Are you dependable?
- You can always be depended upon to do your part or share.
 - You like to do your share more than any of the boys or girls.
 - You do your chores and take care of your jobs at home and at school as much as other boys and girls of your age.
 - You often forget to do your share; you are almost as dependable as many of the boys and girls of your groups.
 - You do not like to have to do things or to be responsible.

16. Do you understand other people?
- You always understand how other people feel and that they have equal rights to you.
 - You know what other people need and how they feel most of the time.
 - You understand how other people feel as well as other boys and girls of your age.
 - Other people sometimes dislike things or are unhappy about things when you cannot understand why.
 - It is hard for you ever to understand how other people act and feel.
17. Do you like yourself as you are?
- You are very pleased with the kind of person you are growing into.
 - You think you are a nice person but would like to improve in some ways, although you are nicer than many people.
 - You consider yourself as nice a person as the other boys and girls of your age.
 - In many ways you would like to be different if you had a chance.
 - You are very dissatisfied with yourself as a person and would like to be different in almost every way.
18. Popularity:
- You believe that you have many friends and the people that know you like you very much.
 - You think you have more friends than many other boys and girls of your age.
 - You think you are as well liked by your friends or have as many friends as most boys and girls of your group.
 - You do not have as many friends and are not as well liked as many of the boys and girls of your age group.
 - You do not think that you have any friends that care anything about you.
19. Are you an important group member?
- You believe that you are one of the most important members of the group and that you help the group a lot.
 - You believe that you help the group to succeed and get things done more than any of the boys and girls in your groups.
 - You believe that you are about as important a group member as most of the boys or girls in which you work.
 - You do not feel that you can do well enough to help the group very much, that you are less important than most of them.

- e. You feel that you really do not belong to any group and that you do not help the groups to get anything done.

20. Are you a worthwhile person?

- a. You think that you can always do very well in home life, in school life, and in making friends.
- b. You usually enjoy the things you do and do well at them.
- c. You think that you are as happy in your home and school situations as the other boys and girls.
- d. You do not think that you are as worthwhile or needed a person in your work and play and friendships as most boys or girls.
- e. You think you do not amount to much as a person, that you are not very worthwhile.

STUDENT: NOMINATIONS FOR SELF-ACCEPTING PERSONS

People who are very worthwhile, who have what is called self-confidence and self-respect, are also self-liking. They like themselves as persons and believe that they are worth something to their parents, to the people they know at school, and to their friends. On this sheet we would like for you to nominate five people in your class whom you think accept themselves or who are self-liking. (People who respect themselves.) We are now going to read the description or word picture of a pupil who is self-liking or self-accepting.

A SELF-ACCEPTING PERSON:

1. feels that others like him.
2. is peppy, lively, has cheerfulness and energy.
3. believes in himself, thinks he is a worthwhile person.
4. takes the responsibility or blame for whatever he does.
5. takes the blame when he has done something wrong.
6. seems to be happy and feels happy.
7. does not give up whenever he fails to do something just right.
8. is self-confident; believes he can do the things he tries.
9. has a good opinion of himself without being smart or conceited.
10. tackles new things which he is doing with interest, enthusiasm; seeming to like doing the things he does.

Now name five persons in this room whom you think are really self-liking persons or who think highly of themselves.

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 4. _____ |
| 5. _____ | |

**CLASSIFICATION OF BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS IN
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT**

Directions: Designate any pupils who fall under the following categories: (1) behavior problems and/or (2) problems from a standpoint of classroom management.

I. AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR:

1. Generalized: toward everyone:

2. Toward specific individuals:

3. Toward adults:

II. WITHDRAWING BEHAVIOR:

1. Generalized: In most or all situations:

2. In specific situations:

3. In peer groups:

4. From adult association:

III. DISINTERESTED: Seems to have no resources or purposeful interests.

IV. IMMATURE: Seems to be dependent on adults.

V. DISLIKED: Poor group acceptance.

VI. DISLIKES OTHERS: Does not respond to efforts of others
to include him.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adler, Alfred, Understanding Human Nature, Greenberg, 1927.
- Bettelheim, Bruno, Love is Not Enough, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1951, pp. 133-69.
- Blair, A. Witt and William E. Burton, Growth and Development of the Preadolescent, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.
- Breckenridge, Marian E. and E. Lee Vincent, Child Development, Philadelphia, London, W. Saunders Company, 1949, pp. 20-21.
- Buhler, Charlotte, Childhood Problems and the Teacher, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1952.
- Cunningham, Ruth and associates, Understanding Group Behavior of Boys and Girls, New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Columbia University, 1951.
- Erikson, Erik H., Childhood and Society, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1950.
- Fenichel, O., The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1945, p. 703.
- Ferguson, Leonard W., Personality Measurement, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1952, p. 20.
- French, Thomas M., The Integration of Behavior, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- Fromm, Erich, The Forgotten Language, New York, Rinehart and Company, 1951.
- Hartshorne, E. and M. May, Studies in the Nature of Character, Vol. I, Studies in Deceit, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Hildreth, Gertrude, Readiness for School Beginner, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, World Book Company, 1950, pp. 13-14.

- Hollingworth, L. S., Gifted Children: Their Nature and Nurture, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1926.
- Hopkins, L. Thomee, The Emerging Self, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- Horney, Karen, Neurosis and Human Growth, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1950.
- Jennings, H. H., Leadership and Isolation, New York, Longmans, Green and Company, Inc., 1943.
- Lecky, Prescott, Self-Consistency, New York, Island Press, 1951.
- Lynd, Robert S., Knowledge for What? Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1939.
- Moreno, J. L., Who Shall Survive, New York, Beacon House, 1934.
- Morris, C., The Open Self, New York, Prentice-Hall, 1948, p. 79.
- Murphy, Gardner, and L. B. and T. M. Newcomb; Experimental Social Psychology, rev. ed., New York, Harper and Brothers, 1939.
- Murphy, L. B., Social Behavior and Child Personality, New York, Columbia University Press, 1937.
- Murray, H. A., Explorations in Personality, New York, Oxford Press, 1938.
- Piaget, Jean, The Construction of Reality in the Child, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1954.
- Piaget, Jean, The Language and Thought of the Child, London, Lund-N Humphries, 1950.
- Piaget, Jean, The Origins of Intelligence in Children, New York, International Universities Press, Inc., 1952.
- Pigors, P., Leadership or Domination, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1935.
- Pollak, Otto, Social Science and Psychotherapy for Children, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1952.

- Porter, E. H., Jr., An Introduction to Therapeutic Counseling, New York, Houghton-Mifflin, 1950.
- Ranbert, Madeleine L., Children in Conflict, New York, International Universities Press, Inc., 1949.
- Redl, Frits and David Wineman, Controls From Within, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1952.
- Rogers, Carl R., Client-Centered Therapy, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1951, p. 560.
- Sherif, Muzafer and M. O. Wilson, Group Relations at the Crossroads, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Snygg, Donald and Arthur W. Combs, Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Sorokin, P. A., Society, Culture and Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1947, pp. 301-02.
- Stephens, J. M., Educational Psychology, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1951, pp. 35-42.
- Synovels, P. M., The Ego and The Self, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951, p. 229.

Articles

- Allport, Gordon W. and Phillip B. Rice, "The Law of Effect and Ego Psychology," selected papers from Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics, by O. Hobart Mower, New York, The Ronald Press, 1950, pp. 203-09.
- Barron, F., "Complexity-Simplicity as a Personal Dimension," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVIII, 163.
- Bells, Robert E., "Self-Concepts and Rorschach Signs of Depression," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII, No. 2, 1954.
- Bender, I. E. and A. H. Mastorf, "On Measuring Generalized Empathic Ability," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVIII, 503-06.
- Bendig, A. W. and J. L. Sprague, "The Guilford-Simmerman Temperament Survey as a Predictor of Achievement Level and Achievement Fluctuations in Introductory Psychology," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII, No. 6 (Dec., 1954), 409.

- Berger, E. M., "The Relationship Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (October, 1952), 778.
- Bettelheim, Bruno and Emy Sylvester, "A Therapeutic Milieu," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XVIII (April, 1948), 191-206.
- Bogardus, Emory S., "Group Behavior and Groupality," Sociology and Social Research, XXXVIII (July-August, 1952), No. 6, 401-03.
- Bonney, Merl E., "The Constancy of Sociometric Scores and Their Relationship to Teacher Judgments of Social Success; and to Personality Self-Ratings," Sociometry, VI, 1943, 409-24.
- _____, "Relationships Between Social Success, Family Size, Socio-Economic Background, and Intelligence Among School Children in Grades III to V," Sociometry, VII (1944), 24-39.
- _____, "Personality Traits of Socially Successful and Socially Unsuccessful Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIV (1943), 449-72.
- _____, "Popular and Unpopular Children, A Sociometric Study," Monograph of the American Sociometric Association, Beacon, New York, 1947, IX, p. 81.
- _____, "Social Behavior Differences Between Second Grade Children of High and Low Sociometric Status," Journal of Educational Research, XLVIII (March, 1955), 482-93.
- Brodbeck, Arthur J., and Howard V. Perlmutter, "Self-Dislike as a Determinant of Marked Ingroup-Outgroup Differences," The Journal of Psychology, XXXVIII (1954), 271-80.
- Brown, Roger W., "A Determinant of the Relationship Between Rigidity and Authoritarianism," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVIII (1953), 469-76.
- Brownfain, John J., "Stability of the Self-Concept as a Dimension of Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 597-606.

- Burrell, Lucille, "Variability in Achievement of Pupils at Fifth Grade Level," California Journal of Educational Research, V (March, 1954), No. 2, 68-73.
- Caldwell, O. and E. Wellman, "Characteristics of School Leaders," Journal of Educational Research, XIV, 1-3.
- Carroll, John B., "Ratings on Traits Measured by Factored Personality Inventory," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII, 626.
- Cattell, R. B., "P Technique Factorization and the Determinants of Individual Dynamic Structure," Journal of Clinical Psychology, VIII (1952).
- Chodoroff, Bernard, "Adjustment and Discrepancy Between the Perceived and Ideal Self," Journal of Clinical Psychology, I (July, 1954), No. 3, 266-68.
- Crutchfield, Richard, "Social Psychology and Group Processes," Annual Review of Psychology, V (1954).
- Diller, Leonard, "Conscious and Unconscious Self-Attitudes after Success and Failure," Journal of Personality, XIII (September, 1954), No. 1.
- Ellis, Albert, "The Validity of Personality Questionnaires," Psychological Bulletin, XLIII (September, 1946), 385-440.
- Faguiri, Renato, "Relational Analysis: an Extension of Sociometric Method with Emphasis upon Social Perception," Sociometry, XV (1952), 91.
- Fey, William F., "Acceptance of Self and Others and Its Relation to Therapy Readiness," Journal of Clinical Psychology, I (1954), No. 3.
- Fiedler, F. E., W. G. Warrington and F. J. Blaisdell, "Unconscious Attitudes as Correlates of Sociometric Choices in a Social Group," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII, 790.
- Fields, Clarence Jerome, "A Comparative Study of the Relation of Certain Factors to the Reading Status of Extreme Groups of Pupils in the 5B Grade of the Baltimore Public Schools," unpublished doctor's dissertation, New York University, New York City, 1953.

- Frunkin, R. M. and Adolph Meyer, "Social Factors in Schizophrenia," Sociology-Social Research, XXXVIII (August, 1954), 6.
- Furfey, P. H., "Recent Research on Children's Friendships," Education (March, 1954).
- Gitelson, Maxwell, "Character Synthesis: The Psychotherapeutic Problem of Adolescence," The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XVIII (July, 1948), 422-31.
- Green, G. H., "Insight and Group Adjustment," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943, pp. 29-61.
- Gustad, John W., "Vocational Interest and Socio-Economic status," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII (1954), No. 5, 336-38.
- Navighurst, R. J., M. Z. Robinson and Don M. Robinson, "The Development of the Ideal Self in Childhood and Adolescence," Journal of Educational Research, XL (December, 1946), 241-57.
- Hallander, E. P. and J. T. Blair, "Attitudes Toward Authoritarian Figures as Correlates of Motivation Among Naval Aviation Cadets," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII (February, 1954), No. 1, 21-25.
- Holt, R. B., "Level of Aspiration: Ambition or Defense," Journal of Experimental Psychology, XXVI, 398-416.
- Howard, Edgerton McG., "An Analysis of Adolescent Adjustment Problems," Mental Hygiene, XXV (July, 1941), 362-90.
- Huntley, W., "Judgments of the Self Based on Expressive Behavior," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXV, 398-427.
- Katz, I., "The Emotional Expression in Failure: A New Hypothesis," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLV, 329-49.
- Kerr, W. A. and R. H. Van Kelst, "Personality Self-Assessment of Scientific and Technical Personnel," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVIII (June, 1954), No. 3, 145.
- Klein, George S. and Nathan Schoenfeld, "The Influence of Ego-Involvement and Confidence," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXVI (April, 1941), 249-58.

- Lippitt, Ronald, "Leadership Through Socially Integrated Groups," Sociatry, I (March, 1947), pp. 82-91.
- Loekman, Robert, "Some Relationships Between the MMPI and Minnesota Personality Scale," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXIX (May, 1954), 211-17.
- Lorr, Maurice and Richard Jenkins, "Patterns of Maladjustment in Children," Journal of Clinical Psychology, IX (January, 1953), 16-19.
- McCurdy, Harold G., and Herbert W. Eber, "Democratic versus Authoritarian: A Further Investigation of Group Problem Solving," Journal of Personality, XXII (December, 1953), 250-69.
- McIntyre, Charles J., "Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII, 624-25.
- Maslow, A. H., "The Authoritarian Character Structure," Journal of Social Psychology, S.P.S.S.I. Bulletin, XVIII (1943), 401-11.
- Moreno, J. L., "Sociometric Theory of Leadership and Isolation," in Who Shall Survive, Sociometry, XIII (1944), 224-37.
- Moreno, J. L., "Sociometry in the Classroom," Sociometry, VI (1943), pp. 425, 428.
- Mower, O. Hobart, "Gradients of Reinforcement and Persistent Non-Integrative Behavior," Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics, New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1950, pp. 7-8.
- Norman, Ralph D., "The Inter-relationships Among Acceptance-Rejection, Self-Other Identity, Insight into Self, and Realistic Perception of Others," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII, 174-86.
- Northway, Mary, "Outsiders: A Study of the Personality Patterns of Children Least Acceptable to Their Age Mates," Sociometry, VII (1944), 10-24.
- Patterson, Ruth Melcher, "Classroom Procedures in a Prolonged Pre-academic Program for Mentally Retarded Boys," Journal of Exceptional Children, XV (October, 1948), 15-20.

- Phillips, E. L., "Attitudes Toward Self and Others: A Brief Questionnaire Report," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII, 153-63.
- Redl, Fritz, "Group Psychological Elements of Discipline Problems," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XIII (January, 1943), 77-78.
- Rogers, Carl R., Bill L. Kell and Helen McNeil, "The Role of Self-Understanding in the Prediction of Behavior," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII, 175-86.
- Rubenstein, Eli A., "Personality Integration and the Perceptive Process," Journal of Clinical Psychology, X (January, 1954), No. 1, 23-29.
- Russell, David H., "What Research Say About Self-Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (April, 1953),
- Schneiderman, Leonard, "Anxiety and Social Sensitivity," Journal of Psychology, 1954, p. 39.
- Sheerer, Elizabeth F., "An Analysis of the Relationships Between Acceptance of and Respect for Self and Acceptance of and Respect for Others in Ten Counseling Cases," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (1949), 169-75.
- Stock, D., "The Self-Concept and Feelings Toward Others," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (1949), 176-81.
- Wrightson, J. Wayne, "Assessing Pupils Adjustment by Self-Descriptive and Sociometric Techniques," from Growing Points in Educational Research, pp. 331-35.
- Zelen, Seymour L., Joseph G. Sheehan and James E. Bugental, "The Self-Percept in Stuttering," Journal of Clinical Psychology, X (1954), No. 1.

Unpublished Works

- Bonney, Merl E., "How I Feel Toward Others," A Sociometric Test, unpublished.
- Bonney, Merl E. and Seth A. Fessenden, "Sociograph," California Test Bureau, Los Angeles, California, 1955, unpublished.

- Lorraine, Paul, "Rationalization About Test Performance as a Function of Self-Concept," August, 1954.
- Moreno, J. L., A Seminar in Houston, Texas, Summer, 1951.
- Newberry, A., "A Study of Some of the Factors Involved in Academic Failure," unpublished, Kansas State College Library, 1947.
- Sherif, Muzafer, Panel on Group Dynamics, Southwestern Psychological Association, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1954.

Films

- Neashan, M. E., "The Relationship of Affectivity to Various Measures of Growth in Children," Microfilm, Michigan University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1941.