CORRELATES OF GROUP ACCEPTANCE FOR SIXTH GRADE PUPILS

A Thesis M. S.

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia

> In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Science

> > by James L. Mietchen June 1967



mol. Approved for the Graduate Council

Approved for the Major Department

D. Milliams Committee

Committee Member

Quinttee Member

DATL PROCEUSING

401000

MAY 2 9 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTE	ER P	AGE
I.	THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
	The Problem	1
	Statement of the problem	1
	Importance of the study	1
	Hypotheses	2
	Definitions of Terms Used	3
	Group acceptance (sociometric status)	3
	"Looks"	3
	Social distance	4
	Halo effect	4
	Identification	4
	Family size	4
	Teacher checked weaknesses	4
	Assumptions	4
	Limitations of the Study	6
II.	RELATED RESEARCH	8
	Review of Research	8
	Relation of Study to the Previous Research	17
III.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	18
	Introduction	18
	Subjects	1 8
	Instrumentation	18

CHAPTER																	PAGE
Proc	edure .	• •	•	••	••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	20
Anal	ysis of	Data	a	• •	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	21
IV. RESULT	s	• •	•	• •	•••	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	22
V. SUMMAR	Y AND C	ONCL	USI	ons	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	25
Summ	ary	••	•	• •	•••	٠	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	25
Conc	lusions	••	•	• •	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	•••	••	•	•••	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	28
APPENDIX A:	Data F	orm	•	• •	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	32
APPENDIX B:	Social	Dis	tan	ce S	cal	e	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	34
APPENDIX C:	*Looks	" Sc	ale	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	37
APPENDIX D:	Revise	d Sc	ale	for	. Re	ti	ng	00	cu	ipe	ati	Loi	n	•	•	•	40

iv

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Summary of Correlation Coefficients Between	
	Various Factors and Group Acceptance	23

/

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to investigate the factors which differentiated those pupils who were accepted by the group from those who were not, in a classroom situation at two sixth grade elementary classes from a Kansas town of approximately twenty thousand. This has been done to provide insight into possible relationships between these specific factors and group acceptance of an individual in a classroom setting.

Importance of the study. Social development has frequently been stressed as one of the more important functions of the educational process. A function of social development should be manifest in the form of group acceptance. If an elementary school teacher were aware of the specific factors that contributed to group acceptance, it might be possible for her to correct some of the deficiencies of the persons rejected by the group. Hurlock stated,

No child is born social, in the sense that he can get along well with others. He must learn to make adjustments to others, and this ability can be acquired only as a result of opportunities to be with all types 5. A pupil's height is not significantly related to his being accepted by the group.

6. Sex is not significantly related to being accepted by the group.

7. Grades are not significantly related to a pupil being accepted by the group.

8. The pupil's median grade level on the Stanford Achievement Test is not significantly related to his being accepted by the group.

9. "Looks" are not significantly related to a pupil being accepted by the group.

10. The child's family size is not significantly related to his being accepted by the group.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The following terms are defined to enable the reader better comprehension while reading this study.

<u>Group acceptance</u> (<u>sociometric</u> <u>status</u>). The degree to which a person is willingly received or accepted by the group.

"Looks". The personal appearance of a person, as perceived by others, especially of a pleasing nature. <u>Social distance</u>. The degree of intimacy with which a person is willing to associate with another person or group.

<u>Halo effect</u>. The tendency, in making an estimate or rating of one characteristic of a person, to be influenced by another characteristic or by one's general impression of that person in a favorable manner.

<u>Identification</u>. The process of a person accepting another person's attitudes and values because that person is admired.

Family size. The total number of brothers and sisters in the pupil's family.

<u>Teacher checked weaknesses</u>. These include those areas of emotional and social habits, work and study habits, and health and safety habits which are areas on the report card that the teacher evaluates.

III. ASSUMPTIONS

It was assumed that the pupils rated each other honestly on the "looks" and social distance scales. Also, it was assumed that both sixth grade teachers graded their respective classes by common criteria. It was further assumed that each teacher used a comparable frame of

reference in determining the weaknesses of each pupil when grades were assigned. Sociometric instruments are based on several assumptions.

One of these is that within any formal organization, such as that existing in a school class, there is an informal organization based on interpersonal attractions and repulsions, and that these informal relationships greatly affect the official functioning of the group, as well as having important personality consequences for each person in the group. Through sociometric testing these informal organizations can be measured and quantatively described. Another assumption of sociometry is that interpersonal bonds between the members of a group are necessary to good morale and to normal personality growth of the individual.²

It was assumed that the teacher perceived the child in such a manner as would be reflected by the number of checked weaknesses on the pupil's report card and that this was transmitted into the classroom and that the other students were able in some manner to detect this. Another assumption was that the absences indicated on the pupil's report card represented sickness or illness of that child. In addition, one of the underlying assumptions of a coefficient of correlation was that the relationship between two variables under study was linear. The height as given by each pupil was assumed to be accurate. The results on the "looks" scale were assumed to reasonably measure each of the pupil's "looks"

²Merl Bonney and Richard Hampleman, <u>Personal-Social</u> <u>Evaluation Techniques</u> (Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1962), p. 60.

as perceived by the child doing the rating. It was assumed that both the "looks" scale and the social distance scale were valid and reliable.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study had several limitations. One limitation was that the findings could not be generalized to all sixth grade populations or to even other sixth grade classrooms in the same city under study. It consisted of intra-group comparisons and did not have any sampling methods applied to the population; therefore, it probably was not representative of sixth grade children as a whole.

Also, any group structure is not static, but is the product of continuous interaction. Groups are continually undergoing change and therefore the sixth grade population of this study was viewed in that context. The study represented the dynamics of the group at the time the data was obtained and it should not be assumed that the same relationships exist at any future point in time.

A further limitation was that no research was found relative to the "looks" scale and therefore it may not be highly reliable or valid.

The limitation of the correlation coefficient must also be acknowledged. This is that even though the two factors are related one did not necessarily cause the other, but could have done so.

A final limitation was that all data from both classes were consolidated to form one group for the purposes of determining correlations for this study. The fact that two teachers were involved may have resulted in different meanings by each teacher when the grades were assigned and when weaknesses were identified.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

I. REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Man is a social as well as a biological animal. Broom and Zelznick wrote, "the way men behave is largely determined by their relations to each other and by their membership in groups."¹ Much of a child's social learning appears to result from indirect influences. Bandura and Huston stated,

Although part of a child's socialization takes place through direct training, much of a child's behavior repertoire is believed to be acquired through identification with the important adults in his life. This process, variously described in behavior as 'vicarious' learning, observational learning, and role taking appears to be more a result of active imitation by the child of attitudes and patterns of behavior that the parents have never directly attempted to teach than of direct reward and punishment of instrumental responses.²

The classroom teacher would quite probably be one of the significant adults in the child's life. Hurlock wrote.

In the early grades, the influence of the teacher is the most important single factor in the total school influence on the child's personality.

¹Leonard Broom and Philip Zelznick, <u>Sociology</u> (third edition; New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 15.

²Albert Bandura and Aletha Huston, "Identification As A Process of Incidental Learning," <u>Readings in Child</u> <u>Development and Personality</u>, ed. Paul Mussen, <u>et al</u>. (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 247.

Directly, the teacher affects the way the child feels about himself by the way she corrects his behavior, ignores him or his social behavior, or by the way she interprets his school work. Indirectly, she influences his personality by helping him to adjust to the group and by helping the group adjust to him, thus influencing the degree of social acceptance he achieves.³

The children in a classroom situation act and react to the teacher's actions. If a teacher continually reacted to a child in a favorable manner, would this create a halo effect for the child as interpreted by the rest of the class or would the class think of this child as a "teacher's pet"? The number of weaknesses that a teacher perceives in a child, as indicated by the child's report card, could have an influence upon the child being accepted by the group because it would be probable that the children in a class would perceive the teacher's attitude toward that child in that classroom setting. Flanders and Havumaki have done related They used two groups of 330 tenth grade students. research. In one group the teacher praised them individually while the other half was praised as a group. They found that the persons whom had been given the praise individually received an increase in sociometric choice value indicating greater

³Hurlock, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 563.

acceptance by the peers.4

The groups' acceptance of the child may be determined by a social distance scale. This scale was developed by Cunningham who wrote, "perhaps the greatest contribution of the Classroom Social Distance Scale to us was to indicate the great range of acceptance or rejection afforded to any one individual in the group."⁵ Cunningham found little significant correlation between group acceptance and intelligence quotient for fourth and fifth grade levels.

Bonney studied mutual friendship pairs of second and third grade children in Denton, Texas, during the school years of 1939-1940, and 1940-1941. He found,

Correlations between the various degrees of attraction and rejection and intelligence quotients showed that generally the closer the degree of mutuality the higher the coefficients, but that all the correlations were low. Relationships between total mutual friendship scores and intelligence quotients ranged from .02 to .51 with an average from six coefficients of .34. These data show that although the higher degrees of brightness are definitely associated with the ability to win friends, intellectual brightness is far from being any kind of a guarantee of social competence.⁶

⁴Ned Flanders and Sulo Havumaki, "The Effect of Pupil-Teacher Contacts Involving Praise on the Sociometric Choices of Students," Journal of Educational Research, LI (1960), 68.

⁵Ruth Cunningham and others, <u>Understanding Group</u> <u>Behavior of Boys and Girls</u> (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951), p. 172.

⁶Merl E. Bonney, "A Study of the Relation of Intelligence, Family Size, and Sex Differences with Mutual Friendships in the Primary Grades," <u>Child Development</u>, XIII (1942), 97. Although Bonney used mutual friendship pairs rather than group acceptance it is significant because it is individuals, pairs of individuals, or groups of individuals that are the components of "the group".

Thorpe obtained somewhat the same results as Bonney. He used Thurstone's Primary Mental Abilities Test and treated the five subtests separately and correlated these with what he called popularity or sociometric status. Thorpe stated, "an estimate of the over-all correlation found in this research between sociometric status and intelligence is .152 with a standard error of .034."⁷ His sample consisted of thirty-four high school classes with a total of nine hundred and eighty. The mean age was twelve years eight months, and had a standard deviation of sixteen months.

Hardy found a somewhat higher relationship between intelligence and group acceptance.

Results from measures of mental alertness and school achievement point to the general superiority of the best liked pupils. Not a single pupil among the preferred companion representatives had an I.Q. below 90 while twenty-nine per cent had I.Q.'s of 120 or above.⁸

⁷J. G. Thorpe, "An Investigation into Some Correlates of Sociometric Status Within School Classes," <u>Sociometry</u>, XVIII (1955), 60.

⁸Martha C. Hardy, "Social Recognition at the Elementary School Age," <u>Journal of Social Psychology</u>, VIII (1937), 376.

Another variable that might have some relationship to group acceptance is that of the socio-economic background of the pupil. Several researchers have investigated such a factor.

Cunningham in her study of fourth and fifth grade children found little or no significant correlation between group acceptance and socio-economic status for those levels.⁹

Hurlock stated,

By the fifth grade, children also take into consideration socio-economic status in the selection of their friends. While children of the lower social classes have more freedom of choice in the selection of their friends than do children of the middle classes whose parents put pressure on them to choose the 'right' type of friends, nevertheless the lower-class child often finds himself barred from participation in social activities of the middle-class. He is thus forced to select his friends mainly from his own social class.¹⁰

Hardy found little relationship between socioeconomic status and popularity.¹¹

Little research can be found which relates incidence of illness with group acceptance. A somewhat related study was done by French, however, in determining the status of Naval recruits in their company. He found that sick bay

⁹Cunningham, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 174.
¹⁰Hurlock, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 298.
¹¹Hardy, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 380.

attendance was negatively related to status in the company, that is, sick bay attenders were less acceptable as liberty companions.¹²

Hardy in her study wrote,

There is a strong indication in the comparative results from the health measures that the pupils who were socially most successful were very likely to have the highest health ratings. The differences are not always large enough to warrant definite conclusions but the trend of the findings is consistent.¹³

Size is another factor. Hardy's research indicated,

Size did not appear to be a significant factor in the amount of recognition given to an individual. The trend of the findings was the same whether or not the socio-economic factor was controlled. The most popular cases tended to deviate in both directions from the average and these deviations did not appear to be related to sex. Short boys and tall girls were noted among the best liked representatives, as well as tall boys and short girls.¹⁴

Sex is often a factor thought to influence group acceptance. Hurlock wrote,

While it is true that there are popular boys just as there are popular girls in any age group, there are indications that girls, as a group, enjoy greater popularity than do boys. Among nursery-school children, girls have been found to be more popular than boys. Among older children, girls at every age are generally more highly socialized than boys of that age and, as a result, make better social adjustments.¹⁵

¹²R. L. French, "Sociometric Status and Individual Adjustment Among Naval Recruits," <u>Journal</u> of <u>Abnormal</u> and <u>Social</u> <u>Psychology</u>, XIII (1951), 72.

> ¹³Hardy, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 377. ¹⁴<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 379. ¹⁵Hurlock, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 312.

Other researchers tend to support Hurlock's position.

Bonney, for example, studied sex differences in pupil choices. This researcher stated, "the results on sex differences show a consistent superiority in favor of girls over boys in social success as measured by pupil choices."¹⁶

Hilkevitch gives additional insight into sex differences. In studying twenty-six boys and twenty-nine girls he found that there were sex differences. He concluded that boys tended to choose other boys who complemented their own personality patterns. Girls on the other hand, choose other girls who had similar attributes rather than differences.¹⁷

Grades have been viewed in relation to group acceptance. Hardy wrote,

School marks recorded by the teacher on daily performance showed three times as large a proportion of the best liked were given high marks as of the total pupils. There can be no question, from these results that these best liked children were mentally capable and scholastically efficient.¹⁸

Ryan studied the relationship between social acceptance and school grades for 326 students at a suburban

¹⁶Bonney, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 98.

¹⁷R. Hilkevitch, "Social Interactional Processes: A Quantative Study," <u>Psychological Report</u>, VII (1960), 201.

¹⁸Hardy, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 376.

senior high school.¹⁹ He found that a small and positive relationship existed between grades and acceptance.

Carew supports this same conclusion. He found in his study of the 205 men college students that there was a tendency for high grade point averages to be related to the degree that an individual was accepted by the group.²⁰

In regard to "looks", Hurlock wrote,

While younger children are not so "looks-conscious" as they will be when they reach the age of adolescence, they are not unaware of the attitudes of others toward physical attractiveness and unattractiveness. Looks are taken into consideration in the selection of friends and leaders, even though this factor may play a minor role, as compared with the role it plays during the adolescent years.²¹

Hardy wrote,

In light of the emphasis placed by certain psychiatrists upon the influence of physical inferiorities on behavior patterns of the individual, it is interesting to find that two-thirds of the group called socially successful were described as having an attractive appearance while less than one-fifth of the unpopular were so described. Conversely, while five per cent of the best liked were classified as 'homely', the proportion in the other cases was twenty-six per cent of the unpopular, and fourteen per cent of the total group observed. The differences were large and make

¹⁹Frank Ryan and James Davie, "Social Acceptance, Academic Achievement, and Aptitude Among High School Students," Journal of Educational Research, LII (1958), 106.

²⁰Donald Carew, "A Comparison of Activities, Social Acceptance, and Scholastic Achievement of Men Students," Journal of Personnel Guidance, XXXVI (1957), 124.

²¹Hurlock, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 313.

it evident that in regard to physical beauty the children whom others liked and chose as their best liked playmates were as a group attractive.²²

The total size of the family is a factor in which many researchers have tended to look as a possible influence upon group acceptance. Thorpe related sociometric status or popularity to the number of siblings in the family.²³ He found that the family size was not significantly related to sociometric status for nine hundred and eighty school subjects with a mean age of twelve years and eight months.

Damrin studied one hundred and fifty-six girls in grades nine to twelve.²⁴ She related family size to social acceptance for these girls. She found a $-.220 \pm .051$ correlation existing between these two factors.

Bonney, however, found,

The results on family size showed a consistent superiority in social success for the only child. This held true regardless of how the data were analyzed. The only child not only held an advantageous position in mutual friendships but also in unreciprocated friendships. This also held true on the basis of total mutual friendship scores. Furthermore, teacher ratings on twenty personal traits were consistent with pupil choices in giving the only child the most favorable social position.²⁵

²²Hardy, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 378. ²³Thorpe, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 57.

²⁴Dora E. Damrin, "Family Size and Sibling Age, Sex, and Position as Related to Certain Aspects of Adjustment," Journal of Social Psychology, XXIX (1949), 101.

²⁵Bonney, <u>loc</u>. <u>cit</u>.

No related research was found that related achievement test scores with group acceptance.

II. RELATION OF THE STUDY TO THE PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The review of related research provided guidelines which gave direction to this study and suggested valuable hypotheses to be explored. However, much of the related research articles were a number of years old and therefore, they did not conform to current situations. This study went beyond previous related research in that it was contemporary. Also, it was determined if these findings agreed with the previously established findings for elementary as well as other age group populations. Finally, achievement test scores were studied in relation to group acceptance since no related research was found in the literature. acceptance was determined from the social distance scale as used by Cunningham.¹ A numerical score was obtained by giving arbitrary weighting to each of the items. The final score was determined by adding the checked number as rated by each pupil for every other pupil. The higher the total score on this scale for each student the greater was his acceptance by the group. This scale is found in Appendix B. page 34. Reliability and validity studies were not found for this instrument. Appendix C. page 37. contains the "looks" scale. Validity on this instrument was established by using a consensus of judgement in the wording of the scale from five college instructors. In Appendix D, page 40. is found the revised scale for rating occupations as devised by Warner, Meeker and Eells.² Each occupational scale was weighted and each "rating assigned to occupation" was multiplied by one for the highest occupation and by seven for the lowest occupation. The lowest score indicated the highest socio-economic occupation for the father. In effect, the pupil's total score was the classification number assigned by Warner to the occupation, squared. Table I, page 23.

¹Cunningham, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 172.

²W. Lloyd Warner, <u>Social Class in America</u> (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949), p. 140. contains a summary of the correlation coefficients between various factors and group acceptance.

IV. PROCEDURE

The data were collected from each pupil's cumulative folder. This information was transcribed onto the Data Form (Appendix A, page 32). The cumulative folder contained all of the information that the Data Form required except the individual's score on the "looks" and social distance scale. The "looks" scale (Appendix C, page 37) was given by the classroom teacher according to the directions which had been provided. Each pupil rated every other pupil, including himself, on the standard IBM 503 sheet for this five point scale according to how the rater thought each pupil looked. The social distance scale (Appendix B. page 34) is also a five point scale and each pupil rated each other in the same manner as they used on the "looks" scale. Each question on the Data Form was given a numerical value of which was derived from the breakdown for the raw score for each question as is shown on the Data Form. After all of the data had been gathered numbers two to eleven on the Data Form were correlated with number one on the same form. The correlations determined which factors were most significantly related to group acceptance.

V. ANALYSIS OF DATA

Pearson's product moment coefficient of correlation was used to determine the relationship between the factors stated in the hypotheses as related to group acceptance. The values to be used in the correlations were found on the Data Form (Appendix A, page 32). A summary table was constructed to show the obtained correlations (Table I, page 23).

The coefficient of correlation represents a ratio which expresses the degree to which changes in one variable are accompanied by changes in a second variable. It also summarizes the magnitude and direction of the relationship between two sets of measurements, such as weight and height based on the same persons, or between the same measurement on pairs of persons. There are two main cautions of the coefficient of correlation. The first is that it cannot be interpreted directly as a percentage. Secondly, correlation does not necessarily mean causation. While correlation does not necessarily mean causation, it provides a basis for clues which may be used for a more formalized hypothesis.³

³Julian C. Stanley, <u>Measurement in Today's School</u> (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp. 89-92.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results showed that there were significantly high, positive relationships existing between intelligence, grades, median grade level, "looks", occupation of the father and the criterion, group acceptance. The respective coefficient of correlations between these variables and group acceptance were .47, .61, .56, .70, and -.38. These data are presented in Table I. The scale for occupational rating of the father was devised in such a manner that the higher his numerical rating was, the lower would be his occupational level. Therefore, the -. 38 correlation between the father's occupation and group acceptance, although negative, actually indicated a low positive trend. Teacher checked weaknesses, incidence of illness, height, ser, and total number of siblings were not shown to be significantly related to group acceptance. Also, there were no significant sex differences. However, the sex differences occuring in the variables of teacher checked weaknesses, incidence of illness, and median grade level approached significance. With the criterion excluded, the following high, positive relationships were found: intelligence and grades, intelligence and median grade level, grades and median grade level, grades and "looks", median

									Varia	ble* (
ariable*	Mean	S.D.	Range	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	86.32 1.01 107.28 19.88 3.44 59.69 1.51 3.55 7.11 2.76 84.32	21.52 2.85 12.93 12.76 3.89 2.93 .50 1.01 1.73 1.85 21.98	40-119 -17 75-133 1-49 -19 53-68 1-2 1-5 3-12 -9 42-125		21	.47 26	38 04 31	22 12 17 05	15 09 25 .16 .10	.06 27 .21 .10 .16 .10	.61 +.38 .73 26 12 11 .38	.56 33 .74 29 07 .06 .27 .80	31 01 09 .16 .27 31 .05 15 18	.90 30 .41 34 15 16 04 .58 .53 20
.3541 .32 .2732 RIABLES*	Signif Signif Signif	ficant a ficant a ficant a	t 0.01 t 0.02 t 0.05											
Ratin Teach I.Q. Occup Total Heigh Sex Grade Perce Total Ratin	g on Soci er Checke ation of Number o t s ntile Rar Number o g on "Loo	al Dist d Weakn Father of Days nk on St of Sibli oks" Sca	ance Sca esses of School anford Ac ngs le	le (C l Mis chiev	Froup A ssed vement	.ccepta Test	nce)							

SUMMARI OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN VARIOUS FACTORS AND GROUP ACCEPTANCE

grade level and "looks", and "looks" and intelligence. Sex -- where male equaled 1 and female equaled 2 -- and grades had a significant positive relationship but the magnitude of the coefficient was not very great. Teacher checked weaknesses had a significant, positive relationship with grades but the magnitude again was not very great.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

Fifty-two sixth grade pupils from a midwest city of approximately twenty thousand comprised the sample in this investigation which was designed to determine the effects of teacher influence, intelligence, occupation of father, incidence of illness, height, sex, grades, median grade level on achievement test, number of brothers and sisters and "looks" upon pupils' acceptance by the group as measured by the Bogardus type social distance scale.

Table I revealed the following:

1. Teacher checked weaknesses had a low, negative relationship with group acceptance, but the coefficient did not reach significance.

2. Intelligence had a significant, positive relationship with group acceptance; the magnitude of the coefficient was moderate.

3. The occupation of the pupil's father had a significant, positive relationship with group acceptance, but the magnitude of the coefficient was moderately low to low.

4. Incidence of illness had a low, negative relationship with group acceptance, but the coefficient did not reach significance. 5. Height had a low, negative relationship with group acceptance, but the coefficient did not reach significance.

6. Sex had a low, positive relationship with group acceptance, but the coefficient did not reach significance.

7. Grades had a significant, positive relationship with group acceptance; the magnitude of the coefficient was comparatively high.

8. Median grade level on the Stanford Achievement Test had a significant, positive relationship with group acceptance; the magnitude was comparatively high.

9. The total number of siblings had a low, negative relationship with group acceptance, but the coefficient did not reach significance.

10. "Looks" had a significant, positive relationship with group acceptance; the magnitude was high.

There were no significant sex differences, but teacher checked weaknesses, incidence of illness and median grade level did approach significance.

II. CONCLUSIONS

It was concluded that the pupil's "looks", as perceived by ones class peers, was a very significant variable in determining the extent to which any particular pupil was accepted by his group. In addition, grades and achievement appeared to contribute more to group acceptance than did intelligence as measured by the Kuhlmann-Finch Intelligence Test even though intelligence appeared to contribute significantly toward group acceptance. Since "looks" were more highly correlated with grades than with intelligence, it appeared that the "better-looking" made better grades even though they were not necessarily more intelligent. Therefore, it was concluded that the better grades were influenced by the fact of being accepted by the group. Group acceptance appeared to foster academic success. BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Bandura, Albert, and Aletha Huston. "Identification As A Process of Incidental Learning," <u>Readings in Child</u> <u>Development and Personality</u>. Paul Mussen (ed.) <u>et al</u>. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Bonney, Merl, and Richard Hampleman. <u>Personal-Social</u> <u>Evaluation Techniques</u>. Washing, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1962.
- Broom, Leonard, and Philip Zelznick. <u>Sociology</u>. Third edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Cunningham, Ruth, and others. <u>Understanding Group Behavior</u> of Boys and Girls. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.
- Hurlock, Elizabeth B. <u>Child Development</u>. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Stanley, Julian C. <u>Measurement in Today's School</u>. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, <u>et al.</u> <u>Social Class in America</u>. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.

B. PERIODICALS

- Bonney, Merl E. "A Study of the Relation of Intelligence, Family Size, and Sex Differences with Mutual Friendships in the Primary Grades," <u>Child Development</u>, XIII (1942) 79-100.
- Bonney, Merl E. "Relationship Between Social Success, Family Size, Socio-Economic Home Background, and Intelligence Among Children in Grades III to V," <u>Sociometry</u>, VII (1944), 26-39.
- Carew, Donald. "A Comparison of Activities, Social Acceptance, and Scholastic Achievement of Men Students," Journal of Personnel Guidance, XXXVI (1957), 121-124.

- Damrin, Dora E. "Family Size and Sibling Age, Sex, and Position As Related to Certain Aspects of Adjustment," Journal of Social Psychology, XXIX (1949), 93-102.
- Flanders, Ned, and Sulo Havumaki. "The Effect of Pupil-Teacher Contacts Involving Praise on the Sociometric Choices of Students," <u>Journal of Educational Research</u>, LI (1960), 65-68.
- French, R. L. "Sociometric Status and Individual Adjustment Among Naval Recruits," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, (1951), 64-72.
- Hardy, Martha C. "Social Recognition at the Elementary School Age," Journal of Social Psychology, VIII (1937), 365-384.
- Hilkevitch, R. "Social Interactional Processes: A Quantative Study," <u>Psychological Report</u>, VII (1960), 195-201.
- Ryan, Frank, and James Davie. "Social Acceptance, Academic Achievement, and Aptitude Among High School Students," Journal of Educational Research, LII, 101-106.
- Thorpe, J. G. "An Investigation into Some Correlates of Sociometric Status Within School Classes," <u>Sociometry</u>, XVIII (1955), 49-62.

VPPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

/

Name	Teacher
1.	Rating on Social Distance Scale
2.	Teacher Rating: Total number of X's for
	Period
3.	I.Q. Name of Test
4.	Socio-Economic Status:
	a. Father's Occupation
	b. CLASSIFICATION NO squared = SCORE
5.	Days of School missed
6.	Height (inches)
7.	Sex Male = 1 Female = 2
8.	Grades Received for Period
	<u>No.</u>
	$\underline{\qquad A's received x 5 = \underline{\qquad A = 5}$
	B's received x 4 = B = 4
	$\underline{\qquad C's received x 3 = \underline{\qquad C = 3}$
	D's received x $2 = D = 2$
	F's received x 1 = F = 1
	TOTAL
	Average Grade Point = <u>Total</u> No. Hours
9.	Median Grade level on Stanford Achievement Test
10.	Total Rating on "looks" scale
11.	Total number of siblings

APPENDIX B

/

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

Teacher Directions:

Here is a list of everyone in our class. I want each of you to darken in the number (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) on the answer sheet for the one that bests describes how you feel about that person.

For example, you "would like to have him as one of my best friends." As you see on your example you would darken in number 5.

Take your time and give your honest opinion. When you come to your name go ahead and rate yourself.

No one will know how you rated anyone.

Keep your eyes on your own paper. Are there any questions? If not, you may begin.

EXAMPLE:

1.	John Doe	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Would like	to have him as one of my best friends.
4.	Would like close fri	to have him in my group, but not as a end.
3.	Would like or for a	to be with him once in awhile, but not often long time.
2.	Don't mind have anyt	his being in our room, but I don't want to hing to do with him.
1.	Wished he w	eren't in our room.

NAMES

1.	14.
2.	15.
3.	16.
4.	17.
5.	18.
6.	19.
7.	20.
8.	21.
9.	22.
10.	23.
11.	24.
12.	25.
13.	26.

APPENDIX C

LOOKS SCALE

Teacher Directions:

Here is another sheet somewhat like the first one. Darken in the number that best describes that person. Mark just one for each person.

For example, you think John Doe is <u>Very Good-Looking</u> so you darken in number 5. If you thought John Doe was <u>Very Bad-Looking</u>, you would have darkened in number 1.

Take your time and give your honest opinion. When you come to your name go ahead and rate yourself.

No one will know how you rated anyone.

Keep your eyes on your own paper. Are there any questions? If not, you may begin.

EXAMPLE:

1. John Doe 1. _____ 2. ____ 3. ____ 4. ____ 5. ____ 1 = Very Bad-Looking 2 = Somewhat Bad-Looking 3 = Neither Bad-Looking or Good-Looking 4 = Somewhat Good-Looking

5 = Very Good-Looking

NAMES

1.		14.
2.		15.
3.		16
4.	١	17.
5.		18.
6.		19.
7.		20.
8.		21.
9.		22.
10.		23.
11.		24.
12.		25.
13.		26.

APPENDIX D

			REVISED	SCALE FOF	RATING OC	CUPATION			
	Rating Assigned to Occupation	Professionals	Proprietors and Managers	Business Men	Clerks and Kindred Workers, Etc.	Manual Workers	Protective and Service Workers	Farmers	
₩	-	Lawyers, doctors, dentists, engineers judges, high-schoo superintendents, weterinarians, ministers (gradu- ated from divinity, etc. with post- etc. with post- etc. with post- etc. with post- etc. with post-	Businesses valued at \$75,000 and over 5,000 and ver 7,000 and	Regional and divisional anan- agers of large fi- nanciel and indus- trial enterprises	Certified Public Accountants	•		Gentleman farmers	
N K	64	High-school teach ers, trained nurses chiropodists, chiro practors, under- taters, ministers (some raining), mewspaper editor- therarians (gradu- ate)	Businesses valued at \$20,000 to 575,000	Assistant managers and office and do- partment managers of large businesses, assistants to execu- tives, etc.	Accountants, sales- men of real estate, of insurance, post- masters	•		Large farm owners, farm owners	
к С		Social workers. Frade-school trate, uptome- trate, librarians (not graduate), undertaker's assist ante, ministers (no training)	Businesses valued at \$5,000 to \$20,000	All minor officials of businesses	Auto salesmen, bank clerks and cashiers, postal clerks, scercuries to executives, su- pervisors of rail- noad, telephone, etc., justices of the prace	Contractors		•	
×	•		Businesses valued at \$2.000 to \$5,000		Stenographers, bookkeepers, nural mail elerts, rail- road ticket agents, sales people in dry goods store, etc.	Factory foremen, electricians own plumbers busi- carpenters ness watchnakers	Dry cleaners, butchers, sheriffs, railtoad engineers and conductors		
× v	ou		Businesses valued at \$500 to \$2,000		Dime store clerks, hardware salesmen, beauty operators, telephone operators	Carpenters, plumb- ers, electriciuus (apprentice), timekcepters, line- men, telephone or telegraph, radio re- pairmen, medium- skill workers	Barbers, firemen, butcher's appren- tices, practical auros: policemen, seanstresses, cooks in restauran, bar- teaders	Tenant farmers	
x 6	80	•	Businesses valued at less than \$500			Moulders, semi- skilled workers, assistants to car- penter, etc.	Baggage men, night policemen and watchmen, taxi and watchers, taxi ants, waitresses in restaurant	Small tenant farmers	
× 7	F	;	· ·	•		Heavy labor, mi- grant work, odd- Job men, miners	Janitors, scrub- women, newsboys	Migrant farm Inborers	
	To obtain number b times it	n the soc y the wei self. Fo	lo-economi ghted valu r example,	c score, te beside if John	multiply t it. In ea Doc's fath	he "ratin ch case there the contract of the case	g to assig his will b lawyer, Jo	ncd occupat e the numbe hn's socio-	1 on" r

,