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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RESEARCHES DONE ON GROUP-STRUCTURE :

2.1 INTRODUCTION :

In this chapter an attempt has been made to review the work that has been done in the area of Group Structure. The review of research literature has its own importance in any research activity. By reviewing the literature, the researcher acquires insight and theoretical perspectives and conceptualization regarding his problems. Various problems and angularities of his own problem could be solved and smoothened and the angularities in the problem can be straightened by the light the review can throw. In the subsequent passages the relevant researches would be described.

America and England are the pioneers in this field. India is still off the starts. Group formation, group behaviour leaders have been the main targets of studies, but not much work has been done particularly in Group Structures.

Presently, the classroom group is achieving more acceptance among social scientists and appear to be becoming another of these so called "field". If one considers, for a moment, the importance this kind of setting has for the socialization of youngsters, just
in time spent each day alone, it is amazing that more social theorists and researchers have not attempted to describe and explain more fully the complex phenomenon found in the classroom. The truth of the matter seems to be that only a very few theorists with a socio-psycho-Educational bias have studied the classroom group structures as an interpersonal setting despite the fact that John Dewey indicated the appropriateness of this early in this Century.

2.2 RESEARCHES DONE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES:

By now the informal aspects of a group affect and its some dimensions should be commonplace to social scientists. Writers such as Moreno (1934), Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), Bion (1948), Stock and Thelen (1958) and others have emphasized the effects on group performance and its bases.

Recently, however, systematic attempt has been made to study the nature of these interpersonal dynamic in the classroom setting. The contents of this research represent an attempt to move towards a more systematic picture of the interrelationships between group phenomenon and individual process in the classroom. The general problem it would consider is how peer group interpersonal process, as it were group structures, can
be linked both conceptually and empirically with interpersonal process and individual status in the classroom setting.

2.2.1. Stability or Consistency in Structure:

The contents of this empirical studies completed on elementary classroom group by Echelberger (1959), Van Egmond (1968) and Lippitt and Gold (1959), indicated among other things, that informal peer relations along interpersonal dimensions such as "liking and disliking" and interpersonal relationships among pupils, in the classroom, achieved stability and structure.

Psychological and Educational literatures actually are filled with studies indicating constancies of sociometric structure over time both in elementary and secondary classroom groups.

Bonney, M.E. (1943) had taken an extensive study of elementary classroom groups over a period of four years, and after making that he reported sociometric status consistency. In study of consistency of sociometric status position in male and female among high school students, Wertheimer (1949) observed sociometric position to be constant from year to year with the sample of high school pupils.

In the study of constancy in sociometric choices, Byrd, E. (1951) made similar conclusions. First he gave
a fourth grade class of twenty seven pupils a sociometric test. He followed this by giving the pupils an actual opportunity to choose in a "real life" situation (for acting together in a play) and finally he retested the same youngsters later with a similar sociometric devices. He did not find the changes from test to life situation. He also found individual social status across conditions appeared to be quite stable.

While Mounton, Blake and Fruchter (1955) in a comprehensive review, concluded that over a period of time the choices status of a person was quite consistent.

All of these studies indicate that stable sociometric structure are conspicuous starting with upper elementary classroom groups through similar high school groups.

2.2.2. Cohesiveness in the Group Structure:

Festinger, L. (1950) had defined the cohesiveness. He said "group cohesiveness is the resultant of all the forces acting on the members to remain in the group." The chief difference between the study of interpersonal attraction and group cohesiveness is that the former emphasizes individual attractions whereas the later emphasizes the number, strength and pattern of attractions within the group. In the study of the
effect of the person-groups and intragroup attitude similarity on perceived group. Good and Nelson (1971) had illustrated differences among cohesiveness and interpersonal attraction. They stated that the attractiveness of the group was positively related to the person's similarity to the group, whereas group cohesiveness was a function of degree of intragroup similarity.

It is generally recognized that greater involvement in group activity and satisfactory social relationships leads to less emotional tension and thus provides a better environment for classroom learning. Hargreaves D.H. (1967) had studied social relations in Secondary school. Lindzey, W. Byrne D (1968) had studied measurement of social choice and interpersonal attractiveness. They tend to promote greater affective ties, and teachers can manipulate the classroom situation to promote greater interaction and thus more interpersonal relationships.

2.2.3. Social Factors and Group Structure:

It is proved that the social factors influence sociometric choices. The studies of high school group indicate social class as a significant factor in informal peer group status. The work of Hollingshed (1945) and Cook (1949) stand as classics in this area.
It is preferred to think of the significant factors, as different cognitive styles and attitudes clusters which get expressed in interpersonal peer group situations and which determine the formation of a sociometric structure. The major point is that personal attributes are at the same time partial causes of consequent sociometric structure and affected by the stable structure that forms.

Stendler (1949) studied the sociometric choice pattern of elementary school children from various socioeconomic class levels, and noted a general tendency for pupils to choose companions from their own socioeconomic level. A finding of special significance in this study was the fact that the nature of the sociometric criterion influence the degree to which socioeconomic class affected the choice pattern.

Sociometric studies by Bonny (1946) Smith (1944) and Lundberg and Beazley (1948) have consistently shown that students of the elementary, secondary and college levels tend to choose associates who have a socioeconomic status similar to their own. An analysis of friendship patterns among an entire high school population, by Hollingshead (1949) revealed similar results. He reported that adolescent cliques tended to follow socio-economic class lines. Bonney and Powell (1949) have systematically observed behaviours of
children with high and low socioeconomic status. They have observed significant differences between high and low sociometric status in some of the areas of behaviours. Bates (1952) studied about some sociometric aspects of social ranking in a small group. In his study he set out to test the hypothesis that there was a positive association between social rank with a sociometric structure and volume of interaction. His results indicate that variation in social rank based on certain criteria of group judgment is closely associated with frequency of interaction.

Bonney and Fowell (1953) found certain differences in the social behaviour of high and low sociometric children exhibited on the first day of first grade life. Those children who eventually became highly acceptable are initially more conforming, smiling, cooperative and are less likely to play alone during free time.

In the study of the analysis of social interaction and sociometric perception, Borgatta (1954) found that high activity in initiation of interaction was highly associated over time, which tended mostly to be effectively positive. Thus, if the individual does not receive positive responses from others, he quickly ceases to interact readily. This indicates that persons
who are highly active generally attract a great proportion of the positive affective behaviour of their co-participants over time. And of course, persons with low interaction rates tend to attract a much smaller amount of positive affective behaviour.

Gold (1958) studied about status in respect to some social factors. In the study of elementary school children, he attempted to find some correlate of high and low power or influence status in the classroom peer group. This findings support the theoretical notion that the more a personal property or attributes is considered a resource by the classroom population, that is, the more a personal attribute is valued by the group the more it is associated with the higher power members of that population. Gold's data indicate that the higher power children are more friendly as a group, more able in terms of their psychological adjustments to be outgoing in social relationships. On the other hand the low power children as a group are quite different. They are, for example, more likely to use physical force as a method of attempting to influence their peers.

Douglas (1983) said 'The nature of friendship groups in adolescence is to substitute the achievement and maintenance of good satisfying socio-emotional
relationships for the task. In other words, the task of the friendship group is to generate and hold onto satisfying relationships.

The studies by Cook (1945), Neugarten (1946), Grossman and Wrighter (1948) and Brown (1954) have shown a consistent tendency for children from homes with a higher sociometric position to have higher sociometric choice status. Where rejection choices were included, it was also reported that children from homes with the lowest socioeconomic position tended to be rejected most frequently on the sociometric test.

Although studies by Bonney (1944) supported these general findings, he noted numerous exceptions when individual cases were analyzed. Some children from homes of relatively low socio-economic status were highly chosen on the sociometric test, because they possessed physical skills, pleasing personal traits, or other social assets. Thus, the group trend reported in most studies can be easily overemphasized when considering individual cases.

A number of sociometric studies do not support the above results. Young and Cooper (1944), Dahlke (1953) and Davis (1957) reported no relationship between children's sociometric status and the socioeconomic level of their parents. Brown and Bond (1955) reported no relationship for boys, but a high degree of
relationships for girls (correlation of 0.82). Although this would seem to suggest that girls are more influenced by socioeconomic status when choosing associates, other studies indicate that this is not the case. Stendler (1949), for example, has shown that boys and girls tend to make similar choices with regard to the sociometric level of the children chosen.

The somewhat contradictory result concerning the relationship between sociometric status and socioeconomic level can probably be partly accounted for by the varying degree of social stratification found in the different communities. In communities where the socio-economic class lines are more sharply drawn and where the residents are more "class conscious" one would expect of socioeconomic status to be reflected to a greater degree in children's sociometric choices. In communities with a less firmly established social structure and where there is less awareness of socioeconomic class differences, a child's sociometric status would be likely to be more influenced by his own personal and social assets and less by his family's socioeconomic position in the community.

2.2.4. Family Size:

Since the family plays a significant role in the personality development of a child, one might expect
certain aspects of family background to be related to sociometric results. Factors such as size of family and position in family are reported in relation to sociometric status.

Bonney (1944) studied the relationship between family size and sociometric results, at both the elementary school level and college level and reported a tendency for highly chosen pupils to come from smaller family units. In harmony with these findings he noted that 'only children' tended to have higher sociometric status than children with siblings.

Although Damrin (1949) also reported a slight tendency of high school girls from smaller families to have higher sociometric status, a number of other studies have indicated no relationships between family size and sociometric results.

The slight tendency for pupils from smaller family units to have higher sociometric status, reported by Bonney and Damrin probably reflect the influence of socioeconomic factors rather than the psychological benefits of having few siblings or of being an "only child".

2.2.5. Status in Family:

The relationship between the position a child holds in his family and his socioeconomic status has been of interest to several investigators. Damrin (1949) showed no relationship between position in
family and sociometric status. He also reported that the age and sex of the siblings were not related to sociometric status. Although Brown (1954) reported to have higher acceptance among peers, no other factors regarding role in the family were found to be significant.

Thorpe (1955) related these two factors in thirty-four school classes and reported a slight tendency for the younger members of families to have higher sociometric status. However, the correlation coefficients were consistently low in all classes, and the opposite relationships occurred in none of the thirty-four classes.

2.2.6. Personal or Psychological Factors:

There is considerable interest in the relationship between sociometric results and the personal characteristics of the pupils choosing or being chosen on a sociometric test. Although cause and effect are not always clear this investigation should provide some insight into the personal factors which influence pupil's sociometric responses.

(a) Age:

Several rather extensive investigations have been concerned with age or grade levels are accepted on a sociometric test. Bedoia (1954) studied the influence
of age on sociometric choices among pupils. He found some association between age and sociometric choices. In similar studies were reported by Morrison and Perry (1956), that the consistent tendency for average children in grades four through six to have lower sociometric status. In grades seven and eight there was no difference in the sociometric status of the average and the above average age children.

(b) Interests:

The interests of individuals seem to play a significant role in sociometric choosing. Marks (1954) compared the interests of highly accepted and least accepted boys and girls at the high school level. In the study those in the highly accepted group received three or more choices as friends, and those in the least accepted pupils showed more social and heterosexual interests than three least accepted as friends. Highly accepted girls had fewer intellectual cultural interests than the least accepted girls, and highly accepted boys had fewer mechanical constructive interests than the least accepted boys. It was suggested that the intellectual interests of isolated girls and the mechanical interests of isolated boys may act both as a cause of their isolation and as a compensation for it.
As with other factors related to the choice process, it is difficult to determine whether individual's consciously choose associates with similar interests. However Austin (1948) and Brown (1954) have extensively studied at both the elementary school level and the secondary school level, have reported that an analysis of pupils, reasons for their sociometric preferences includes a relatively large number of statements pertaining to similarity of interests. Thus similarity of interests seems to be of considerable importance to pupils in their choice of associates.

(c) Achievement:

There are distinct sociometric differences between students with extremely high or low achievement. Gronland (1959) identifies many studies which suggest that high levels of achievement are related to high social acceptance, but the direction of causality is not clear. However, the relationship is stronger where achievement is most highly valued by the group.

Buswell (1953) studied the relationship between social structure of the classroom and the academic success of the pupils. In an extensive study of fifth and six grade pupils he reported that those pupils who were highly chosen on a sociometric test had significantly higher achievement in the basic subject skills than those pupils who were least accepted.
The relationship between sociometric status and achievement tend to follow the pattern of intelligence. It seems likely that achievement is related to social acceptance up to a point. But another possibility, of course, is that being accepted and secure in his social relationships, he is better able to concentrate on his school work and he has greater motivation to maintain a reasonable level of scholastic achievement. This social pressure to achieve and to maintain status is a common phenomenon in group work. Its influence would seem to be greatest among pupils with high sociometric status, since they have the largest number of relations with either group members and consequently a greater source of social pressure.

We can only speculate as to whether achievement contributes to social acceptance or social acceptance contributes to achievement, classroom observations would seem to indicate that both directions of influence are possible and that improvement in one area is likely to result in improvement in the other areas. However, the complexity of the factors entering into both school achievement and social acceptance should make the teacher worry of simple generalizations concerning cause and effects.
STUDY : 1: Feinberg, M.R. "Relation of Background Experience to Social Acceptance", (1953). He studied social acceptance among 2000 pupils of adolescent boys. He studied the number of choices received on a sociometric test. The findings about the main three independent variables like scholastic achievement, skill, and family experiences of pupils were as under:

(i) The most accepted students had higher scholastic averages than those in the least accepted group.

(ii) Both social and physical skill appear to be related to the number of choices received on a sociometric test.

(iii) The parents of pupils with high socioeconomic status tend to be interested in sports and social activities. There is also some evidence that pupils who are rejected by their parents tend to be rejected by their peers.

STUDY : 2: Brown D. "Factors Affecting Social Acceptance of High School Studies" (1954). He studied the 200 most accepted and 200 least accepted students in total population of 1600 high school students. The main aim of the inquiry was to make a comparative study of the status of the high ranked and the low ranked among pupils.

The main findings were as follows:

(i) The most accepted students had higher scholastic
averages than those in the least accepted group.

(ii) The frequency of participation in sports and extracurriculum activities is related to greater acceptance by peers.

(iii) The analysis of pupil's reasons for their sociometric preferences includes a relatively large number of statements pertaining to similarity of interests and values. Thus, similarity of interests and values seem to be of considerable importance to pupils in their choice of associates.

(iv) The pupil who is not highly chosen on a sociometric test is the one who is perceived by the largest number of persons as possessing need satisfying personality characteristics.

(v) A consistent tendency for children from homes with a higher socioeconomic position have higher sociometric choice status.

(vi) He found no differences in high and low sociometric status at family size levels.

STUDY : 3 : Green, T.L. "Studies of Inter-Group Relations in Ceylon (1954) : The problem was to study the relations between Ceylon's sub-cultural groups - 'Unity', 'Amity' or 'Conflict', how these relations come about and what can be done to improve them?"
The work is mainly concerned with group interaction. But, the study throws light on interpersonal relations rather than intergroup relations.

The methods used, included 'observations', 'analysis of written material', 'social distance scale', 'sociometric technique' and 'social concepts tests', etc.

The results are:

1. The 'race' and 'religion-language complex affect interpersonal relations.
2. The interpersonal tensions can be reduced.
3. The vocational attitudes are related to certain aspects of inter-group relations.

2.3. RESEARCHES IN INDIA:


The study tested fortyfour hypotheses concerning relationships between intelligence and interest patterns and differences on these variables among populars, neglectees and rejectees with special reference to sex.

The study was conducted on 234 students of high school, 78 each of populars, neglectees and rejectees. Intelligence was measured by Group Tests of General Mental Ability (Joshi), interest pattern was measured
through Interest Record (Singh) and the sociometric data were collected by using a sociometric questionnaire.

By use of Duncan's Range Test and contingency coefficients, some of the following results were found:

(i) There were significant differences in intelligence between populars and rejectees as well as populars and neglectees.

(ii) There was significant difference in interest among populars, neglectees and rejectees as well as between sex levels.

(iii) The popular boys had significantly greater interest in scientific and social fields; popular girls had more interest in scientific, social and aesthetic fields; neglectee boys were most interested in scientific area and the next was social area, the neglectee girls liked socially aesthetic and scientific area and rejectee girls preferred social, aesthetic and scientific areas.

(iv) Populaters had significantly higher socio-economic status than the neglectees and rejectees.


In all, forty-eight hypotheses were tested
relating to differences among populars, neglectees, rejectees and isolates on various dimensions of adjustments and the other personality dimensions and scholastic achievement.

A sociometric questionnaire was administered to 300 boys and 500 girls of class IX of ten higher secondary schools. The actual study was conducted on 130 boys and 130 girls in which populars, neglectees and isolates were taken. For the achievement purpose percentage of school marks and Adjustment Inventory of Jai Prakash were used.

For the dimensions of scholastic achievement he found:

(i) The populars were superior to all the other three groups on scholastic achievement.

(ii) The neglectee were superior to all the other three groups on scholastic achievement, but they were comparable on scholastic achievement of the isolates.

(iii) Sociometric status was significantly related to the various grades of adjustment.

STUDY : 3 : Badami H. D. and Badami C. H., A study of Group Status in Relation to School Achievement as Revealed by a Sociometric Test (1975).

The main aim of the inquiry was to make a comparative study of the group status of the high ranked and the low ranked pupils among the junior high
schools, and to determine the amount and kind of
to determine the amount and kind of
relationship that existed between the group status as
an individual pupil and his school achievement.

The tool used was a sociometric test suitable for
the high school status. The sample comprised two groups
each of sixtyfive of high ranked and low ranked pupils
drawn from classes V, VI and VII of four schools. Chi-
square and contingency coefficient were computed for
data analysis. The main findings were:

(i) The sociometric scores and the degree of peer
group acceptance - rejection were found to be
positively related with school achievement.

(ii) There was no relationship between the incidence
of mutual choice and the level of school
achievement.

(iii) School achievement played a doubtful role in
determining the group structure of an individual
pupil among his peers.

STUDY : 4 : Joshi H.O., Sociometric Study of the Star
and Isolate Girls (1980).

The study was undertaken to determine whether any
difference existed in respect of selected variables as
personal, psychological and environmental among the
star and isolate girls.

The study was conducted in three randomly selected
schools. A two-choice, two-criteria sociometric test administered to twelve divisions of standard IX. The test criteria were the school behaviour and the index of achievement level in study. Thirty six stars and thirty six isolates were identified from among 700 students. The chi-square technique was used to test the significance of difference between the two groups.

The some of the results were:

(i) The star differed from the isolates in certain personal factors, mathematics and science were their most preferred subjects. They read stories and adventure novels, had games as hobbies, and engaged themselves in science club activities, debates, plays and essay competitions as extra activities.

(ii) They were high achievers. They had interest in studies and preferred technical field as a goal for future vocational field.

(iii) The nearest friend of the stars had a high achievement level and belonged to higher-income families.

2.4 CONCLUSIONS:

The review of the related researches had served a unique purpose. These reviews had thrown light upon the various aspects of research methodology, their analysis and techniques of collection data.
The present investigation deals with the exploration of group structures with their various aspects and patterns. The influence of these may be reflected upon the achievement of the pupils. These would be dealt with in the next chapter with data and their interpretation after testing the various hypotheses.
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