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6.1 Discussion of Results

The results derived from the analysis of the data given in chapter-IV are discussed and conclusion in verification of hypotheses have been presented in this chapter. The results are directly or indirectly in accordance with the various studies available.

From the obtained results it is clear that there are difference of personality patterns in respect of different sociometric groups as measured through Free-Expression Drawings & Paintings. Populars are found emotionally open, combinative in imagination, practical in intellect and dynamic in activity. Neglectees, Rejectees and Isolates are also emotionally open but the difference is there in degree; the populars are having the higher degree of the attribute of openness than that of the other three groups. On the trait of imagination too, populars possess higher degree of combinative imagination than that of the other three groups. In practical intellect Populars, Neglectees and Rejectees possess the same degree of this attribute but Isolates differ from them in degrees. In controlled activity Neglectees and Rejectees are average whereas populars and isolates are below average (vide Table 5.14).

The results of the present study are borne out by LaFontana and Cillesen (2002) results, which revealed significant differences between pupils with high and low sociometric status on some behaviour characteristics.

Cowley, Moore & Flemming (1935), Bonney (1943), Khulen & Lee (1943), Sharma (1970), Choudhary (1974), Arora (1975), Modi (1976), Malik (1978), Malik (1984), Asher & Wheeler (1985), Dubow (1988), Boivin & Begin (1989), Frentz et al. (1991), Pellegrini (1994), Duncan & Cohen (1995), Demir & Tarhan (2001), Sebanc (2003) have also reported differences in personality patterns of different sociometric groups. This study has also indicated fundamental differences on the personality patterns between populars, Neglectees, Rejectees and Isolates. Thus, the first null hypothesis that there will be no difference on the personality patterns of the different sociometric group is rejected.

The second hypothesis in the present investigation is that the difference between the personality patterns of Populars and Neglectees will not be significant. In order to find out whether there is any significant difference in the personality patterns of Populars and Neglectees, means, SDs and t-values are calculated for these two groups. The results obtained are not in accordance with the above hypothesis. The
variables of personality patterns show that the mean scores of Populars and Neglectees are different (vide Table 5.13). On Emotion-Open, the mean score of Populars and Neglectees are 54.63 and 44.03 respectively, on Emotion-seclusive, the mean score of Populars is 38.20 and the mean score of Neglectees is 40.79. On imagination-combinative, the mean score of Populars is 41.61 and the mean score of Neglectees is 35.23 and on creative imagination, the mean scores of Populars and Neglectees are 27.10 and 28.14 respectively.

On practical intellect, the mean score of Populars is 22.37 and the mean score of Neglectees is 20.64 and on speculative intellect, the mean scores of populars and Neglectees are 11.32 and 13.21 respectively. On Dynamic-Activity, the mean score of Populars is 47.48 and the mean score of Neglectees is 43.66. The total mean score of Populars is 263.08 and the total mean score of Neglectees is 251.27.

The analysis of the Table 4B.34 (Groupwise t-ratios on the total score) reveals that on personality patterns the difference between Populars and Neglectees is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. Thus, the second hypothesis that there will be no significant differences on personality patterns between Populars and Neglectees is rejected.

The third hypothesis that no significant difference will be found between the personality patterns of Populars and Neglectees has been rejected in the light of the results obtained. The t-ratios reveals that on personality patterns the difference between Populars and Rejectees is significant at 0.01 level of confidence (refer to Table 4B.34).

The fourth hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between the personality patterns of Populars and Isolates has not been confirmed for the reason that results show significant difference on personality patterns between these two groups. Groupwise t- ratios on the total score reveals that on personality patterns, the difference between Populars and Isolates is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. Thus, the fourth hypothesis is also rejected.

The fifth hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between the personality patterns of Neglectees and Rejectees has also been rejected in the light of the t-ratios obtained. Groupwise t-ratios on the total score shows that on personality patterns, the difference between Neglectees and Rejectees is significant at 0.05 level of significance (refer to Table 4B.34).
The sixth null hypothesis that there is no significant difference will be found between personality patterns of Neglectees and Isolates stands confirmed in the light of the results obtained. The analysis of the Table 4B.34 reveals that on personality pattern, though there is difference between Neglectees and Isolates yet it is not significant.

The seventh null hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between the personality patterns of Rejectees and Isolates is confirmed for the reason that t-ratios on the total score reveals no significant difference on personality patterns between these two groups (refer to Table 4B.34).

The eighth hypothesis that the personality patterns of Populars will not be more acceptable socially than the personality patterns of other groups, is rejected in the light of the results obtained. The populars are having high score on open emotion, viz. 54.63. Neglectees, Rejectees, and Isolates have 44.03, 43.09 and 44.74 respectively (Table 5.13). On combinative imagination, practical intellect, Dynamic Activity, also populars have high mean score (vide Table 5.13). The variable of intelligence shows that mean score of Populars is higher than that of Neglectees, Rejectees and Isolates (mean score of Populars - 52.470, Isolates - 44.07, Neglectees - 43.33, Rejectees - 37.32). Thus, it shows that scores of populars are high on those variables of personality, which are more socially acceptable. This is corroborated by the researches done by Choudhary (1943), Satyaprakash (1968), Gaffar (1971), Modi (1976), Malik (1978), Goldman et al. (1980), Laronen (1981), Kulas (1982), Malik (1984), Kurdek & Lilli (1985), Rubin (1989), Frentz (1991), Bryant (1992), Eronen & Nurmi (2001).

Malik (1984) came to the conclusion that popular students were having good personality as they were found to be more outgoing, intelligent, emotionally stable, assertive, happy go lucky and venture some. Frentz (1991) found that popular students were having good personality characteristics as they were found to be displaying more socially skilled behaviour and fewer behaviour problems than rejected students. According to the study of Duncan & Cohen (1995) the popular children received the most positive ratings while the rejected children received the lowest.

Similarly Eronen & Nurmi (2001) too concluded that Popularity was predicted by a high approach orientation and high sociometric status was related to pro-social
behaviours whereas low sociometric status was associated with behavioural deficiencies.

Beyond doubts high intelligence factor seems to be more potent in populars than other groups. The results obtained in the present study are in agreement with the findings of Johsons & Cripe (1950), Galedar and Coder (1957), Singh (1971), Modi (1976), Malik (1978), Malik (1984), Czerwinska (1984), Czechlik & Rost (1995), Aranha & Rangel (1997).

Johsons & Cripe (1950) have concluded that Isolates and Rejectees have low intelligence than populars. Singh (1971) found that intelligent students are emotionally more open than low intelligence students. Malik (1978) found that Populars were higher than Neglectees in dimension of intelligence and Rejectees were found to be having the lowest intelligence Malik (1984) concluded that on the factor of intelligence the populars were found to be superior to the rest of the sociometric groups. Neglectees were found to be generally low on each variable as compared to the other sociometric groups. Czerwinska (1984) gave the similar results he found the most popular and well liked students to be extremely intelligent. The least like or least popular students were found creative and less intelligent. Czechlik & Rost (1995) too found a positive relation between intelligence and popularity and a negative relation between intelligence and rejection. Thus, we see that above mentioned studies corroborate the findings of the present study.

The ninth hypothesis is that there will not be any correlation between Free-Expressive Drawings-Paintings components and personality patterns. This has also been rejected. The coefficient of correlation between the 32 variables of drawings and paintings and the co-efficient of correlation between eight variables of personality & intelligence is significant at 0.01 and 0.05 levels, thereby rejecting the null hypothesis.

The relationship between the drawing-painting components namely strong lines & symbolism, technical and light base colour, thick stroke and light mixed colour in the group of populars is positively significant at 0.01 level whereas the relationship between variables. Animate & Style, Movement & Dark Base colours, Detail & Soft Lines, Strong Lines and Light Mixed Colours, soft lines and light mixed colour for this group is positively significant at 0.05 level.

For rest of the groups, the relationship between physiognomy & symmetric, atmosphere & symmetric, empty coverage and scribbles, smooth stroke and dark base
colour, style & soft lines is significant at 0.01 level and between variables physiognomy and atmosphere, full coverage & dark base colour, casual stroke and scribbles, physiognomy & curved lines, empty coverage and curved lines is significant at 0.05 level.

On personality patterns the correlation was found between open emotion & combinative imagination, open emotion & dynamic activity, open emotion & total score, seclusive emotion & creative imagination, seclusive emotion & dynamic activity, seclusive emotion & total score, combinative imagination & practical intellect, combinative imagination & speculative intellect, combinative imagination & controlled activity, combinative imagination & total score, creative imagination & dynamic activity, creative imagination & total score, creative imagination & intelligence, practical intellect & speculative intellect, practical intellect & total score, speculative intellect & total score, speculative intellect & intelligence, dynamic activity & total score, dynamic activity & intelligence, controlled activity & total score.

There is sufficient research evidences support the result obtained in the present investigation. Alshuler (1947), Naumburg (1947), Samson (1952), Pathak (1962), Mathur (1971), Modi (1976), Malik (1978), Malik (1984), Jolley & Thomas (1994), Silver (1996), Dicarlo (2000), Wessom & Salmon (2001) and Murayama (2002) had also come to the conclusion that there is correlation between personality patterns and drawing-painting components.

Goodenough (1926) found out the relationship between intelligence & drawing components. Munro, Horvitz & Barnhart (1942) concluded that intelligence is positively correlated with drawing ability. Phatak (1956) predicted the intelligence of children through drawings. Malik (1978) also found out the correlation of intelligence and drawing painting components. Silver (1983) identified intellectually superior children by using a drawing test.

Azad (1991) also predicted intelligence through drawings and paintings. He found that subjects of different intellectual levels had different preferences and disliking for colours, geometrical shapes, and for the location on the tray. Sharma (1993) conducted a study on 24 junior high school students he found the significant effect of intelligence on projective personality of students as the students differed significantly in their projective performance in the selection of different colours and

6.2 Conclusion

The results which are derived from the data collected for the present study given in chapter-III, statistically analysed in chapter IV & V and discussed in chapter-VI, the main conclusions drawn are as follows:

1. On the personality characteristic of Emotion-Open, the Populars fall in high category whereas the Neglectees, Rejectees and Isolates belong to above average category.

2. On the personality pattern of Emotion-Seclusive, Populars and Isolates belong to average category whereas Neglectees and Rejectees belong to above average category.

3. On the personality patterns of combinative imagination, the populars come in high category whereas the rest of the three groups belong to above average category.

4. So far as creative imagination is concerned, the group of populars stands in average category only whereas the other three groups under study belong to above average category.

5. On the personality characteristic of intellect practical all the four groups belong to above average category only.

6. On the personality pattern of speculative intellect all the four groups show average speculative intellect.

7. So far as dynamic activity is concerned Populars and Rejectees belong to high category whereas Neglectees and Isolates come in above average category.

8. On the criterion of controlled activity populars and isolates belong to below average category whereas the group of Neglectees and Rejectees belong to average category.

9. Populars have high scores on some personality variables, viz., they are emotionally more open, more combinative in imagination, they show more dynamism than the other two groups, i.e., group of Neglectees and Isolates.

10. Isolates have been found lower in the order whereas Neglectees and Rejectees have been found almost similar.
On the dimension of intelligence, the populars are higher than the Neglectees, Rejectees and Isolates. Neglectees and Isolates are equal in the scale and Rejectees have been found with low intelligence.

The foregoing discussion leads us to the chief personality patterns of each group which are briefly enumerated below:

1. **Populars**
   - Emotion : Open
   - Imagination : Combinative
   - Intellect : Practical
   - Activity : Dynamic

2. **Neglectees**
   - Emotion : Open & seclusive
   - Imagination : Combinative & creative
   - Intellect : Practical
   - Activity : Dynamic

3. **Rejectees**
   - Emotion : Open & seclusive
   - Imagination : Combinative & creative
   - Intellect : Practical
   - Activity : Dynamic

4. **Isolates**
   - Emotion : Open
   - Imagination : Combinative & creative
   - Intellect : Practical
   - Activity : Dynamic
6.3 **Suggestions for further Research**

Keeping in view the delimitations caused by the paucity of the resources available to individual investigator in general and the lack of time at the disposal of the present investigator in particular, the present study is, an initiation in the field of the research. It, therefore, opens up certain avenues for further research which are briefly listed:

1. In the present research, only four sociometric groups namely the group of Populats, Neglectees, Rejectees and Isolates are taken up. It is suggested that research may also be done on some other sociometric groups such as group of below average students, average students and above average students.

2. The sample in the present study consisted of 100 subjects from each groups taken from four randomly selected districts of western U.P. It is suggested that research may be tried on a larger sample, which may be taken from one or more states of the country.

3. The sample was drawn from four schools of each district under study. It is suggested that from each district, the investigator may choose all the schools to make study comprehensive.

4. This study is based on sociometric groups of adolescents in the age range of 12 to 19 years. It is suggested that research studies may be conducted on adults also or persons are different age groups may be included.

5. The sociometric groups are taken only from the boys, it is suggested that girls may also be taken up or comparison of boys and girls may be made to make the study more comprehensive.

6. In this study the sample has been drawn from urban areas only. In order to make the results more reliable, their comparison can be made by taking the sample from rural areas too.

7. The results of the personality patterns on the basis of free-expression drawings & paintings may be compared with the results of other verbal tests to validate the findings further.

8. The case studies of Populats, Neglectees, Rejectees and Isolates may be compared with the case studies of other group of students for yielding interesting results.
9. Drawing & paintings may also be used to identify exceptional children also. It may also be used for identifying psychic individuals or the individuals with behavioural problems.

6.3.1 Suggestions for the Principals, Teachers & Parents

In the present investigation, the personality patterns of sociometric Populars, Neglectees, Rejectees & Isolates were found out through the Free-Expression Drawing & Paintings. In the light of the present investigation, following suggestions may be helpful for a teacher for making teaching learning process more effective and improving the class room climate:

1. Since a teacher has to deal with groups from five to six periods daily, he should have adequate understanding of 'Syntality' of the group, so that the forces of the group could be utilized for making teaching-learning process effective and for providing better guidance for adjustment.

2. In this study populars have got high scores on intelligence and those personality variables, which are socially more acceptable, viz. this group of students have got high scores on open emotion, combinative imagination, practical intellect and dynamic activity in comparison to the group of Neglectees, Rejectees and Isolates. It may be served as a pointer to the teacher to take care of the deprived group.

3. The teachers should encourage the populars and give them more work so that their energies could be utilized for the betterment. The quality of leadership & co-operation may be developed among them.

4. For bringing rejectees into mainstream, the teacher should find out the causes for rejection. Low intelligence may be one of the possible causes for their rejection.

5. In this investigation, one or two isolates have been found in almost all the classes. The teacher should try to find out the causes of their isolation. The teacher may select few students from the class who show least aversion to the isolates and form an occasional group, small in size of isolates and other promising classmates. The group should be asked to work together on a task, in which the isolates have some hope of success. Success breeds success. Finding a measure of success, the isolates may throw some of the diffidence that made them unpopular.
6. The teacher should pay proper attention on the group of Neglectees also. Their seclusiveness may be one of the possible causes for their being neglected. The teacher should try to find out the other causes also which make them neglected. The teacher may take the help of Popular students to encourage neglectees to participate in group activities so that they could consider themselves as part and parcel of the class, school & ultimately the society and live as active members of the society.

Thus, the teachers should develop cordial and intimate social interaction within the students in order to create healthy and educative atmosphere in the class as well as in the society. For this the help and cooperation of Principals and other staff cannot be underestimated. They should provide teacher their full support when needed.

6.3.2 Suggestions for the Parents

The role and responsibilities of parents too are equally important for the education and proper adjustment of their wards in their school. They should ensure that their wards do not fall in the categories of Neglectees, Rejectees or Isolates. For this, they should be in direct touch with the teachers. They should provide conducive environment to their wards at home also. It is mostly seen that the children from broken families keep themselves aloof and do not like to take interest in group activities. Cases have also been reported that children who are born with some physical deformities become the object of amusement for some people, inspite of having average intelligence and other abilities. This develops the feeling of insecurity among themselves and thus they hesitate to take part in group activities and become neglectees. Parents should see in this direction also. If such a child is born, they should be able to provide him full security, they should never compare him with their other sons and daughters and treat him with gentle hand from very beginning and encourage his participation in group activities in the neighbourhood.

Thus, we see that for improving educational and social climate of the school not only the teachers but also the Principals, Parents and other staff of the school will have to work in collaboration with each other. Only then the teaching can be made meaningful, effective, worthy and relevant to our national needs.