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SUMMARY

Relations with others can be the source of the deepest satisfaction and of the blackest misery ................
Many people are lonely and unhappy; some are mentally ill, because they are unable to sustain social relationships with others. Many everyday encounters are unpleasant, embarrassing or fruitless, because of inept social behaviour. Many of these difficulties and frustrations could be eliminated by a wider understanding and better training in skills of social interaction. Evidence has suggested that there are negative consequences associated with having few friends or low level of acceptance by peers; thus sociometric measures may be good predictors of psychological risk. Children whose sociometric status is low are more likely than their peers to be identified as deviant (e.g., school dropout, mental health problems) during adolescence and adulthood. Low status children are often characterized as socially incompetent and at risk for adjustment problems. Impaired peer relationships are what brings most patients to psychotherapy.

Keeping in view the importance of interpersonal relations, the present study was conducted in two phases.

Phase - I

Objectives

The main objectives of Phase-I of this study were as follows:
1) it intended to study the relationship among sociometric status scores derived from three sociometric criteria;

2) it proposed to study surface and structural relationship between measures of sociometric status, intelligence, personality, and motives;

3) it intended to compare the structure of sociometric status at preadolescent age with the adolescent stage of development;

4) it intended to study whether the correlates of sociometric status remain the same or not at preadolescent and adolescent age levels;

5) it intended to study whether the correlates of sociometric status remain the same or not for different sociometric criteria; and

6) to compare 'populars' and 'rejectees' on different measures of intelligence, personality, and motives.

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were formulated:

1) The measures of sociometric status derived from different sociometric criteria are not identical;

2) All the fourteen personality characteristics, ten motives, and intelligence would be found relevant for sociometric status;
3) The relevance of intellectual, personality, and motivational variables for sociometric status will undergo significant change for different sociometric criteria. More precisely speaking, intellectual, personality, and motivational correlates of sociometric status will be different for different sociometric criteria.

These hypotheses derived their rationale from a vast majority of investigations which have made use of pooled information on different sociometric criteria. It is just possible that a person who is a desirable companion in one social-interactional situation may not be desirable in the other social-interactional situation. By pooling information on different social-interactional situations (sociometric criteria), differentiation of sociometric status is lost (Moreno, 1960).

4) The relevance of intelligence, personality, and motives for sociometric status will undergo significant change from preadolescent to adolescent age levels.

So far as this hypothesis regarding change in the relevance of intelligence, personality, and motives for sociometric status at various stages of development, is concerned, the following observations seem to be in order:

1) Horrocks (1955) remarked that: adolescence is both a way of life and a span of time in the physical and psychological development of an individual. It represents a period of growth and change in nearly all the aspects of the child's physical, mental, social,
and emotional life. It is a time of new experiences, new responsibilities, and new relationships with adults as well as peers;

ii) Speaking in the same vein, Hurlock (1967, p.2) professes that studies of adolescents have revealed that there is a marked difference in the behaviour patterns of the young and the older adolescents; and

iii) Taylor (1952) emphasized that different factors might underlie sociometric status of an individual at different stages of life.

5) There will be significant difference in populars and rejectees on personality, motives, and intelligence.

Sample

The study was carried out at two age levels, comprising preadolescent and adolescent girls. The age in the preadolescent sample ranged from 11-13 years (Mean : 12.37, S.D.: 0.86); whereas, in the adolescent group, the age ranged from 15 to 17 years (Mean : 16.30, S.D.: 0.94). The description of the sample follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preadolescent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following tests were used:

A) Sociometric Status Measure;
B) Hindi version of Junior-Senior High School Personality Questionnaire, Form A (Kapoor and Mehrotra, 1967);
C) Culture Fair Intelligence Test: Scale 2, Form A (Cattell and Cattell, 1960);
D) Hindi version of School Motivational Analysis Test (Singh, 1975); and

The analysis was carried out separately for preadolescent and adolescent groups. For each subject, 30 types of scores were available. These were:

1) Sociometric status scores on the three sociometric criteria;
2) Scores on 14 personality factors and 10 motives;
3) Scores on neuroticism and extraversion; and
4) Scores on measure of general intelligence.

In view of the objectives of Phase-I of the investigation, the relationship between the measured variables, was studied, both by correlational technique and factor analysis.

Comparison of Extreme Groups (Popularts and Rejectees)

Keeping in view the sociometric status scores concerning different sociometric criteria, two groups were selected to form 'popularts' and 'rejectees' with respect to each sociometric criterion separately. This was done separately for each group. The individuals falling above $P_{75}$ were termed as 'popularts', whereas, those below $P_{25}$ were labelled as 'rejectees'.

The two groups of 'popularts' and 'rejectees' were compared in relation to their scores on different measures by making use of the t-test of significance.
CONCLUSIONS:

The main findings of Phase I are:

1) The measures derived from sociometric rating scale, Junior - Senior High School Personality Questionnaire, School Motivational Analysis Test, Junior Personality Inventory, and Culture Fair Intelligence Test: Scale 2, Form A are fairly reliable;

2) The sociometric criterion referring to playing together during recess is functionally different from the other two sociometric criteria (sitting in the classroom and working together in the craft period). There is slight overlap in the sociometric status scores derived from sociometric criterion I (sitting in the classroom) and sociometric criterion III (working together in craft period);

3) For both preadolescent and adolescent age levels, the findings of the present study justify the separate use of the three sociometric criteria instead of pooling the sociometric status scores based on three sociometric criteria;

4) Different analyses carried out in the present study reveal that personality characteristics, motives, and intelligence are relevant for sociometric status at the preadolescent and adolescent stages.
of development. However, different factors emerged to be relevant for different sociometric criteria as well as different age levels.

(A) Preadolescent Age Group

i) Four variables namely, intelligence, Factor Q₃ (uncontrolled vs controlled) and two motives, designated as, self-concept and home have turned out to be significant correlates of sociometric status pertaining to first sociometric criterion;

ii) three personality factors, namely, Factors C (affected by feelings vs emotionally stable), I (tough-minded vs tender-minded), and J (zestful vs circumspect individualism); and one motive designated as home have turned out to be relevant correlates of sociometric status pertaining to sociometric criterion II (playing together during recess);

iii) four personality factors, designated as, extraversion, Factors E (obedient vs assertive), J (zestful vs circumspect individualism), Q₂ (socially group-dependent vs self-sufficient); one motive: Home; and intelligence have emerged to be relevant correlates of sociometric status concerning sociometric criterion III (working together in craft period);

iv) the measures pertaining to intelligence and one motive designated as 'home' have appeared to be relevant
correlates of sociometric status in case of both first and third sociometric criteria;
v) the significant correlates of sociometric status derived from second sociometric criterion (playing together) undergo a drastic change in comparison to the other two sociometric criteria. The significant correlates of sociometric status derived from second sociometric criterion are: Factors B (less intelligent vs more intelligent), C (affected by feelings vs emotionally stable), I (tough-minded vs tender-minded), J (zestful vs circumspect individualism) and home. The relevance of home for second sociometric criterion (playing together) is different from the relevance of home in the case of Sociometric Criteria I & III.

(B) Adolescent Age Group

i) One personality characteristic, namely, Factor Q₃ (uncontrolled vs controlled); two motives designated as self-concept and home; and intelligence have emerged to be relevant correlates of sociometric status concerning sociometric criterion I (sitting in the classroom);

ii) one personality variable, namely, Factor G (disregards rules vs conscientious), and three motives designated as mating, narcissism, and school-sentiment have emerged to be significant correlates of sociometric status in the case of second sociometric criterion (playing together during recess);
iii) four personality factors, designated as extraversion, Factors E (obedient vs assertive), J (zestful vs circumspect individualism), Q₂ (socially group-dependent vs self-sufficient); one motive; Home; and intelligence have emerged to be relevant correlates of sociometric status concerning sociometric criterion III (working together in craft period).

5) The correlates of sociometric status for different sociometric criteria have been found to be different;

6) The relevance of personality characteristics, motives, and intelligence from the viewpoint of sociometric status undergo change from the preadolescent to adolescent age level. More precisely speaking, the correlates of sociometric status for preadolescent and adolescent age levels are different;

7) The measures of extraversion and neuroticism as derived from Junior Personality Inventory are insignificantly correlated both at the preadolescent and adolescent age levels; and

8) The correlations between fourteen personality measures as derived from Junior - Senior High School Personality Questionnaire are in the expected direction both at the preadolescent and adolescent age levels.
Phase II

The main objective of Phase II of the study was to assess whether sociometric status can be predicted from intelligence, personality, and motives. It was hypothesized that sociometric status scores concerning different sociometric criteria can be predicted from relevant variables pertaining to personality, motives, and intelligence.

To predict sociometric status scores concerning different sociometric criteria from relevant correlates multiple regression equations were developed from the intercorrelations obtained in Phase I. These regression equations were used in Phase II to predict the sociometric status scores of preadolescent and adolescent girls separately for different sociometric criteria.

Subjects

The subjects for Phase II comprised preadolescent and adolescent girls. The age in the preadolescent sample ranged from 11 to 13 years (Mean: 12.11, S.D.: 0.98); whereas, in the adolescent group, the age ranged from 15 to 17 years (Mean: 16.08, S.D.: 0.90). The detailed description of the sample follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>