CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 **Social Interaction**

According to Bonner (1953) man is truly and fundamentally a social being, not by virtue of any biological endowment but by reason of his participation in a social group. From the moment of his birth he comes in contact with some persons and as he matures, the area of his social interaction develops the very essence of his personality and makes him truly a social being. It is through social interaction that a man modifies his own behaviour and brings changes into that of another for the mutual gratification of both.

The dictionary of Sociology (1958) has defined the term "Social Interaction" as social process when analysed from the standpoint of the inter stimulations and responses of personalities and groups. It is a two way process whereby each individual or group stimulates the other and in varying degrees, modifies the behaviour of the participants. According to Malik (1978) it is now an established fact that no two individuals are alike in all the characteristics of their personality. There are chances that two individuals may have similarities in most of the characteristics
but still they are apt to differ on some points and these differences in their personality are manifested in the way they act while interacting in the group or the society. The society is a formation of groups of individuals and the individual is the non-separating, permanent constituent atom of the society. Without the individual's existence, the thought of any society would be meaningless. When the individual is in the society and he interacts in it, there are chances of his being accepted as a leader or to accept the role of a follower. There are some individuals, who are neglected by the group, some are rejected and still, there are some who are neither rejected nor accepted by the group; and they themselves keep aloof from the group and live in the society as isolates.

Malik (1973) mentions that the central task of the school is to help pupils to learn skills and assimilate information effectively and economically. The term learning is no more confined to intellectual learning but also includes 'motor learning', 'social learning' and 'emotional learning'. Moreover, effective teaching in schools is done in groups and in classes, and learning takes place within the setting of student-student relationship. All teachers and educators recognize that an individual student's academic, social and emotional growth can be
affected favourably or adversely by his position among class fellows and that all students stimulate or thwart each other in many ways. Therefore, the teacher must know the mentality of the group (class personality) besides knowing the child's personality and the subject matter in order to teach them. The teacher should also know how to direct group forces so that they work for learning in order to vitalise the teaching/learning process. He can do much to create an atmosphere and provide leadership and encouragement in building up a group in which all students can gain a type of acceptance by satisfying many personal needs as well as removing obstacles to learning. In this way social, emotional and intellectual conditions for learning by students can be more evenly developed and more adequately integrated and good mental health of class can be ensured.

According to Shamsa (1970) when children are grouped on the basis of adequate information about the individuals in the class, they can develop qualities of leadership, cooperation, responsibility and democratic living. As the children work in groups, they may discover that learning is not just wisdom to be accepted passively as it emanates from the teacher rather the valuable learning can take place when individuals join forces as members of a group. In group situations, children
discover that people working together can usually accomplish more than one person alone as they can plan some of their learning experiences, grow in self direction and learn to evaluate their progress.

1.2 Man and Society

According to Evans (1962) in recent years awareness has been growing of the influence exerted on the behaviour and development of human beings by the groups to which they belong. Very few people live in complete isolation from their fellows, and the normal individual in our society is a member of a variety of groups, most of which are small. Indeed the fundamental social unit is a small group, the family.

For very young children life is bounded by the family, but as they grow older and go out into the world, they become aware of their membership of a wider society composed of fellow countrymen, the whole human race. Nevertheless, most people continue to function as members of the wider society. A child is a member of his class at school before he realizes himself as a member of the school, and his life is lived mainly in his classroom with only brief excursions into the assembly of the whole school. Later as an adult, he may become an employee of a firm or
organization, but he lives his working life in a workshop or office group. In the leisure hours he may be a member of a team or a social group, and if he belongs to a Church, he actually lives his Church life as a member of a local congregation, and is probably more aware of this membership than of the wider Church of which it forms a part. If he falls sick he may find himself among a group of people in a hospital ward or in some other kind of therapeutic group. In old age he may return to the shelter of his family group or he may seek refuge in a home for old people. From the cradle to the grave we are members of small groups.

According to the report of the Secondary Education Commission (1952-53) "The special function of the secondary school is to train persons who will be able to assume the responsibility of leadership in social, political, industrial or cultural fields with the proper functioning of democracy. It is to be hoped that leadership will be increasingly drawn from the masses." Malik (1978) holds that in every society we find types of persons. But in a class where populars facilitate the teaching-learning process it is a challenge for the teacher how he organizes them and how best he uses their abilities and capabilities.

1.3 What is Sociometry?

According to Evans (1962) the term has been subjected to
considerable criticism. From analogy, both terms biometrics and psychometrics might be concerned with the measurement of social behaviour."

Moreno (1953) and Chapin (1940) have analysed the word sociometry into "socius", translated by Moreno as companion and by Chapin as social, and derived either from the Latin metrum or Greek metron meaning 'a measure'. From this point on there appears to be a divergence of opinion, Moreno using the word in a narrower and Chapin using it in a wider sense. The term sociometry has been derived from Latin and it means social or companion measurement.

Moreno (1953) has said that 'Sociometry deals with the mathematical study of psychological properties of populations, the experimental technique and the results obtained by the application of quantitative methods. This is undertaken through methods which inquire into the evolution and organisation of groups and the position of individuals within them'. According to this definition sociometry is concerned only with the social structure of groups and not with such topics as the measurement of attitudes, interests and personality qualities of the individuals who compose them.

Chapin (1940) on the other hand, defined sociometrics as the 'study and the use of social measurements' into three
categories:
- Psychometrics or psychological measurements.
- Demometrics or measurements of large units of population.
- Sociometrics, including (a) scales to measure the interaction process within social groups and (b) those that attempt to measure the family group and the home environment.

It will be seen that Moreno's use of the word sociometry is confined to the third of Chapin's categories. It seems to be further restricted in practice to what Chapin described as 'procedures that attempts to measure informal friendship constellations and seems to get at the latest cultural patterns of a group of people'. This appears to be a very narrow field, but it cannot be denied that Moreno and his followers have developed effective instruments and techniques for its study and have been responsible for making available a considerable amount of interesting and useful material about the structure and development of groups, and about the ways in which these can be modified.

Several different approaches in sociometric work are mentioned by Moreno (1937). There is first a research procedure, in which the aim is to study the organization of a group or groups. Secondly, there is the diagnostic procedure where the aim is to classify the positions of individuals in
a group of a wider community. Thirdly, there is what may
be either a therapeutic or political procedure aimed at
helping individuals or groups to a better adjustment. Lastly,
there is what Moreno calls the complete sociometric procedure
where all these approaches are united. The instrument used
to obtain the information needed for the application of any
of these procedures is the sociometric test.

1.4 Sociometric Testing and Its Implications:
The sociometric test is a technique for measuring the
extent to which individuals are accepted by other group
members and for determining the internal structure of a
group. In its administration, it requires individuals to
choose a given number of associates for some group situation
or activity (the sociometric test was first administered in
a school setting by the founder of sociometry, Moreno). The
basis of the choice is commonly called the sociometric question
or the sociometric criterion. Regardless of variations in
the sociometric test it is basically a method of evaluating
the feelings of the group members towards each other with
respect to a common criterion. The number of choices that
each individual receives is referred to as his sociometric
status, his social status or his group status. The pattern
of choices to and from individuals, revealing the network
of interpersonal relations among group members is called
the sociometric structure, the social structure or the group structure. This structure of choice patterns is commonly presented in the form of diagram, with the group members represented by lines drawn between the figures. Such graphic representation of the sociometric structure of a group is referred to as a sociogram. The term sociogram is frequently confused with the sociometric test and is used as a synonym for it. However, the sociometric test is the method used to evaluate the group structure and sociogram is merely one method of presenting the results.

It may be considered that Moreno (1955) made too high sounding a claim when he wrote:

"The aim of sociometry is to help in the formation of a world in which every individual whatever his intelligence, race, creed, religion or ideological affiliations, is given an equal opportunity to survive and to apply his spontaneity and creativity within it."

According to Gronlund (1959) "Through the measurement of the attractions and rejections between the individual group members the sociometric test is uniquely adopted to the study of the social structure of groups. When the network of choices is presented in the form of sociogram, the pattern of interpersonal relations becomes readily apparent. Mutual friendships, small cliques of pupils cleavages between
sub-groups and general patterns of group integration and disintegration are easily identified by the classroom teacher. Thus, the sociometric test provides an objective basis for identifying interpersonal conflicts and improving the inter-personal relations of group members. Recognising that a closely knit clique of pupils is disrupting the efficiency of the classroom, regrouping procedures may be utilised. Identifying cleavages between social, religious, rural-urban, or socio-economic status groups may indicate the necessity of putting special emphasis on programmes to integrate the divided fractions.

A general lack of mutual attraction among pupils and a disintegrated group structure might reflect a highly competitive and hostile classroom atmosphere arising from autocratic teaching procedures. Better integration may result from the introduction of group work and teacher-pupil planning.

It is, of course, recognised that the sociometric test does not indicate why resulting social structure is present in the classroom, neither does it specify the therapeutic procedures necessary for improving interpersonal relations. Like any diagnostic tool it merely identifies the present situation. However, it does provide a graphic representation of interpersonal relations among pupils which is not available by other methods. Combined with classroom
observations and other diagnostic information, the sociometric test serves as a firm base for improving social structure of groups.

Gronlund (1959) further maintains that the modern teacher's increasing concern with the social and emotional development of his pupils has resulted in the need for an objective approach to improved social relations in the classroom. Sociometry has provided the basis for such an approach. Through sociometric testing the teacher is able to analyze the social relations among class members, to organize classroom groups which have a beneficial effect on pupils' social relations, and to evaluate the social development of individual pupils when combined with other educational procedures. The sociometric test can also make constructive contributions to the solution of many of the educational problems faced by teachers, supervisors, counselors and administrators."

According to Bonney (1943) "It has been pointed out that using the sociometric test will make teachers more aware of the importance of interpersonal relationships among their pupils."

According to Gronlund (1959) "A Study of the internal structure of the group will provide hunches concerning the pattern of the classroom interaction, the emotional climate
of the group, and the problems of learning and adjustment of individual pupils. It will also provide a basis for organizing classroom groups and for evaluating attempts to improve the social structure of the group or the group status of individual pupils. Within this general framework, there are a number of specific purposes for which the sociometric test is especially useful in a school setting.

According to Gronlund (1939) "Since Moreno's original use of the sociometric test in the public schools, its use has spread to prisons, industry, summer camps, and various other places where interpersonal relations are considered important. All communities have been studied by means of the sociometric technique. Institutes of sociometry have been developed in several countries. Despite the widespread use and acceptance of sociometry, the most extensive use of the sociometric test has been in school settings. Teachers and research workers alike have used this technique to study the extent to which individual pupils were accepted by their peers and to analyze the social structure of the classroom groups. It is a simple and convenient device for measuring various aspects of social relations that previously were neglected or were evaluated by teacher's judgement. The ease with which it can be constructed and administered makes it a practical instrument for use by the regular classroom teacher.

In addition to the simplicity and the convenience
of the sociometric test, its increased use in school settings is due to several merging forces. The recent stress placed by modern education on social adjustment has made the classroom teacher more conscious of the social development of his pupils. Cartwright & Zander (1953) and Hare, Borgatta and Bales (1955) have pointed out the implications of group structure for the effective functioning of group (Findings from small group research). Anderson and Brewer (1946), and Lippitt and White (1943) have indicated the influence of the emotional climate of groups on the learning and behaviour of individuals (studies of group leadership). It has also been shown by Jean (1956) that emotional isolation affects adversely the quality, quantity and attitude towards learning behaviour of individuals.

Taba (1955) has pointed out that the quality of participation in peer culture affects the development of basic life orientation and if educators do not pay any heed to this important factor during the formative years of life there is a likelihood of great damage to the personality of the pupil.

Authorities in human development like Havighurst (1950) and Olson (1949) have stressed the value of social relations in the normal development of personality. Likewise,
mental hygienists like Lindgren (1953), Redl and Wattenberg (1951) and Shaffer and Shohet (1956) have emphasized the importance of being accepted by others in the attainment of good personal and social adjustment.

Bonney (1943), McCandless, Boyd & Marshall (1957) and Olson (1946) have pointed out that the social status or other interpersonal relationship patterns in a group tend to remain the same unless otherwise modified. Moreover, acceptance scores of one group tend to remain unaltered in the other similar groups. Bonney (1943), Kuhlen and Lee (1943) and Northway (1946) found that pupils who are isolated or rejected by the group are generally characterized as possessing socially ineffective behaviour patterns or withdrawal tendencies which interfere with their social adjustment. Charles (1948) and Olson (1946) found out that the emotional isolation from the group on the other hand has a tendency to lead to unhappiness, insecurity and neurosis. Thelen & others (1953) found out in a study that the group containing more mutual friends had a significantly higher level of involvement in the task and were free to express and workout real feelings and did more work.

Recent text books in educational psychology by
Blair, Jonas and Simpson (1954), Cronbach (1954) and Lindgren (1956) have pointed out the inextricable relationship between the learning and adjustment of individual pupils and their position in the group structure. These emerging forces have created a need for a practical instrument to study the structure of classroom groups. The sociometric test, to a large extent, satisfies this need.

1.5 **Sociometric Categories**

According to Sharma (1970) "On the basis of sociometric analysis students can be classified into following sociometric categories i.e., popular, above average, average, below average neglectee, isolate and rejectee, based on the sociometric status score they received". In the present study only four extreme categories namely populars (stars), neglectees, rejectees and isolates have been taken into account.

**Star**: According to Oronlund (1959) the term star refers to an individual who receives a large number of choices on a sociometric test, Moreno (1934) reported that some of the pupils "attracted so many choices that they captured the center of the stage like stars". Bronfenbrenner (1945) later made the definition more specific by indicating that a star was any individual who received more choices on the sociometric test than could be expected by chance alone. He developed
a table of scores indicating the number of choices it would be necessary to receive, with various choice limits, in order to be placed in the star category.

**Isolate:** The isolate is an individual who receives no choice on a sociometric test. Although he is a physical member of the group, he is psychologically isolated from the other members of the group. He is also sometimes referred to as an Outsider or a "social island", although these designations are not as common as the term isolate.

**Neglectee:** This term is used to identify the individual who receives relatively few choices on the sociometric test. Although he receives some choices, he tends to be neglected by the majority of the group members. Bronfenbrenner (1945) also clarified this term by indicating that a neglectee was any individual who received fewer sociometric choices than could be expected by chance. Where three choices are used with three sociometric criteria, any individual receiving one to three choices would be classified as a neglectee. Neglectees are also referred to as "fringers", since they are located on the fringe of the group.

**Rejectee:** The rejectee is an individual who receives negative choices on a sociometric test. Negative choices are those resulting from requesting individuals to indicate those
whom they least prefer for a group activity. This term is commonly confused with the term isolate. However, the isolate receives neither positive nor negative choices on a sociometric test. In short, he is truly isolated from the group, since he attracts no attention from the group members. The rejectee on the other hand may receive no positive choice from the group, but he does receive negative or rejection choices. Thus, he attracts attention from the group members, but the attention is of reactive nature. The confusion between these terms has probably arisen from the fact that negative sociometric choices are seldom used. Consequently, some of the individuals receiving no positive choices are true isolates, whereas others would be rejectees if negative sociometric questions were introduced. Without the use of negative questions the rejectees cannot be identified. Therefore, where only positive sociometric questions are used, the isolates would include some unidentified rejectees. The two terms, however, have distinct meanings and cannot be used interchangeably.

The method of classifying popular, above average, below average, neglectee and isolate is given in Table 1.1 based on Bronfenbrenner's (1945) fixed frame of reference.
TABLE 1.1
CRITICAL RAW STATUS SCORES FOR DIVERSE SOCIOMETRIC SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of choices received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>15 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>10 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>4 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglectee</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bronfenbrenner (1945) worked out critical sociometric status scores for varying number of choices with up to three sociometric criteria. The upper limit which identifies populars was fifteen or more choices. The average or expected number of choices was nine. In the present study, to identify popular, above average, average and below average, the upper limits were used. The lower limit which identifies neglectee consists of three or less choices. These critical raw sociometric status scores given in the table 1.1 are applicable to any group which consists of not less than ten and not more than fifty members. Thus, the values of upper and lower limits and the expected value remain fixed for groups of varying size, and this quality of the 'fixed frame of reference' permits a comparison of the distribution of students in different sociometric
categories of different classes of a school directly even though the size of classes is different. No doubt, it is assumed that the criteria employed and the number of choices allotted for each criterion remains the same for all the classes.

Further, the values of upper and lower limits of the 'fixed frame of reference' are statistically significant at .03 and .02 levels respectively. It allows one to say with reasonable degree of confidence that students categorised as populars and neglectees have been placed in the proper sociometric category.

Negative Choices (Rejections): According to Sharma (1970), the teacher or counsellor should be concerned about those who received three or more rejections.

1.6 Objectives Of The Study

The following objectives were formulated for the present study:

1. To compare the intelligence of populars, neglectees, isolates and rejectees.

2. To find out the difference in achievement, if any, in respect of four sociometric categories.

3. To explore the adjustment of populars, neglectees, isolates and rejectees.
4. To make a comparison of the socio-economic status, in respect of sociometric stars, neglectees, isolates and rejectees.

5. To find out, if any relationship exists in intelligence achievement, adjustment and socio-economic status of different sociometric groups.

1.7 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be tested in this study:

1. The differences in the intelligence of populars, neglectees, isolates and rejectees will be statistically significant.

2. Achievement varies directly with the sociometric status of the children i.e., children with high sociometric status will have high achievement.

3. On the dimension of adjustment the populars will come at the top when compared to other sociometric groups.

4. The socio-economic status is positively related with the sociometric groups of adolescents. Higher the sociometric status, higher is the socio-economic status.

5. There will be a positive correlation among the variables of intelligence, achievement, adjustment and socio-economic status.
1.8 Statement of the Problem

"A study of intelligence, achievement, adjustment and socio-economic patterns of different sociometric groups of adolescents".

1.9 Delimitation Of The Study

The study has been delimited with respect to the following considerations:

- The area of the study is the city limits of Jullundur. To cover the whole city all the four zones i.e., north, south, east and west and the centre have been taken.

- The period of adolescence only has been selected in view of the fact that the adjustment patterns get manifested by this period of development. The sample has been drawn from the adolescent girls and boys in the age group of 14+ studying in IX class of Government and Private schools of Jullundur City.

- Out of the different types of sociometric categorization only four groups, namely populars, neglectees, isolates and rejectees have been taken up for the study since these contribute extreme groups on the sociometric scale.

1.10 Justification Of The Variables

The variables which have been taken under study are
intelligence, achievement, adjustment and socio-economic status. The relationships between these variables and sociometric categories have been found along with the inter-correlations between the variables of intelligence, achievement, adjustment and socio-economic status.

Some studies have been conducted to find out the relationship of intelligence with sociometric status.

Jenkins (1931), Bonney (1943, 1944) and Laughlin (1954) found little direct relationship between intelligence and degree of acceptance of the peers. Johnson (1950), Johnson and Kirk (1950), Bonney & Powell (1953), Bonney (1955), Grossman & Wrighter (1948), Barbe (1954), Haber (1956), Gallagher and Crowder (1957), Singh (1963), Calogero (1965), Shinkum (1966), Yamamoto (1966), Sharma (1966), Sharma (1970), Baboo (1973), Singh (1975), Modi (1976) and Malik (1978) conducted studies to find out the relationship of intelligence with sociometric status. The researcher has taken up the variable of intelligence to find out if there exists any relationship between intelligence and sociometric status.

The second variable understudy is achievement in respect of different categories of children on the sociometric dimension. Bonney (1943) and Laughlin (1954) found correlation .14 to .36, in various school subjects and sociometric status. Grossman & Wrighter (1948), Buswell (1953), Brown (1954),
Falnberg (1953), Ohlsen and Dennis (1951), Bonney (1955),
and Smith (1945) and Sharma (1970) reported that the pupils with
high sociometric status had higher achievement (scores)
than those pupils who were least accepted.

Bhargava (1964) found that the correlation between
achievement and social status was positive. Baboo (1973)
exhibited positive and low correlation between social
acceptance and achievement.

The studies quoted above give different research
evidences ranging from high to low and show the relationship
between sociometric status and achievement. Lindsey and
Urdan (1954), however, reported no relationship between
sociometric status and achievement. Laughlin (1952) found
that academic achievement was of less importance in determi-
ing social acceptance or rejection.

One variable considered significant for the present
study pertains to the adjustment of the pupils. This has
been taken in view of reported positive relationship of
this variable with the sociometric status. Many studies
have been conducted to establish the relationship between
adjustment and sociometric status.

Bonney (1955) and Bonney & Powell (1953) indicated
that the highly chosen children were more active and flexible
in their social relations than were the children with low
sociometric status. Olson (1949) and Bonney (1947) concluded that the highly chosen pupils were clearly superior in adjustment to the pupils with low sociometric status. Jennings (1950) noted significant differences when the behaviour descriptions were compared with the results of a sociometric test. Schoeppe and Havighurst (1952) established that good peer relations were found to correlate significantly with adjustment. Bonney, Hoblit and Dreyer (1953) indicated better social adjustment for those individuals who were highly chosen on a sociometric test.

Bonney (1943), Kuhlen & Lee (1943), Laughlin (1954) and Gronlund and Anderson (1957) reported significant differences between pupils with high and low sociometric. They found pupils with high sociometric status to be significantly superior on both personal and social behaviour descriptions. Potashin (1946) found that acceptance by others was a strong factor making for good personal adjustment. The studies of Grossman and Wrighter (1948), McCllland & Ratcliff (1947) and Kuhlen & Bretsch (1947) showed that the children who were not well accepted had more social problems. Northway and Wigdor (1947) found the unaccepted groups appeared to be more severely disturbed, than either of others. Hallworth (1952) found no evidence that the children of average sociometric status were less neurotic than those of high or low status.
Sharma (1968) found that the populars were more adjustable in school and neighbourhood. Mathur (1966), Arora (1967), Gaffar (1971), Bayti (1972) and Arora (1975) showed better social adjustment for those individuals who were highly chosen on a sociometric test. Sharma (1970) found that the populars had better adjustment than the isolates in five areas - home, health, social, emotional, school and on the whole. Bhargava (1964) found that the stars tended to exceed the average by social participation, and better mental health. Prasad (1966) reported that there were significant differences in the personality patterns of the socially acceptable and non-acceptable adolescents in terms of their social and family adjustment. Mehra (1980) concluded that the popularity among classmates and social adjustment were related to each other significantly.

These studies indicate the difference of personality patterns and hence adjustment of populars and others. But whether the other categories on the sociometric dimension are also different from each other on the variable of adjustment has not been spelt out clearly by these researchers. The study of populars, neglectees, isolates and rejectees on this dimension may perhaps yield useful results.

Another variable considered significant for the present study pertains to the socio-economic status of the
pupils. This has been taken up to study the relationship of this variable with the sociometric status of different individuals.

Cook (1945), Neugarten (1946), Davitz (1955), Bonney (1946), Smith (1944), Lundberg and Beasley (1948), Hollingshead (1949) and Stendler (1949) revealed that there was a general tendency amongst the children to choose friends from their own socio-economic level. Brown and Bond (1955) reported that boys and girls have different patterns of sociometric choices. They found no relationship between socio-economic level and sociometric choices for boys but they found a very high correlation for the girls. Abrahamson (1952) found that the students from higher social class backgrounds tended to receive higher social class acceptance scores. Studies by Brown (1954), Grossman and Wrighter (1948), Neugarten (1946), Stendler (1949) and Bonney (1944) have shown that children from homes with the lowest socio-economic status tended to be rejected most frequently on the sociometric test. Davis (1957), Dahlke (1953) and Young & Cooper (1944) reported no relationship between the sociometric choices and the socio-economic level of the children. The studies of Smith (1945), Gustad (1952), Grossman & Wrighter (1948) and Becker & Loomis (1948) showed the extent to which socio-economic status influenced a child's popularity. Singhal (1960), Gulati (1965) and Baboo (1973) showed that socio-economic status influences social acceptability.
The above studies by analogy lead us to the conclusion that the socio-economic status is a relevant factor in interpreting the sociometric status of the students.

Intelligence as a variable has been taken up for investigation on another count i.e., because of its close relationship with scholastic success. It has been found on the basis of different studies that correlations between intelligence and academic achievement, range between .10 to .90. Chauncey (1929) has reported correlation of .593, John (1930) exhibited correlation of .60, Edds and McCull (1933) showed correlation ranging between .315 to .600, and Murray (1938) got correlation of .70. McClelland (1942) showed correlation of .804. According to Pintner (1945) the coefficients of correlation ranged between .26 to .60 with a few below .40; Louttit (1947) reported median coefficients of correlation in different subjects — .60 in Reading, .55 in arithmetic, .50 in spelling, .40 in handwriting. Carter (1948) gave correlation of .78; Lennon (1950) showed correlation of .72 in grade VIII and .67 in grade VII and IX, Ellis (1951) found correlation ranging between .40 to .75; Froelish and Hoyt (1959) reported correlation of .30 to .80; Emmett (1945) exhibited correlation of .743; Cain et al (1952) got correlation coefficient of less than .50;
Wolking (1955), Shinn (1956) and Wellman (1957) showed correlation of .70; Fleschere (1963), Klausmeier & Weirama (1964) and Edwards & Tyler (1965) reported correlation of .70; McCandless & Roberts (1972) found correlation of .45; Crano et al (1972) exhibited correlation of .781 and .770; Thurstone (1925), McPhail (1925), Toops (1926) and Edds & McCall (1933) have reported correlation ranging from .315 to .600; Harris (1940) concluded correlation ranged from .33 to .64; Rosenfield & Namzak (1938), Keys (1940) and Hillhartz & Huston (1941) found correlations ranging from 0.31 to 0.35; Travers (1949) has stated multiple r's of 0.6 or 0.7; Brown (1950) found the correlation of .41 and Carter (1950) reported the correlation coefficient of about .51.

Similar studies have been conducted in India also. Doseh (1958) found the correlation of .60 for mathematics, .60 for General Science and .39 for the first language; Shukla (1958) reported correlation of .71 in Gujarati, .52 in English, .53 in second language, .46 in History, .45 in Geography, .62 in Mathematics, and .46 in Science; Rai (1958) reported correlation of .93 in Hindi, .54 in English, .47 in History, .45 in Geography, .38 in Maths, and .02 in Arts of Class VIII; Januar (1955 & 1959) reported the correlation of .34; Rith in 1959 (r.293); Mishra et al in 1960 (r .31) and Purandare (1961) found a low correlation. Rao, 1965 (r.80), Hundal et al (1972) reported moderately and high correlation/ Passi (1971) found correlation ranging from .422 and .462.

Kundu (1962) reported a correlation of ranging -.106 to +.499.

These studies, except one indicating negative relationship, report varying degrees of positive relationship that exists between intelligence and achievement.

Many studies have been conducted to establish the relationship between achievement and adjustment. For instance, Burt (1917), Terman (1925), Richmond (1929), White (1932), Stagner (1933), Thompson (1934), Fischer (1943), Assum & Levy (1947), Martin (1952), Berger & Sutker (1956), Rishton (1957), Heilbrun (1960), Centi (1962), and Cattell & Butcher (1968) identified the influence of adjustment on the success in academic achievement. They concluded that adjustment and achievement are closely and directly related to each other.

On the other hand Prescott (1938), Crow & Crow (1942), Mangass and Woodward (1949), Gough (1953), Sutton (1961), Suinn (1965) and Robinson (1966) reported the importance of emotional factors in scholastic success.

But no significant results were obtained by Griffiths (1945), whereas Evans (1930) reported no correlation between success in college and emotional stability.

The variable socio-economic status has been taken up for another count also, because of reported positive relationship of this variable with the other variables.
under study i.e., intelligence and achievement. For instance the studies of Clark (1927), Bear (1928), Terman and Oden (1947), Kimball (1953), Malloy (1955), Drews and Teahan (1957), Rossi et al (1959), Frankel (1960), Brim (1960), Impellizzeri (1961), Curry (1962), Lindgren & Guedes (1963), Anderson and Evans (1969), Guthrie (1971), Quick (1972) and Stedman & Adams (1972) explored that socio-economic status has a positive effect on achievement.

Coleman (1940) found the correlation of .300 in the eighth and .353 in the ninth grade, Gerberich (1957) found a correlation of +.437. Majoribanks (1972) exhibited a correlation of .38 between achievement and socio-economic status.

Some studies have also been conducted in India when socio-economic status as a variable has been taken up with achievement. It is noticed that achievement scores decrease consistently as the level of socio-economic status decreases. Higher the socio-economic status higher is the achievement. The studies by Gagdil & Dandekar (1955), Raghvacharyulu (1957), Deb (1958), Sharma & Kalra (1960), Sinha & Misra (1960), Sinha (1960), Chitkara (1961), Kaur (1961), Choudhri (1963), Fairtheman (1963), Sinha (1966), Jamuar (1963), Gupta (1973) and Dutt & Sabharwal (1973) bear testimony to the above contention.
Mishra et al (1960) reported a correlation of .59, Rao (1965) exhibited correlation of .39 between SES and achievement and r of .49 between SES and the IQ.

Since no study has been conducted in which all the four variables have been taken up together for exploring their impact on the sociometric dimension, such a study is of great significance.

The present investigation is aimed at studying the intelligence, achievement, adjustment and socio-economic status in respect of sociometric classification of populars, neglectees, isolates and rejectees. Such a study would be of great educational importance to the teachers, parents and counsellors in understanding the adjustment patterns of these different types of students and suggest improvements leading to better adjustment. The intelligence and achievement patterns of such students will provide data of useful educational significance to all who are concerned with the education of these children.