CHAPTER-II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Review of related literature is the study and analysis of related studies carried out by the researchers at various levels. It involves locating, reaching and evaluating of research as well as the reports of casual observations and the opinions that are related to the individual’s planned research project. The general purpose of the review of related literature is to develop a thorough understanding and insight into the work already done and the areas left unexplored or untouched. Through review of related literature, the investigator gets an understanding of his own problems. It facilitates the investigator to have an idea as to what extent the problem has been explored and whether the evidence provided is adequate enough or not. Moreover, the survey of the related studies gives assistance in framing objectives, outlaying the research design and locating the necessary data. A comprehensive review of the past studies is thus the backbone of any research endeavor. Hence this chapter is devoted to review of literature relevant to the past studies.

The investigator tapped the various sources of available literature like Surveys of Research, Research Reports, Indian Educational Abstracts, Research Journals, International Encyclopedia, Theses, Year Books, Dissertations etc. pertaining to the present study. Here an attempt has been made to present pertinent literature, which is likely to have direct or indirect bearing on this study. In the present study, the related studies have been presented in Chronological cum Theme-wise order.
II.1 STUDIES DONE ABROAD

(a) Personality dimensions and the unaccepted groups of Sociometric categories

Bonney (1943 & 1944) found significant difference between the students of low and high sociometric status on their personality profile. Pupils with low sociometric status were found less enthusiastic, inactive in reactions, unwelcomed by other members and exhibited individualistic qualities, whereas the pupils with high sociometric status were found more enthusiastic, daring, active in reactions, at ease with others, welcomed by other classmates and exhibited leadership qualities. Similar results were found by Kuhlen & Lee (1943) and Baker & Locmic (1944) also. Jenning (1943) found that the neglected girls showed unacceptable behavior such as quarrelsome, complaining, nervous, dominant and aggressive than the accepted girls who exhibited acceptable behavior like co-operation and non attention seeking behavior. Kuppersmidt & Patterson (1991) found that the neglected girls were more depressive than the rejected girls.

Northway (1944) found that isolate students were listless, lacked vitality, physically par below, low in intelligence, careless about their appearance, possessions & work and showed little interest in the world around them. Moreover, Jenning (1943 & 1950) found that isolate students were more self-bound than other students and were unable to bridge the gap between themselves and others. Dygdon & Conger (1990) reported that isolate students had higher rate of anxiety depression and loneliness than the neglected, rejected and students of other sociometric groups. Young & Cooper (1944); Northway & Wigdor (1947); Bonney & Powell (1953); Labon (1953); Heber (1956); Laughlin (1956);
Mc Candless, Castaneda & Palerma (1956); Trent (1959); Cattell & Beloff (1962); Guinourd & Rychlak (1962); Horowitz (1962); Lorber (1969); Newcomb & Pattee (1993) and Garcia-Bacete (2007) found that unaccepted students were less extroverted, less co-operative, less intelligent, less self-confident, less cheerful, less enthusiastic, less acceptable to group members, less conventional with social approval, smiled rarely, not involved in group activities, felt more disturbed, schizophrenic, more serious, more anxious, more aesthetically sensitive, unsocial, not preferred by peers, more aggressive, more guilt prone, insecure, tense, excitable, restless, nervous, emotionally unstable, annoying others more, disruptive and not good looking than the accepted students.

Austin & Thompson (1948) found that rejection of peers among the adolescents was influenced by negative traits like lack of recent contacts, recent quarrel, disloyalty, bullyingness etc., whereas selection depended upon positive traits like frequent association, co-operation, kindness etc. However Pinter, Forelane and Freeman (1935) found that in the selection of peers in a group, individual’s whole personality plays less role than his/her physical and mental abilities. Monjas, Sureda & Garcia-Bacete (2008) reported that the reasoning for rejecting a classmate involved behaviors associated with aggressiveness such as prepotency, dominance, intimidation and verbal or physical aggression.

Grossman & Wrighter (1948) and Cowley (1955) found that rejected pupils were more nervous, lacked the feeling of belongingness and had negative personality traits whereas the accepted pupils had positive personality traits with normal personality adjustment. Scandrettee (1953) and Bjerstedt (1956) also found similar results.
Olson (1949) and Marks (1954) found that neglected pupils were shy, bossy, sulky, less social and had less heterosexual interests than the popular students who were dependable, well adjusted, friendly, quiet and good natured.

Baron (1951) found that girls of low sociometric groups frequently indicated the presence of adverse emotionality or a sense of inordinate environmental demands where as the girls of high sociometric groups seldom indicated these adverse qualities. Kidd (1951); Gronlund & Anderson (1957); Green, Vosk, Forehand & Beck (1981); Coie, Dodge & Coppotelli (1982); Dodge, Coie & Brakkle (1982); Dodge et al. (1982); Coie & Kupersmidt (1983); Dodge (1983); Cantrell (1984); Carlson, Lahey & Neeper (1984); Asher & Wheeler (1985); Coie et al. (1990); Crick & Ladd (1990); Kupersmidt (1990); Ollendick et al. (1992); Franzoi, Mark & Vasquez-Suson (1994); Coie et al. (1995); Kratz-Keily (2000); Hubbard (2001); Gazzell & Ladd (2003); Jimenez (2003); Beirman (2004); Jorune & Kardelis (2005); Garcia-Bacete (2007); Ingles et al. (2008); Munoz et al. (2008); Ingles et al. (2010) and Lavictoire (2010) found that rejected pupils were more domineering, irritable, aggressive, selfish, dishonest, noisy, disruptive, tense, restless, excitable, disturbed, fightful, help seeking, antisocial, nervous, untidy, dull, unfriendly, withdrawn, anxious, depressive, exhibited more attention seeking and inconsiderate behavior, were more at risk, had more negative outcomes, demanded more attention from teachers, were not good looking and not preferred by peers, exhibited more disruptive behavior, had more anger and non-verbal happiness, had more aggressive disruptive behavior, were less social, less likable, less intelligent and less attractive than the neglected pupils who were more shy in nature, quiet, had more friends, engaged more in peer activities, were less aggressive, non disruptive, prosocial, more preferred by peers, were less
talkative, cold and non interfering, less noisy and unselfish. Asher & Hymel (1981); French & Tyne (1982); Burton (1985) and French & Wass (1985) also found similar results. Moreover, Ingles et al. (2008) also reported that the rejected adolescents violate other’s right, insult, threaten, hit and criticize their classmates whereas the neglected adolescents avoid and escape from social situations.

Hallworth (1952) found no significant difference in the neurotic behavior of low and high sociometric status groups. Thorpe (1953) also found similar results and concluded that neuroticism was not of permanent importance in differentiating unaccepted from accepted pupils.

Marks (1954) and Cirino & Beck (1991) found that the neglected girls had more intellectual-cultural interests and were less social than the neglected boys who were more social and had more mechanical-constructive interests. Marks (1954) further found that the isolate girls had more intellectual interests whereas the isolate boys had more mechanical interests and their interests acted as cause of their isolation in the group.

Guinourd & Rychlak (1962); Wood et al. (2002); Walker (2004) and Jorune & Kardelis (2005) found significant sex differences among different sociometric groups and reported that girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate groups were more warm and sociable, more enthusiastic, happy-go-lucky, more aesthetically sensitive, more insecure & tense, excitable, less aggressive, less disruptive and less overt than neglected, rejected and isolate boys who were found significantly more mature and calm, more individualistic, more aggressive, more adventurous and more self-sufficient.

Gaffer (1971) found that the neglected students have more positive personality traits than the rejected and isolate students. Dodge, Coie, Pettit &
Prince (1990) and Spinrad (2004) found that the neglected students engaged more in positive prosocial behavior than the rejected and isolate students. Moreover, Dubow & Cappas (1988) and La Greca et al. (1988) found that the neglected students were poor leaders, less co-operative, had higher levels of social anxiety and lower perceived social competence than the rejected and isolate students. Kurdeck & Lillie (1985); Begin (1986) and Patterson, Kupersmidt & Griesler (1990) also found similar results. However, Crick and Ladd (1994) found that the isolate students were poor in social skills, significantly more shy and physically below than the rejected students. Ladd (1983) and Carlson, Lahey & Neeper (1984) reported significant sex differences in different sociometric groups regarding prosocial and agnostic behavior patterns of students and found that boys were more extroverted and behaved with other group members less positively than the girls. Kratochwill & French (1984) found that behavior profile of rejected students was much different from the neglected, isolate and other group students. Virtue & French (1984) also found that the rejected students had more undesirable behavior than the neglected and popular students. Frentz, Gresham & Elliott (1991) also found similar results.

Milich & Landau (1985); French (1990) and Hatzichristou & Hopf (1996) found that the rejected boys were more aggressive and exhibited antisocial behavior patterns, had negative self-concept regarding physical appearance and were less withdrawn than the rejected girls who were more shy, unhappy, had negative self-concept with reported parental disappointment and lacked prosocial behavior. French (1988 & 1990) and Garcia-Bacete, Sureda & Monjas (2010) also found similar results.
Coie, Dodge & Kupersmidt (1990); Newcomb, Bukowski & Pattee (1993); Dekovic & Gerris (1994) and Warden & Mackinnon (2003) found that the behavioral characteristics which have emerged as strongly related to the development of poor sociometric status include prosocial, aggressive, cooperative and disruptive behavior and withdrawn patterns of social approach. Garcia-Bacete (2007) and Munoz, Moreno and Jimenez (2008) reported that the sociometric type students varied significantly on different personality traits. Their interpersonal relations with their peers had an impact on their degree of acceptance or rejection within the peer group.

(b) **Patterns of reactions to frustration and the unaccepted groups of sociometric categories**

Adinolfi, Watson & Klein (1973) found that internalizing aggression and insisting on the frustrating situation led to peer rejection, particularly in lower-class males, while externalizing aggression was associated with positive peer evaluation for lower-class males.

Green, Vosk, Forehand & Beck (1981) and Coie, Dodge & Coppotelli (1982) found that the rejected students scored high on disrupts, fights, restlessness, excitable, seek help from others and demand teacher’s attention more than the neglected students. They also scored higher on items which assessed their lack of concentration and tendency to daydream. Neglected students on the other hand only received high rating on the shy category.

Dodge et al. (1982) found that the rejected students were aggressive and when they made prosocial approach their timing was poor and they appeared disruptive where as the neglected students were neither aggressive nor disruptive. Dodge, Coie & Brakke (1982); Coie & Kupersmidt (1983); Hubbard (2001) and
Bierman (2004) found that peer rejected students exhibited more aggressive behavior, expressed more anger & non-verbal unhappiness, undesirable social behavior than the peer neglected and accepted students. Moreover, they were emotionally more reactive, disruptive and unskilled and engaged in context-inappropriate behavior than any other sociometric group students.

Coie and Kupersmidt (1983) found that the rejected boys exhibited significantly more anti-social and aggressive behavior than any other social status group and were highly interactive and talkative.

Dodge (1983); Cantrell (1984); Caryn, Benjamin & Ronald (1984); Marilyn & Doran (1984); Ollendick et al. (1992) and Lindsay (2010) found that the rejected students were more aggressive externally, had higher level of conduct disturbances, committed delinquent offences, more disruptive, domineering, more nervous, overactive than the neglected and accepted students while interacting with other people.

Newcomb, Bukowski and Patte (1993) found that high levels of aggression and withdrawal and low levels of social ability and cognitive abilities were associated with rejected peer status where as a consistent profile marked by less socio-ability and aggression emerged for the neglected status.

Salmivalli, Kaukiainen and Lagerspetz (2000) reported that the use of indirect aggression contributed among boys to social acceptance by peers. The direct (physical and verbal) forms of aggression were unrelated to adolescent’s social acceptance scores. No clear differences were detected between girl’s and boy’s acceptance or rejection of their aggressive peers, despite the finding that boys seemed to tolerate indirect aggression better than the girl’s did.
Karjalainen and Keltikangas-Jarvinen (2002) found that the girls were usually more prosocial oriented and they developed more empathic strategies and were significantly more nominated as accepted/liked by their classmates, but, Garcia-Bacete et al. (2008) and Sureda, Garcia-Bacete & Monjas (2009) did not agree with the results. Moreover, Buelga, Musitu, Murgue & Pons (2008) and Ingles et al. (2008) found that boys usually display more aggressive behavior than their female classmates and Garcia-Bacete et al. (2008) reported that boys were rejected to a greater extent by their peers than girls.

Jorune and Kestutis (2005) found that the rejected adolescents got significantly the highest estimates of aggressive-disruptive behavior than the neglected and popular adolescents when put in social situations. The neglected adolescents were prosocial and not aggressive.

Monjas, Sureda and Garcia-Bacete (2008) reported that the reasons for rejecting a classmate involved behaviors associated with aggressiveness, such as prepotency, dominance, intimidation and verbal or physical aggression.

Brenda, Carol, David & Laila (2010) found that the rejected-aggressive and rejected-withdrawn students had more difficulties with reactive aggression combined with an inability to respond positively to peers than their non-rejected age mates. Ingles et al. (2010) conducted a study on social interaction styles (aggressiveness, prosociability and social anxiety) among the rejected, neglected and liked adolescents and reported significant difference in the rejected, neglected and liked adolescents. The study revealed that aggressive adolescents were rejected the most by their classmates and the adolescents identified as having social anxiety were chosen as the least liked among their classmates and they were neglected more than the prosocial students. Socially anxious
adolescents i.e. neglected adolescents avoid and escape from social situations because they produce high level of anxiety and cause discomfort whereas aggressive adolescents violate other’s right, insult, threaten, hit or criticize their classmates. In contrast prosocial adolescents i.e. liked adolescents tend to have adequate peer relationships, communicating assertively & empathically and displaying co-operative & helping behavior in the classroom.

(c) Problems of students and the unaccepted groups of sociometric categories

Northway (1944); Kuhlen & Bretch (1947); Mc Clelland & Retliff (1947) and Bonney & Powell (1953) found that unaccepted students had inadequate adjustment to their social environment, had more social & personal skills, had serious family conflicts, were unhappy in school, seldom confined to classroom requirements and were less co-operative in group activities.

Young & Cooper (1944); Grossman & Wrighter (1948); Bedoian (1953) and Scandrette (1953) found that unaccepted students had more psycho-social, personal, emotional, educational and adjustment problems than the accepted students. Further the unaccepted students were found more insecure in school relations than the accepted students. Bonney (1944); Becker & Loomic (1948); Gustad (1952) and Bjerstedt (1956) further reported that the students who did not participate in social activities tended to show more problems and maladjustment than those who participated. However, Keislar (1954) found no difference between low and high sociometric group students on various problems.

Dodge, Coie & Brakkle (1982); Burton (1985); Coie et al. (1990); Ladd (1990); Connel & Wellborn (1991); Wentzel (1991 b); Ollendick et al. (1992); Asher & Wentzel (1995) and Buhs (2001) found that the rejected students
remained more frequently off-task during classroom work, were wandering and
trying to initiate contact with others, significantly took more time in
interacting with teachers (e.g. receiving instructions, directions, being
reprimanded), violated social norms at school, acted aggressively, failed
repeatedly, had low academic performance, more academic difficulties & task
inappropriate behavior, less favorable school perception, significantly higher
levels of school avoidance & lower school accomplishment, reduced classroom
participation, lower level of motivation to engage in classroom activities and
more dropout rate than the neglected students who were found more appropriate
with respect to classroom behavior, remained more on-task, were more
independent at school and were preferred more by teachers and classmates at
school. Dubow & Coppas (1988); French & Wass (1985); Frentz, Gresham &
Elliott (1991) and Asher & Wentzel (1995) found that the rejected students had
more behavior problems, were socially less skilled, had task avoidance attitude,
manifest anxiety, hostile isolation and were more impulsive than the neglected
students. Further research findings have shown that the rejected students were at
risk for a variety of adolescent problems (Asher & Wheeler, 1985; Cowen et al.,
1973; Roff, 1961; Roff et al. 1972 and Ullmann, 1957). Neglected students were
seen as exhibiting less problem behavior than the rejected students. Further, there
was little evidence that the neglected students were at risk for later disorders
(Asher & Wheeler, 1985; Coie & Dodge, 1983; French & Tyne, 1982; French &

French (1990) found that the neglected, rejected and isolate boys exhibited
more frequently externalizing problems than the neglected, rejected and isolate
girls who exhibited more frequently internalizing problems. Cirino & Beck
(1991) reported that the neglected girls displayed deficits in social information processing i.e. lacked social information than the neglected boys. However, Parkhurst & Asher (1992) found no sex difference in the problem profile of the neglected students. De Rosier, Kupersmidt & Patterson (1994); Hatzichristou & Hopf (1996); Miller-Johnson, Coie, Maumary-Gremaud, Lochman & Terry (1999); Ladd & Burgess (2001); Miller-Johnson, Coie, Maumary-Gremaud, Bierman & Conduct Problem Prevention Research (2002) and Wentzel (2003) found that the rejected students displayed higher levels of absenteeism, performed most poorly on academic achievement, had more adjustment problems in all aspects of life including school adjustment and violated rules and norms at school than the neglected and isolate students. Similar results were also found by Asher & Wheeler (1985); Coie et al. (1982); Parker & Asher (1987) and Parkhurst & Asher (1992). However, Gilman (2004) found that the neglected adolescents reported significantly more interpersonal problems, school difficulties and lower life quality than the rejected and isolate adolescents.

Coie, Terry, Lenox, Lochman & Hyman (1995); Ladd & Troop-Gordon (2003) and Ladd (2006) found that long term rejection by peers has been identified as a contributing risk factor towards future negative outcomes such as poor school adjustment.

Hatzichristou & Hopf (1996) found that the rejected boys exhibited the most interpersonal problems, lacked prosocial behavior, had negative self-concept regarding physical appearance, had low classroom adaptation, high anti-social and aggressive behavior and had high school performance than the rejected girls who had the most intrapersonal problems, low school performance and negative
self-concept regarding achievement. Martin (2011) also reported that the rejected boys had more school adjustment problems than the rejected girls.

II.2 STUDIES DONE IN INDIA

(a) **Personality dimensions and the unaccepted groups of sociometric categories**

Choudhary (1943); Sharma (1968); Dhar (1986) and Singh (1993) found that the rejected students were more talkative, proudy, quarrelsome, indisciplined, irresponsible, irregular, non-cooperative, happy-go-lucky, assertive, suspicious, forthright apprehensive, lacked self-confidence and had bad habits.

Bhargava (1965); Rajput (1970); Sharma (1970); Joshi (1980) and Pandey (1985) found that the isolate students were emotionally more disturbed, lacked social skills, were more self-bound, had low intelligence, were low achievers, less interested in studies, had poor memory and poor personality adjustment than the accepted students.

Parsad (1966); Arora (1967); Rao & Banerjee (1973); Sharma (1975); Modi (1976) and Shukla (1983) found significant differences in the personality patterns of unaccepted and accepted students. The unaccepted students were found dull, reserved, shy, casual, socially and emotionally less adjusted than the accepted students. Gaur (1967) conducted a study on personality profiles of the isolates and found that the isolate girls were more introvert, day-dreamer, had uncontrolled emotions, were afraid of even anticipated limitations, lacked common sense, generally failed to find immediate solutions to problems, were below average in intelligence, weak in studies, quarrelsome, selfish, shabbily dressed and told lies whereas the isolate boys were more aggressive, depressed,
detached & completely maladjusted in the group, were weak in studies &
proudly, had stealing habits, were shabbily dressed and had sex perversions.

Sharma (1970) compared the personality traits of the neglected, isolate and
rejected students and found that the degree of unacceptance increased as
proceeded from the neglected to isolate and to rejected. The personality trait
scores decreased as the degree of acceptance decreased. The scores of rejectees
were lowest while the scores of neglectees were highest and those of isolates lied
in between the two. He further found that there were significant differences
between the scores of neglectees and isolates, neglectees and rejectees. However,
the rejectees and isolates were similar. Isolates were more submissive, careless &
casual, lacking in social sense, selfish, non-cooperative, remained under pressure
to finish work, not good looking, not sharing responsibility and were more
unsocial than the neglectee students. Rejectees were found to be lacking in
initiative, non-confident, gloomy, cowardly & weak, using things without
permission, were unfair & dishonest, unpopular, ugly and did not share
responsibility. Bajpeyi (1971); Sharma (1974); Chandratre (1982) and Singh
(2005) found that the rejected students were less intelligent, less extroverted, less
secure, less sociable, less reflective, less impulsive, less responsible, less
vigorous and more placid than the neglected students. However, Badami &
Tripathi (1973) found that the rejected students were more intelligent than the
neglected students. Bajpeyi (1971) found that the neglected boys were
significantly more intelligent than the neglected girls. In aesthetic area,
significant difference was also found between the neglected boys and the
neglected girls. He further found that the rejected boys differed significantly from
the rejected girls in outdoor area. Joshi (1980) found that the isolate girls differed
from the star girls in certain personal and psychological factors. The isolate girls were low achievers and had less interest in studies than the star girls. They had not good memory and lacked positive attitude towards school and work.

Sagar (1972); Arora (1975) and Dutt (1981) found that the rejected students were less humorous, thought themselves superior, had unappealing nature, were vanity, more restless, irritable, tense, emotionally immature, unstable, fickle minded, dependable, less intelligent and less extroverted than the accepted students who were found more co-operative, sweet tempered, honest, had good habits & friendly disposition, had cheerful outlook, were likeable, matured, emotionally stable and extroverted.

Pathak (1971) found that the neglected, rejected and isolate students were inferior to the accepted students on various personality dimensions and in each area of adjustment. The neglectees were similar to the rejectees and isolates in home adjustment and school adjustment but they were significantly inferior in health adjustment. The rejectees and isolates were comparable in home adjustment, school adjustment, emotional adjustment, and social adjustment but they differed in health adjustment.

The neglectees were superior to the rejectees and the isolates on socio-school adjustment and the rejectees only on scholastic achievement but they were comparable on personality dimensions and the scholastic achievement of the isolates. The rejectees and isolates were similar in socio-school adjustment and inferior to the isolates in scholastic achievement and personality dimensions. Pathak (1971 a, 1971 b, 1972, 1972 a, 1972 b, 1974 and 1975) also found similar resuls. Malik (1978) and Sushma & Upmanyu (1979) found that the rejected, neglected and isolate pupils had low scores on each personality variable. They
were emotionally less open, less practical in intellect, less dynamic in activities and less combinative in imagination than the accepted pupils. The isolates were found lowest in order where as the neglected and rejected had equal scores.

Chandratre (1982) found significant differences between the neglected boys and the neglected girls on tough-mindedness, conformity, normalcy and tenseness. However, the rejected boys and girls differed only on tenseness. Chouhan (1982) found that the neglected, rejected and isolate boys differed significantly from the neglected, rejected and isolate girls on global self-concept. Boys had better self-concept than the girls.

Madhosh (1982 & 1989) found that the neglected students were dull, cool, tense, timid, hard obstructive, not submissive and guilt prone whereas the isolate students were withdrawing, shy, conservative and restless.

Malik (1984) found significant differences among various sociometric groups with regard to personality patterns. The data revealed that the rejected students were outgoing, average on intelligence, emotionally less stable, excitable, assertive, happy-go-lucky, expedient, venturesome, tough-minded, high on doubting, apprehensive, depending, indisciplined and tense. The isolates were reserved, more intelligent, emotionally stable, phlegmatic, shy, tough-minded, doubting, placid, obedient, sober, conscientious, group-dependent, indisciplined and relaxed. The neglectees were found low on each variable i.e. they were reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, phlegmatic, assertive, sober, expedient, shy, less tough-minded, vigorous, placid, took their own decisions, were indisciplined and relaxed.

Dhar (1986) found that the girls belonging to different sociometric groups differed on a set of personality factors from the boys. Girls were found sober,
shy, tender-minded, apprehensive and indisciplined whereas the boys were found happy-go-lucky, venturesome, tough-minded, placid and controlled.

Upmanyu, Upmanyu & Dhingra (1988) and Sangeeta (2002) found that the rejected students were more lonely, less intelligent and more depressive than the neglected, isolate and other students and these differences were significant.

Singh (2005) found that the neglected adolescent boys were more tough-minded, more vigorous, more aggressive, less tolerative, less impulsive, less placid than the neglected adolescent girls. Further it was also found that the rejected adolescent boys were less impulsive, less placid, less tolerant, more vigorous, more aggressive and more tough-minded than the rejected adolescent girls.

(b) Patterns of reactions to frustration and the unaccepted groups of sociometric categories

Muthayya (1960) found that aspiration patterns (high positive, low positive and negative) had significant association with the frustration-reaction categories viz. Extrapunitive, Intropunitive and Impunitive respectively.

Malviya (1968) found that the reactions of the male and female subjects were different. Males were more aggressive than the females. Sumbali (1981) also found similar results and reported that boys were more aggressive than the girls. Aggressive subjects had poor family relationships and showed poor home, emotional and school/college adjustment at the adolescent level. They also showed poor teacher relationships and had poor relations with their siblings as compared to the normal subjects.

Sharma (1973) conducted a study of reaction to frustration among the adolescents in the school situation and found that ego-defence, need-persistence
and obstacle-dominance were the prominent factors related to the type of aggression at all the stages of development.

Sharma (1973) found that different factors of reaction to frustration showed a tendency of age both in boys and girls. Pandit (1973) found that boys and girls reacted differently to experimentally produced (different situations) factors of reaction to frustration.

Mithal (1975) found that boys were predominantly extragressive, while the girls were impresive, the differences between the boys’ and girls’ behavior was significant.

Dubey (1982) conducted research on Reactions to frustration as a function of personality factors and need patterns of adolescents found that the relationship between personality factors, need patterns and reactions to frustration varied with age and caste. The degree of relationship though significant, was found to be high. The non-schedule caste subjects had come up with some strange personality and need correlates of reactions to frustration. They seemed to perceive their circumstances as hopeless. Among the adolescents more meaningful relationships had developed of personality and need variables with reactions to frustration. It was also revealed that the reactions to frustration were interdependent, interactive and reciprocal in operation.

Sharma and Nagaich (1983) found that women were more affected by frustration than the men. Women reacted to frustration through regression, fixation and resignation, whereas the men reacted through aggression. Significant male-female difference in reaction occurred for the regression and fixation modes. Dubey (1984) found that physically handicapped students were more
ego-defensive, extragressive and obstacle-dominant as well as introgressive and need-persistive than non-handicapped students.

Gyanoni (1984) found that most of the subjects of the parents population were not very aggressive or passive in frustrating situation. Significant increase in intropunitive behavior was observed, whereas impunitive frustration reaction increased with age but a significant fall in this particular reaction was observed after the age of 20 years. Ego-defensive and obstacle-dominant reactions to frustration decreased as the subject advanced in age but their need persistent reactions significantly increased with increase in their age.

Biswas (1989) conducted a research work on Reaction to frustration in school children and found that age, family structure & tension had significant effect on frustration reaction pattern. However, sex had little differential effect on it. Ray (1989) found that sex had little impact on frustration reaction and intelligence & neuroticism were correlated significantly with reaction patterns; the frustration variables could be predicted from the psycho-social variables and all the psycho-social variables, except extraversion could be predicted from the frustration reaction.

Biswas and Biswas (1991) found that the creative and non-creative groups differed significantly only in Extragression. The creative group was found to be less extragressive than the non-creative group. The mean scores of the two groups in introgression did not differ significantly. The creative group had higher mean score in imgression than the non-creative group.

Sunanda (1991) found that middle age men and women showed a greater tendency of extragression, imagression and obstacle-dominance. Life satisfaction
and self-acceptance were positively related to extragression, imagression, obstacle-dominance and need persistence reactions.

Lata (1995) found that there were sex differences in 16% of comparison, indicating a high degree of similarity of reaction sensitivity between the sexes. Female students showed more intense ego-defensive reactions, while the males showed higher scores on reactions indicating higher motivation towards achievement. Males were more extragressive than the females.

Kundu and Basu (1998) found the depressed group to have less extragression and more introgressive, more ego-defence and less need-persistence than that of the conduct disordered group.

(c) Problems of students and the unaccepted groups of sociometric categories

Choudhary (1943); Sharma (1968) and Dhar (1986) found that the rejected students were indisciplined, maladjusted in school & neighborhood and had bad habits.

Aatish (1963) found that the isolate students reported more problems in the emotional, peer status, discipline & control and social aspects of family life than the accepted students. However, no differences were found in intellectual & cultural, religion & conviction in God and economic aspects of family life. He further studied the eight aspects of school life viz. class atmosphere, discipline, teacher-student relations, student-student relations, teacher-teacher relations, extra-curricular activities, moral education and guidance & counseling in relation to isolation and popularity and found that the isolate students had more problems than the popular students in all the aspects of school life, except in one aspect i.e.
student-student relations. Sharma (1970) also found that the isolate students had more problems than the accepted students in all the aspects of life.

Parsad (1966) and Arora (1967) found that the unaccepted students were socially & emotionally less adjusted than the accepted students. Sharma (1974) found that the unaccepted students had more problems in family life than the accepted students.

Sharma (1970) conducted a study on life at home and at school and found that the isolate students reported more problems in school life as compared to the home life. The isolates had the largest number of problems in the guidance & counseling aspect besides in the classroom atmosphere and extracurricular aspects. Pathak (1971) found that the neglected students were poor in health adjustment and superior in socio-school adjustment than the rejected and isolate students. In home adjustment and emotional adjustment, they were found similar to the rejected and isolate students. He also found that the rejected and isolate students were similar in all the areas of adjustment but they differed in health adjustment. The isolates were inferior to the rejected students in health adjustment. He further found that the neglected, rejected and isolate students were significantly inferior to the populars in all the areas of adjustment which indicated that they have more problems than the populars.

Joshi (1980) found that the isolate students were low achievers, less interested in studies, with poor memory and had negative attitude towards school and work. Singh (2005) found that the rejected students had significantly more personal, socio-emotional and educational problems than the neglected students. Singh (2005) found that the rejected boys had more personal problems than the rejected girls. In family problems, socio-emotional problems & educational
problems, no sex differences were found between the rejected boys and girls. Further no differences were found between the neglected boys and girls on different problem areas.

After going through the review of related literature pertaining to the present problem, the investigator found certain areas left unexplored in the field of sociometry so far as the scoring factors of Rosenzweig P.F study are concerned. The limited literature which was found in this area is incorporated in the present chapter. However, no literature was found related to the academic stream differences among different personality traits, reactions to frustration and various problems at the adolescent stage among the students of different sociometric categories.