CHAPTER VI
INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

After analyzing the data, the investigator has to proceed with the stage of discussion of the results. The process of discussion is essentially one of stating what the results show, what are their meanings and significances and what is the answer to the original problem? Discussion of the results calls for a careful, logical and critical examination of results obtained after analysis, considering the limitations of the sample chosen, the tools selected and used in the study. The results obtained on each objective are discussed under the following headings:

VI.1 INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS BASED ON THE MEAN PERSONALITY FACTORS IN DIFFERENT SOCIOMETRIC CATEGORIES, SEX AND ACADEMIC STREAMS

VI.1(a1) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-A, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 11 that F-ratio value (4.23) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-A, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on the Factor-A. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a_1(i)” completely.

It is again evident from the Table 11 that F-ratio value (4.89) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came significant with Factor-A, taken as criterion. The
mean value came higher among the girls (5.68) than the boys (5.18). The girls were found more warmhearted, outgoing, easygoing and participating than the boys who showed reserved, detached, critical, aloof and stiff behavior. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a(i)” completely. It may be due to the reason that girls are more psychologically attached to their parents and have seen various situations of life. This closeness to the elders makes them more warmhearted, relaxed and participating. Guinourd and Rychlak (1962) and Gaur (1967) also reported similar results. Singh (2005) found no significant difference between boys and girls on warmthness dimension.

It is again evident from the Table 11 that F-ratio value (11.53) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-A, taken as criterion. The mean value came higher among the students of arts stream (5.82) than the students of science stream (5.05). The arts stream students were found more warmhearted, outgoing, easygoing and participating than the science stream students who showed reserved, detached, critical, aloof and stiff behavior. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the arts stream students have more time for various activities because of limited curriculum having no practical work like science stream students. As such they are more social than the science stream students and this social ability makes them more warmhearted, outgoing, easygoing and participating.

It is also clear from the Table 11 that F-ratio value (0.12) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-A, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different
sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-A. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a₁(i)” completely.

Again it is evident from the Table 11 that F-ratio value (0.007) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-A, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-A. This finding is thus also accepting the second null hypothesis “2a₁(ii)” completely.

Again it is evident from the Table 11 that F-ratio value (0.18) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-A, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-A. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a₁(iii)” completely.

It is again apparent from the Table-11 that F-ratio value (0.43) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-A, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-A. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a₁(iv)” completely.

VI.1(a₂)  ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-A scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 13 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 2.68, which is significant at 0.01 level of
confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-A. The mean value of neglected category of students (5.73) came higher than the rejected category of students (4.98). It means that the students of neglected category were found more warmhearted, outgoing, easygoing and participating than the students of rejected category who seemed to be reserved, detached, critical, aloof and stiff. However Singh (2005) found no significant difference between the neglected and rejected category of students on the warmthness dimension of personality.

It is clear from the Table 13 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 0.47, which is insignificant. It shows that the students of neglected and isolate categories were found alike on the Factor-A.

It is again clear from the Table 13 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 2.22, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that students belonging to rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-A. The mean value of isolate category of students (5.60) came higher than the rejected category of students (4.98). It means that the students of isolate category were found more warmhearted, outgoing, easygoing and participating than the students of rejected category who seemed to be reserved, detached, critical, aloof and stiff. It is due to the reason that the isolate students too possess some good personality traits and behavioural patterns which to some extent makes them social, warmhearted, cooperative and participative in nature.
VI.1 (b1) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-B, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 17 that F-ratio value for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-B, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on the Factor-B. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a2(i)” completely.

It is again evident from the Table 17 that F-ratio value (0.05) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-B, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls were found alike on the Factor-B. This finding is thus accepting the first null hypothesis “1a2(ii)” completely. Gaur (1967) found that isolate girls were less intelligent and weak in studies than boys. However, Badami and Tripathi (1973) found no significant difference in the intelligence level of boys and girls.

It is clear from the Table 17 that F-ratio value (6.64) for the third main factor i.e ‘Academic streams’ came significant, with Factor-B, taken as criterion. The mean value came higher among the students of science stream (4.65) than the students of arts stream (4.04). The science stream students were found more intelligent, abstract thinkers and of higher scholastic mental capacity than the arts stream students who were found less intelligent, concrete thinkers and of lower scholastic mental capacity. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a2(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the science stream students possess high problem solving aptitude and they deal with advanced scientific
terms and numerical/mathematical calculations which sharpens their intellect. This sharpeness contributes to their being intelligent having higher scholastic mental capacity and they can easily carry on abstract thinking.

It is evident from the Table 17 that F-ratio value (0.36) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-B, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on Factor-B. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a2(i)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 17 that F-ratio value (0.49) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-B, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on Factor-B. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a2(ii)” completely.

It is again evident from the Table 17 that F-ratio value (0.04) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-B, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-B. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a2(iii)” completely.

It is apparent from the Table 17 that F-ratio value (0.83) against the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with factor-B, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic
streams on the Factor-B of students. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a2(iv)” completely.

VI.1(b2) ‘t’- ratio values of the mean Factor-B scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 19 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 2.17, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-B. The mean value of neglected category of students (4.98) came higher than the rejected category of students (4.35). It means that the students of neglected category were found more intelligent, abstract thinkers, bright and showed higher scholastic mental capacity than the students of rejected category who seemed to be less intelligent, concrete thinkers and showed lower scholastic mental capacity.

It is again clear from the Table 19 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 4.42, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-B. The mean value of neglected category of students (4.98) came higher than the isolate category of students (3.70). It means that the students of neglected category were found more intelligent, abstract thinkers, bright and showed higher scholastic mental capacity than the students of rejected category who seemed to be less intelligent, concrete thinkers and showed lower scholastic mental capacity.

It is further clear from the Table 19 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 2.24, which is significant at 0.05 level of
confidence. It shows that students belonging to rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-B. The mean value of rejected category of students (4.35) came higher than the isolate category of students (3.70). It means that the students of rejected category were found more intelligent, abstract thinkers, bright and showed higher scholastic mental capacity than the students of isolate category who seemed to be less intelligent, concrete thinkers and showed lower scholastic mental capacity.

Bajpeyi (1971) found significant result in intelligence level of neglected and rejected category of students. Neglected students were found more intelligent than the rejected students. However, Badami and Tripathi (1973) found that rejected students were more intelligent than the neglected and isolate category of students. It may be due to the fact that the neglected students are of participating nature as they receive some sort of acceptance from their peers. This participating mode of behavior contribute to raise their intelligence level to some extent with abstract thinking.

VI.1 (C₁) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-C, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 23 that F-ratio value (7.76) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-C, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on Factor-C. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1α(i)” completely.
It is evident from the Table 23 that F-ratio value (0.78) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-C, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls were found alike on Factor-C. This finding is thus accepting the first null hypothesis “1a3(ii)” completely. Guinourd and Rychlak (1962) found that boys were more mature and calm than the girls. Gaur (1967) found that isolate girls were emotionally more unstable and introverts than the isolate boys.

It is evident from the Table 23 that F-ratio value (4.29) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with, Factor-C, taken as criterion. The mean value came higher among the students of science stream (5.55) than the students of arts stream (5.08). The science stream students were found emotionally more stable, mature, face reality, calm and showed higher level of ego strength than the students of arts stream who seemed to be affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, easily upset, changeable and showed lower level of ego strength. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a3(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that science stream students are more practical oriented and face the realities of life in an effective way. This tendency makes them self esteemed and mature personalities having higher level of confidence. They do not lose temper on petty issues.

It is evident from the Table 23 that F-ratio value (0.71) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-C, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on Factor-C. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a3(i)” completely.
It is evident from the Table 23 that F-ratio value (1.06) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-C, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on Factor-C. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a3(ii)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 23 that F-ratio value (0.20) against the International effect of ‘Sex and Academic stream’ came insignificant with Factor-C, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on Factor-C. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a3(iii)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 23 that F-ratio value (0.30) against the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic stream’ came insignificant with Factor-C, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-C of students. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a3(iv)” completely.

VI.1(C2) ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-C scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 25 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 3.82, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-C. The mean value of neglected category of students (5.90) came higher than the rejected category of
students (4.83). It means that the students of neglected category were found emotionally more stable, mature, face reality, more calm, of higher ego strength than the students of rejected category who seemed to be affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, easily upset, changeable and of lower ego strength.

It is again evident from the Table 25 that ‘t’- ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 2.39, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and isolate categories differs significantly from each other on the Factor-C. The mean value of neglected category of students (5.90) came higher than the isolate category of students (5.23). It means that the students of neglected category were found emotionally more stable, mature, face reality, calm, of higher ego strength than the students of isolate category who seemed to be affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, easily upset changeable and of lower ego strength.

It is clear from the Table 25 that the ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 1.43, which is insignificant. It shows that the students of rejected and isolate categories were found alike on the Factor-C. It may be due to the reason that the neglected students are more social than rejected and isolate students as they receive some positive choices from their peers which gives them a sense of belongingness. This positive acceptance makes them emotionally stable and calm.
V.I (d₁) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial
design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-
ratios with Factor-D, as criterion.

It is evident from the table 29 that F-ratio value (3.16) for the first main
factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-D, taken as
criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the
students belonging to different sociometric categories on Factor-D This finding is
thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a₄(i)” completely.

It is evident from the table 29 that F-ratio value (1.37) for the second main
factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-D, taken as criterion. It indicates
that boys and girls were found alike on the Factor-D. This finding is thus
accepting the first null hypothesis “1a₄(ii)” completely. Guinourd and Rychlak
(1962) found that girls were more excitable than boys.

It is evident from the Table 29 that F-ratio value (4.95) for the third main
factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-D, taken as criterion.
The mean value came higher among the students of science stream (4.70) than
the students of arts stream (4.07). The science stream students were found more
excitable, impatient, demanding, overactive and showed unrestrained behavior
than the students of arts stream who seemed to be undemonstrative, deliberate,
inactive, stodgy and Phlegmatic. This finding is thus rejecting the first null
hypothesis “1a₄(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the science
stream students possess a great deal to eagerness and are curious to get the
minute details to satisfy their intellect. They are anxious to get original and
innovative things and they feel overactive and demand more after the fulfillment of their desires.

It is evident from the Table 29 that F-ratio value (0.23) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-D, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on Factor-D. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a4(i)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 29 that F-ratio value (0.44) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-D, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-D. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a4(ii)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 29 that F-ratio value (5.48) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-D, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams differed significantly on the Factor-D thus rejecting the second null hypothesis “2a4(iii)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 29 that F-ratio value (0.15) against the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-D, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-D thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a4(iv)” completely.
VI.1 (d₂) ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-D scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 31 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 2.52, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-D. The mean value of rejected category of students (4.83) came higher than the neglected category of students (3.95). It means that the students of rejected category were found excitable, impatient, demanding, overactive, unrestrained than the students of neglected category who seemed to be undemonstrative, deliberate, inactive, stodgy and phlegmatic. It may be due to the reason that the rejected students are mostly careless and irresponsible in nature. They don’t bother about the feelings of others. They have least control over their nerves having wandering lust which make them impatient, excitable and remained unrestrained.

It is clear from the Table 31 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 1.23, which is insignificant. It shows that the students of neglected and isolate categories were found alike on the Factor-D.

It is again clear from the Table 31 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 1.29 which is insignificant. It shows that the students of rejected and isolate categories were found alike on the Factor-D.
VI.1 (e1) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for $3 \times 2 \times 2$ Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-E, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 35 that the F-ratio value (12.57) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-E, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on Factor-E. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “$1a_3(i)$” completely.

It is evident from the Table 35 that the F-ratio value (5.24) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came significant with the Factor-E, taken as criterion. There was found significant difference between boys and girls on Factor-E. The mean value has came higher among the boys (6.02) than the girls (5.48). The boys were found more assertive, competitive, aggressive, stubborn and dominant than the girls who were obedient, mild, easily led, accommodating, and submissive. This finding is thus rejecting the second null hypothesis “$1a_3(ii)$” completely. Kidd (1951) also found that rejected men were more domineering, noisy and exhibiting other types of attention seeking and inconsiderate behaviour. Guinourd and Rychlak (1962) found that boys were significantly more aggressive than girls. Gaur (1967) found that isolate boys were more aggressive than girls. Singh (2005) found that boys belonging to the neglected and rejected categories were significantly more aggressive than girls of these two categories.

It is evident from the Table 35 that F-ratio value (11.78) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-E, taken as criterion. The mean value came higher among the students of science stream (6.15) than
the students of arts stream (5.35). The science stream students were found more assertive, competitive, aggressive, stubborn and dominant than the arts stream students who seemed to be obedient, mild, easily led, accommodating and submissive. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a5(iii)” completely. It is due to the reason that the science stream students possess intolerance behaviour and they try to thrust their ideas on others. This attitude makes them aggressive, assertive, stubborn and dominant.

It is evident from the Table 35 that F-ratio value (0.16) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-E, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-E. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a5(i)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 35 that F-ratio value (0.02) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-E, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on Factor-E. This finding is thus also accepting the second null hypothesis “2a5(ii)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 35 that F-ratio value (0.01) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic Streams’ came insignificant with Factor-E, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-E. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a5(iii)” completely.
It is evident from the Table 35 that F-ratio value (0.006) against the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-E, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-E of students. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a3(iv)” completely.

VI.1 (e2) ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-E scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 37 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 4.89 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-E. The mean value of rejected category of students (6.50) came higher than the neglected category of students (5.08). It means that the students of rejected category were found more assertive, competitive, aggressive, stubborn and dominant than the students of neglected category who seemed to be obedient, mild, easily led, accommodating and submissive.

It is again evident from the Table 37 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 2.07 which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-E. The mean value of isolate category of students (5.68) came higher than the neglected category of students (5.08). It means that the students of isolate category were found more assertive, competitive, aggressive, stubborn and dominant than the students of
neglected category who seemed to be obedient, mild, easily led, accommodating and submissive.

It is again clear from the Table 37 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 2.83, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students of rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-E. The mean value of rejected category of students (6.50) came higher than the students of isolate category (5.68). It means that the students of rejected category were found more assertive, competitive, aggressive, stubborn and dominant than the students of isolate category who seemed to be obedient mild, easily led, accommodating and submissive. Dhar (1986) found that rejected students were significantly more aggressive than the students of other sociometric categories. However Singh (2005) found no significant difference between the students of neglected and rejected categories on the aggressive dimension of personality. It may be due to the fact that the rejected students received negative choices as the result of which they develop some undesirable traits viz. aggressiveness, dominance and assertiveness.

VI.1 \( (f_1) \) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-F, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 41 that F-ratio value (3.30) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-F taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the
students belonging to different sociometric categories on Factor-F. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a(i)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 41 that F-ratio value (6.82) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came significant with Factor-F taken as criterion. There was found significant difference between boys and girls on Factor-F. The mean value came higher among the boys (4.47) than the girls (3.78). The boys were found more enthusiastic, heedless, happy-go-lucky than the girls who were found sober, taciturn and serious. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a(ii)” completely. Dhar (1986) found that boys were significantly more happy-go-lucky than girls who were found sober and serious.

It is evident from the Table 41 that F-ratio value (50.08) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-F, taken as criterion. There was found significant difference between the students of arts and science streams on Factor-F. The mean value came higher among the students of arts stream (5.05) than the students of science stream (3.20). The arts stream students were found more enthusiastic heedless and happy-go-lucky than the students of science stream who were found sober, taciturn and serious. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a(iii)” completely. It may be due to the fact that the arts stream students are mostly easy going and carefree by nature. They do not get easily excited over various matters of life particularly studies. This tendency makes them happy-go-lucky having feeling of enthusiasm.

It is clear from the Table 41 that F-ratio value (0.27) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-F, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different
sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-F. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a(i)” completely.

It is clear from the Table 41 that F-ratio value (0.70) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-F, taken as criticism. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-F. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a(ii)” completely.

It is clear from the Table 41 that F-ratio value (0.20) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-F, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-F. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a(iii)” completely.

It is apparent from the Table 41 that F-ratio value (0.20) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams came insignificant with Factor-F, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-F of students. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a(iv)” completely.

VI.1 (f2) ‘t’- ratio values of the mean Factor-F scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 43 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 2.25 which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students of neglected and rejected categories differ
significantly on the factor-F. The mean value of rejected category of students (4.60) came higher than the neglected category of students (3.88). It means that the students of rejected category were found more enthusiastic, heedless and happy-go-lucky than the students of neglected category who seemed to be sober, taciturn and serious. It may be due to the reason that the rejected students also exhibit carefree temper and lethargic attitude and as such they project themselves as more enthusiastic, heedless and non-serious.

It is clear from the Table 43 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 0.06 which is insignificant. It shows that the students of neglected and isolate categories were found alike on the Factor-F.

It is also clear from the Table 43 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 2.19, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students of rejected and isolate categories differ significantly on the Factor-F. The mean value of rejected category of students (4.60) came higher than the isolate category of students (3.90). It means that the students of rejected category were found more enthusiastic, heedless and happy-go-lucky than the students of isolate category who seemed to be sober, taciturn and serious. Dhar (1986) also found that rejected students were more happy-go-lucky than the students of other sociometric categories. Singh (2005) found no significant difference between boys and girls on the persistent characteristics.
VI.1 (g1) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-G as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 47 that the F-ratio value (11.82) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-G, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on the Factor-G. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a7(i)” completely.

It is again evident from the Table 47 that F-ratio value (3.28) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-G, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls were found alike on the Factor-G. This finding is thus accepting the first null hypothesis “1a7(ii)” completely.

It is further evident from the Table 47 that F-ratio value (6.94) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-G taken as criterion. There was found significant difference between students of arts and science streams on the Factor-G. The mean value came higher among the science stream students (6.44) than the arts stream students (5.90). The science stream students were found more conscientious, persistent, moralistic, staid and showed stronger super ego strength than the arts stream students who disregarded rules, expedient, and showed weaker super ego strength. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a7(iii)” completely. It may be due to the fact, that the students of science stream have high scientific temper and they show continuity in their efforts to arrive at innovative conclusions. This type of tendency makes them persistent, staid and conscientious.
It is clear from the Table 47 that F-ratio value (0.44) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-G, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-G. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a7(i)” completely.

It is clear from the Table 47 that F-ratio value (0.12) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-G, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-G. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a7(ii)” completely.

It is again clear from the Table 47 that F-ratio value (0.25) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic stream’ came insignificant with Factor-G, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to the arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-G. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a7(iii)” completely.

It is apparent from the Table 47 that F-ratio value (0.33) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic stream, came insignificant with Factor-G, taken as criterion. It can therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-G of students. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a7(iv)” completely.
V I.1(g2) ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-G scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 49 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 4.80 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that students of neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-G. The mean value of neglected category of students (6.80) came higher than the rejected category of students (5.60). It means that students of neglected category were found more conscientious, persistent, moralistic, staid, have stronger super ego strength than the students of rejected category who seemed to disregard rules, expedient, have weaker super ego strength. Singh (2005) found no significant difference between the students of neglected and rejected categories on the persistive dimension of personality.

It is evident from the Table 49 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 2.80, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that students of neglected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-G. The mean value of neglected category of students (6.80) came higher than the isolate category of students (6.10). It means that students of neglected category were found more conscientious, persistent, moralistic, staid and have stronger super ego strength than the students of isolate category who seemed to disregard rules, expedient and have weaker super ego strength.

It is again evident from the Table 49 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 2.00, which is significant at 0.05
level of confidence. It shows that the students of rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-G. The mean value of isolate category of students (6.10) came higher than the rejected category of students (5.60). It means that students of isolate category were found more conscientious, persistent, moralistic, staid and have stronger super ego strength than the students of rejected category who seemed to disregard rules, expedient and have weaker super ego strength. It may be due to the reason that neglected students are submissive and accommodating. This tendency makes them persistent and conscientious.

VI.1 (h1) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-H, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 53 that F-ratio value (21.46) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-H, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on the Factor-H. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a8(i)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 53 that F-ratio value (7.30) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came significant with Factor-H, taken as criterion. There was found significant difference between boys and girls on the Factor-H. The mean value came higher among the boys (6.38) than the girls (5.76). The boys were found more adventurous, thick-skinned and socially bold than the girls who were found shy, timid and threat sensitive. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a8(ii)” completely. Guinourd and Rychlak (1962) found that boys
were significantly more adventurous than the girls. Dhar (1986) found that girls were significantly more shy than the boys who were venturesome and adventurous.

It is again evident from the Table 53 that F-ratio value (8.98) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-H, taken as criterion. There was found significant difference between students of arts and science streams on the Factor-H. The mean value came higher among the science stream students (6.42) than the arts stream students (5.73). The science stream students were found more adventurous, thick-skinned and socially bold than the arts stream students who were found more shy, timid and threat sensitive. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the science stream students involve themselves in outdoor activities more. They want to develop and discover new things to satisfy their lust. This makes them adventurous and socially bold.

It is clear from the Table 53 that F-ratio value (0.26) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-H, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-H. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a(i)” completely.

It is clear from the Table 53 that F-ratio value (0.58) against the interactional effect of “Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-H, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-H. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a(ii)” completely.
It is again clear from the Table 5 that F-ratio value (0.14) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-H, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-H. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a(iii)” completely.

It is apparent from the Table 5 that F-ratio value (0.07) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-H, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-H of students. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a(iv)” completely.

VI.1(h2) ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-H scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 5 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 6.00, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students of neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-H. The mean value of rejected category of students (7.13) came higher than the neglected category of students (5.45). It means that the students of rejected category were found more adventurous, thick-skinned and socially bold than the students of neglected category who seemed to be shy, timid and threat sensitive. It may be due to the reason that the rejected students are fond of participating in various outdoor and energy consuming activities. They prefer to be involved in various activities other than classroom learning. They seem to possess a healthy body build having no
tension about the people surrounding them. They are mostly thick skinned and
carefree.

It is again evident from the Table 55 that ‘t’- ratio between the neglected and isolate category of students came 0.72, which is insignificant. It shows that students of neglected and isolate category were found alike on the Factor-H.

It is again evident from the Table 55 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 5.29, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that students of rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-H. The mean value of the rejected category students (7.13) came higher than the isolate category of students. It means that students of rejected category were found more adventurous, thick-skinned and socially bold than the students of isolate category who seemed to be shy, timid and threat sensitive. Olson (1949) found that neglected students were found shy, bossy and sulky.

VI.1 (i₁) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-I, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 59 that F-ratio value (9.41) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor I, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on the Factor-H. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a₉(i)” completely.
It is evident from the Table 59 that F-ratio value (7.33) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came significant with Factor-I, taken as criterion. There was found significant difference between boys and girls on Factor-I. The mean value came higher among the girls (5.90) than the boys (5.25). The girls were found more tender-minded, sensitive, clinging and over protected than the boys who were found tough-minded and reject illusions. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1α(ii)” completely. Chandratre (1982) found that boys belonging to neglected and rejected groups were significantly more tough-minded than the girls of these groups. Dhar (1986) also found that boys were significantly more tough-minded than girls who were tender-minded. Singh (2005) also found that boys belonging to the neglected and rejected categories were significantly more tough-minded than girls.

It is evident from the Table 59 that F-ratio value (4.05) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-I, taken as criterion. There was found significant difference between the students of arts and science streams on the Factor-I. The mean value came higher among the arts stream students (5.82) than the science stream students (5.34). The arts stream students were found more tender-minded, sensitive, clinging and over protected than the science stream students who were found more tough-minded and reject illusions. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1α(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the girls and the arts stream student are sober by nature and are more attached to their respective families. This emotional attachment is the source of their being tender mindedness, sensitiveness and overprotection.
It is clear from the Table 59 that F-ratio value (0.02) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-I, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-I. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a0(i)” completely.

It is clear from the Table 59 that F-ratio value (0.20) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with HSPQ Factor-I, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-I. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a0(ii)” completely.

It is again clear from the Table 59 that F-ratio value (0.01) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-I, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-I. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a0(iii)” completely.

It is apparent from the Table 59 that F-ratio value (0.47) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-I, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-I of students. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a0(iv)” completely.
VI.1 (i_2) ‘t’- ratio values of the mean Factor-I scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 61 that ‘t’-ratio values between the neglected and rejected category of students came 4.42, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students of neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-I. The mean value of neglected category of students (6.23) came higher than the rejected category of student (5.95). It means that students of neglected category were found more tender-minded, sensitive, clinging and over-protected than the students of rejected category who seemed to be tough-minded and reject illusions. It may be due to the reason that the neglected students receive some sort of acceptance because of their obedience nature and are appealing to the senses of others. This appealing nature makes them sensitive to others to some extent. Chandratre (1982) found that rejected students were more tough-minded than the neglected students. However Singh (2005) found no significant difference between the students of neglected and rejected categories on this dimension of personality.

It is evident from the Table 61 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 2.35, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students of neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-I. The mean value of neglected category of students (6.23) came higher than the isolate category of students (5.55). It means that the students of neglected category were found more tender-minded, sensitive, clinging and overprotected than the students of isolate category who were found more tough-minded and reject illusion.
It is again evident from the Table 61 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 2.07, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that students of rejected and isolate categories differ significantly on the Factor-I. The mean value of isolate category of students (5.55) came higher than the rejected category of students (4.95). It means that isolate students were found more tender-minded, sensitive, clinging and over protected than the students of rejected category who seemed to be tough-minded and reject illusions.

VI.1 (j1) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-J, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 65 that F-ratio value (4.55) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-J, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students of different sociometric categories on the Factor-J. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a_10(i)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 65 that F-ratio value (0.04) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-J, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls were found alike on the Factor-J. This finding is thus accepting the first null hypothesis “1a_10(ii)” completely. Singh (2005) also found similar result on the reflective dimension of personality. However, opposite result was found by Guinourd and Rychlak (1962) on this dimension of personality.

It is again evident from the Table 65 that F-ratio value (4.47) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-J, taken as
criterion. There was found significant difference between the students of arts and science streams on the Factor-J. The mean value came higher among the arts stream students (6.18) than the science stream students (5.67). The arts stream students were found more circumspect individualistic, reflective and internally restrained than the science stream students who were found zestful and like group actions. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a_{10}(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the arts stream students are self bound having less participatory and involvement tendency as their curriculum does not involve the practical work in groups. Hence they become circumspect and reflective individuals.

It is clear from the Table 65 that F-ratio value (0.69) against the interactional effect of “Sociometric categories and Sex” came insignificant with Factor-J, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-J. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a_{10}(i)” completely.

It is clear from the Table 65 that F-ratio value (2.33) against the interactional effect of “Sociometric categories and Academic streams” came insignificant with Factor-J, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-J. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a_{10}(ii)” completely.

It is again clear from the Table 65 that F-ratio value (1.69) against the interactional effect of “Sex and Academic streams” came insignificant with Factor-J, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and
science streams were found alike on the Factor-J. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a_{10}(iii)” completely.

It is apparent from the Table 65 that F-ratio value (0.15) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-J, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-J of students. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a_{10}(iv)” completely.

**VI.1 (j₂) ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-J scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.**

It is evident from the Table 67 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 2.07, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that students of neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-J. The mean value of neglected category of students (6.05) came higher than the rejected category of students (5.43). It means that students of neglected category were found more circumspect individualistic, reflective and internally restrained than the students of rejected category who seemed to be zestful and like group actions. However Singh (2005) found no significant difference between the students of neglected and rejected categories on this dimension of personality.

It is again evident from the Table 67 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 0.84, which is insignificant. It shows that students of neglected and isolate categories were found alike on the Factor-J.
It is evident from the Table 67 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 2.90, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that students of rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-J. The mean value of isolate category of students (6.30) came higher than the students of rejected category (5.43). It means that students of isolate category were found more circumspect individualistic, reflective and internally restrained than the students of rejected category who seemed to be zestful and like group actions. It may be due to the reason that the neglected students are submissive and mild. So they became internally restrained.

V I.1(k₁) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-O, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 71 that F-ratio value (5.86) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-O, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on the Factor-O. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a₁(i)” completely.

It is again evident from the Table 71 that F-ratio value (6.24) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came significant with Factor-O, taken as criterion. The mean value came higher among the boys (5.52) than the girls (4.92). It indicates that the boys were found more apprehensive, self-reproaching, insecure, worrying and guilt prone than the girls who seemed to be assured, placid, secure, complacent and untroubled. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis
“1a_{11}(ii)” completely. Guinourd and Rychlak (1962) found that girls were significantly more insecure than the boys. Dhar (1986) found that boys were significantly more placid than girls who were more apprehensive. Singh (2005) found no significant difference between boys and girls belonging to the neglected and rejected categories.

It is again evident from the Table 71 that F-ratio value (4.93) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-O, taken as criterion. The mean value came higher among the students of arts stream (5.48) than the students of science stream (4.95). The arts stream students were found more apprehensive, self-reproaching, insecure, worrying and guilt prone than the students of science stream who seemed to be assured, placid, secure, complacent and untroubled. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a_{11}(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the arts stream students in the adolescent stage show much concern about their future perspectives and this is the career oriented stage where the adolescents have to think about their careers. This feeling makes them more insecure, worried and apprehensive.

It is again evident from the Table 71 that F-ratio value (0.40) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-O, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-O. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a_{11}(i)” completely.

It is again evident from the Table 71 that F-ratio value (0.08) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-O, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science
stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-O. This finding is thus also accepting the second null hypothesis “2a11(ii)” completely.

Again it is evident from the Table 71 that F-ratio value (0.17) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-O, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to the arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-O. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a11(iii)” completely.

It is again apparent from the Table-71 that F-ratio value (0.06) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-O, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-O of students. This finding is thus accepting the null hypothesis “2a11(iv)” completely.

VI.1(k2) ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-O scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 73 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 3.45 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-O. The mean value of rejected category of students (5.75) came higher than the neglected category of students (4.75). It means that the students of rejected category were found more apprehensive, self reproaching, insecure, worrying and guilt prone than the
It is evident from the Table 73 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 1.38, which is insignificant. It shows that the students of neglected and isolate categories were found alike on the Factor-O.

It is again evident from the Table 73 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 2.07, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-O. The mean value of rejected category of students (5.75) came higher than the isolate category of students (5.15). It means that the students of rejected category were found more apprehensive, self reproaching, insecure, worrying and guilt prone than the students of isolate category who seemed to be assured, placid, secure, complacent and untroubled. Dhar (1986) found that rejected students were more apprehensive, suspicous and forthright.. However Singh (2005) found that rejected students were more placid than the neglected students. It may be due to the reason that the rejected students are less intelligent having low scholastic achievement level. This makes them worry about their future in this age of uncertainty.

VI.1 (l₁) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-Q₂, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 77 that F-ratio value (5.64) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-Q₂, taken as
criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on the Factor-Q2. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a_{12}(i)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 77 that F-ratio value (2.35) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-Q2, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls seemed to be alike on the Factor-Q2. This finding is thus accepting the first null hypothesis “1a_{12}(ii)” completely. However dissimilar result was observed by Guinourd and Rychlak (1962) who found that boys were significantly more self-sufficient than girls.

It is evident from the Table 77 that F-ratio value (9.38) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-Q2, taken as criterion. The mean value came higher among the students of arts stream (5.57) than the students of science stream (4.84). The arts stream students were found more self-sufficient, prefer own decisions and resourceful than the science stream students who seemed to be socially group dependent, joiner and sound follower. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a_{12}(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the arts stream students study the curriculum which don’t support group activities and dependency on others. So they become self sufficient and prefer their own decisions.

It is again evident from the Table 77 that F-ratio value (0.72) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-Q2, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-Q2. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a_{12}(i)” completely.
It is again evident from the Table 77 that F-ratio value (0.54) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-Q2, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-Q2. This finding is thus also accepting the second null hypothesis “2a12(ii)” completely.

Again it is evident from the Table 77 that F-ratio value (0.12) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-Q2, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-Q2. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a12(iii)” completely.

It is again apparent from the Table 77 that F-ratio value (0.49) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-Q2, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-Q2 of students. This finding is thus accepting the null hypothesis “2a12(iv)” completely.

VI.1 (l2)  ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-Q2 scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 79 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 2.42, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-Q2. The mean value of rejected category of students (5.75) came higher than the neglected category of
students (5.05). It means that the students of rejected category were found more self-sufficient, prefer own decisions and resourceful than the students of neglected category who seemed to be socially group dependent, joiners and sound followers. It may be due to the reason that the rejected students are self asserted and heedless in nature. This tendency develops in them a sense of resourcefulness and self sufficiency.

It is evident from the Table 79 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 0.86, which is insignificant. It shows that the students of neglected and isolate categories were found alike on the Factor-Q₂.

It is evident from the Table 79 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category of students came 3.28, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-Q₂. The mean value of rejected category of students (5.75) came higher than the isolate category of students (4.80). It means that the students of rejected category were found more self-sufficient, prefer own decisions and resourceful than the students of isolate category who seemed to be socially group dependent, joiners and sound followers. However Bharguava (1965) found that isolates were more self-bound.

VI.1 (m₁) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for 3×2×2 Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-Q₃, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 83 that F-ratio value (8.45) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-Q₃, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the
students belonging to different sociometric categories on the Factor-Q3. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a13(i)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 83 that F-ratio value (2.18) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-Q3, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls were found alike on the Factor-Q3. This finding is thus accepting the first null hypothesis “1a13(ii)” completely. Dhar (1986) found that boys were more controlled and disciplined whereas girls were uncontrolled and indisciplined.

It is evident from the Table 83 that F-ratio value (5.20) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-Q3, taken as criterion. The mean value came higher among the students of science stream (5.88) than the students of arts stream (5.32). The science stream students were found more controlled, socially precise, self-disciplined, compulsive and have high self-concept control than the arts stream students who seemed to be uncontrolled, lax, followed own urges careless of social rules and have low integration. This finding thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a13(iii)” completely. It may be due to the fact that the science stream students are involved in group activities which develop in them self-discipline, high self-control and they become socially precise.

It is evident from the Table 83 that F-ratio value (0.10) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-Q3, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-Q3. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a13(i)” completely.
It is again evident from the Table 83 that F-ratio value (0.47) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-Q3, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-Q3. This finding is thus also accepting the second null hypothesis “2a13(ii)” completely.

Again it is evident from the Table 83 that F-ratio value (0.005) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-Q3, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-Q3. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a13(iii)” completely.

It is again apparent from the Table 83 that F-ratio value (0.09) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-Q3, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-Q3 of students. This finding is thus accepting the null hypothesis “2a13(iv)” completely.

VI.1 (m2) ‘t'-ratio values of the mean Factor-Q3 scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 85 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected category of students came 4.17, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-Q3. The mean value of neglected category of students (6.23) came higher than the rejected category of
students (4.98). It means that the students of neglected category were found more controlled, socially precise, self-disciplined, compulsive and have high self-concept control than the students of rejected category who seemed to be uncontrolled, lax, follow own urges, careless of social rules and have low integration.

It is evident from the Table 85 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate category of students came 2.10, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-Q3. The mean of neglected category of students (6.23) came higher than the isolate category of students (5.60). It means that the students of neglected category were found more controlled, socially precise, self-disciplined, compulsive and have high self-concept control than the students of isolate category who seemed to be uncontrolled, follow own urges, careless of social rules and have low integration.

It is evident from the Table 85 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate category students came 2.07, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-Q3. The mean value of isolate category of students (5.60) came higher than the rejected category of students (4.98). It means that the students of isolate category were found more controlled, socially precise, self-disciplined, compulsive and have high self-concept control than the students of rejected category who seemed to be uncontrolled, follow own urges, careless of social rules and have low integration. It may be due to the reason that the neglected students prefer the group activities and their peers also
give them some sorts of positive choices which gives them a sense of belongingness. The sense of being a part of group develops their high self concept control. Choudhary (1943) found that rejected students were more indisciplined than students of any other sociometric group. Singh (1963) also found similar results.

VI.1 \( (n_1) \) Summary of Three-way Analysis of Variance for \( 3 \times 2 \times 2 \) Factorial design showing the sum of squares for various components and F-ratios with Factor-Q, as criterion.

It is evident from the Table 89 that F-ratio value (5.59) for the first main factor i.e. ‘Sociometric categories’ came significant with Factor-Q, taken as criterion. It indicates that there was found significant difference among the students belonging to different sociometric categories on the Factor-Q. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a\( _{14}(i) \)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 89 that F-ratio value (0.55) for the second main factor i.e. ‘Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-Q, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls were found alike on the Factor-Q. This finding is thus accepting the first null hypothesis “1a\( _{14}(ii) \)” completely. However dissimilar results were reported by Guinourd and Rychlak (1962) who found that girls were significantly more tense than the boys; and Chandratre (1982) who found that boys belonging to neglected and rejected categories were significantly more tense than the girls.

It is evident from the Table 89 that F-ratio value (5.57) for the third main factor i.e. ‘Academic streams’ came significant with Factor-Q, taken as criterion. The mean value came higher among the students of science stream (5.37) than
the students of arts stream (4.78). The science stream students were found more tense, driven, overwrought, frustrated and fretful than the students of arts stream who seemed to be relaxed, tranquil, torpid, unfrustrated and composed. This finding is thus rejecting the first null hypothesis “1a$_{14}$(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the science stream students remain over busy in their curriculum related assignments. The over burden of scholastic activities generate more pressure, tension and over-wroughtness on them.

It is evident from the Table 89 that F-ratio value (1.24) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Sex’ came insignificant with Factor-Q$_4$, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-Q$_4$. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis “2a$_{14}$ (i)” completely.

It is again evident from the Table 89 that F-ratio value (0.03) against the interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-Q$_4$, taken as criterion. It indicates that arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories were found alike on the Factor-Q$_4$. This finding is thus also accepting a part of the second null hypothesis ‘2a$_{14}$(ii)” completely.

Again it is evident from the Table 89 that F-ratio value (0.12) against the interactional effect of ‘Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-Q$_4$, taken as criterion. It indicates that boys and girls belonging to arts and science streams were found alike on the Factor-Q$_4$. This finding is thus accepting the second null hypothesis ‘2a$_{14}$(iii)” completely.
It is again apparent from the Table 89 that F-ratio value (0.14) for the triple interactional effect of ‘Sociometric categories, Sex and Academic streams’ came insignificant with Factor-Q4, taken as criterion. It can, therefore, be inferred that there was found no cumulative effect of sociometric categories, sex and academic streams on the Factor-Q4 of students. This finding is thus accepting the null hypothesis “2a14(iv)” completely.

VI.1 (n2) ‘t’-ratio values of the mean Factor-Q4 scores of students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 91 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and rejected categories of students came 2.57, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to neglected and rejected category differ significantly from each other on the Factor-Q4. The mean value of rejected category of students (5.65) came higher than the neglected category of students (4.88). It means that the students of rejected category seemed to be more tense, driven, overwrought, frustrated and fretful than the students of neglected category who seemed to be relaxed, tranquil, torpid, unfrustrated and composed.

It is evident from the Table 91 that ‘t’-ratio value between the neglected and isolate categories of students came 0.60, which is insignificant. It shows that the students of neglected and isolate categories seemed to be alike on the Factor-Q4.

It is evident from the Table 91 that ‘t’-ratio value between the rejected and isolate categories of students came 3.17, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that the students belonging to rejected and isolate categories differ significantly from each other on the Factor-Q4. The mean value of rejected category of students (5.65) came higher than the isolate category of students.
(4.70). It means that the students of rejected category seemed to be more tense, driven overwrought, frustrated and fretful than the students of isolate category who seemed to be relaxed, tranquil, torpid, unfrustrated and composed. It may be due to the reason that the rejected students do not occupy an accepted place in the classroom situation as they receive negative choices from their peers. This rejection creates frustration, tension and overwroughtness. Chandratre (1982) also found that rejected students were more tense than the neglected students.

VI.2 INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS ON THE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BASED ON THE ELEVEN SCORING FACTORS OF REACTIONS TO FRUSTRATION

(a. Sociometric Category-Wise Differences)

V1.2 (a1) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Extrapeditive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

The interpretation and discussion under this caption is based on the Table 92. The CR value (5.08) between the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories on the “Extrapeditive” factor was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of students of rejected category (4.37) came higher as compared to the students of neglected category (3.05). The students of rejected category insistently pointed out the presence of frustrating obstacle in their responses more than the students of neglected category. This finding is thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a1(i)” completely.
The CR value (2.32) between the students belonging to neglected and isolate categories on the ‘Extrapeditive’ factor was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of students of isolate category (3.70) came higher as compared to the students of neglected category (3.05). Students of isolate category insistently pointed out the presence of frustrating obstacle more than the students of neglected category. This finding is thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a1(ii)” completely.

The CR value (2.24) between the students belonging to rejected and isolate categories on the ‘Extrapeditive’ factor was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of students of rejected category (4.37) came higher as compared to the students of isolate category (3.70). It seems that students of rejected category insistently pointed out the presence of frustrating obstacle in their responses more than the students of isolate category. This finding is thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a1(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the students of rejected category are suffering from a number of problems which make them feel the presence of frustrated obstacle in their responses and they insistently pointed out that obstacle in their responses.

VI.2 (a2) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Intropeditive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

The interpretation and discussion under this caption is based on the Table 93. The CR value (3.69) between the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories on the “Intropeditive” factor was found significant at 0.01 level of
confidence. The mean value of the students of neglected category (0.74) came higher as compared to the students of rejected category (0.26). The students of neglected category showed more emphasise on the extent of their embarrassment at being involved in instigating others’ frustration than the students of neglected category thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a2(i)” completely.

The CR value (2.22) between the students belonging to neglected and isolate categories on the “Intropeditive” factor was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of the students of neglected category (0.74) came higher as compared to the students of isolate category (0.43). It seems that the students of neglected category showed more emphasis on the extent of their embarrassment being involved in instigating others’ frustration than the students of isolate category thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a2(ii)” completely.

The CR value (2.13) between the students belonging to rejected and isolate categories on the “Intropeditive” factor was also found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of the students of isolate category (0.43) came higher as compared to the students of rejected category (0.26). It seems that the students of isolate category showed more stress on extent of embarrassment being involved in instigating others’ frustration than the students of rejected category. This finding thus rejected the third null hypothesis “3a2(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that isolate students are not given any positive or negative choices as they are shy, introvert, hesitating and less social. These characteristics make them show more emphasis on the extent of their embarrassment at being involved in generating frustration on others. They feel embarrassed at being involved in causing frustration to others.
VI.2(a) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Impeditive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

The interpretation and discussion under this caption is based on the Table 94. The CR value (3.50) between the students belonging to neglected and rejected categories on the “Impeditive” factor was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of the students of neglected category (1.14) came higher as compared to the students of rejected category (0.72). It seems that the students of neglected category denied the presence of obstacle in the frustrating situation more than the students of rejected category, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a(i).”

The CR value (0.50) between the students of neglected and isolate categories on the “Impeditive” factor was found insignificant. The students belonging to neglected and isolate categories seemed to be alike on denial response regarding the presence of obstacle in the frustrating situation. This finding thus accepted the third null hypothesis “3a(ii)” completely.

The CR value (2.92) between the students of rejected and isolate categories on the “Impeditive” factor was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of the students of isolate category (1.07) came higher as compared to the students of rejected category (0.72). It seems that the students of isolate category showed denial response regarding the presence of obstacle in frustrating situation more than the students of rejected category, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a(iii).” It may appear that being isolated by the peer group members, these students feel embarrassment in case of frustrating others and as
such they showed denial response and refused to accept the presence of any obstacle in frustrating situation.

Adinolfi, Watson and Klein (1973) found that internalizing aggression and insisting on the frustrating situation was more in the rejected category of students whereas externalizing aggression was associated with positive peer evaluation for students. Dodge, Coie and Brakke (1982); Coie & Kupersmidt (1983); Hubbard (2001) and Bierman (2004) found that peer rejected students exhibited more aggressive behavior than the peer neglected students. Moreover 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 and domineering than the neglected students while interacting with other people.

**VI.2(a) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Extrapunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.**

It is evident from the Table 95 that the CR value (5.07) between the students belonging to the neglected and rejected categories on the “Extrapunitive” factor was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of students of rejected category (5.52) came higher as compared to the students of neglected category (4.0). It indicates that the students of rejected category blamed other people or things in the environment for frustrating situation more than the students of neglected category thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a4(i).”
The CR value (2.86) between the students belonging to the neglected and isolate categories on the ‘Extrapunitive’ factor was also found significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value (4.80) of students of isolate category came higher in comparison to the students of neglected category (4.0). This shows that the students of isolate category blamed and showed hostility to other people or things more than the students of neglected category thus rejecting third null hypothesis “3a(iii)”.

Moreover the CR value (2.40) between the students belonging to the rejected and isolate categories on this factor was found significant at .05 level of confidence. The mean value (5.52) of students of rejected category came higher than the students of isolate category. This shows that the students of rejected category blamed other people or things more for frustrating situation than the students of isolate category thus also rejecting third null hypothesis ‘3a(iii).’ It may be due to the reason that the rejected students are very firm to their behaviour and feelings and are not ready to accept their weaker points. As such they always try to put the blames on other people or things around them to get an escape from the frustrating situation. Green, Vosk & Beck (1981) and Coie, Dodge & Coppotelli (1982) also found that the rejected students scored high on disrupts, fights and showed restlessness in their responses than the neglected students.
VI.2(a5) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Variant of “Extrapunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 96 depicted that the CR value (4.54) between the students belonging to the neglected and rejected categories on the “Variant of Extrapunitive” factor was found significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of students of rejected category (1.08) came higher than the students of neglected category (0.49) which shows that the students of rejected category denied more aggressively that they are responsible for some offences with which they are charged as compared to the students of neglected category thus, rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a5(i).” The CR value (8.08) between the students belonging to the neglected and isolate categories on this factor was also found significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of students of isolate category (1.54) came higher than the students of neglected category (0.49) which shows that the students of isolate category denied their responsibility for their offences more than the students of neglected category, thus, rejecting the third null hypothesis “3(a5)(ii).”

Moreover, the CR value (3.07) between the students belonging to the rejected and isolate categories on this factor was also reported significant at .01 level of confidence and the mean value of students of isolate category (1.54) came higher than the mean value of students of rejected category (1.08). Thus this finding points out that the students of isolate category seemed to be more denial of their responsibility regarding the offences, being charged as compared
to the students of rejected category, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a₃(iii).” It may be due to the reason that the isolate students in the classroom situation are not enjoying a socially desirable position as the classmates are not noticing them and considering them for a number of activities. The reason for being isolated in the class may be the rigidity in their behaviour patterns and they are not responsible members in the class. They are not ready to accept their responsibility regarding the offences being charged by others.

VI.2(a₆) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Intropunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 97 depicted that the CR value (5.84) between the students belonging to the neglected and rejected categories on “Intropunitive” factor was found significant at .01 level of confidence and the mean value of the students of neglected category (2.08) came higher than the students of rejected category (1.03). It indicates that the students of neglected category blamed themselves more than the students of rejected category regarding the frustrating situation. They held themselves responsible for being frustrated in the different situations. This finding is thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a₆(i).”

The CR value (2.27) between the neglected & isolate students on this factor was also found significant at .05 level of confidence and the mean value of neglected students (2.08) came higher than that of isolate students (1.58). It shows that neglected students seemed to show more responsible behaviour regarding the frustrating situation in comparison to isolate students, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a₆(ii).”
Significant difference was also found between the students of rejected and isolate categories as CR value (3.24) came significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of the students of isolate category (1.58) was found higher than the students of rejected category (1.03). This also shows that the students of isolate category were found more responsible for accepting their frustrating behavior as compared with the students of rejected category, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a6(iii).” It may be due to the reason that neglected students get a few choices in the classroom situation, possesses some positive personality traits and desirable behaviour patterns which attracts some class members towards them. This positive attitude, to some extent, make them responsible for accepting their frustrating behaviour. They have some sort of belongingness in the classroom situations.

VI.2(a7) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Variant of Intropunitive” factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is clear from Table 98 that significant difference was found between the students of neglected & rejected categories on “Variant of Intropunitive” factor and the CR value (6.40) was found significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of students of neglected category (0.84) came higher than the mean value of students of rejected category (0.20) which shows that the students of neglected category admitted their guilt for the frustrating situation by denying their essential fault more than their rejected counterparts, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a7(i).”
Significant difference was also reported between the students of neglected and isolate categories as their CR value (3.55) came significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of neglected students (0.84) reported higher than the mean value of isolate students (0.45) which indicates that neglected students showed more admittance behavior by accepting their guilt for frustrating situation than their isolate counterparts, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a(i).”

Significant difference was also noted between the students of rejected and isolate categories as their CR value (3.57) also came significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of students of isolate category (0.45) came higher than that of students of rejected category (0.20) which indicates that the isolate students were also found admitting their guilt for frustrating situation more than the rejected students thus rejecting the part of third null hypothesis “3a(ii).” It may be due to the reason that the neglected students in comparison to the rejected and isolate students, possess certain emotional and psychological traits which make them submissive to their faults and guilt for frustrating situation.

VI.2(a)(8) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Impunitive” factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 99 that CR value (4.10) between the students of neglected category and the students of rejected category on ‘Impunitive’ factor was found significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of students of rejected category (3.72) came higher than the students of neglected category (2.90) which points to the finding that the students of rejected category regarded the frustrating situation as unavoidable and tried to evade the blame for
frustration more than the students of neglected category, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a(i).”

No significant difference was reported between the students of neglected and isolate categories as the CR value (1.39) came insignificant. This points out that neglected and isolate students were found alike in considering the frustrating situation as unavoidable and evading the blame thereof, thus accepting the third null hypothesis “3a(ii).”

Moreover the CR value (2.59) between the rejected and isolate groups of students on this factor was found significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of rejected students (3.72) came higher than that of isolate students (3.15) which shows that the rejected students also regarded the frustrating situation as unavoidable for them more than the isolate students, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a(iii)” completely. It may be due to the fact that rejected students do not have enough potential and capacity to fight the frustrating situation. Moreover they do not have the attitude and behavioural skills essential for being accepted in the group mates. This makes them unaccepted which weakens their power of intellect and thus they consider the frustrating situation as unavoidable for them and try to evade the blame there in.

VI.2(a9) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Extrapersistive” factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 100 revealed that the CR value (4.18) between the students of neglected and rejected categories on “Extrapersistive” factor was found significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of students of neglected
category (1.09) came lower than the students of rejected category (1.80). The students of rejected category expected emphatically the solution for their frustrating situation from others more than the students of neglected category thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a9(i).”

The CR value (2.57) between the students of neglected and isolate categories on this factor was also found significant at .05 level of confidence. The mean value of students of neglected category (1.09) came lower than the students of isolate category (1.45). The students of isolate category showed more expectation for the solution for their frustrating situation in comparison to the neglected students, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a9(ii).”

Moreover the CR value calculated (2.06) between the students of rejected and isolate categories on this factor was also found significant at .05 level of confidence and the mean value of students of rejected category (1.80) was reported higher than that of the students of isolate category (1.45). The finding thus points out that the students of rejected category were found more optimistic regarding the solution of their frustrating situation as compared with the isolate students, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a9(iii).” It may appear that the rejected students don’t have required ability to avoid the frustrating situation and thus expect the solution of the same from others without personal involvement. They welcome the solution from others without making their own efforts.
VI.2(a_{10}) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Intropersistive” factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 101 revealed that the CR value (5.17) between the students of neglected and rejected categories on “Intropersistive” factor was found significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of the students of neglected category (5.53) came higher than the mean value of the students of rejected category (3.98) which confirms that the students of neglected category offered amendments for solving the problems more frequently than the students of rejected category, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis, “3a_{10}(i).”

Moreover the CR value (2.44) between the students of neglected and isolate categories on this factor was found significant at .05 level of confidence and the mean value of students of neglected category (5.53) came higher than the students of isolate category (4.75). This infers that the students of neglected category offered amendments more than isolate students for solving the frustrating problem, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis, “3a_{10}(ii).”

The CR value (2.57) calculated between rejected and isolate students was also found significant at .05 level of confidence and the mean value of isolate students (4.75) was found higher than that of rejected students (3.98). This infers that isolate students showed more liberal behavior and offered amendments to reduce their frustrating problems as compared with the rejected students, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a_{10}(iii).” The neglected students have some positive personality traits and they appear to be in the position to tackle the frustrating situation more effectively as compared with the isolate and rejected
students. These students are in the position to offer various amendments for solving the frustrating problem.

VI.2(a11) **Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Impersistive” factor of reactions to frustration between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.**

Table 102 depicted that significant difference was found between the students of neglected and rejected categories on ‘Impersistive’ factor as the CR value (3.53) came significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of neglected students (2.24) came higher than that of rejected students (1.57) which infers that the neglected students showed more patience and hope regarding the solution of frustrating problems than their rejected counterparts, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a11(i).”

Moreover significant difference was also reported between the students of neglected and isolate categories on this factor as the CR value (4.10) also came significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of neglected students (2.24) came higher than that of isolate students (1.42) which infers that the neglected students showed more conformity and positive hope regarding circumstance oriented solution of the problem, in comparison to isolate students, thus rejecting the third null hypothesis “3a11(ii).”

No significant difference was reported between the students of rejected and isolate categories on this factor and as the CR value came insignificant. It shows that the students of rejected and isolate categories had alike expressions regarding the solution of frustrating problems and thus accepting the third null hypothesis “3a11(iii).” It may be due to the reason that the neglected students are more
submissive and emotionally controlled in comparison to the rejected and isolate students. They possess and exhibit a great deal of patience regarding the solution of the frustrating situation.

(b. Sex-Wise Differences in Different Sociometric Categories)

VI.2 (b1) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Extrapeditive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

The interpretation and discussion under this caption is based on the Table 103. The CR value (3.03) between boys and girls belonging to the neglected category on the “Extrapeditive” factor was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of boys (3.53) came higher than girls (2.56). The boys of neglected category insistently pointed out the presence of frustrating obstacle in their responses more than girls, thus rejecting the fourth null hypothesis “4a1(i)” completely.

It is also evident from the Table 103 that the CR value (3.26) between boys and girls belonging to the rejected category on the “Extrapeditive” factor was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of boys (4.97) came higher than girls (3.73). The boys of rejected category also pointed out the presence of frustrating obstacle in their responses more than girls thus rejecting the fourth null hypothesis “4a1(ii)” completely.

It is again evident from the Table 103 that the CR value (2.00) between boy and girls belonging to isolate category on the “Exrapeditive” factor was found
significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of the boys (4.14) came higher than girls (3.30). The boys of isolate category highlighted the presence of frustrating obstacle more than the girls, thus rejecting the fourth null hypothesis “4a1(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the boys in the three sociometric categories of adolescents lack problem solving instinct. Moreover they cannot handle the frustrating problem easily and properly. So they highlight the presence of frustrating obstacle.

VI.2(b2) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Intropeditive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 104 depicted that no significant differences were found between boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories of students on “Intropeditive” factor as their CR values came insignificant. It shows that the boys and girls belonging to neglected, rejected and isolate categories were found alike regarding the emphasis on the extent of their embarrassment at being involved in instigating others’ frustration, thus accepting the fourth null hypothesis completely.

VI.2(b3) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Impeditive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 105 also revealed the similar picture. No significant differences were found between boys and girls in the three sociometric categories on “Impeditive” factor as their CR values came insignificant. It is clear from these results that boys and girls in the respective sociometric categories were observed to be alike
towards the denial of presence of obstacle in the frustrating situation thus accepting the fourth hypothesis completely.

**VI.2(b4)** Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Extrapunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 106 presented the same picture of insignificance. No significant differences were reported between boys and girls in the three sociometric categories viz. neglected, rejected and isolate students on “Extrapunitive” factor as their CR values came insignificant. It infers that boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories of students possessed similar feelings by blaming other people or things in the environment for frustrating situation thus rejecting the fourth null hypothesis completely. Buelga, Musitu, Murgui & Pons (2008) and Ingles et al. (2008) found that boys displayed more aggressive behavior than their female class mates.

**VI.2(b5)** Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Variant of “Extrapunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 107 presented a slight different picture. Significant difference was found between boys and girls in the neglected category on “Variant of Extrapunitive” factor as the CR value (2.15) came significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of girls (0.63) was reported higher than the mean value of boys (0.35) which infers that girls denied more aggressively for their being responsible for their offences in comparison to boys thus rejecting the fourth null hypothesis “4a5(i).” It may be due to the reason that the girls have
least sense of sharing responsibilities. They are not ready to accept their responsibilities regarding the frustrating situation.

But no significance differences were observed between boys and girls in the rejected and isolate categories of students as their CR values came insignificant. The boys and girls in both these categories seemed to be alike in denying their responsibilities for some offences with which they are charged thus accepting the fourth null hypotheses “4a3(ii) & 4a3(iii). Malviya (1968) found that reactions of males and females were different. Males were more aggressive than females. Moreover Sumbali (1981) also found similar results and reported that boys were more aggressive than girls. Journe and Kestutie (2005) reported significant difference between the aggressive-disruptive criterion and sex groups. The aggressive-disruptive factor was more expressed among boys in all the sociometric groups than girls.

VI.2(b) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Intropunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 108 depicted a picture of insignificance of CR values. No significant differences were found between boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively on “Intropunitive” factor as their CR values came insignificant. These results show that boys and girls in all the three sociometric categories were found alike regarding the nature of blaming and censuring themselves for the frustrating situations, thus accepting the fourth null hypothesis completely.
VI.2(b7) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Variant of Intropunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 109 also presented a similar picture. No significant differences were observed between boys and girls in all the three sociometric categories respectively on the “Variant of Intropunitive” factor as their CR values calculated came insignificant. The results thus interpret that boys and girls in all sociometric categories had similar feelings in case of admitting their guilt for the frustrating situation by denying their essential fault there in thus accepting the fourth null hypothesis completely.

VI.2(b8) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Impunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Similar picture of insignificance of CR values was revealed in the Table 110. No significance differences were noticed between boys and girls in the neglected, rejected or isolated categories respectively on the “Impunitive” factor as their CR values came insignificant. It appears that both boys and girls had common feelings regarding the frustrated situation. They regarded the frustrating situation as unavoidable and tried to evade the blame for the frustration. These results thus accepting the fourth null hypothesis completely.
VI.2(b9) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Extrapersistive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 111 also presented the same picture as no significant differences were reported between boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively on the “Extrapersistive” factor as their CR values came insignificant. The boys and girls in all the three sociometric categories were found alike as they expected emphatically the solutions for the frustrating situation from others thus, accepting fourth null hypothesis completely.

VI.2 (b10) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Intropersistive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 112 depicted that the CR value (2.48) between boys and girls in the neglected category on “Intropersistive” factor was found significant at .05 level of confidence. The mean value of girls (6.07) came higher than that of boys (4.98) which infers that girls in the neglected category were found offering more amendments for solving the problems arising from frustrating situation in comparison to boys, thus rejecting the fourth null hypothesis “4a10(i)” completely.

The CR value (2.08) between boys and girls in the rejected category on this factor was also found significant at .05 level of confidence and the mean value of girls (4.40) came higher than the boys (3.59) which shows that girls also
preferred more amendments for solving a frustrating situation than boys, thus rejecting the fourth null hypothesis “4a10(ii)” completely.

Moreover significant difference was also found between boys and girls in the isolate category as the CR value (2.10) came significant at.05 level of confidence. The mean value of girls (5.16) was found higher than that of boys (4.28) which infers that the girls in comparison to boys, in the isolate category also favoured more amendments for solving the frustrating situation. The finding is thus rejecting the fourth null hypothesis “4a10(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively are flexible in nature and possess a great sense of adopting behavior. As such they offer amendments for solving the frustrating situation.

VI.2(b11) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Impersistive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 113 depicted a picture of insignificances in the CR values. No significant differences were found between boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively on the “Impersistive” factor as their CR values came insignificant. These results, hence, indicate that boys and girls in all the three respective sociometric categories were found alike in showing patience and hope about the circumstance that bring solution of frustrating problems thus accepting the fourth null hypothesis completely.
VI.2 (c.) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Extrapeditive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

The interpretation and discussion under this caption is based on the Table 114. The CR value (2.60) between arts and science stream students belonging to neglected category on the “Extrapeditive” factor was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of arts stream students (3.48) came higher than science stream students (2.62). It means that arts stream students of neglected category insistently pointed out more presence of frustrating obstacle in their responses than science stream students. This finding is thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a1(i)” completely.

It is also evident from the Table 114 that the CR value (2.68) between arts and science stream students belonging to rejected category on the “Extrapeditive” factor was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of arts stream students (4.85) came higher than science stream students (3.83). It means that arts stream students of rejected category insistently pointed out the presence of frustrating obstacle in their responses more than science stream students thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a1(ii)” completely.

It is again evident from the Table 114 that the CR value (6.14) between arts and science stream students belonging to isolate category on the “Extrapeditive” scoring factor was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value
of arts stream students (4.83) came higher than science stream students (2.62). It means that arts stream students of isolate category pointed out the presence of frustrating obstacle in their responses more than science stream students thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a1(iii)” completely. It may be due to the reason that the arts stream students in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories possess low problem solving abilities in comparison to the science students. This is why they project the presence of frustrating obstacle in their responses. They lack psychology of hiding their inner tendencies regarding the problem generating frustrations.

VI.(C2) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Intropeditive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 115 depicted that the CR value (0.17) between arts and science stream students in the neglected category on ‘Intropeditive’ factor was found insignificant which infers that arts and science stream students in this category were found alike regarding the emphasis on the extent of their embarrassment at being involved in instigating others’ frustration, thus accepting the fifth null hypothesis “5a2(i).” But the CR value (2.56) calculated between arts and science streams students of rejected category was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. This finding indicates that science stream students (0.38), in comparison to arts stream counterparts (0.15) put more emphasis on the extent of their embarrassment at being involved in instigating others’ frustration, thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a2(ii).”
The CR value (0.67) between arts and science stream students in the isolate category was found insignificant which showed that both the arts and science stream students in this category were found alike on putting emphasis on the extent of their embarrassment at being involved in instigating others’ frustration thus accepting the fifth null hypothesis “5a_3(iii).” It may be due to the reason that the science stream students are practical in nature and they believe in self respect. As such they are more concerned with their embarrassment for frustrating others.

VI.2(c_3) Significance of difference of means scores based on the “Impeditive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories

Table 116 also depicted the same picture. Significant difference was found between arts and science stream students in the neglected category on “Impeditive” factor as their CR value (3.21) came significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of arts stream students (1.45) came higher than science stream students (0.84). The arts stream students showed more denial responses regarding the presence of obstacle in the frustrating situation than the science stream students thus rejecting the hypothesis “5a_3(i).” But no significant differences were reported between arts and science stream students, in the rejected as well as isolate categories as their CR values came insignificant. It is observable that arts and science stream students in these categories were found alike as they denied the presence of obstacle in the frustrating situation thus accepting the fifth null hypotheses “5a_3(ii) & 5a_3(iii).”
VI.2 \( (C_4) \) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Extrapunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 117 revealed that the CR value (2.42) between arts and science stream students in the neglected category on “Extrapunitive” factor was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence and the mean value of science stream students (4.49) came higher than arts stream students (3.50). The science stream students blamed other people or things in the environment for frustrating situation more than the arts stream students thus rejecting the hypothesis “\( 5a_4(i) \)” completely.

The CR value (4.40) between arts and science stream students in the rejected category was found significant at .01 level of confidence and the mean value of science stream students (6.53) appeared higher than arts stream students (4.64). The finding thus holds that science stream students showed more concern in blaming the other people or things for their frustrating situation as compared to arts stream students, thus rejecting the hypothesis “\( 5a_4(ii) \).” Moreover the CR value (2.83) between the students of arts and science streams in the isolate category was also found significant at .05 level of confidence and the mean value of science stream students (5.35) came higher than arts stream students (4.22). It infers that again the science stream students showed more blaming other people or things for their frustrating situation than the arts stream students, thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “\( 5a_4(iii) \).” It may be due to the reason that Science stream students in all the three sociometric categories do not possess submissive traits.
and as such they are not welcoming the blames put on them regarding the frustrating situation. They try to put blames on other people or things around and try to get an escape from the blames.

VI.2(C5) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Variant of Extrapunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is revealed from table 118 that CR value (2.30) between arts and science stream students in the neglected category was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence on the “Variant of Extrapunitive” factor. The mean value of science streams students (0.60) reported higher than that of arts stream students (0.30). It showed that the students belonging to science stream denied aggressively for being responsible for their offences in comparison to the students belonging to the arts streams thus rejecting the hypothesis “5a5(i).” Significant difference was also found between students of arts and science streams in the rejected category and the CR value (4.53) came significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of science stream students (1.54) came higher than that of arts stream students (0.68). The science stream students exhibited more denying behavior and responses in accepting their responsibilities for some offences than the arts stream students, thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a5(ii).”

Significant difference was also reported between the arts and science stream students in the isolate category as the CR value (2.09) came significant at .05 level of confidence and the mean value of science stream students (1.76) again came higher than that of arts stream students (1.30). It reveals that again science
stream students showed more denial behavior in comparison to arts stream students, thus rejecting the null hypothesis “5a5(iii).” It appears again the students studying in the science stream don’t have shared responsibility and belongingness with others regarding the frustrating situation. They appear to be ego centric which prohibits them to accept their responsibilities regarding their offences. They usually deny their responsibility for their offences and hold others responsible for the causes of their offences. It may also be due to the reason that science stream students usually remain busy in their subject’s practical significance bothering least about the frustrating situations. Moreover being scientific in nature and having scientific outlook, they donot believe in illusions of various kind.

VI.2 (C6) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Intropunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 119 depicted a picture of insignificance of CR values. No significant differences were found between students of arts and science stream in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively on “Intropunitive” factor as their CR values came insignificant. These results show that arts and science stream students in all the respective sociometric categories were found alike regarding the nature of blaming themselves for the frustrating situation, thus accepting the fifth null hypothesis completely.
VI.2(C7) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Variant of Intropunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is revealed in the Table 120 that significant difference was reported between the students belonging to arts and science streams in the neglected category on the “Variant of Intropunitive” as the CR value (2.29) came significant at .05 level of confidence. The mean value of arts stream students (1.04) came higher than that of science stream students (0.65) which shows that arts stream students, in comparison to science stream students admitted their guilt for the frustrating situation more by without accepting their essential fault there in. This finding is thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a7(i).” It may be due to the reason that arts stream students possess accepting and submissive nature which make them to admit their guilt for the frustrating situation. They may realize their guilt as and when it is projected by others.

But no significant differences were found between arts and science stream students in the rejected as well as isolate categories respectively as the CR values came insignificant. Both the arts and science stream students were found alike in admitting their fault for the frustrating situations, thus accepting the fifth null hypotheses “5a7(ii) & 5a7(iii).”
VI.2(C8) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Impunitive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 121 revealed that no significant differences were reported between arts and science stream students in the neglected and isolate categories respectively on the ‘Impunitive’ factor as their CR values came insignificant. Arts and science stream students in both the categories were found alike as they had same feelings regarding the frustrating situation. They considered the frustrating situation as unavoidable and tried to evade the blame for it. These findings are thus accepting the fifth null hypotheses “5as(i) & 5as(iii).”

But significant difference was found between arts and science stream students on this factor, in the rejected category as the CR value (5.87) came significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean value of arts stream students (4.54) came higher than that of science stream students (2.78). The arts stream students seem considering frustrating situation as unavoidable and evadable more than the science stream students, thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5as(ii).” It may be due to the reason that arts stream students do not have enough potential and problem solving aptitude. Due to this inability, they consider frustrating situation as unavoidable and evadable.
VI.2(C9) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Extrapersistive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is clear from Table 122 that the CR value (2.34) between the arts and science stream students in the neglected group on the “Extrapersistive” factor was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of science stream students (1.30) came higher than that of arts stream students (0.88) which gives a clear indication that science stream students in comparison to arts stream students, were more expecting emphatically the solutions for the frustrating situation from other persons, thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a0(i).”

Similar results were found in case of rejected and isolate categories. Significant difference was found between arts and science stream students in the rejected category as the CR value (2.39) came significant at .05 level of confidence. The finding thus reveals that Science stream students (2.16) were more concerned about the solutions for the frustrating situation from other sources as compared to arts stream students (1.49) thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a0(ii).” Significant difference was also noted between arts and science stream students in the isolate category as the CR value (2.82) came significant at 0.01 level of confidence signifying that science stream students (1.76) were again found more concerned regarding the solutions of the frustrating situation from others than their arts stream (1.14) counterparts, thus rejecting the fifth hypothesis “5a0(iii).” It may be due to the reason that science stream students have to remain busy in their studies more than the arts stream students.
Due to lack of time, they expect the solution of any frustrating situation (if any) from others as they do not want to waste their precious time for involving themselves in these unnecessary things.

VI.2\((C_{10})\) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Intropersistive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 123 depicted a significant picture of CR values. Significant difference was found between arts and science stream students in the neglected category as the CR value (2.04) came significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The science stream students (5.98) were found offering more amendments for solving the frustrating situation in comparison to arts stream students (5.06), thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a_{10(i)}.” Significant difference was also reported between arts and science stream students in rejected category as the CR value (2.53) came significant at .05 level of confidence. The science stream students (4.49) were again found more concerned with offering amendments in order to get solutions of frustrated situations than their arts stream (3.53) counterparts.

The CR value (2.28) was found significant at .05 level between arts and science stream students in the isolate group. The science stream students (5.23) again showed more considerate behaviour in bringing some amendments in their behavior for solving problems of frustration in comparison to the arts stream students (4.25). These findings thus rejected the null hypotheses “5a_{10(ii)} &5a_{10(iii)}.” It appears that science students possess more adaptive behavior as compared to the arts stream students. They appear more flexible in their behavior...
and get ready to bring amendments in their behavior to solve the frustrated problems. Moreover they also give their view points in order to get an easy and time saving solution to the frustrating situation.

VI.2 (C_{11})  **Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Impersistive” scoring factor of reactions to frustration between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.**

Table 124 also presented a similar picture. The CR value (2.66) between arts and science stream students in neglected group was found significant at .05 level of confidence on the factor “Impersistive.” The mean value of arts stream students (2.63) came higher than that of science stream students (1.86) which infers that arts stream students were more patient and hopeful regarding the solution of the frustrating situation than the science stream students and thus rejecting the fifth null hypothesis “5a_{11}(i)”

Significant difference was also found between these stream students in the rejected category as the CR value (5.60) came significant at .01 level of confidence. The arts stream students (2.09) in comparison to science stream students (0.97) showed more patient behavior for the solution of the frustrating tendencies. Significant difference was also noted between students of arts and science streams in the isolate category as the CR value (2.16) came significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of arts stream students (1.69) came higher than that of science streams students (1.15) which infers that arts stream students in the isolate category were also found more patient and hopeful than the science stream students regarding finding solutions for the frustrating situations.
thus rejecting the fifth null hypotheses “5a_{11}(ii) & 5a_{11}(iii)” completely. It is due to the reason that arts stream students are more introvert, emotionally controlled and easy going and as such they exhibit more patience regarding the solution of the problem. They remain hopeful having positive outlook that the solution of the frustrating problem can be attained with the passage of time. They believe in wait and watch policy and do not believe in making their own efforts for bringing about the solution of the problem.

VI.3 INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS BASED ON THE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF THE ELEVEN PROBLEM AREAS

(a. Sociometric Category-Wise Differences)

VI.3(a) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Health and Physical Development” area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

The interpretation and discussion under this caption is based on the Table 125. The CR value (2.54) between the students belonging to the neglected and rejected categories on the “Health and Physical Development” area was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of students of rejected category (14.44) came higher as compared to the students of neglected category (13.02). It seems that the students of rejected category experienced more problems regarding the “Health and Physical Development” than the students of neglected category. This finding is thus rejecting the sixth null hypothesis “6a_{1}(i)” completely.
The CR value (0.06) between the students belonging to the neglected and isolate categories on the “Health and Physical Development” area was found insignificant. The students belonging to the neglected and isolate categories were found to be alike on the “Health and Physical Development” area of problems thus accepting the sixth null hypothesis “6a1(ii)” completely.

The CR value (2.50) between the students belonging to the rejected and isolate categories on the “Health and Physical Development” area was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of students of rejected category (14.44) came higher as compared to the students of isolate category (12.99). It seems that the students of rejected category experienced more Health and Physical Development problems than the students of isolate category, thus rejecting the sixth null hypothesis “6a1(iii)” It may be due to the reason that rejected students do not possess sound physical health. They do not attract others for a variety of activities. They lack sound living habits and little bother about their health and physical aspects of personality.

**VI.3(a2)** Significance of differences of mean scores based on the “Finance, Living conditions and Employment” area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

In the present study, the neglected, rejected and isolate groups of students were compared on “Finance, Living conditions and Employment” area (Table 126). There were found significant mean differences between neglected (15.14) & rejected (17.92) and between rejected (17.92) & isolate (15.58) groups of students on finance, living conditions and employment area of the problems and their CR values came significant at .01 level of confidence, thus rejecting the
sixth null hypotheses “6a$_2$(i)” and “6a$_2$(iii).” But there was found no significant
difference between neglected (15.14) and isolate (15.58) groups of students as the
CR value came insignificant thus accepting the sixth null hypotheses “6a$_2$(ii)
completely.

The rejected and isolate groups of students were found to have more finance,
living conditions and employment problems as compared to the neglected group
of students. The isolate group of students, when compared to the neglected
students experienced more problems in this area and on the other hand rejected
students when compared with the neglected and isolate students experienced
more finance, living conditions and employment related problems. Hence it is
clear that finance, living condition and employment problems were displayed
more by the rejected group of students when compared with neglected and isolate
groups of students. It may be due to the reason that the rejected students come
from the low socio-economic status families and they do not enjoy modern
facilities of life at home. This will have negative influence on their personality
development which becomes the cause of their being rejected. They are uncertain
about their employment at this career oriented stage.

VI.3(a$_3$) Significance of differences of mean scores based on the “Social
and Recreational Activities” area between the students belonging
to different sociometric categories.

The neglected, rejected and isolate group of students were also compared on
“Social and Recreational Activities area” (Table 127). There were found
significant mean differences between neglected (17.08) & rejected (19.22) and
rejected (19.22) & isolate (16.53) groups of students on “Social and Recreational
Activities’ area of problems and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence, thus rejecting the sixth null hypotheses “6a³(i) and 6a³(iii).” But there was found no significant difference between neglected (17.08) & isolate (16.53) groups of students as the CR value came insignificant, thus accepting the sixth null hypothesis “6a³(ii)” completely.

It seems that neglected and rejected groups of students experienced more social and recreational problems when compared to isolate group of students. The rejected students when compared to the neglected students experienced more problems. Hence it is clear that ‘Social and Recreational Activities’ problems were displayed more by the rejected group of students when compared with neglected and isolate groups of students. It may be due to the reason that these students do not mix themselves with other students properly.

VI.3(a4) Significance of differences of mean scores based on “Courtship-Sex and Marriage” area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

The investigator also compared the neglected, rejected and isolate groups of students on “Courtship-Sex and Marriage” area of problems (Table 128). There were found significant mean differences between neglected (13.87) & rejected (16.40) and rejected (16.40) & isolate (13.17) groups of students on “Courtship-Sex and Marriage” area and their CR values also came significant at 0.01 level of confidence, thus rejecting sixth null hypotheses “6a₄(i) and 6a₄(iii).” But there was found no significant difference between neglected (13.87) and Isolate (13.17) groups of student, on this area of problems as the CR value came insignificant, thus accepting the sixth null hypothesis “6a₄(ii).”
It is clear from the Table 128 that rejected students experienced more courtship-sex and marriage problems as compared to neglected group of students. Moreover the rejected group of students also experienced more problems when compared to isolate group of students. It may be due to the reason that rejected students are more concerned with life matters instead of study matter. They show interest in courtship-sex and marriage related issues which may also become a cause of their rejection to some extent. Thus it becomes clear that the rejected group of students displayed more courtship-sex and marriage related problems when compared with neglected and isolate groups of students, but neglected and isolate students experienced alike feelings regarding courtship sex and marriage related issues.

VI.3(a5) Significance of differences of mean scores based on “Social-Psychological Relations” area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 129 depicted the comparison of neglected, rejected and isolate groups of students on “Social-psychological Relations” area of problems. It is clear from the table that there were found significant mean differences between neglected (14.34) & rejected (16.92) and rejected (16.92) & isolate (14.26) groups of students on Social-Psychological Relation area and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence, thus rejecting the sixth hypotheses “6a5(i) & 6a5(iii).” But no significant difference was found between neglected (14.34) & isolate (14.26) groups of students on this problem area as the CR value came insignificant, thus accepting the sixth null hypothesis “6a5(ii).” Singh (2005) also
found that the rejected students had more socio-emotional problems than the neglected students.

It is evident from the table that the rejected group of students experienced more social-psychological relation problems in comparison to the neglected and isolate groups of students. Moreover the neglected and isolate groups of students were found to be alike on the social-psychological relation problems. Thus it is clear from the table that the rejected group of students displayed more social-psychological relation problems in comparison with the neglected and isolate group of students. It may be due to the reason that the rejected group of students are suffering from lack of sociability and accepting tendencies which hinder them in making effective social-psychological relations with others.

VI.3(a6) Significance of differences of mean scores based on “Personal-Psychological Relations” area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 130 depicted the comparison of neglected, rejected and isolate groups of students on “Personal-Psychological Relations” area of problems. The table shows that there were found significant mean differences between neglected (15.42) & rejected (18.27) and rejected (18.2) & isolate (15.50) groups of students of ‘Personal-psychological Relations’ area of problems and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence thus rejecting the sixth null hypotheses, “6a6(i) and 6a6(iii).” But no significant difference was found between neglected (15.42) and isolate groups of students (15.50) as the CR value came insignificant, thus accepting the sixth null hypothesis “6a6(ii).” Singh (2005) also found that rejected students had more personal problems than the

The rejected group of students seemed to have more personal-psychological relations problems in comparison to the neglected and isolates groups of students. Moreover the neglected and isolate groups of students seemed to be alike on this problem area. Thus it becomes clear from the above picture that rejected group of students exhibited more personal-psychological relation problems when compared with the neglected and isolate groups of students. It may be due to the reason that the rejected students may possess socially undesirable traits and aggressive attitude which exercise a negative influence on their personalities. They can’t make good congenial relations with their classmates and thus exhibit more personal-psychological problems in the classroom situation. Aatish (1963) also found that isolate students had more emotional problems than rejected and neglected students.

VI.3 (a7) Significance of differences of mean scores based on “Moral and Religion’ area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 131 that there existed significant differences between neglected (14.14) & rejected (16.32) and rejected (16.32) & isolate (14.56) groups of students on “Moral and Religion” problem area and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence, thus rejecting sixth null hypotheses “6a7(i) & 6a7(iii).” But there was found no significant difference between neglected (14.14) & isolate (14.56) groups of students on ‘Moral and
Religion’ area of problems as the CR value came insignificant, thus accepting the sixth null hypothesis “6a(ii).”

Thus it becomes clear from the table that the rejected group of students experienced more moral and religion related problems in comparison to the neglected and isolate groups of students. Moreover the neglected and isolate groups of students seemed to be alike on moral and religion related problems. Hence the rejected group of students displayed more moral and religion related problems as compared to the neglected and isolate groups of students. It may be due to the reason that rejected students do not have deep sense of morals and religions. They lack morality which contributes to their rejection by the classmates. Moreover they have no concrete idea about religious ideologies and they are least concerned with them.

V1.3(a) Significance of differences of mean scores based on “Home and Family” area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories

It is clear from the Table 132 that there existed significant differences between neglected (13.35) & rejected (15.59), neglected (13.35) & isolate (12.32) and rejected (15.59) & isolate (12.32) groups of students on “Home and Family” area of problems and their CR values came significant thus rejecting the sixth null hypothesis completely.

The rejected group of students were found to have more ‘Home and Family’ problems than the neglected and isolate groups of students. Moreover the neglected group of students, in comparison to the isolate group of students, experienced more ‘Home and Family’ related problems. Hence the rejected group
of students possess more domestic and household problems than the neglected and isolate groups of students. It may be due to the reason that these students seemed to have improper and un congenial home and family atmosphere which renders them to experience a number of problems at their respective homes. Choudhary (1943); Sharma (1968) and Dhar (1986) also found that rejected students were indisciplined, maladjusted in school and neighbourhood and had bad habits. However Sharma (1970) also found that isolate students had more home problems.

**VI.3(a) Significance of differences of mean scores based on “The Future: Vocational and Educational” area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories.**

Table 133 presented the picture of comparison between the students belonging to different sociometric categories on “The Future: Vocational and Educational” area of problems. There were found significant differences between neglected (15.47) & rejected (17.94), neglected (15.47) & isolate (13.95) and rejected (17.94) & isolate (13.95) groups of students on the future: vocational and educational problem area and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence thus rejecting sixth null hypothesis completely.

It is clear from the table that the rejected group of students experienced more future vocational and educational problems than the neglected and isolate groups of students. Moreover the neglected group of students, in comparison to isolate group of students, experienced more vocational and educational problems. It may be due to the reason that the rejected group of students seemed to be uncertain about their education and vocation and much worried about their respective
adjustment in the modern set up. They possess more problems regarding their future education and type of vocation to be adopted in the later stage of life than the neglected and isolate group of students. Singh (2005) also reported that the rejected students experienced more educational problems than the neglected students.

VI.3(a10) Significance of differences of mean scores based on “Adjustment to school work” area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories

It is clear from the Table 134 that there existed significant differences between neglected (16.69) & rejected (18.90) and rejected (18.90) & isolate (16.59) groups of students on ‘Adjustment to school work’ area of problems and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence thus rejecting the sixth null hypotheses “6a10(i) & 6a10(iii).” But there was found no significant difference between neglected (16.69) & isolate (16.59) groups of students regarding adjustment to school work as the CR value came insignificant. This finding thus, accepted the hypothesis, “6a10(ii).”

The rejected group of students experienced more adjustment problems in the school work in comparison to the neglected and isolate groups of students who seemed to be alike regarding their adjustment in the school work. Hence the rejected students appeared to be confronted with more adjustment problems at school work than the neglected and isolate groups of students. It may be due to the reason that the rejected students do not enjoy a good social relation in the classroom situation. These students possess certain personality traits and behavioural patterns which are not liked by others. This makes them socially
islands in the classroom. They receive negative choices from their classmates. All these characteristics create difficulty for them to adjust properly at school work.

Joshi (1980) found that isolate students were low achievers, less interested in studies, had not good memory and had negative attitude towards school and work. Pathak (1971) found that the neglected students were superior in socio-school adjustment to rejected and isolate students. He also found that rejected and isolate students were similar in all areas of adjustment, but they differ in health adjustment. Dodge, Coie and Brakkle (1982); Burton (1985); Coie et al. (1990); Ladd (1990) Connel & Wellborn (1991); wentzel (1991b), Ollendick et. al (1992) Asher and Wentzel (1995) and Buhs (2001) found that rejected students experienced more classroom work problems.

**VI.3(a11) Significance of differences of mean scores based on “Curriculum and Teaching Procedures” area between the students belonging to different sociometric categories**

Table 135 presented the picture of comparison between neglected & rejected; neglected & isolate and rejected & isolate groups of students regarding the “Curriculum and Teaching Procedures” area of problems. There were found significant differences between neglected (15.75) & rejected (17.67) and rejected (17.67) & isolate (14.82) groups of students on curriculum and teaching procedures problem area and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence. Moreover significant difference was also observed between neglected (15.75) and isolate (14.82) groups of students on this problem area and their CR
values came significant at 0.05 level of confidence. These findings, thus, rejected the sixth null hypothesis completely.

It is clear from the table that rejected group of students, in comparison to the neglected and isolate groups of students experienced more curriculum and teaching procedures related problems. Moreover the neglected group of students exhibited more problems in this area than the isolate group of students. Hence the rejected group of students were found to have a number of problems relating to the curriculum and procedures of the teaching as compared with the neglected and isolate group of students. Hence the rejected group of students were found to have a number of problems relating to the curriculum and procedures of the teaching as compared with the neglected and isolate groups of students. Singh (2005) also found that the rejected students had more educational problems than neglected students. It may be due to the reason that rejected students do not have high intellectual level and as such they are academically low achievers. The rejection in classroom has direct or indirect bearing on the academic achievements of students. So they experience more curriculum related and teaching procedures problems.

(b. Sex-Wise Differences in Different Sociometric Categories)

V1.3 (b1) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Health and Physical Development” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

The interpretation and discussion under this caption is based on the Table 136. The CR value (1.40) between boys and girls belonging to the neglected category on the “Health and Physical Development” area was found insignificant.
It seems that the boys and girls belonging to the neglected category were found alike on Health and Physical Development area of problems, thus accepting the seventh null hypothesis “7a₁(i)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 136 that the CR value (0.83) between boys and girls belonging to rejected category on the “Health and Physical Development” area was found insignificant. It seems that the boys and girls belonging to the rejected category were found alike on Health and Physical Development area of Problems, thus accepting the seventh null hypothesis “7a₁(ii)” completely.

It is also evident from the Table 136 that the CR value (0.85) between boys and girls belonging to isolate category on the “Health and Physical Development” area was found insignificant. It seems that the boys and girls belonging to the isolate category were found alike on Health and Physical Development area of problems. This finding is thus accepting the seventh null hypothesis “7a₁(iii)” completely.

VI.3 (b₂) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Finance, Living conditions and Employment” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

In the present study, the boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories were compared on “Finance, Living conditions and Employment” area of the problems. Table137 depicted that no significant differences were found between the boys and girls belonging to the neglected, rejected and isolate categories on Finance, Living conditions and Employment area as the CR values came insignificant. It seemed that the boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and
isolate groups were found alike on Finance, Living conditions and employment related problems thus accepting the seventh null hypothesis completely.

Hence it is clear from the above picture that both boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate group respectively, experienced the same types of problems regarding the Finance, Living conditions and Employment. They more or less displayed alike feelings on this problem area.

VI.3. (b3) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Social and Recreational Activities” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 138 revealed that significant differences were found between boys (15.21) & girls (18.98) in the neglected group; between boys (18.32) & girls (20.18) in the rejected group and between boys (14.00) & girls (18.79) in the isolate group respectively on “Social and Recreational Activities” area of problems and their CR values came significant at .05 and .01 levels of confidence. The girls more than the boys in the neglected group reported social and recreational related problems. In the rejected group and isolate group, similar results were found where girls experienced more problems in this problem area as compared to boys, thus rejecting the seventh null hypothesis completely. It is clear from the table that girls experienced more social as well as recreational problems in the neglected, rejected and isolated groups respectively. It may be due to the reason that girls seem to be worried about their social and recreational activities. They are not allowed by their parents and elders to participate in these activities.
V1.3 (b₄) Significance of differences of mean scores based on “Courtship-Sex and Marriage” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from Table 139 that there were found significant differences between boys (13.04) & girls (14.72) in the neglected group and between boys (12.22) & girls (14.02) in the isolate group on “Courtship-Sex and Marriage” problem area and their CR values came significant at 0.05 level of confidence thus rejecting the seventh null hypotheses, “7a₄(i) & 7a₄(iii).” Moreover no significant difference was found between boys and girls in the rejected group as the CR value came insignificant thus accepting the seventh null hypothesis “7a₄(ii).”

It is clear from the table that girls in the neglected group as well as in the isolate group, experienced more courtship-sex and marriage related problems than boys. It may be due to the reason that girls are more sensitive to the concept of courtship-sex and marriage related issues in comparison to boys. Both boys and girls in the rejected group were found to be alike regarding courtship-sex and marriage related problems. They have similar attitude towards this problem area.

VI.3(b₅) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Social-Psychological Relations” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 140 revealed different picture as no significant differences were found between boys (13.83) & girls (14.86) in the neglected group; between boys (17.36) & girls (16.43) in the rejected group and between boys (14.24) & girls (14.27) in the isolate group on “Social-Psychological Relations” area of problems
as the CR values came insignificant. These findings, thus, accepted seventh null hypothesis completely. It is seen that boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate group, experienced alike problems related to the area of social-psychological relations. They experienced more or less same type of feelings regarding various social and psychological relation problems.

French (1990) found that boys belonging to neglected, rejected and isolate categories exhibited more external problems than the girls of these three sociometric categories. However Parkhurstg and Asher (1992) found no sex differences in the problem profile of the neglected students. Singh (2005) also found no significant sex difference in rejected students on the socio-emotional problem area.

VI.3 (b₆) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “personal-Psychological Relations’ area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

As evident from Table 141, there were found significant differences between boys (14.18) & girls (16.68) in the neglected group and between boys (14.12) & girls (16.74) in the isolate group of Personal-Psychological relations area of problems and the CR values came to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence, thus, rejecting seventh null hypotheses “7₆(i) & 7₆(iii).” Significant difference was also reported between boys (17.43) & girls (19.17) in the rejected group on personal and psychological relation problems and the CR values came significant at 0.05 level of confidence thus rejecting the seventh null hypothesis “7₆(ii).”

It is clear from the table that the girls, in the neglected, rejected and isolate groups respectively, revealed more personal and psychological problems than
boys in the respective groups. The girls seemed to be confronted with a number of personal and psychological issues and problems. They appeared to be more sensitive to their personal issues and thereby hesitated to maintain psychological relations with others. Hatzichristou and Hopf (1996) found that the rejected boys exhibited the most interpersonal problems, than the rejected girls. Singh (2005) also found that the rejected boys had more personal problems than the rejected girls.

V.3(b) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Moral and Religion” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

The values of Table 142 presented a significant picture of all the critical ratios. These results thus completely rejected Seventh null hypotheses completely. Significant differences were reported between boys (13.14) & girls (15.14) in the neglected group; between boys (14.34) & girls (18.43) in the rejected group and between boys (13.44) & girls (15.56) in the isolate group on Moral and Religion area of problems and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence.

It is clear from the table that girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate groups were reported to experience more moral and religion related problems in comparison to boys in the respective sociometric groups. The girls as appeared from the results, were found much concerned and possessive regarding the moral conduct and religion based issues and problems in comparison to boys in respective sociometric categories. It may be due to the reason that girls are much
attached to their families and parents. They have clear understanding of various moral and religious matters. They show greater concern for these issues.

VI.3 (b8) **Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Home and family” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.**

As evident from the values of Table 143, there was found significant difference between boys (12.34) and girls (14.38) in the neglected group on “Home and Family” area, of problems and the CR value came significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The finding thus rejected the seventh null hypothesis “7a8(i)” completely. It seemed that girls, more than boys, in the neglected group experienced home and family problems. But no significant differences were found between the boys (15.92) & girls (15.23) in the rejected group and between boys (11.90) & girls (12.68) in the isolate group on home and family area of problems as CR values came insignificant thus accepting the seventh null hypotheses of “7a8(ii) & 7a8(iii)” completely. It is revealed from the above results that boys and girls in rejected and isolate groups respectively were reported to be alike regarding the home and family problems. These students had more or less same types of feelings regarding the home and family related problems. However, in the neglected group, girls in comparison to boys, were found more associated with home and family related contexts. Singh (2005) found no significant sex difference in the rejected students on the home and family problem area. It may be due to the reason that girls are more attached to their homes and families and are more sensitive to domestic matters and issues. They
are seen fully involved in the domestic and household matters but the boys are least concerned with these issues.

**V1.3.(b) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “The Future: Vocational and Educational” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.**

Table 144 depicted that no significant differences were found between boys (15.98) & girls (14.95) in the neglected group and boys (18.49) & girls (17.36) in the rejected group on vocational and educational problems in the future context as the CR value came insignificant. These findings thus accepted the seventh null hypotheses “7a9(i) & 7a9(ii).” On the other hand, significant difference was found between boys (12.90) & girls (14.39) in the isolate group on vocational and educational problems and CR value came significant at 0.01 level of confidence, thus rejecting a part of seventh null hypothesis “7a9(iii).”

It is clear from the table that boys and girls in the neglected and rejected groups were found to be alike regarding the future context of vocational and educational problem area. Moreover in the isolate group, the girls in comparison to boys, experienced more problems in the vocational and educational fields in the future context. The girls in this group seemed to be more bothered about future educational planning and vocational adjustment thereof. Singh (2005) found no significant sex difference in rejected students on the educational problems.
VI.3 (b₁₀) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Adjustment to School Work” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 145 presented insignificant differences between boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate groups respectively on adjustment to school work area of problems. The boys (16.50) & girls (16.88) in the neglected group; the boys (19.36) & girls (18.40) in the rejected group; and the boys (16.82) & girls (16.39) in the isolate group were found alike on adjustment to school work area of problems thus accepting the seventh hypothesis completely. Hatzichristou & Hopf (1996) found that rejected boys had low classroom adaptation than the rejected girls. Martin (2011) also reported that rejected boys had more school adjustment problems than the rejected girls.

VI.3. (b₁₁) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Curriculum and Teaching Procedures” area between boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 146 also revealed insignificant differences between boys (15.55) & girls (15.95) in the neglected group; between boys (17.87) & girls (17.45) in the rejected group and between boys (14.78) & girls (14.86) in the isolate group on the “Curriculum and Teaching Procedures” related problems thus accepting the seventh null hypothesis completely. It is clear from the table that boys and girls in the neglected, rejected and isolate groups respectively were found alike on curriculum and teaching procedure area of problems.
(c. Academic Stream-Wise Differences in Different
Sociometric Categories)

V1.3(C1) Significance of difference of mean scores based on the “Health and Physical Development” area between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

The interpretation and discussion under this caption is based on the Table 147. The CR value (2.37) between arts and science stream students belonging to neglected category on the “Health and Physical Development” area was found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The mean value of arts stream students (13.89) came higher than science stream students (12.16). It means that arts stream students experienced more health and physical development problems than the science stream students of neglected category thus rejecting the eighth null hypothesis “8a1(i)” completely.

It is also evident from the Table 147 that the CR value (4.24) between arts and science stream students belonging to rejected category on the “Health and Physical Development” area was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The mean value of arts stream students (15.96) came higher than science stream students (12.70). It means that arts stream students experienced more health and Physical Development problems than the science stream students of rejected category thus rejecting the eighth null hypothesis “8a1(ii)” completely.

It is evident from the Table 147 that the CR value (0.30) between arts and science stream students belonging to isolate category on the ‘Health and Physical Development” area was found insignificant. It means that the arts and science stream students belonging to isolate category were found alike on the health and
physical development area of problems. It may be due to the reason that these students are not conscious about the medical and physical aspects of health. They are not medically sound towards various physical health related issues as these do not form the part of curriculum in the arts stream thus accepting the eighth null hypothesis “8a1(iii)” completely.

V1.3(C2) **Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Finance, Living conditions and Employment” area between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.**

Table 148 revealed that significant differences were found between the arts and science stream students in the neglected, rejected and isolate groups respectively thus rejecting the eighth null hypothesis completely. The CR value (4.27) between arts (16.97) and science (13.34) stream students in the neglected group was found significant at .01 level of confidence. It seems that arts stream students experienced more finance, living conditions and employment related problems than science stream students.

It is also evident from the table that the CR value (6.42) between arts (19.92) & science (15.62) stream students in the rejected category was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that arts stream students experienced more finance, living conditions and employment related problems than science stream students. Moreover the CR value (3.89) between arts (17.58) & science stream (13.65) students was found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It showed that the students in the arts stream exhibited more problems in this area in comparison to science stream students.
It is clear from the table that arts stream students in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively were found to experience more finance, living conditions and employment related problems than science stream students. It may be due to the reason that the arts stream students have poor socio-economic backgrounds and conditions. They may appear more worried about their family living condition and employments of parents. They make justified use of money given to them by their parents. They have to remain aloof from unwanted expenditures. They are not independent in taking decision regarding the financial matters being helpless.

VI.3 (C₃) **Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Social and Recreational Activities” area between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.**

Table 149 depicted insignificant differences between arts and science stream students in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively thus accepting the eighth null hypothesis completely. The arts and science stream students in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively were reported to be alike on social and recreational activities area of problems.

**VI.3(C₄) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Courtship-Sex and Marriage” area between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.**

Table 150 depicted significant differences between arts and science stream students in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively thus, rejecting the eighth null hypothesis completely. The CR value 2.34 between arts (14.64) & science (13.10) stream students in the neglected category on
courtship-sex and marriage area was found significant at .05 level of confidence. It is clear from this finding that arts stream students experienced more courtship-sex and marriage problems than science stream students. Moreover the CR value (2.96) between arts (17.30) and science (15.38) stream students in the rejected category was found significant at .01 level of confidence which showed that arts stream students in the rejected category also experienced more courtship-sex and marriage related problems than their science stream counterparts. The students studying in the arts stream understand clearly courtship-sex and marriage issues as a part of their curriculum which enable them to develop a positive attitude towards these aspects. They take these issues more seriously which exhibited in them and eventually gives rise to problems.

The CR value (2.70) between arts (14.63) & science (12.06) stream students in the isolate category was also found significant at .01 level of confidence. This finding also showed that arts stream students in the isolate category experienced more courtship sex and marriage problems in comparison to their science stream counterparts.

VI.3 (C₃) Significance of difference of meanscores based on “Social-Psychological Relations’ area between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 151 revealed a slight different picture. Significant differences were found between arts (15.20) & science (13.49) stream students in the neglected category and between arts (18.23) & science (15.42) stream students in the rejected category and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence thus, rejecting the eighth null hypotheses “8a₃(i) & 8a₃(ii).” But no significant
difference was found between the arts (14.29) & science (14.23) stream students in the isolate category on social-psychological relations area as the CR value came insignificant thus accepting the eighth null hypothesis “8a_5(iii).”

It is clear from the table that arts stream students, in comparison to science stream students, in the neglected and rejected categories respectively experienced more social and psychological relation problems. It is due to the reason that arts stream students develop certain inferiority complexes regarding their stream as science subjects enjoy great value in the society. This passive feeling in arts stream students develop some undesirable traits in them and they start experiencing various social and psychological problems in their lives. But the arts and science students in the isolate category were found alike regarding these types of problems.

VI.3(C₆) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Personal-Psychological Relations” area between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

As evident from Table 152, there were found significant differences between arts (16.34) & science (14.50) stream students in the neglected category and between arts (19.42) & science (16.95) stream students in the rejected category and the CR values were found significant at .01 level of confidence. These findings, thus, rejecting the eighth null hypotheses “8a_6(i) & 8a_6(ii).” Moreover CR value (2.35) between arts (16.29) & science (14.74) stream students in the isolate category was found significant at .05 level of confidence thus rejecting a part of eighth null hypothesis “8a_6(iii)” completely.
It is clear from the table that arts stream students in the neglected, rejected and isolate categories respectively displayed more personal and psychological problems in comparison to their science stream counterparts. It may be due to the reason that the arts stream students have clear concept of various personal and psychological issues and parameters and they show more concern to their personal and psychological problems.

VI.3(C7) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Moral and religion” area between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

The values of Table 153 presented a significant picture of all the critical ratios. These results thus completely rejected the eighth null hypothesis completely. Significant differences were observed between arts (15.06) & science (13.23) stream students in the neglected category; between arts (17.38) & science (15.09) stream students in the rejected category and between arts (15.72) & science (13.45) stream students in the isolate category on moral and religion area of problems and their CR values came significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It is observed from the table that arts stream students in all three sociometric categories experienced more problems regarding moral and religion area than the science stream students. It may be due to the reason that students of arts stream study various issues regarding the moral and religious aspects of life. This makes them more sensitive and concerned towards the morals and religions. They may develop certain concrete ideologies and concepts which create problems for them.
VI.3(C₈) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Home and Family” area between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

As evident from the values of Table 154, significant difference was found between arts (14.06) & science (12.65) stream students in the neglected category and the CR value came significant at .05 level of confidence thus rejecting the eighth hypothesis “8aᵢ(i).” Significant difference was also found between arts (16.43) & science (14.62) stream students in the rejected category thus rejecting eighth null hypothesis “8aᵢ(ii).” Moreover no significant difference was found between arts (12.54) and science (12.09) stream students in the isolate category as the CR value came insignificant thus accepting the eighth null hypothesis “8aᵢ(iii).”

It is clear from the table that arts stream students in the neglected and rejected categories respectively experienced more home and family problems than the science stream students. It may be due to the reason that arts stream students are more attached to their domestic life and they are fully involved in various family matters. They become more sensitive to home and family matters. But arts and science stream students in the isolate category were found alike regarding home and family problems. They experienced same feelings on this area of problems.
VI.3(C_9) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “The Future: Vocational and Educational” area between the arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 155 depicted that there were found significant differences between arts (16.18) & science (14.77) stream students in the neglected category and between arts (14.77) & science stream (13.17) students in the isolate category and their CR values were found significant at .05 level of confidence thus, rejecting the eighth null hypotheses “8a_9(i) & 8a_9(iii).” Moreover significant difference was also reported between arts (19.62) & science (16.03) stream students in the rejected category and CR value was found significant at .01 level of confidence thus rejecting a part of eighth null hypothesis “8a_9(ii).” These findings clearly indicate that arts stream students in all the three sociometric categories experienced more vocational and educational problems in the future context than their science stream counterparts. It may be due to the reason that arts stream students suffer from low academic merit which they think, will create problems for making proper vocational adjustment in future life.

VI.3(C_{10}) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Adjustment to School Work” area between arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

Table 156 depicted that significant differences were found between arts (18.06) & science (15.35) stream students in the neglected category and between arts (20.85) & science (16.67) stream students in the rejected category and their CR values were found significant at .01 level of confidence. Significant difference was also found between the arts (17.25) & science (15.96) stream
students in the isolate category and the CR value was found significant at .05 level of confidence thus completely rejecting the eighth null hypothesis. It is revealed from the table that arts stream students in comparison to their science stream counterparts in the respective sociometric categories, experienced more adjustment problems to school work. It appears that the students of arts stream do not have well polished intellect, potential and personality traits which render them to face adjustment problems at school work. They do not have the ability to understand and Judge others properly.

VI.3.(C_{11}) Significance of difference of mean scores based on “Curriculum and Teaching Procedures” area between arts and science stream students belonging to sociometric categories.

Table 157 also revealed similar results. There were found significant differences between arts (16.88) & science (14.63) stream students in the neglected category; between arts (18.84) & science (16.34) stream students in the rejected category and between arts (15.80) & science (13.87) stream students in the isolate category and their CR values were found significant at .01 level of confidence thus, rejecting the eighth null hypothesis completely.

It is quite clear from the table that again the arts stream students in all the three sociometric categories of students were reported to experience more curriculum and procedures of teaching related problems in comparison to their science stream counterparts. It may be due to the reason that the arts stream students have no proper academic backgrounds and are having low academic achievement level which create problems for them to understand the complex
nature of their curriculum which blocks them to comprehend the teaching procedures.

VI.4 INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS BASED ON THE MOST PRESSING AND THE LEAST PRESSING PROBLEM AREAS OF STUDENTS BELONGING TO DIFFERENT SOCIOMETRIC CATEGORIES

VI.4(a) The Most Pressing and the least pressing problem areas of neglected, rejected and isolate categories of students.

It is clear from the Table 159 that among the students of neglected sociometric category, “Social and Recreational Activities” was the most pressing problem area and “Health & Physical development” was the least pressing problem area as the mean value of the most pressing problem area came (17.08) and that of least pressing problem area (13.02). Among the students of rejected sociometric category, same problem area in case of the most pressing and the least pressing problems were found and the mean value of the most pressing problem area was found (19.22) and that of least pressing problem area was found (14.44).

However among the students of isolate sociometric category, “Adjustment to School Work” was the most pressing problem area and “Home and Family” was found the least pressing problem area. The mean value of the most pressing problem area was found (16.59) and of the least pressing problem area was found (12.32). These findings thus rejecting the ninth null hypotheses completely.
VI.4(b) The most pressing and the least pressing problem areas of boys and girls belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from Table 161 that among the boys in the neglected category, “Adjustment to School Work” (16.50) was found the most pressing problem area and ‘Home and Family” (12.34) was found the least pressing problem area. But in the girls, “Social and Recreational Activities” (18.98) was found the most pressing problem area and “Health and Physical” Development” (13.54) was found the least pressing problem area. It seems that the boys showed more adjustment problems regarding school work and girls expressed more Home and family related problems.

It is again evident from the Table that among the rejected sociometric category, boys depicted “Adjustment to School Work” (19.36) as the most pressing problem area and “Moral and Religion” (14.34) as the least pressing problem area. But the girls depicted. “Social and Recreational Activities” (20.18) as the most pressing problem area and “Health and Physical Development” (14.08) as the least pressing problem area. It is clear that boys too showed the same problem as most pressing but Moral and Religion as the least problem. They are not bothered about the moral and religious aspects of life. But the same results were found in case of girls in this category.

Table 161 also depicted that the boys in the isolate sociometric category experienced “Adjustment to School Work” (16.82) as the most pressing problem area and “Home and Family” (11.90) as the least pressing problem area. The girls in this category also depicted the same result having “Social and Recreational
Activities” (18.79) as most pressing problem area and Home and Family” (12.68) as the least pressing problem area. The girls in this category also depicted the same result having “Social and Recreational Activities” as the most pressing area and “House and Family” (12.68) as the least pressing problem area. These findings thus rejecting the tenth null hypotheses completely.

It is clear from the table that boys in the isolate category showed a great deal of adjustment problems at school work and least concerned with their home and family life problems. It may be due to the reason that isolate boys posses certain traits which make them least noticed in the class and this may lead to their maladjustment in school work. But the girls in this category showed a great concern regarding social and recreational activities and little bothered about home and family problems.

VI.4(c) The most pressing and the least pressing problem areas of arts and science stream students belonging to different sociometric categories.

It is evident from the Table 163 that the students of arts stream belonging to neglected sociometric category depicted “Adjustment to school work” (18.06) as the most pressing problem area and “Health and Physical Development” (13.89) as the least pressing problem area. But the science stream students depicted “Social and Recreational Activities” (16.93) as the most pressing problem area and Health and Physical Development” (12.16) as the least pressing problem area.

In case of rejected sociometric category, the arts stream again depicted the same problem area i.e. “Adjustment to School Work” (20.85) as the most
pressing problem area and “Health and Physical development” (15.96) as the least pressing problem area. But the science stream students depicted “Social and Recreational Activities (18.59) as the most pressing problem area and “Health and Physical Development” (12.70) as the least pressing problem area.

In case of isolate sociometric category, the arts stream students depicted “Finance, Living conditions & Employment” (17.58) as the most pressing problem area and “Home and Family” (12.54) as the least pressing problem area. But the science stream students depicted a different picture by depicting “Social and Recreational Activities” (16.54) as the most pressing area of problems and “Courtship-Sex and Marriage” (12.06) as the least pressing problem area thus rejecting the eleventh null hypotheses completely.

It is clear that arts stream students in both the neglected & rejected sociometric categories experienced more adjustment problems at school work and science stream students experienced social and recreational activities as most pressing problem area and health and physical development as least pressing area. It may be due to the reason that arts stream students possess certain personality characteristics which lead to improper adjustment to school work. Moreover the science stream students are more bothered about their social and recreational activities and paying least attention to their health and physical development aspect.

But a different picture was obtained in case of isolate students. The arts stream students depicted more finance, living condition and employment related problems more and the science stream students depicted more social and recreational activities area of problems. It may be due to the reason that the
students of arts stream have poor socio-economic background as compared to the science stream students which make them much concerned about their financial matters and living conditions. But science stream students appeared to be enjoying all the luxuries of life and as such they believe in participating in various social and recreational activities of life.

The least problem area concern of arts stream students is ‘Home and Family’ and that of science stream students is Courtship-Sex and Marriage. This showed that arts stream students little bothered about their home and family matters and science students are bold enough and least bothered regarding courtship sex and Marriage related issues.

VI.5 INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS BASED ON THE ASSOCIATION OF DIFFERENT SOCIOMETRIC CATEGORIES WITH SEX AND ACADEMIC STREAMS

VI. 5(a) Association of different sociometric categories with sex.

It is evident from the Table 164 that there was found insignificant association of different sociometric categories viz. neglected, rejected and isolate with sex. The calculated value of chi-square (0.536) is less than the Table value (5.991 at 0.05 level and 9.210 at 0.01 level against 2df), thus accepting the null hypothesis “12(a)” completely. The results thus showed that sociometric categories of students were not significantly associated with their gender.
VI.5(b) Association of different sociometric categories with academic streams.

It is apparent from the Table 165 that there was found no significant association of different sociometric categories viz. neglected, rejected and isolate with academic streams. The calculated value of chi-square is (0.546) is less than the Table value (5.991 at 0.05 level and 9.210 at 0.01 level against 2df), thus accepting the null hypothesis “12(b)” completely. The results, thus showed that sociometric categories of students were not significantly associated with their academic streams.