

THE RELATIONSHIP OF KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN'S  
RECIPROCAL SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES TO  
PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

By

ANN ADAIR CURD

Bachelor of Science

Northwest Missouri State College

Maryville, Missouri

1961

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College of  
the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
May, 1967

JAN 10 1966

THE RELATIONSHIP OF KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN'S  
RECIPROCAL SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES TO  
PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

Thesis Approved:

*Josephine Hoffer*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser  
*Elizabeth K. Stodumacher*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*N. N. Durham*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

358662

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This investigation has involved the skill and dedication of many people. The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to her adviser, Dr. Josephine Hoffer, Acting Head of the Department of Family Relations and Child Development, for her patient guidance and helpful suggestions throughout the study. Indebtedness is acknowledged to Dr. Elizabeth Starkweather, Associate Professor of Family Relations and Child Development, for her assistance in the analysis of the data.

Deepest appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Harold Riley, kindergarten teacher at the First Methodist Church, Stillwater, Oklahoma; for her cooperation in obtaining the data. Special thanks is expressed to the children who so willingly participated in the study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS IMPORTANCE. . . . .	1
Need for Study . . . . .	1
Plan for the Investigation . . . . .	3
II. LITERATURE RELATED TO THE PROBLEM . . . . .	4
Sociometric Choices of Preschool Children. . . . .	4
Reliability of Sociometric Techniques. . . . .	5
The Relation Between Sociometric Status and Personal and Social Adjustment. . . . .	6
Implications for the Present Study . . . . .	9
III. PROCEDURE AND METHOD. . . . .	11
Subjects . . . . .	11
Pilot Study. . . . .	12
Sociometric Test . . . . .	15
Weighting of Reciprocal Choices. . . . .	15
Personal and Social Adjustment Test. . . . .	16
Administration of the Tests. . . . .	17
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA. . . . .	18
Number of Reciprocal Choices and Weighted Reciprocal Choice Scores. . . . .	19
Comparison of Reciprocal Choice Scores for Gifts and Questions. . . . .	20
Relationship of Reciprocal Choice Scores to Personal and Social Adjustment Scores. . . . .	20
Analysis of Total Reciprocal Choice Scores According to Sex . . . . .	23
Summary. . . . .	23
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	24
Findings . . . . .	24
Recommendations. . . . .	25

Chapter	Page
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	27
APPENDICES	
Appendix A . . . . .	30
Appendix B . . . . .	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Values of $U^*$ in a Comparison of Adjustment Scores on the California Test of Personality Obtained by Children With High and Low Total Reciprocal Choice Scores . . . . .	21
II. Values of $U^*$ in a Comparison of Adjustment Scores on the California Test of Personality Obtained by Children With High and Low Reciprocal Choice Scores for Gifts . . . . .	22
III. Values of $U^*$ in a Comparison of Adjustment Scores on the California Test of Personality Obtained by Children With High and Low Reciprocal Choice Scores for Questions . . . . .	22
IV. Raw Scores Obtained by Individual Children on a Sociometric Test and on the California Test of Personality . . . . .	31

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND ITS IMPORTANCE

The problem of this study is focused upon the frequency of reciprocal sociometric choices of children and the relationship of these choices to personal and social adjustment. Specifically, the purpose of the investigation is to determine whether there are differences in personal and social adjustment between children whose sociometric choices are frequently reciprocated and those whose choices are nonreciprocal or infrequently reciprocated. This study is concerned not with the number of times a child may be chosen, but the number of times he is chosen by those within the group whom he chooses and the relationship of these choices to his personal and social adjustment. Should peer acceptance relate to personality in young children as it does in later years, then it seems important to identify problems in this area at an early age.

#### Need for Study

The need for studying the friendship choices of young children is supported by Singer (24) who presents evidence that friendship acceptance is established in the early school years. Budden (4) found that "even at the preschool level there is clear differentiation in children's preferences for companions and that these preferences and the resulting social organization of the group is fairly stabilized." (p. 430)

The importance of studying the personality development of young children as it relates to peer acceptance is supported by Frankel (8). He stated, "the most fruitful approach for obtaining clues in this area of interpersonal relations is by studying the personality development of the children." (p. 223) There is not evidence that lack of peer acceptance causes poor personal and social adjustment or that poor personal and social adjustment causes a lack of peer acceptance, however it may be that the two factors are related. If children whose sociometric choices are infrequently reciprocated score lower in personal and social adjustment, this knowledge may be of value to parents and teachers in helping these children achieve greater peer acceptance and perhaps more satisfactory personal adjustment.

Although many investigators (4, 7, 8, 13, 16, 19) have studied the sociometric status of children, few of them have used kindergarten children. Since most children do not attend nursery school, kindergarten is most likely the first continuing group situation of which the child may be a part.

To the knowledge of the investigator, no studies have been directed toward reciprocal friendship choices as related to the personal and social adjustment of kindergarten children. The concern of most studies of sociometric status is that of analyzing the social organization of a group or determining the children most or least often chosen by the group. Although a child may be chosen numerous times by his classmates, these may or may not be those children whom he would choose as friends.

A study of this type could contribute to knowledge in the use of sociometric devices for the classroom teacher if evidence can be obtained to indicate there is a high correlation between number of reciprocal



sociometric choices and personal and social adjustment. A simple sociometric measuring device could then be used by the classroom teacher to at least identify those children who need help in establishing satisfying friendships within the group.

#### Plan for the Investigation

To achieve the purpose of this investigation, the literature was reviewed, a test of personal and social adjustment was selected, a sociometric test was selected on the basis of a pilot study conducted to determine the reliability of the two methods of sociometric testing, the sociometric test and the test of personal and social adjustment were administered, the data were analyzed, and the results presented.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE RELATED TO THE PROBLEM

The literature concerning the sociometric choices of children, the reliability of sociometric techniques with young children, and the relationship of sociometric status to personal and social adjustment was reviewed and is presented in these categories.

#### Sociometric Choices of Preschool Children

There appears to be evidence to support the belief that the sociometric choices of young children can and should be studied. Horowitz (12) pointed to the influence of peer relationships at the preschool level, and concluded that "At early ages the process of socialization has progressed to include motivational components in peer relationships which tend to differ relative to the nature of the relationship." (p. 110)

Northway (18) stated "As incipient co-operative group behavior has been found to originate during the preschool period it would seem that the origin of sociometric relationships would arise in this period." (p. 429) Moreno (19), Budden (4), and Dunnington (7) in their studies of preschool children gave support to the above statement. Moreno (19) stated that "Children of preschool age develop a significant social status in groups of their own making as for instance nursery school groups." (p. 411) Budden (4) suggested that "At the preschool level

there is differentiation in children's preferences for companions."

(p. 430) Dunnington (7) found that "the subjects had and were able to verbalize preferences among their peers." (p. 101)

Singer (24) in a study of adolescents found that:

. . . the picture of social friendship acceptances are molded and set in the early grades rather than the adolescent level. Therefore, it would be of practicality to teach and guide in acquiring social success in the earliest grades and throughout education. (p. 39)

#### Reliability of Sociometric Techniques

Sociometric techniques used with young children show conflicting results in the area of reliability. Frankel (8) in a study of nursery school children found that there was no relationship between the sociometric test and time sampling observation of children's actual play behavior. Koch (13) and Lippitt (15), who studied the popularity of children, found little relationship between the popularity of children and their observed participation in the group. However, Biehler (3) in a study of kindergarten children found that there was high agreement between the sociometric first choices of the children and their actual behavioral choices. This may indicate that children may become more consistent in their behavioral and verbal sociometric choices as they progress from nursery school to kindergarten.

Regarding the stability of sociometric choices, McCandless and Marshall (16) in their study of preschool children found that the sociometric choices of these children remained relatively stable over a 10 to 30 day period in newly formed groups. Speroff (25) studied kindergarten children and found that after the 10th to 12th week of measurement the sociometric choices, at least for the girls, began to stabilize,

and for his subjects only one change occurred after this time.

Regardless of the stability of the sociometric choices of young children, Northway (17) stated the following concerning the reliability and validity of sociometric measures:

Sociometry is concerned with discovering the preferred relationships which are present in a group at a particular time. If each individual discloses his preferences on the test honestly, the test is perfectly reliable and valid. (p. 16)

#### The Relation Between Sociometric Status and Personal and Social Adjustment

Studies have been conducted for the purpose of determining the relationship between sociometric status and personal and social adjustment; however, there seems to be conflicting evidence as to the relationship between these variables.

Studies Using California Test of Personality. In a study where the California Test of Personality has been used as a measure of personal and social adjustment, Scandrette (23) found when studying eighth graders that "All but one of the 12 components of the test (CTP<sup>\*</sup>) revealed differences in favor of the most frequently chosen group." (p. 295) Results of his study showed four of the components for measuring personal and social adjustment were statistically significant. These were sense of personal worth, sense of personal freedom, feeling of belonging, and freedom from withdrawing tendencies.

Phillips and De Vault (21), Dahlke (6), and Zelen (28) also found relatively high correlations between scores on the California Test of

---

\* California Test of Personality

Personality and sociometric status. Phillips and De Vault (21) in a study of third grade children found that seven of the subsections of the CTP "produced evidence to indicate a relationship between one's social position among his peers and some aspect of personality adjustment as measured by this test." (p. 412) Dahlke (6) studied children in grades two through eight and found that "personality adjustment is related to the interaction and choice status in the school. Poorly adjusted children will rate low as compared with those who are better adjusted." (p. 335) Zelen (28) using sixth grade children found that the CTP Feelings of Personal Worth Scale correlated highly with peer acceptance.

The reader should note, however, that Nowell (20) and Singer (24) found little relationship between the components of the CTP and the sociometric status of the subjects studied. Nowell (20) used the California Test of Personality, the Brown Personality Inventory for Children, and the Rogers Test of Personality in a study of fifth graders and found that "neither the totals earned on these tests, nor any of the components of the tests, was found to be related to sociometric status." (p. 39) Singer (24) as a result of a study of seventh and eighth graders, stated "There is little relationship between certain aspects of personality as measured by the California Test of Personality and inter-personal group social modes as measured by the sociogram and the classroom social distance scale." (p. 39)

Related Studies. Other studies of personality and sociometric status indicate that there are wide differences in the personality characteristics of children who are high and low in popularity. Young and Cooper (27) used sociometric procedures to obtain popularity scores

for children in grades five through eight. Among their findings were that the popular children proved to have a higher sense of personal worth and a stronger sense of belonging. Guinouard and Rychlak (11) studied popular and unpopular children in grades six through eight and found that the " Unpopular children were less self-confident, less cheerful, less enthusiastic, less acceptant of group standards, less conventional, and less concerned with social approval than popular children." (p. 442)

Baron (2) found that there is a relationship between social status and self-concept. He stated, "Inadequacies in self-concept are revealed in the frequency with which members of the average and low status groups compare themselves unfavorably with their peers." (p. 40) Satterlee (22) used the Rogers Personality Test as a measure of personality adjustment with children from the fifth to the seventh grade and found "a low but definite correlation between sociometric choices of the group toward an individual and the individual's self-appraisal of himself in that group." (p. 182) He also found a significant relationship between sociometric stars and isolates and their scores on the Rogers Personality Test.

Austin and Thompson (1) and Grounlund and Anderson (9) cite evidence to support the belief that personality characteristics influence peer acceptance. Austin and Thompson (1), in a study of the basis on which children select and reject their best friends, pointed out that "personality characteristics appear to be the most important factors influencing children's selection and rejection of 'best friends.'" (p. 116) Grounlund and Anderson (9) studied the personality characteristics of socially accepted, socially neglected and socially rejected junior high school

students and found that "strong, positive personality characteristics are associated with social acceptability among junior high school pupils." (p. 335)

Gronlund and Holmlund (10) found in another study in which they measured the value of elementary school sociometric status scores for predicting pupil's adjustment in high school that generally the adjustment of pupils in high school can be predicted from sociometric scores in the sixth grade. He stated:

Although there is no assurance that improving an individual's social acceptance by his peers will improve his total school adjustment, the improvement of social acceptance is a worthy objective in itself. In addition, there is the possibility that greater acceptance will contribute to improved adjustment in other areas. (p. 260)

While there is some evidence to deny the relationship between sociometric status and personal and social adjustment, there appears to be a larger body of research in support of the belief that the two variables are related. Regarding this point, Lindzey and Borgatta (14) stated:

In general, we may suggest that the evidence is moderately convincing for the existence of regular relationships between certain sociometric dimensions and attributes measured by conventional personality instruments. Personality, at both overt and covert levels appears to relate to sociometric variables in significant respects. (p. 436)

Frankel (8) concluded from her research with nursery school children that "the most fruitful approach for obtaining clues in this area of interpersonal relationships is by studying the personality development of the children." (p. 223)

#### Implications for the Present Study

Implications for the present research can be drawn from the reported studies. (1) The importance for studying the social relationships

of young children. (2) Feasibility of studying the social relationships of young children. (3) The reliability of the use of sociometric measures with young children. (4) The establishment of a relationship between sociometric status and personality characteristics of older children. (5) The importance of studying personality adjustment as a means to better understanding of sociometric status. (6) The limited study of the relationship between sociometric status and the personal and social adjustment of young children. The review of literature appears to indicate that the measurement of reciprocal sociometric choices as an indication of sociometric status is an area which has not been widely researched.



## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE AND METHOD

The purpose of this study was to test the hypothesis that children whose choices are frequently reciprocated on a sociometric test will differ in personal and social adjustment from children whose choices are nonreciprocal or infrequently reciprocated.

To achieve this purpose, a pilot study was conducted to determine the reliability of two methods for measuring the sociometric choices of children. On the basis of the results of the pilot study, the sociometric tests were selected and administered to a group of kindergarten children followed by a test of personal and social adjustment. The sociometric choices of these children were charted and the number of reciprocal choices for each child tabulated and weighted. The weighted score for reciprocal choices was then compared with scores on the test of personal and social adjustment.

Chapter III will include a description of the subjects, the pilot study, the sociometric test, the weighting of the reciprocal choices, the test selected for the measurement of personal and social adjustment, and the administration of the tests.

#### Subjects

The subjects were 47 kindergarten children, 46 white and one Negro, enrolled in a church-sponsored kindergarten in Stillwater, Oklahoma.

The sample included children from both morning and afternoon classes totaling 19 boys and 28 girls. They ranged in age from five years and five months to six years and five months inclusively. Fifty children were tested; however, three children, two girls and one boy were eliminated from the sample because they had been a part of the group less than 12 weeks. According to Speroff (25) the sociometric choices of kindergarten children in his sample did not begin to stabilize until after that time. No children who participated in the pilot work were included in the final study.

#### Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted at the Oklahoma State University Children's Center for the purpose of determining which of two methods was most reliable as a measure of the sociometric choices of young children. The two methods tested were as follows:

Question Method. The children were asked to make sociometric choices in response to two questions. (1) "If your mother told you that you could invite some friends from nursery school to come to your house and play, who would you invite?" (2) "If your mother told you that you could have a birthday party and invite some friends from nursery school, who would you invite?" The subjects were encouraged to choose four children in answer to each question; however, they were not forced to make four choices if a lesser number seemed to satisfy them.

Gift Method. Children were asked to make sociometric choices in response to the opportunity to give a gift to those children of their choice within the group. The child was presented with balloons of

various shapes and colors. He was first asked to choose a balloon that he would like to keep for himself which was placed in a bag with his name on it. He was then given four balloons of the same color and shape as the one he had chosen and asked to choose four friends to whom he would like to give them. As he chose a child to whom he wanted to give a balloon, it was placed in a bag with the chosen child's name on it. The activity was then repeated with the child choosing another balloon for himself and giving away four of the same kind to children of his choosing in the nursery school group.

Through the use of both methods, the child was given an opportunity for a maximum of 16 sociometric choices, four for each of two questions, and four for each of two gifts. After all the children had been tested, the investigator equalized the number of balloons in the bags so that upon distribution each child received a bag containing approximately the same number of balloons.

The pilot study consisted of a pre-test and a post-test using both methods, gifts and questions. Thirteen children, eight boys and five girls ranging in age from four years and five months to six years and one month, inclusive, participated in the pilot study.

An analysis of the pilot study data served to answer the following questions: (1) whether the test should be administered in one or two sessions, (2) whether gifts or questions were the more reliable method for measuring reciprocal choices, and (3) whether gifts and questions were measuring different aspects of sociometric status.

There was no significant difference between the first and second sessions of the testing as indicated by an analysis of the number of

children who were chosen for both gifts and questions. (For example, in session I three of the children chosen by Child A for gifts were also chosen by Child A in response to the questions; and in session II Child A chose four of the same children for gifts and questions.) The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test was used for this analysis ( $T = 25.5$ ; n.s.). Therefore, it was concluded that the sociometric test could be administered in one session.

The reliability of the two methods, gifts and questions, was analyzed by comparing the number of children chosen by each child for gifts in both session I and session II with the number chosen in response to questions in session I and session II. (For example, three of the same children were chosen by Child A for gifts in session I and in session II and five of the same children were chosen by Child A in response to questions in session I and session II.) The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test indicated that the gift method was more reliable than the question method ( $T = 11.5$ ;  $p. < .02$ ).

An analysis of the pilot study data indicated that the two methods, gifts and questions, were measuring different aspects of sociometric status. The two methods were compared in terms of the number of reciprocal choices each child received and in terms of the popularity of each child i.e. the number of times he was chosen by other children. Both analyses indicated that the two methods were measuring significantly different aspects of sociometric status. (The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test was used for these analyses. For popularity,  $T = 16$ ;  $p. < .05$ . For reciprocal choices  $T = 9$ ;  $p. < .01$ .)

### Sociometric Test

The sociometric test was used in the final study as described in the pilot study with the following changes: The questions were changed to read: (1) "If your mother told you that you could invite some friends from kindergarten to come to your house and play, who would you invite?" (2) "If your mother told you that you could have a birthday party and invite some friends from kindergarten, who would you invite?"

The gift method was changed to include small plastic cars, colored marbles, and tiny American flags, as well as balloons to add variety to the gift giving. The sociometric test which included both methods was administered once in the final study.

### Weighting of Reciprocal Choices

For purposes of data analysis, it seemed wise to weight the number of reciprocal choices. A simple count of the number of reciprocal choices gave an extremely small range of possible scores (zero to seven). One child was chosen by seven of the children he had chosen, and one child was chosen by none of the children he had chosen. For every other score there were many ties. A score with greater discriminatory power was needed.

A weighted score was devised which reflects the strength of the relationship between the child and the children he chooses, or in other words, reflects the return that he receives from his investment.

The method used for weighting the number of reciprocal choices was as follows: Every choice which the child made was weighted according to the number of times he chose a friend and the number of times the

friend chose him. For example, Child F-22 chose Child F-27 twice, but Child F-27 chose Child F-22 four times. For Child F-22, the score for that reciprocal choice would be 4 to 2 or 2.00. For Child F-27, the score for that reciprocal choice would be 2 to 4 or .50. These scores for each child were then totaled and divided by the number of children chosen by him. The weighted score for Child F-27 would be:

$$\frac{(2/4) + (3/4) + (3/4) + (4/0)}{4} = \frac{.50 + .75 + .75 + .00}{4} = .50$$

This score takes into consideration the total number of children chosen by Child F-27 and the return which that subject receives from each child.

The above method was used to determine a reciprocal choice score for each child on gifts, questions, and total reciprocal choices.

#### Personal and Social Adjustment Test

The California Test of Personality, Primary, form AA, was selected as the instrument to be used to measure the personal and social adjustment of the subjects. The CTP is one of the few personality inventories that is available for use with young children. The test is divided into two sections, one for measuring personal adjustment and the other for measuring social adjustment. (See Appendix B, page 35.) Each section is divided into six subsections that contain eight questions making a total of 96 questions to which the subjects answer "yes" or "no."

In the area of reliability, concerning the CTP, Sims in Buros (5) stated that tests for internal consistency "indicate a fair degree of reliability for the total and two main components, social and personal adjustment, particularly for the lower scores." (p. 39)

The CTP appears to be one of the better personality inventories which is available and as a measure of self-concept it is as valid as most instruments (Buros, 5).

#### Administration of the Tests

The subjects were tested individually, with the sociometric test and the California Test of Personality being administered during the same test session. The subject was taken by the investigator to a separate room adjacent to the classroom to help provide an atmosphere which was quieter and less distracting in which to work.

The sociometric test was administered first; followed by the CTP. The procedure used followed the directions in the test manual (26):

Young children (especially those in kindergarten and first grade) who do not have a sufficient reading ability to follow the printed questions should have the questions read aloud to them individually and the responses of the pupil should be recorded by the examiner.  
(p. 21)

The manual also suggested that it is often desirable to have rest periods during the testing. For the above reason, at an appropriate time during the test the child was given an opportunity to rest if he showed signs of fatigue or restlessness. While resting, he was able to walk down the hall and get a drink of water or go to the rest room.

When all the subjects had been tested, the sociometric choices were charted, the California Test of Personality was scored, and the results were tabulated by the investigator. A description of the data analysis follows in Chapter IV.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine if there are differences in personal and social adjustment between those children whose sociometric choices are frequently reciprocated and those whose choices are nonreciprocal or infrequently reciprocated. Scores for individual children are presented in Table IV (Appendix A, page 31).

The Mann-Whitney U Test, the Spearman rank order correlation, and Chi-square were chosen for the data analyses. This chapter will include the following data analyses:

1. A comparison of the number of reciprocal choices and total reciprocal choice scores.
2. A comparison of the reliability of the two parts of the sociometric test using the reciprocal choice scores for gifts and reciprocal choice scores for questions. A further comparison of the reliability of the two parts by using the ranks of the subjects on reciprocal choice scores for gifts and reciprocal choice scores for questions.
3. A comparison of children who were high and low in total reciprocal choice scores for differences in personal and social adjustment. Similarly, a comparison of children who were high and low in reciprocal choice scores for gifts and children who were high and low in reciprocal choice scores for questions for differences in personal and social adjustment.



4. A comparison of sex differences in total reciprocal choice scores.

Number of Reciprocal Choices and Weighted  
Reciprocal Choice Scores

A Chi-square analysis of reciprocal choices and the total reciprocal choice scores indicated that children who had many reciprocal choices had a high total reciprocal choice score and children who had few reciprocal choices had a low total reciprocal choice score, ( $\chi^2 = 30.98$   $p. < .001$ ). For example, Child F-22 had seven reciprocal choices and a reciprocal choice score of 1.44; and Child F-21 had one reciprocal choice and a reciprocal choice score of .33.

The reciprocal choice score was selected for use, however, because it presented a more accurate picture of the child's investment in others and the proportionate return. For example, Child M-10 and Child M-12 both had five reciprocal choices; however, Child M-10 had a reciprocal choice score of 1.22 and Child M-12 had a reciprocal choice score of .58. At the lower end of the scale, Child F-21 and Child F-39 both had one reciprocal choice; however, Child F-21 had a reciprocal choice score of .33 and Child F-39 had a reciprocal choice score of .06. In view of the foregoing evidence, the reciprocal choice scores will be used in the remainder of the data analysis in place of the number of reciprocal choices.

### Comparison of Reciprocal Choice Scores for Gifts and Questions

The reliability of the two parts of the sociometric test was tested by comparing the reciprocal choice scores for gifts and questions. The Mann-Whitney U Test was applied and the results indicated that there was no significant difference between scores for gifts and scores for questions. (U = 1028 n.s.)

Reliability of the two parts of the sociometric test was further tested by comparing the ranks of the subjects on reciprocal choice scores for gifts and questions. The Spearman rank order correlation was used for this analysis. A high correlation was found between the ranks of the subjects on one measure and their rank on the other measure. (rho. = .616; p. < .01) The sociometric test was accepted as reliable.

### Relationship of Reciprocal Choice Scores to Personal and Social Adjustment Scores

Because of the small range of scores on the California Test of Personality, only twenty subjects were used in the following analyses, the ten highest and the ten lowest.

Total Reciprocal Choice Score. Ten subjects with high and ten with low total reciprocal choice scores were compared for differences in personal adjustment, social adjustment, and total adjustment on the California Test of Personality. Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test are presented in Table I.

These analyses indicate that there is no relationship between the total reciprocal choice scores and any of the adjustment scores on the California Test of Personality.

TABLE I

VALUES OF  $U^*$  IN A COMPARISON OF ADJUSTMENT SCORES ON  
THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY OBTAINED  
BY CHILDREN WITH HIGH AND LOW TOTAL  
RECIPROCAL CHOICE SCORES

(N = 20)

	U	p
Personal Adjustment Scores	39.5	n.s.
Social Adjustment Scores	25.5	n.s.
Total Adjustment Scores	31.0	n.s.

\*Mann-Whitney U Test

Reciprocal Choice Score for Gifts. Ten children who were highest and ten who were lowest in reciprocal choice scores for gifts were compared for differences in personal adjustment, social adjustment, and total adjustment on the California Test of Personality. Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test are presented in Table II.

These analyses indicate that there is no relationship between the reciprocal choice scores for gifts and any of the adjustment scores on the California Test of Personality.

Reciprocal Choice Score for Questions. Ten children who were highest and ten who were lowest in reciprocal choice scores for questions were compared for differences in personal adjustment, social adjustment, and total adjustment. Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test are presented in Table III.

These analyses indicate that there is no relationship between the

reciprocal choice scores for questions and any of the adjustment scores on the California Test of Personality.

TABLE II

VALUES OF  $U^*$  IN A COMPARISON OF ADJUSTMENT SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY OBTAINED BY CHILDREN WITH HIGH AND LOW RECIPROCAL CHOICE SCORES FOR GIFTS

(N = 20)

	U	p
Personal Adjustment Scores	40.5	n.s.
Social Adjustment Scores	35.5	n.s.
Total Adjustment Scores	46.5	n.s.

\*Mann-Whitney U Test

TABLE III

VALUES OF  $U^*$  IN A COMPARISON OF ADJUSTMENT SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY OBTAINED BY CHILDREN WITH HIGH AND LOW RECIPROCAL CHOICE SCORES FOR QUESTIONS

(N = 20)

	U	p
Personal Adjustment Scores	44.5	n.s.
Social Adjustment Scores	29.0	n.s.
Total Adjustment Scores	32.5	n.s.

\*Mann-Whitney U Test

Analysis of Total Reciprocal Choice Scores  
According to Sex

The total reciprocal choice scores for boys and total reciprocal choice scores for girls were compared by means of the Mann-Whitney U Test. Analysis of the data indicate that there is no significant difference between the total reciprocal choice scores of boys and girls. (U = 200 n.s.)

Summary

The results of the statistical analyses were as follows:

1. The number of reciprocal choices and the total reciprocal choice scores were comparable. The reciprocal choice score was used because it presented a more accurate picture of the child's investment in others and the proportionate return.
2. The reliability of the two parts of the sociometric test is indicated by the high correlation between scores for gifts and scores for questions. Reliability is also supported by the high correlation between the ranks of the subjects on the question measure and their ranks on the gift measure.
3. There was no relationship between the total reciprocal choice scores for the subjects and their adjustment scores on the California Test of Personality. Similarly, there was no relationship between the reciprocal choice scores for gifts and questions and the adjustment scores on the California Test of Personality.
4. There was no significant difference between total reciprocal choice scores for boys and girls.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there are differences in personal and social adjustment between children whose sociometric choices are frequently reciprocated and those whose sociometric choices are nonreciprocal or infrequently reciprocated.

The subjects for this investigation were 47 children enrolled in a church-sponsored kindergarten in Stillwater, Oklahoma. Children were administered a sociometric test which included the use of two methods selected on the basis of a pilot study. Children made sociometric choices in response to two questions and in response to the opportunity to give gifts to children in their group. The California Test of Personality, Primary, form AA, (Appendix B, page 39), was administered as a measure of personal and social adjustment.

The sociometric choices of the children were charted and the number of reciprocal choices tabulated. The number of reciprocal choices was then weighted for use in data analysis. The data were analyzed by means of the Mann-Whitney U Test, the Spearman rank order correlation, and Chi-square.

#### Findings

The findings of this investigation were as follows:

1. The number of reciprocal choices and the total reciprocal

choice scores were comparable. The reciprocal choice scores were used because it presented a more accurate picture of the child's investment in others and the proportionate return.

2. The reliability of the two parts of the sociometric test is indicated by the high correlation between scores for gifts and scores for questions. Reliability is also supported by the high correlation between the ranks of the subjects on the question measure and their ranks on the gift measure.

3. There was no relationship between the total reciprocal choice scores for the subjects and their adjustment scores on the California Test of Personality. Similarly, there was no relationship between the reciprocal choice scores for gifts and questions and the adjustment scores on the California Test of Personality.

4. There was no significant difference between total reciprocal choice scores for boys and girls.

#### Recommendations

The findings of the study indicate no relationship between reciprocal choice scores and personal and social adjustment, which the purpose of this study was to investigate. Unrelated to this purpose another finding emerged in the area of sociometric testing. Both the gift method and the question method indicated high reliability. If further studies in the use of the two methods obtain the same results, it may be that, at least for kindergarten children, either method may be used. Recommendations for further study are as follows:

1. An investigation should be conducted using both methods of sociometric testing with a larger sample of kindergarten subjects.

2. An investigation should be conducted to compare reciprocal choice scores with personal and social adjustment using a sample that would offer a wider range of personal and social adjustment. A public school sample might lend such a differentiation in personal and social adjustment.

3. An investigation should be conducted to compare reciprocal choice scores with personal and social adjustment using other criteria as an index of adjustment.



#### A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Austin, Mary C. and George G. Thompson. "Children's Friendships: A Study of the Basis on Which Children Select and Reject Their Best Friends." Journal of Educational Psychology, XXIX (January, 1948), 101-116.
2. Baron, Denis. "Personal-Social Characteristics and Classroom Social Status: A Sociometric Study of Fifth and Sixth Grade Girls," Sociometry, XIV (February, 1951), 32-43.
3. Biehler, Robert F. "Companion Choice Behavior in Kindergarten." Child Development, XXV (March, 1954), 45-50.
4. Budden, J. "A Study of the Degree of Consistency of Social Acceptability of Preschool Children in a Nursery School Setting." (Abstract) Sociometry, VI (November, 1943), 429-433.
5. Buros, Oscar Krisen. The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1959.
6. Dahlke, H. Otto. "Determinants of Sociometric Relations Among Children in the Elementary School." Sociometry, XVI (November, 1953), 327-338.
7. Dunnington, Margaret J. "Investigation of Areas of Disagreement in Sociometric Measurement of Preschool Children." Child Development, XXVIII (March, 1957), 93-101.
8. Frankel, Esther B. "The Social Relationships of Nursery School Children." Sociometry, IX (May, 1946), 210-225.
9. Grounlund, Norman E. and Loren Anderson. "Personality Characteristics of Socially Accepted, Socially Neglected, and Socially Rejected Junior High School Pupils." Educational Administration and Supervision, XLIII (October, 1957), 329-338.
10. Grounlund, Norman E. and Walter S. Holmlund. "The Value of Elementary School Sociometric Status Scores for Predicting Pupil's Adjustment in High School." Educational Administration and Supervision, XLIV (September, 1958), 255-260.
11. Guinouard, Donald E. and Joseph F. Rychlak. "Personality Correlates of Sociometric Popularity in Elementary School Children." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (January, 1962), 438-442.

12. Horowitz, Frances Degen. "Incentive Value of Social Stimuli for Preschool Children." Child Development, XXXIII (March, 1962), 111-116.
13. Koch, Helen Lois. "Popularity in Preschool Children: Some Related Factors and a Technique for its Measurement." Child Development, IV (June, 1933), 165-175.
14. Lindzey, Gardner and Edgar Borgatta. "Sociometric Measurement." Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. I. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
15. Lippitt, Rosemary. "Popularity Among Preschool Children." Child Development, XII (December, 1941), 305-332.
16. McCandless, Boyd R. and Helen R. Marshall. "A Picture Sociometric Technique for Preschool Children and its Relation to Teacher Judgements of Friendship." Child Development, XXVIII (June, 1957), 139-147.
17. Northway, Mary L. A Primer of Sociometry. University of Toronto Press, 1952.
18. Northway, Mary L. "Social Relationships Among Preschool Children Abstracts and Interpretation of Three Studies." Sociometry VI (November, 1943), 429-433.
19. Moreno, Florence B. "Sociometric Status of Children in a Nursery School Group." Sociometry, V (November, 1942), 395-411.
20. Nowell, Ann. "Peer Status as Related to Measures of Personality Adjustment." California Journal of Educational Research, VI (September, 1955), 181-184.
21. Phillips, Beeman N. and M. Vere De Vault. "Relation of Positive and Negative Sociometric Valuations to Social and Personal Adjustment." Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXIX (December, 1955), 409-412.
22. Satterlee, Robert Louis. "Sociometric Analysis and Personality Adjustment." California Journal of Educational Research, VI (September, 1955), 181-184.
23. Scandrette, Onas C. "Classroom Choice Status Related to Scores on Components of the California Test of Personality." Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (December, 1953), 291-296.
24. Singer, Arthur. "Certain Aspects of Personality and Their Relation to Certain Group Modes and Consistency of Friendship Choices." Journal of Educational Research, XLV (September, 1951), 34-42.

25. Speroff, B. J. "The Stability of Sociometric Choice Among Kindergarten Children." Sociometry, XVIII (May, 1955), 129-131.
26. Thorpe, Louis, P., Willis W. Clark, and Ernest W. Tiegs. Manual: California Test of Personality. Los Angeles: California Test Bureau, 1953.
27. Young, Lyle L. and Dan H. Cooper. "Some Factors Associated With Popularity." Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIII (December, 1944), 512-535.
28. Zelen, Seymour L. "Acceptance and Acceptability: An Examination of Social Reciprocity." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (October, 1954), 316.

APPENDIX A

TABLE IV

RAW SCORES OBTAINED BY INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN ON A SOCIOMETRIC TEST AND ON  
THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY

(N = 47)

Sex and Code Number	Number of Reciprocal Choices	Reciprocal Choice Scores			California Test of Personality		
		Questions	Gifts	Total	Personal Adjustment	Social Adjustment	Total Adjustment
M-1	1	.08	.13	.07	38	37	75
M-2	1	.13	.50	.19	17	29	46
M-3	3	.67	.17	.69	40	46	86
M-4	2	.38	.25	.31	26	36	62
M-5	2	.00	.09	.25	23	42	65
M-6	2	.14	.13	.33	41	45	86
M-7	3	.20	.10	.29	40	45	85
M-8	1	.00	.13	.06	29	30	59
M-9	0	.00	.00	.00	40	32	72
M-10	5	1.20	1.00	1.22	43	46	89
M-11	3	.16	.50	.48	31	33	64
M-12	5	.70	.38	.58	39	39	78
M-13	1	.17	.25	.19	30	29	59
M-14	5	.71	.50	.93	40	44	84
M-15	1	.10	.20	.15	34	44	78
M-16	2	.25	.50	.38	37	41	78
M-17	5	.58	.33	.47	38	43	81
M-18	4	.36	.25	.83	28	34	62
M-19	5	.67	.90	1.10	44	46	90

TABLE IV (Continued)

Sex and Code Number	Number of Reciprocal Choices	Reciprocal Choice Scores			California Test of Personality		
		Questions	Gifts	Total	Personal Adjustment	Social Adjustment	Total Adjustment
F-20	5	.43	.60	1.00	29	32	61
F-21	1	.33	.33	.33	13	39	52
F-22	7	1.33	.88	1.44	40	45	85
F-23	1	.20	.00	.10	29	34	63
F-24	1	.10	.13	.10	30	40	70
F-25	2	.38	.17	.37	46	47	93
F-26	5	.75	.83	.57	33	45	78
F-27	3	.38	.63	.50	41	46	87
F-28	3	.38	.17	.48	26	42	68
F-29	2	.43	.44	.35	23	32	55
F-30	3	.57	.60	.48	27	37	64
F-31	3	.75	.10	.42	44	46	90
F-32	3	.13	.63	.33	28	35	63
F-33	4	.29	.42	.54	35	38	73
F-34	2	.25	.00	.44	38	40	78
F-35	6	.86	.90	1.10	33	38	71
F-36	5	.50	.29	.65	41	38	79
F-37	5	.91	.70	1.12	34	45	79
F-38	4	1.00	.63	.81	38	44	82
F-39	1	.00	.20	.06	40	40	80

TABLE IV (Continued)

Sex and Code Number	Number of Reciprocal Choices	Reciprocal Choice Scores			California Test of Personality		
		Questions	Gifts	Total	Personal Adjustment	Social Adjustment	Total Adjustment
F-40	1	.17	.33	.22	41	42	83
F-41	6	.56	.60	1.50	32	42	74
F-42	4	.42	.25	.58	35	45	80
F-43	3	.60	.33	.67	43	43	86
F-44	2	.10	.38	.22	38	45	83
F-45	4	.83	.25	.40	20	27	47
F-46	5	.86	.57	.91	30	35	65
F-47	5	.35	.14	.58	38	40	78

APPENDIX B



## CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY

Definitions of the Components:<sup>1</sup>

The following components are not names for so-called general traits. They are, rather, names for groupings of more or less specific tendencies to feel, think, and act.

Personal Adjustment

- 1A. Self Reliance---An individual may be said to be self-reliant when his overt actions indicate that he can do things independently of others, depend upon himself in various situations, and direct his own activities. The self-reliant person is also characteristically stable emotionally, and responsible in his behavior.
- 1B. Sense of Personal Worth---An individual possesses a sense of being worthy when he feels he is well regarded by others, when he feels that others have faith in his future success, and when he believes that he has average or better than average ability. To feel worthy means to feel capable and reasonably attractive.
- 1C. Sense of Personal Freedom---An individual enjoys a sense of freedom when he is permitted to have a reasonable share in the determination of his conduct and in setting the general policies that shall govern his life. Desirable freedom includes permission to choose one's own friends and to have at least a little spending money.
- 1D. Feeling of Belonging---An individual feels that he belongs when he enjoys the love of his family, the well-wishes of good friends, and a cordial relationship with people in general. Such a person will as a rule get along well with his teachers or employers and usually feels proud of his school or place of business.

---

<sup>1</sup>Louis P. Thorpe, Willis W. Clark, and Ernest W. Tiegs, Manual: California Test of Personality (Los Angeles, 1953), pp. 3-4.

- 1E. Withdrawing Tendencies---The individual who is said to withdraw is the one who substitutes the joys of a fantasy world for actual successes in real life. Such a person is characteristically sensitive, lonely, and given to self-concern. Normal adjustment is characterized by reasonable freedom from these tendencies.
- 1F. Nervous Symptoms---The individual who is classified as having nervous symptoms is the one who suffers from one or more of a variety of physical symptoms such as loss of appetite, frequent eye strain, inability to sleep, or a tendency to be chronically tired. People of this kind may be exhibiting physical expressions of emotional conflicts.

### Social Adjustment

- 2A. Social Standards---The individual who recognizes desirable social standards is the one who has come to understand the rights of others and who appreciates the necessity of subordinating certain desires to the needs of the group. Such an individual understands what is regarded as being right or wrong.
- 2B. Social Skills---An individual may be said to be socially skillful or effective when he shows a liking for people, when he inconveniences himself to be of assistance to them, and when he is diplomatic in his dealings with both friends and strangers. The socially skillful person subordinates his or her egoistic tendencies in favor of interest in the problems and activities of his associates.
- 2C. Anti-Social Tendencies---An individual would normally be regarded as anti-social when he is given to bullying, frequent quarreling, disobedience, and destructiveness to property. The anti-social person is the one who endeavors to get his satisfactions in ways that are damaging and unfair to others. Normal adjustment is characterized by reasonable freedom from these tendencies.
- 2D. Family Relations---The individual who exhibits desirable family relationships is the one who feels that he is loved and well-treated at home, and who has a sense of security and self-respect in connection with the various members of his family. Superior family relations also include parental control that is neither too strict nor too lenient.
- 2E. School Relations---The student who is satisfactorily adjusted to his school is the one who feels that his teachers like him, who enjoys being with other students, and who finds the school work adapted to his level of interest and maturity.

Good school relations involve the feeling on the part of the student that he counts for something in the life of the institution.

- 2F. Community Relations---The individual who may be said to be making good adjustments in his community is the one who mingles happily with his neighbors, who takes pride in community improvements, and who is tolerant in dealing with both strangers and foreigners. Satisfactory community relations include as well the disposition to be respectful of laws and of regulations pertaining to the general welfare.

**CALIFORNIA TEST BUREAU****AIRMAIL**

June 27, 1966

Miss Ann Adair Curd  
510 West Maple  
Apartment 4  
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Dear Miss Curd:

Your letter of June 21, 1966 to Mr. Philip H. Webber has been referred to me for an answer.

In view of Oklahoma State University's rule on including copies of tests used in research in the completed dissertation, we feel obligated to grant you permission to include the CTP booklet in your bound thesis.

We would appreciate receiving an abstract or a carbon copy of your study.

If we can be of further service, do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

John L. Holmes  
Director  
Customer Services

JLH:mec

Primary • GRADES  
KGN. to 3 • form **AA**

# California Test of Personality

1953 Revision

Devised by

LOUIS P. THORPE, WILLIS W. CLARK, AND ERNEST W. TIEGS



(CIRCLE ONE)

Name.....  
Last First Middle

Grade..... Boy Girl

School..... City..... Date of Test.....  
Month Day Year

Examiner..... (.....) Pupil's Age..... Date of Birth.....  
Month Day Year

**TO BOYS AND GIRLS:**

This booklet has some questions which can be answered YES or NO. Your answers will show what you usually think, how you usually feel, or what you usually do about things. Work as fast as you can without making mistakes.

**DO NOT TURN THIS PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.**



PUBLISHED BY CALIFORNIA TEST BUREAU / A DIVISION OF MCGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY,  
 DEL MONTE RESEARCH PARK, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA—COPYRIGHT © 1942, 1953 BY MCGRAW-HILL, INC.—ALL RIGHTS RESERVED—PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—THIS WORK, OR ANY PARTS THEREOF, MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED IN ANY FORM WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHERS.

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

**PRACTICE QUESTIONS**

A. Do you have a dog at home?                      **YES NO**

B. Did you walk all the way to school today?      **YES NO**

## SECTION 1 A

1. Is it easy for you to play by yourself when you have to? YES NO
2. Is it easy for you to talk to your class? YES NO
3. Do you feel like crying when you are hurt a little? YES NO
4. Do you feel bad when you are blamed for things? YES NO
5. Do you usually finish the games you start? YES NO
6. Does someone usually help you dress? YES NO
7. Can you get the children to bring back your things? YES NO
8. Do you need help to eat your meals? YES NO

Section 1 A  
(number right) .....

## SECTION 1 B

1. Do the children think you can do things well? YES NO
2. Do the other children often do nice things for you? YES NO
3. Do you have fewer friends than other children? YES NO
4. Do most of the boys and girls like you? YES NO
5. Do your folks think that you are bright? YES NO
6. Can you do things as well as other children? YES NO
7. Do people think that other children are better than you? YES NO
8. Are most of the children smarter than you? YES NO

Section 1 B  
(number right) .....



## SECTION 1 C

1. Do your folks sometimes let you buy things? YES NO
2. Do you have to tell some people to let you alone? YES NO
3. Do you go to enough new places? YES NO
4. Do your folks keep you from playing with the children you like? YES NO
5. Are you allowed to play the games you like? YES NO
6. Are you punished for many things you do? YES NO
7. May you do most of the things you like? YES NO
8. Do you have to stay at home too much? YES NO

Section 1 C (number right) .....
-------------------------------------

## SECTION 1 D

1. Do you need to have more friends? YES NO
2. Do you feel that people don't like you? YES NO
3. Do you have good times with the children at school? YES NO
4. Are the children glad to have you in school? YES NO
5. Are you lonesome even when you are with people? YES NO
6. Do people like to have you around them? YES NO
7. Do most of the people you know like you? YES NO
8. Do lots of children have more fun at home than you do? YES NO

Section 1 D (number right) .....
-------------------------------------





1. Do the boys and girls often try to cheat you? YES NO
2. Do you feel very bad when people talk about you? YES NO
3. Are most of the boys and girls mean to you? YES NO
4. Do you feel bad because people are mean to you? YES NO
5. Do many children say things that hurt your feelings? YES NO
6. Are many older people so mean that you hate them? YES NO
7. Do you often feel so bad that you do not know what to do? YES NO
8. Would you rather watch others play than play with them? YES NO

## SECTION 1 E

Section 1 E (number right) .....
-------------------------------------

1. Do you often wake up because of bad dreams? YES NO
2. Is it hard for you to go to sleep at night? YES NO
3. Do things often make you cry? YES NO
4. Do you catch colds easily? YES NO
5. Are you often tired even in the morning? YES NO
6. Are you sick much of the time? YES NO
7. Do your eyes hurt often? YES NO
8. Are you often mad at people without knowing why? YES NO

## SECTION 1 F

Section 1 F (number right) .....
-------------------------------------



## SECTION 2 A

1. Should you mind your folks even when they are wrong? YES NO
2. Should you mind your folks even if your friends tell you not to? YES NO
3. Is it all right to cry if you cannot have your own way? YES NO
4. Should children fight when people do not treat them right? YES NO
5. Should a person break a promise that he thinks is unfair? YES NO
6. Do children need to ask their folks if they may do things? YES NO
7. Do you need to thank everyone who helps you? YES NO
8. Is it all right to cheat if no one sees you? YES NO

Section 2 A (number right) .....
-------------------------------------

## SECTION 2 B

1. Do you talk to the new children at school? YES NO
2. Is it hard for you to talk to new people? YES NO
3. Does it make you angry when people stop you from doing things? YES NO
4. Do you say nice things to children who do better work than you do? YES NO
5. Do you sometimes hit other children when you are playing with them? YES NO
6. Do you play games with other children even when you don't want to? YES NO
7. Do you help new children get used to the school? YES NO
8. Is it hard for you to play fair? YES NO

Section 2 B (number right) .....
-------------------------------------



**SECTION 2 C**

1. Do people often make you very angry? YES NO
2. Do you have to make a fuss to get people to treat you right? YES NO
3. Are people often so bad that you have to be mean to them? YES NO
4. Is someone at home so mean that you often get angry? YES NO
5. Do you have to watch many people so they won't hurt you? YES NO
6. Do the boys and girls often quarrel with you? YES NO
7. Do you like to push or scare other children? YES NO
8. Do you often tell the other children that you won't do what they ask? YES NO

Section 2 C  
(number right) .....

**SECTION 2 D**

1. Are your folks right when they make you mind? YES NO
2. Do you wish you could live in some other home? YES NO
3. Are the folks at home always good to you? YES NO
4. Is it hard to talk things over with your folks because they don't understand? YES NO
5. Is there someone at home who does not like you? YES NO
6. Do your folks seem to think that you are nice to them? YES NO
7. Do you feel that no one at home loves you? YES NO
8. Do your folks seem to think that you are not very smart? YES NO

Section 2 D  
(number right) .....



## SECTION 2 E

1. Do you often do nice things for the other children in your school? YES NO
2. Are there many bad children in your school? YES NO
3. Do the boys and girls seem to think that you are nice to them? YES NO
4. Do you think that some teachers do not like the children? YES NO
5. Would you rather stay home from school if you could? YES NO
6. Is it hard to like the children in your school? YES NO
7. Do the other boys and girls say that you don't play fair in games? YES NO
8. Do the children at school ask you to play games with them? YES NO

Section 2 E  
(number right) \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION 2 F

1. Do you play with some of the children living near your home? YES NO
2. Do the people near your home seem to like you? YES NO
3. Are the people near your home often mean? YES NO
4. Are there people near your home who are not nice? YES NO
5. Do you have good times with people who live near you? YES NO
6. Are there some mean boys and girls who live near you? YES NO
7. Are you asked to play in other people's yards? YES NO
8. Do you have more fun near your home than other children do near theirs? YES NO

Section 2 F  
(number right) \_\_\_\_\_

VITA

Ann Adair Curd

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

**Thesis:** THE RELATIONSHIP OF KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN'S RECIPROCAL  
SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES TO PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

**Major Field:** Family Relations and Child Development

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Kirkwood, Missouri, January 18, 1941,  
the daughter of Charles and Evelyn Scott Curd.

**Education:** Attended grade school in Barretts Station and  
Crystal City, Missouri; was graduated from Crystal City  
High School in 1957; received the Bachelor of Science  
degree from Northwest Missouri State College, with a major  
in Elementary Education, in May, 1961; completed require-  
ments for the degree of Master of Science in Family Relations  
and Child Development in August, 1966.

**Professional Experience:** Taught kindergarten in Mehlville,  
Missouri, from 1961 to 1963 and in Elyria, Ohio from 1963  
to 1965; Graduate assistant in the Department of Family  
Relations and Child Development from 1965 to 1966.

**Professional Organizations:** Southern Association on Children  
Under Six, Oklahoma Association on Children Under Six,  
National Education Association.