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CHAPTER I

TEACHERS' ABILITY TO PREDICT THE FRIENDSHIP STATUS OF SPEECH-HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

The sociometric test, a technique for evaluating the extent to which an individual is accepted by his peers, was used by Dr. J. L. Moreno in more than thirty years of extensive studies involving school children of all ages from walks of life ranging from public schools to detention schools. Dr. Moreno cautioned that, "While a sociometric test reveals a degree of acceptability only with regard to a specific test criterion on a specific group, generalizations can be made if the criterion reflects an activity meaningful to the age group for which it is intended."\(^1\)

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the classroom teacher is as able to predict the friendship status\(^2\) of the speech-handicapped school child as she is to predict that of his peers. Sociometry seemed to be a meaningful way to measure friendship status.

There is evidence that teachers are able to predict


\(^2\) Friendship status in this study refers to being chosen specifically for a party situation.
the social acceptability of their pupils by using a sociometric test. In an extensive survey, Gage, Leavitt and Stone\(^3\) compared the judgments of 103 teachers in fourth, fifth, and sixth grade classes with the results of a sociometric test administered to pupils. The pupils were asked in the test to name the five pupils whom they would prefer as classmates and the teachers were asked to name the five classmates each pupil would choose. The number of choices each pupil received on the sociometric test was correlated with the number of choices the teacher predicted and the resulting correlation coefficient was .48 with a standard deviation of .91.

Gronlund\(^4\) conducted a study wherein teachers were requested to rank their pupils in the order in which they thought the students were accepted by their classmates. The relationship between teachers' judgments and sociometric results was determined by comparing the teachers' rank order predictions of pupils' acceptance with actual ranking of students based on the number of sociometric choices received on three criteria (seating companion, work companion, play companion). Gronlund obtained an average correlation


coefficient of .60. Although he did not report the standard error of the statistic, the mean is based on correlation coefficients of forty classes. The forty correlation coefficients varied from .40 to .83. The study gives additional support to the assertion that teachers are able to predict social acceptability.

Social acceptance is a crucial aspect of any child's social relationships. Unless he is accepted he will not have the opportunity for the development Hurlock describes:

The major concern of every normal boy or girl is to be accepted by his contemporaries and to be regarded as a member of a "gang". (The gang is defined as a group of boys or girls of roughly the same age whose interest is having a good time together).

Once he enters grade school, the child is no longer satisfied to play at home alone or do things with members of his family. He wants to be with his gang because only there will he find games he now enjoys. The child bends over backwards to be like the members of his gang in dress, opinions and behavior and if conflict arises between parental and peer group standards the child will likely conform to those of the latter rather than those of the former.

From these contacts with friends, the child learns to compete with others, to cooperate and work as a member of a team, to accept responsibilities and to see them through, to take the part of others when they are mistreated or neglected and to be a good sport in adversity as well as success. This training in socialization which can be derived through no other medium than day-in, day-out contact with peers, is of value not only in childhood, but throughout the remaining years of the child's life.  

Social scientists attest to the value of social

---

acceptance of the individual. Moreno\textsuperscript{6} studied extensively the social relationships of all girls at Hudson Village, a detention school in New York. The results of some of his research suggest that individuals profit socially if they are allowed to work and play with those whom they have personally selected. Gronlund\textsuperscript{7} suggests that an individual is able to achieve more not only socially but academically if he participates in activities with chosen associates, because he experiences a feeling of personal security if freed from interpersonal tensions.

Experimental evidence resulting from sociometry indicates that speech-handicapped school children rate lower than their non-speech-handicapped peers in the crucial area of social acceptability. In Perrin's study\textsuperscript{8} 445 school children in grades 1-6 including 37 speech-defectives were given a sociometric test asking for choices in work, play and favorites-to-sit-next-to. The speech-defectives were defined as those having disorders of articulation, rhythm or voice who were at that time receiving therapy from the school therapist. Isolates (receiving 0-1 vote) comprised 21.6\% of the speech-defective group and 13.5\% of the non-defective

\textsuperscript{6}Moreno, op. cit., pp. 219-527.

\textsuperscript{7}Norman E. Gronlund, Sociometry in the Classroom (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 16.

group while neglectees (receiving 2-4 votes) comprised 37.8% of the speech-defective group and 24.5% of the non-defective group. There were no stars (receiving 20 or more votes) in the speech-defective group as compared to 6.5% in the non-defective group.

Carrow and Woods\(^9\) investigated the social position of speech-defective children (defined as having dysarthria or disorders of voice, articulation, or rhythm) in elementary public school. Their assumption that speech-defective children tend to be under-accepted by peers was partially confirmed by their data. Although there was no significant difference in scores between the two groups in work criterion, the scores differed significantly between speech-defectives and non-speech-defectives in criteria of play and "friends".

Ideally the speech-handicapped child should have a speech therapy program as expansive and intensive as his individual case requires. But in Montana he rarely has this opportunity. At the time this study was begun, five of the 909 public school districts in this state employed qualified speech therapists and only one of these was employed on a full-time basis. Elks' sponsored therapists visited thirty-two cities from one to four times a month.

There were two speech and hearing clinics at Billings, one at Great Falls, and one at the University of Montana, Missoula. Some private therapy was available on a part-time basis.\textsuperscript{10}

Even if therapy is unavailable to him, the speech-handicapped school child may still be helped in a way social scientists consider vital to his development—he may be helped to become more socially acceptable. The investigator believes the teacher to be the ideal one to assist the child because the classroom offers contacts with others his own age. Montana is a large sparsely populated rural state where many students ride buses miles to and from the school which provides one of the few opportunities the child has to associate with peers.

It is the investigator's concern that the teacher may inaccurately estimate the speech-handicapped child's social acceptability. She may be unaware that he is not as socially acceptable as his non-speech-handicapped peers and may therefore overestimate his social status. Research indicating whether the teacher does recognize the speech-handicapped child's lower social acceptance is significant because only to the extent that she recognizes it can she help him.

The hypothesis investigated in this study was that the

\textsuperscript{10} The data was obtained in April, 1963, from the Supervisor of Special Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Helena.
classroom teacher is not as able to predict the friendship status for the speech-handicapped child as she is able to predict that of his peers.
CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

The Subjects

The subjects for this study were fourth through eighth grade students attending regular classes in the public schools at Helena, Montana. The 22 experimental subjects were diagnosed by the school speech therapist as speech-handicapped after referral from their respective classroom teachers. Thirteen students had articulation disorders ([θ/θ], [v/r], [f/θ] substitutions or [r] distortions). In addition some of the thirteen had disorders labeled "fluency," "speed" or "nasality." Six others had disorders of "fluency" and "speed." The therapist classified three students according to etiology rather than symptoms; two of these have repaired cleft palates and lips and one has cerebral palsy.

A total of 25 students were originally referred to the investigator by the speech therapist. However in three cases, two subjects were attending the same class. One subject was randomly omitted in each of these three cases in order to maintain independence of subjects in the analysis of data.

The speech therapist, from whose diagnosis the experimental subjects were chosen, received a BA degree in speech therapy from Denver University. She is a member of the
American Speech and Hearing Association and has basic certification in speech.

The 569 subjects in the control group were the classmates of the 22 experimental subjects. Each of the 22 teachers involved in the study had an experimental subject in her class.

The Measurement Devices

A sociometric test (Appendix A) was used to measure friendship status. The test criterion, based on a party situation, concerned an activity familiar to the age group but was general enough to minimize specific skills which could influence choices. Each child was asked to put himself in the hypothetical situation of being able to invite his entire class to a party. He was asked to rate each classmate by marking the one category which best represented what he would do in regards to inviting that individual to his party. The five categories were labeled: (1) I WOULD ALWAYS INVITE THIS PERSON, (2) I WOULD PROBABLY INVITE THIS PERSON, (3) I DON'T KNOW, (4) I WOULD PROBABLY NOT INVITE THIS PERSON, (5) I WOULD NEVER INVITE THIS PERSON. Thus a rating for every subject was obtained from each of his respective classmates.

The teachers' ratings of friendship status of their

---

11 Gronlund believes these to be the important qualifications of a good criterion. (Sociometry in the Classroom, p. 17).
respective pupils were obtained from the Teacher's Rating Sheet (Appendix A) in which the party situation was explained. The teacher was asked to mark the one category (five were available here also) which best represented the degree to which she thought each child would be invited by most of his classmates. The five categories were labeled: (1) HIGHLY ACCEPTED FOR THE PARTY, (2) MODERATELY ACCEPTED FOR THE PARTY, (3) NEUTRAL, (4) MODERATELY REJECTED FOR THE PARTY, (5) HIGHLY REJECTED FOR THE PARTY.

The Pilot Study

In order to check the validity\(^{12}\) and reliability of the sociometric test and the workability of the administration procedure, a pilot study was made in five Missoula, Montana, public grade school classes. First the teachers completed the Teacher's Rating Sheets; then the students completed the sociometric tests. For each class the frequency with which a student was rated in each category by his classmates was tabulated for each child. The ratings on each student were compared with the teacher's rating.

The criterion for teacher-student agreement was the teacher's rating corresponding to the category where there

\(^{12}\)Gronlund cautions that validity is extremely difficult to assess in sociometric testing, because as yet there is little agreement among sociometrists as to what is being measured. He says a gross indication of validity may be obtained by comparing one set of responses to another, as in this case, students' to teachers'. *Ibid.*, pp. 158-183.
were the largest number of student ratings for a particular individual (the mode). If, for example, the teacher rated SUBJECT A in category number 2 (MODERATELY ACCEPTED FOR THE PARTY), the largest number of students would have to rate SUBJECT A in category number 2 on the sociometric test in order to be considered in agreement. If, as in some instances, SUBJECT A had the same number of ratings in two or three categories on the chart or variation between categories was by two or less ratings, then the category containing the median rather than the mode was used as the student rating.

The percentage of students in a respective class that agreed with the teacher was calculated. The average percentage of agreement between all teachers and students was 54%. This level of agreement, while not high, was consistent with that found in other sociometric tests, therefore this test was considered valid for the purpose of the study.\(^{13}\) The test was again given to the same students one week later and the average percentage of agreement, determined in the same manner as for teacher-student, between the first test and the second was 92%. The sociometric test was

\(^{13}\)Gronlund has used this method to test the validity of several sociometric tests and he has found that pupil-teacher agreement varies from near-zero to near-perfect, but as an overall average it nears 50%. Ibid., pp. 158-185.
considered reliable for the purpose of this study.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{The Main Study}

After giving his permission to conduct the main study in the Helena schools, the superintendent explained the procedure to the principals involved. Each principal gave a Teacher's Rating Sheet to every teacher who had an experimental subject in her class. The teachers were told only that they as well as their students had been selected to participate in a study, but that after the data had been collected they would have an opportunity to see the results if they wished. On the Teacher's Rating Sheet the teacher listed alphabetically the names of the students in her class, made the appropriate rating for each, then gave the sheet back to the principal.

The investigator collected the completed Teacher's Rating Sheets, then provided the principals with Teacher's Direction Sheets (Appendix A) for the teachers of experimental subjects and enough sociometric tests for the class of each experimental subject. The teachers then gave the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14}Gronlund found a high degree of agreement (,75) between sociometric tests given at an interval of four months. In the study he used approximately the same sociometric choice and grades as those used in the study described above, indicating that the present sociometric test would be somewhat reliable for longer than an interval of one week. Norman E. Gronlund, "The Relative Stability of Classroom Social Status with Weighted and Unweighted Sociometric Status Scores," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXVI, (1955), pp. 345-354.
\end{flushright}
sociometric tests to their classes. In order to standardize the testing procedure they were asked to follow the directions on the Teacher's Direction Sheet. In a given school all classes writing the sociometric test did so at approximately the same time on the same day. When the sociometric tests were completed the teachers returned them to the principals' offices where they were collected.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The data for the main study were collected according to the procedure described in Chapter II. A tabulation was made of the frequencies with which each subject was rated in each category by his classmates. The investigator wanted to avoid as much ambiguity as possible when determining the friendship status for each subject. In order to exclude individuals who had ambiguous ratings all those with semi-interquartile range scores\(^{15}\) (Q-scores) of 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) or more were omitted from the study. There were originally 595 control subjects of whom 26 were omitted leaving 569. No experimental subjects were omitted on the basis of this factor.

Teacher-student agreement was determined by the same method as described in the pilot study. Three divisions were tabulated: (1) teacher ratings higher than those of students, (2) teacher ratings the same as those of students, (3) teacher ratings lower than those of students.

To determine if there was a significant difference in the agreement between teachers' ratings and students' modal or median ratings of friendship status between

speech-handicapped and non-speech-handicapped, a chi-square test of independence\textsuperscript{16} was used. The frequencies for this chi-square test are presented in Table I.

The obtained chi-square value was 78.26 with two degrees of freedom. Because this is significant at the 0.001 level the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between teachers' and students' ratings of friendship status of speech-handicapped and non-speech-handicapped children was rejected.

On the basis of these statistical results the hypothesis that the classroom teacher is not as able in predicting the friendship status for the speech-handicapped child as she is in predicting that of his peers was considered to be tenable.

The significant difference which seems to exist appears to be one of the teacher overestimating friendship status because in the cell Speech-Handicapped Higher of Table I the expected frequency (4.02) is smaller than the observed frequency (12).

The percentage of individuals falling in each of the five categories of friendship was computed for the speech-handicapped group and the non-speech-handicapped group. These results are presented in Table II. Upon visual

TABLE I

A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' RATINGS AND STUDENTS' RATINGS OF FRIENDSHIP STATUS OF SPEECH-HANDICAPPED AND NON-SPEECH-HANDICAPPED SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers' Ratings as Compared to Students' Ratings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Handicapped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (4.02)</td>
<td>E (12.61)</td>
<td>E (5.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Speech-Handicapped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (103.98)</td>
<td>E (326.39)</td>
<td>E (138.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O = Observed frequency
E = Expected frequency

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
### TABLE II

THE PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS RATING IN EACH OF THE FIVE FRIENDSHIP CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES*</th>
<th>SPEECH-HANDICAPPED</th>
<th>NON-SPEECH-HANDICAPPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES:

1 I WOULD ALWAYS INVITE THIS PERSON
2 I WOULD PROBABLY INVITE THIS PERSON
3 I DON'T KNOW
4 I WOULD PROBABLY NOT INVITE THIS PERSON
5 I WOULD NEVER INVITE THIS PERSON
examination it appears evident that the speech-handicapped group rated lower in friendship status than did the non-speech-handicapped group.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

While sociometric testing alone may provide only a limited indication of friendship status some definite patterns seemed to emerge from this study. The results indicate that speech-handicapped children rate low as a group in the area of friendship status\(^\text{17}\) and that teachers are relatively unaware of it.

The investigator checked the raw data and it appeared that those subjects who had the more severe speech problems rated lower for the most part than those with the milder disorders. Of the six subjects rating in category 5, four of them had what the experimenter would judge to be the more severe involvements, e.g. cleft lips and palates or stuttering disorders. The two subjects rating in category 1 had apparently mild articulation disorders. The findings may further suggest that the more severe the disorder a subject has the more the teacher overrates him in comparison with

\(^\text{17}\)Gronlund has found in his research that greater stability occurs at extreme sociometric positions; that there is as much stability at the extreme low as at the extreme high. (Sociometry in the Classroom, p. 130).
how the students rate him. While the teacher may not actually prefer the severely handicapped, she may tend to sympathize with him. She may unintentionally hope that friendship status for this child is higher than it turns out to be. The need for further investigation into the reliability of this finding is apparent.

Another area of investigation is suggested by the apparently high degree of agreement with which the speech-handicapped were rated by their peers. The ratings for those subjects with the more severe disorders tended to be concentrated in one category. The three subjects who had somewhat ambiguous friendship status (Q-scores of 1) had articulation disorders involving only two phonemes. Eight speech-handicapped subjects rated in categories 4 and 5. Five of these had Q-scores of ½ and three had Q-scores of 0. This would indicate that there was generally strong agreement on the part of classmates that these subjects should be so rated.

Perrin and Carrow and Woods obtained results in studies cited in Chapter I which indicated that the speech-handicapped rate low not only in friendship status as this study indicates but also in other areas of social acceptance. This is significant, the investigator believes, because these children as a group seem to need help in

18Gronlund found that teachers tend to overjudge status of pupils they most prefer and underjudge status of those they least prefer. Ibid., p. 11.
becoming more socially acceptable; and it would appear the more severe the speech-handicap an individual has the more he needs the help.

Cruickshank and Johnson\(^{19}\) state that American schools are responsible for a program rich enough to provide total adjustment for each child. For the speech-handicapped child, "total adjustment" would ideally include enough speech therapy to either eliminate or reduce the speech disorder and, perhaps as a consequence, alleviate some of his social problems. Since this study was begun, additional speech therapists have been employed by Montana's public schools and in time every speech-handicapped individual may obtain all the therapy necessary for his particular case. In the meantime until there are enough speech therapists in the schools social adjustment of the speech-handicapped should be a special concern to the classroom teacher.

Would classroom teachers, if unaware of the speech-handicapped child's lower social status, be more aware if they took special courses in understanding him and his problems? Studies aimed at providing an answer to this question would be worthwhile and in the investigator's opinion necessary to partially determine the value of special education courses in the training program for teachers. While some states do require these special courses, Montana at present

The investigator believes that if the teacher is aware of the speech-handicapped child's lower social status she can help him become more socially acceptable. As a possible first step she can help this child gain self-confidence by creating a warm and comfortable classroom atmosphere wherein she accepts him as a worthwhile respected person. Cruickshank and Johnson\(^{20}\) say that to whatever degree the teacher can accept him is the degree to which most of his classmates accept him too.

The teacher may be able to help this child become better adjusted socially by (1) helping him understand his abilities and disabilities and (2) helping him to establish goals harmonizing with these. Social activities planned for the class might be in areas where he could interact on a relatively equal basis. From time to time activities might be of a type whereby he could utilize some special skill. The ultimate goal might be that as the speech-handicapped individual matures he will have enough self-understanding to be able on his own to select social and occupational situations wherein he can operate effectively.

In imparting skills, information and in building attitudes the teacher wields influence over the child. Perhaps the best type of teacher to help the speech-handicapped

\(^{20}\)Ibid., p. 409.
child accomplish these goals would be the one who could assume a variety of roles—who could rapidly transform as need be from authority figure to supervisor to parent substitute to friend. The investigator believes it would be unfortunate for this child if his teacher were the inflexible type who maintained the role of authority primarily.

Results of this study seem to indicate that many classroom teachers need first to be more aware of the speech-handicapped child's lower social acceptability if they are to help him with his social problems.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the classroom teacher was as able to predict the friendship status of the speech-handicapped student in her class as she was to predict the friendship status of the non-speech-handicapped students.

The experimental group consisted of 22 students diagnosed speech-handicapped by the school speech therapist. These students in 22 separate classrooms attended grades four through eight in the public schools at Helena, Montana. The control group was composed of the 569 classmates of the speech-handicapped children.

In order to obtain students' ratings of friendship status a sociometric test was used. The sociometric criterion, a party situation, was explained and every subject was asked to rate each of his classmates by marking the one of five available categories which best represented what he would do about inviting each individual to the party.

The 22 teachers rated friendship status of their respective pupils on the Teacher's Rating Sheets. The party situation was explained and five categories were available here also. The teacher was asked to choose the one category...
which she thought most representative of the degree to which each pupil would be asked by the majority of his classmates.

The ratings of the students in each class were then compared with the teacher's ratings. The criterion for teacher-student agreement was the teacher's rating corresponding to the category where there were the largest number of student ratings for a particular individual. If there was no agreement it was determined if the teacher's rating was higher or lower than the ratings of the majority of students. A chi-square test of independence was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between teachers' ratings and students' ratings of friendship status of (1) speech-handicapped and (2) non-speech-handicapped subjects.

The statistical analysis of data tends to support the following conclusions:

(1) Teachers are not as able to predict the friendship status of speech-handicapped students as they are to predict that of non-speech-handicapped students.

(2) Teachers tend to overrate the friendship status of the speech-handicapped in comparison to students' ratings.

Examination of the raw data tends to suggest that:

(1) Speech-handicapped students as a group rate low in friendship status.

(2) The speech-handicapped students with the more
severe disorders rate lower than do those with mild disorders.

(3) The more severe the disorder a subject has the more the teacher tends to overrate him in comparison with how the students rate him.

(4) The more severe the disorder a subject has the less ambiguous the ratings are; the more concentrated they become in one category.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


APPENDIX A

MATERIALS USED IN THE MAIN STUDY
**TEACHER'S RATING SHEET**

**DIRECTIONS:** Suppose the students in your classroom were to have individual parties and could invite everyone else in class. Check the square below which you feel best indicates the degree to which each child would be invited by most of his classmates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Every Class Member (Alphabetically)</th>
<th>Highly Accepted For the Party</th>
<th>Moderately Accepted For the Party</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Rejected For the Party</th>
<th>Highly Rejected For the Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE TO TEACHER: So that this administering procedure is standardized as much as possible with those of other teachers participating in this project, please follow these instructions as closely as possible:

1. Administer the sociometric test in the morning before the actual school routine begins.

2. By way of introducing the sociometric test, say something like this (or whatever is appropriate for your age group):

   "You have been chosen to participate in a study being done at Montana State University. I will pass out the papers now, but do no writing until I tell you to do so."

3. Distribute one sociometric test to each child.

4. List on the blackboard in alphabetical order the name of each child in class. Have the students copy the list on their sociometric tests under the heading "Name of Every Class Member".

5. Now read aloud and have the students follow the directions on the sociometric tests. Explain that each child is to check one box (AND ONLY ONE BOX) for each of his classmates, but that he must not check a box for himself. In other words, when he comes to his own name, leave blank all the boxes opposite it.

6. Tell the student that it is not necessary for him to write his name on the paper.

7. Assure him that his classmates WILL NOT SEE what he has marked about them.

8. Explain that the success of this study depends on every person telling the truth. "Mark the box which most honestly tells what you would do concerning every one of your classmates."

9. When the tests are completed, collect them and return them to your principal.

10. Thank you--your assistance is greatly appreciated.
READ THESE DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY UNTIL YOU UNDERSTAND THEM - IF YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND, ASK YOUR TEACHER.

**DIRECTIONS:** Suppose you were giving a party to which your entire class could be invited. Check the box below which most honestly tells what you would do about inviting each of your classmates to your party. Remember, check ONLY ONE box for each classmate. Leave all of the boxes opposite your own name blank. Do not begin work until your teacher tells you to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Everyone In Class (Alphabetically)</th>
<th>I Would Always Invite This Person</th>
<th>I Would Probably Invite This Person</th>
<th>I Don't Know</th>
<th>I Would Probably Not Invite This Person</th>
<th>I Would Never Invite This Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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APPENDIX B

MATERIALS USED IN THE PILOT STUDY
**TEACHER'S RATING SHEET**

**DIRECTIONS:** Suppose the students in your classroom were to have individual parties and could invite everyone else in class. Check the square below which you feel best indicates the degree to which each child would be invited by most of his classmates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Every Class Member (Alphabetically)</th>
<th>Highly Accepted For the Party</th>
<th>Moderately Accepted For the Party</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Rejected For the Party</th>
<th>Highly Rejected For the Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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NOTE TO TEACHER: So that this administering procedure is standardized as much as possible with those of other teachers participating in this project, please follow these instructions as closely as possible:

1. Administer the sociometric test in the morning before the actual school routine begins.

2. By way of introducing the sociometric test, say something like this (or whatever is appropriate for your age group):

   "You have been chosen to participate in a study being done at Montana State University. I will pass out the papers now, but do no writing until I tell you to do so."

3. Distribute one sociometric test to each child.

4. List on the blackboard in alphabetical order the name of each child in class. Have the students copy the list on their sociometric tests under the heading "Name of Every Class Member".

5. Now read aloud and have the students follow the directions on the sociometric tests. Explain that each child is to check one box (AND ONLY ONE BOX) for each of his classmates, but that he must not check a box for himself. In other words, when he comes to his own name, leave blank all the boxes opposite it.

6. Tell the student that it is not necessary for him to write his name on the paper.

7. Assure him that his classmates WILL NOT SEE what he has marked about them.

8. Explain that the success of this study depends on every person telling the truth. "Mark the box which most honestly tells what you would do concerning every one of your classmates."

9. When the tests are completed, collect them and return them to your principal.

10. Thank you--your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
READ THESE DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY UNTIL YOU UNDERSTAND THEM - IF YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND, ASK YOUR TEACHER.

**DIRECTIONS:** Suppose you were giving a party to which your entire class could be invited. Check the box below which most honestly tells what you would do about inviting each of your classmates to your party. Remember, check ONLY ONE box for each classmate. Leave all of the boxes opposite your own name blank. Do not begin work until your teacher tells you to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Everyone In Class (Alphabetically)</th>
<th>I Would Always Invite This Person</th>
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RECOMMENDATION SHEET

(To be completed by the teacher)

DIRECTIONS: Write below any recommendations you have for making directions sheet and/or sociogram more workable.
INFORMATION SHEET
(To be completed by the teacher)

1. Teacher's name ________________________________

2. Number in class _______________________________

3. Number of students completing sociogram __________

4. Date sociograms given ___________________________