



## TEMPERAMENTAL STUDY OF RESPONDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR SOCIOMETRIC STATUS

Suneeta Paswan<sup>1</sup>, Indu Bansal<sup>2</sup> and Kumar Sanjeev<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Saharsa, Bihar

<sup>2</sup>Banasthali Vidyapith, Banasthali, Rajasthan

<sup>3</sup>Rajendra Agricultural University, Pusa, Samastipur, Bihar

\*Corresponding author (Kumar Sanjeev) Email : [ksanjeevsmca@gmail.com](mailto:ksanjeevsmca@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

For the study Faizabad regions of state Uttar Pradesh were selected as locales. Faizabad region includes five districts namely-Faizabad, Barabanki, Sultanpur, Ambedkar Nagar and Gonda. Four Schools and hundred children from each district were selected. Hence a total of 500 primary school children were assessed for temperamental study of respondents in relation to their sociometric status. Result of this study shows that High scores of temperamental dimensions mean, the child is quite responsive to the environment, adjustable, adaptable and uninhibited. As evident from the research almost for all the aspects of temperament, the mean scores of the rejected respondents were slightly higher than the popular. Whereas popular respondents were having better temperament than the rejected.

**Key words :** Temperament, respondent, sociometric status.

In the present scenario human beings strive for popularity in different social groups, but all do not achieve the same degree of success. In any social group one comes across the popular people, rejected ones, isolated ones and some being in between. The modern educational practices aim at overall development of personality of the people because there are individual differences among children in their characteristics, behaviors and skills. To a large extent these individual differences are the outcomes of many factors. One such factor is the social and cultural group to which children belong.

Among the modern techniques of assessing and thereby help in developing the personality of an individual, Sociometric techniques in the past three decades have increasingly been used as means of assessing peer relations among children. Sociometric techniques are defined as the measures of interpersonal attraction among the members of a specified group. It is an experimental methodology applicable to all social sciences. Etymologically, 'sociometry' has been derived from the Latin word 'socius' meaning 'social' and the Latin 'metrum' or the Greek 'metron' meaning 'measure'. Thus, the term means 'social measurement'. To examine the social status of children, the technique sociometry can be applied on children, thus providing an evaluation of a child's peer relations from the perspective of peers themselves, rather than relying on outside or external adult source of information. Moreover, the sociometric

measures provide a simple procedure for gathering information on a considerable number of children in a relatively short period of time (depending on the measures used).

Sociometric techniques are the measures of inter-personal attraction among the members of a specified group. When applied to children, it provides an evaluation of a child's peer relations from the perspective of peers themselves because, peer group influence speech, values, clothing habit, modes of behavior etc. Sociometric assessments also show relatively good temporal stability (Coie and Dodge, 1983). A further advantage of the sociometric approach is that status is correlated with other indices of adjustment both concurrently and predictive (Parker and Asher, 1987 parker *et al.*, 1995). Differences in sociometric status of children can be the out-come of many factors including the social group, to which children belong, the opportunities of peer interaction and problem- solving, temperament of the children, exposure to the behavior of family members and home environment. Parenting style and disciplinary techniques used in the home are also the factors that affect children's peer relationship and directly or indirectly have impact/relation on sociometric status of children. Research studies have revealed that rejected children are agonistic, aggressive, rebellious, inconsiderate of others, insensitive, dishonest and are poor in joining a peer group (Coie *et al.*, 1982).

Researchers have identified a variety of characteristics and behaviors that are associated with being accepted or rejected in a peer group. The peer report studies suggest that social acceptance (positive status) is related at all ages to helpfulness, rule conformity, friendliness and pro-social interaction. Social rejection (negative status) is related to disruptiveness and aggression at all ages. Popular or well-liked children seem to be those who are helpful to peers, follow the rules, co-operate in group situation and are generally competent. Rejected children more often seem to be off task. They are also more often involved in negative interactions with others, particularly, aggressive and argumentative interactions. There is some evidence that teachers perceive rejected children as displaying two types of behavior—hyperactive and disruptive and aggressive. Rejected children appear to be anxious to be involved not shy.

Negi and Balda (2002) have reported that socio-personal variables like academic performance, parental and maternal educational level, occupational status of the family and family income are significantly correlated with sociometric status of the children as well as number of positive ratings. Acceptance and social preferences are positively correlated with successful peer group entry, popularity among class-mates, outgoing social behavior and positive conflicts resolution strategies.

In modern society, children are experiencing social interaction with peers at an early age and for longer time periods. Peer relationships play a significant role in the social development of children. Peer relationships have qualities that do not exist in adult-child relationships (Hartup, 1983). Children need to value each other's opinion for peer acceptance. They negotiate and compromise for conflicts resolution and learn give and take to have successful peer interactions. The development of these skills promotes social competence. Peers have significant pressure on children's behavior because they can modify behavior by acceptance or rejection.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Sample :** Five hundred 6 to 8 years old primary school children from Faizabad Region of State Uttar Pradesh participated in the present study. The children were administered with Sociometric measures, to assess the Sociometric status of children the nomination measure was used:

**Nomination measure (Hymel, 1983) :** This is the traditional and most commonly used sociometric technique. Children were individually and separately asked to identify three peers according to the specified interpersonal criteria. Both positive and negative sociometric criteria were used (for example, "Name three classmates you like very much," versus, "Name three classmates you do not like at all"). In an attempt to simplify the task for 6-8 yrs old children, a modification of the procedure was used. In this procedure, the photographs of peers were used as the stimulus materials. Photographs of all children in the age range of 6-8 years were put on a display board. Children were required to select the photographs of peers, *i.e.*, three for positive and three for negative nomination from the full group display. This procedure was presumably thought to avoid the memory problems with 6-8 years old children.

For scoring of the nomination data, procedure suggested by Hymel (1983) was used. Two different scores were obtained, depending on the sociometric criteria (positive or negative) used: acceptance and rejection scores. Positive nominations received from peers were used to compute acceptance scores, while negative nominations from peers were used to compute rejection scores.

The unweighted scoring system was used in which the child's score on the nomination measure is simply the total number of nominations received from peers (without weighting scores in terms of order of nomination). Acceptance and rejection scores were considered to be separate indices of social status and were calculated and examined independently. On the basis of this method, the nominations received were further classified into six categories. These categories were a combination of the classifications as suggested by Hymel (1983) and Ladd (1983).

The classification is as follows :

**Popular children :** Who received large number of positive choices (high liking and low disliking scores).

**Rejected Children :** Who received large number of negative choices (High disliking and low liking scores).

**Average children :** Who received relatively few positive and negative choices?

**Isolated children :** Who failed to receive even a single choice, or no positive and very few negative, or no negative and very few positive

**Table-1** : Mean differences in the Temperament on the basis of sociometric status.

Gender Variables	Popular (N=250)		Rejected (N=250)		't' values
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	
Temperament					
(i) Sociability	9.31	1.94	9.62	2.00	-1.78*
(ii) Emotionality	6.60	3.09	6.67	3.63	-0.23
(iii) Energy	6.37	1.33	6.47	1.35	-0.83
(iv) Attentivity	2.97	0.98	2.91	0.98	0.69
(v) Rhythm city	2.73	1.20	2.62	1.48	1.19
(vi) Total	27.99	4.49	28.28	5.02	-0.70

**Note** : Significant at \*p < 0.05

**Table-2** : Temperament wise distribution of popular and rejected children.

Categories of Temp.	Popular n = 250	Rejected n = 250	Total N = 500
Sociability	65 (26)	23 (9.2)	88 (17.6)
Emotionality	44 (17.6)	63 (25.2)	107 (21.4)
Energy	37 (14.8)	73 (29.2)	110(22.0)
Attentivity	41 (16.4)	65 (26.0)	106 (21.2)
Rhythmicity	63 (25.2)	26 (10.4)	89 (17.8)

**Note** : Figures in parentheses indicate percentage.

choices? Physically an isolate is member of the group but he is not treated psychologically as such by other member, as no one interacts with him, neither accepts, or rejects.

**Controversial children** : Who received high liking and disliking scores?

A combination of acceptance and rejection scores was also used to create a single index of social status. Social preference score (acceptance minus rejection scores) was computed to assess the degree of likeability and unacceptability among children. For both measures, the nomination and rating scale, scores were calculated and computed separately with the help of allotted scores.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table-1 indicated the mean differences in the temperament on the basis of sociometric status. A negative significant difference was seen in sociability scores ( $t = -1.78, p < 0.01$ ). Whereas, for other aspects of temperament no significant differences were found on the basis of sociometric status. Almost for all the aspects of temperament, the mean scores of the rejected respondents were slightly higher than popular.

The crux of the table displays that, popular respondents were having better temperament than rejected. The reasons attributed for these differences

may be the home environment, financial conditions of the family and parental education.

Table-2, Describes maximum respondents out of total were having energy, attentivity and emotionality followed by sociability and rhythmicity. Further, maximum (26.0%) percentages of popular respondents were having the quality of sociability followed by rhythmicity (25.2%), emotionality (17.60%), and attentivity (16.40%). While, maximum (29.2%) percentages of rejected respondents was energetic followed by attentive (26.0%), emotional (25.20%), and rhythmic (16.40%).

High scores of temperamental dimensions mean, the child is quite responsive to the environment, adjustable, adaptable and uninhibited. Generally positive, happy mood, more physical as well as psychological energy exhibited in the child's behavior, fleeting attention and high distractibility, regular and predictable biological functions and vice versa.

Table-3, Revealed that, almost for all the aspects of temperament, the mean scores of the rejected respondents were slightly higher than the popular.

't' values for mean difference between popular and rejected children on different dimensions of temperament and temperament as whole are not significant. Hence null hypotheses for these variables may be accepted. It may be calculated that there is no

**Table-3** : Statistics on temperament of popular and rejected children.

Variables	Popular (N=250)		Rejected (N=250)		't' values
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Temperament					
(i) Sociability	9.31	1.94	9.62	2.00	1.78
(ii) Emotionality	6.60	3.09	6.67	3.63	0.23
(iii) Energy	6.37	1.33	6.47	1.35	0.83
(iv) Attentivity	2.97	0.98	2.91	0.98	0.69
(v) Rhythmicity	2.73	1.20	2.62	1.48	1.19
(vi) Total	27.99	4.49	28.28	5.02	0.70

significant difference in temperament of popular and rejected children.

The crux of the table displays that, popular respondents were having better temperament than the rejected. The reasons attributed for these differences may be the home environment, financial conditions of the family and parental education.

## CONCLUSIONS

Result of this study shows that high scores of temperamental dimensions mean, the child is quite responsive to the environment, adjustable, adaptable and uninhibited. As evident from the research almost for all the aspects of temperament, the mean scores of the rejected respondents were slightly higher than the popular. Whereas popular respondents were having better temperament than the rejected.

## REFERENCES

- Coie, J. D. and K. A. Dodge (1983). "Continuities and changes in children's social status:A five-year longitudinal study." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 29(3): 261-282.
- Coie, J. D., Dodge, K.A., and Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status: A cross age perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 18 (4): 557-570.
- Dodge, K. A. (1983). Behavioral antecedents of peer social status. *Child Development*. 54: 1386-1399.
- Hartup W W(1983). Peer Relationship and later Personal Adjustment; *Personality and Social Development*. New York; John Wiley and Sons, pp. 103-196.
- Hartup, W.W. and Moore, S.G. (1990). Early peer relations: Developmental significance and prognostic implications. *Early childhood research quarterly*, 5: 1-17.
- Hatch, J.A. (1987). Peer interaction and the development of social competence. *Child study journal*, 17(3), 169-183.
- Ladd, G.W. (1983)." Social networks of popular, average and rejected children in school settings." *Merrill-palmer quarterly*. 29 (3): 283-307.
- Negi, M., S. Balda, and S. Punis (2002). "Maternal control practices and sociometric status of 6-8 years old children." *Indian Journal of Social Research*.41 (2): 123-130.
- Negi, M., S. Balda, et al. (2003). "Social behavior and socio-personal factors associated with the sociometric status of 6-8 years old boys." *Behavioral Scientist*, 4(2): 117-120.
- Parker, J.G., and Asher, S.R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin*, 102: 357-389.