



## ASSOCIATION OF SOCIOMETRIC STATUS WITH DIFFERENT PERSONAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES OF 6-8 YEARS OLD CHILDREN

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

<sup>1</sup>KVK, Saharsa, Bihar, <sup>2</sup>RAU, Pusa, Samastipur, Bihar

<sup>3</sup>Department of Human Development, Faculty of Home Science, Banasthali Vidyapith, Banasthali, Rajasthan

Corresponding Author (Kumar Sanjeev) Email : [ksanjeevsmca@gmail.com](mailto:ksanjeevsmca@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

Faizabad region of state Uttar Pradesh was selected as locale for studying the problem related to sociometric status of 6-8 yrs old children. Five districts of this region namely-Faizabad, Barabanki, Sultanpur, Ambedkar Nagar and Gonda were selected for the purpose. Four Schools and hundred children from each district were selected. Hence a total of 500 primary school children were assessed for Association of sociometric status with different personal and socio-economic variables of 6-8 years old children. Result of this study shows that, sociometric is associated with family size, mother's occupation, father's occupation, mother's education, father's education and number of earning members. Whereas six values were not significant, hence null hypothesis for age, sex, birth order, number of siblings, family type and monthly income. These variables were accepted. Hence it may be calculated that sociometric status of 6-8 years old children were independent of their age, sex, birth order, number of siblings, family type and monthly income.

**Key words :** Sociometric status, association, socio-economic variables

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. Sociometric techniques from 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).

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Sample :** Five hundred primary school's children of 6-8

years old from Faizabad Region of State Uttar Pradesh was participated in the study.

**Measures :** The children were administered with Sociometric measures, to assess the Sociometric status of children. The nomination measure was used as describe below :

**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 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

Demographic profile and association of sociometric status with different personal and socio-economic variables of children : There were total 4016 children in 80 schools selected for the study. All the children were assessed for their sociometric status and personal & socio economic variables. Therefore, Children were categorized in the 3 sociometric status groups i.e. Happy, Neutral and Sad on the basis of peer rating. Neutral children were excluded from the sample. Rests

of the children were taken for peer nomination. Peer Nomination were having 4 groups i.e. Popular, Rejected, Average, Isolated, and Controversial.

Details of these variables have been presented in the following tables. Figures in parentheses are in percentages.

**Table-1 :** Sociometric Status at a glance.

Variables	Total, N=4016
Popular	1436 (35.76)
Rejected	1040 (25.90)
Average	1408 (35.06)
Isolated	80 (1.99)
Controversial	52 (1.29)

As evident from the above table-1 maximum percentage of children (35.76%) were popular followed by average (35.06%), rejected (25.90%), isolated (1.99%) and controversial (1.29%). The above findings are in congruence with Dodge's (1983) identified status groups of popular, rejected, neglected, controversial and average boys. Rejected or neglected boys were those who were engaged in inappropriate behaviour. They were engaged in physical aggression more than any other group. Popular boys refrained from aggression. Controversial boys were engaged in high frequencies of both prosocial and antisocial behaviours.

**Table-2 :** Sociometric Status and Age.

Variables	6 yrs n=1204	7 yrs n=1352	8 yrs n=1460
Popular	436 (36.21)	492 (36.39)	508 (34.79)
Rejected	320 (26.58)	340 (25.15)	380 (26.03)
Average	412 (34.22)	476 (35.21)	520 (35.62)
Isolated	20 (1.66)	28 (2.07)	32 (2.19)
Controversial	16 (1.33)	16 (1.18)	20 (1.37)

Age wise distribution of sociometric status has been incorporated in Table-2. In case of 6 yrs old children, majority (36.21%) of them were popular followed by average (34.22%), rejected (26.58%), isolated (1.66%) and controversial (1.33%). Among 7 yrs children same trend was seen that, maximum percentages (36.39%) of respondents were popular followed by average (35.21%), rejected (25.15%), isolated (2.07%) and controversial (1.18%). Regarding 8 yrs respondents table further indicated that, maximum percentages (35.62%) of children were average followed by popular (34.79%), rejected (26.03%), isolated (2.19%) and controversial (1.37%).

**Table-3** : Sociometric Status and Sex.

Variables	Male (N=2152)	Female (N=1864)
Popular	764 (35.50)	672 (36.05)
Rejected	564 (26.21)	476 (25.54)
Average	752 (34.94)	656 (35.19)
Isolated	44 (2.04)	36 (1.93)
Controversial	28 (1.30)	24 (1.29)

Table-3 indicated gender wise sociometric status. Regarding male respondents it was found that, majority (35.50%) belongs to popular category followed by average (34.94%), rejected (26.21%) isolated (2.04%) and controversial (1.30%). Same trend was seen in case of female respondents that, majority (36.05%) belonged to popular category followed by average (35.19%), rejected (25.54%), isolated (1.93%) and controversial (1.29%).

**Table-4** : Sociometric Status and Birth order.

Variables	2nd n=1064	3rd n=1412	4th n=1536
Popular	384 (35.96)	508 (35.98)	544 (35.42)
Rejected	312 (29.21)	360 (25.50)	368 (23.96)
Average	344 (32.21)	500 (35.41)	564 (36.72)
Isolated	16 (1.50)	28 (1.98)	36 (2.34)
Controversial	12 (1.12)	16 (1.13)	24 (1.56)

Table-4 presents the distribution of sociometric status of respondents on the basis of birth order. Maximum percentages (35.96%) of second born children were popular followed by average (32.21%), rejected (29.21%), isolated (1.50%) and controversial (1.12%). In case of third born children, same trend was observed that, majority of respondents were popular and average (35.98% & 35.41%) followed by rejected (25.50%), isolated (1.98%) and controversial (1.13%). Further it was seen in same table that, maximum (36.72%) percentage of fourth born children belonged to average category followed by popular (35.42%), isolated (2.34%) and controversial (1.56%).

**Table-5** : Sociometric Status and no. of siblings.

Variables	1-3 n=1172	3-5 n=1944	5 & > n=900
Popular	404 (34.47)	684 (35.19)	348 (38.67)
Rejected	308 (26.28)	512 (26.34)	220 (24.44)
Average	420 (35.84)	672 (34.57)	316 (35.11)
Isolated	24 (2.05)	44 (2.26)	12 (1.33)
Controversial	16 (1.37)	32 (1.65)	4 (0.44)

Table-5 presents the distribution of sociometric status of respondents on the basis of number of siblings. Maximum percentages (35.84%) of average children were having 1-3 siblings followed by popular (34.47%), rejected (26.28%), isolated (2.05%) and controversial (1.37%). Further, maximum percentage (35.19%) of popular children was having 3-5 siblings followed by average (34.57%), rejected (26.34%), isolated (2.26%) and controversial (1.65%). In case of five and above siblings same trend was observed that, majority of (38.67%) of popular children was having 5 & > siblings followed by average (35.11%), rejected (24.44%), isolated (1.33%) and controversial (0.44%).

**Table-6** : Sociometric Status and Family Type.

Variables	Nuclear n=2184	Joint N=1832
Popular	772 (35.35)	664 (36.24)
Rejected	568 (26.01)	472 (25.76)
Average	764 (34.98)	644 (35.15)
Isolated	48 (2.20)	32 (1.75)
Controversial	32 (1.47)	20 (1.09)

Table-6 indicated regarding sociometric status on the basis of family type. Result reveals that, maximum percentage (35.35%) of popular children belonged to nuclear family system followed by average (34.98%), rejected (26.01%), isolated (2.20%) and controversial (1.47%). Regarding joint family system, maximum percentages (36.24%) of popular children belonged to joint family system followed by average (35.15%), rejected (25.76%), isolated (1.75%) and controversial (1.09%).

**Table-7** : Sociometric Status and Family Size.

Variables	Small (3-6) n=1368	Medium(6-9) N=1652	Large (9 & >) n=996
Popular	468 (34.21)	604 (36.56)	364 (36.55)
Rejected	364 (26.61)	412 (24.94)	264 (26.51)
Average	496 (36.26)	564 (34.14)	348 (34.94)
Isolated	24 (1.75)	48 (2.91)	8 (0.80)
Controversial	16 (1.17)	24 (1.45)	12 (1.20)

Table-7 depicted regarding sociometric status on the basis of family size. Result reveals that, maximum percentage (36.26%) of average children belonged to small family followed by popular (34.21%), rejected (26.61%), isolated (1.75%) and controversial (1.17%). Regarding medium family size, maximum percentages (36.56%) of popular children were belonged to medium family followed by

average (34.14%), rejected (24.94%), isolated (2.91%) and controversial (1.45%). Further same trend was observed in case of large family that, maximum percentages (36.55%) of popular children belonged to large family followed by average (34.94%), rejected (26.51%), controversial (1.20%) and isolated (0.80%).

**Table-8** : Sociometric Status and Mother's occupation.

Variables	House Wife n=2572	Labour N=1032	Service n=412
Popular	896 (34.84)	384 (37.21)	156 (37.86)
Rejected	668 (25.97)	272 (26.36)	100 (24.27)
Average	908 (35.30)	352 (34.11)	148 (35.92)
Isolated	68 (2.64)	8 (0.78)	4 (0.97)
Controversial	32 (1.24)	16 (1.55)	4 (0.97)

Table 8 presents the sociometric distribution of respondents on the basis of mother's occupation. Analysis unveils that, maximum percentages (35.30%) of average children's mothers were house wife followed by popular (34.84%), rejected (25.97%), isolated (2.64%) and controversial (1.24 %). Table further shows that, maximum percentages (37.21%) of popular children's mothers were labour followed by average (34.11%), rejected (26.36%), controversial (1.55 %) and isolated (0.78%). Further, maximum percentages (37.86%) of popular children's mothers were in service followed by average (35.92%), rejected (24.27%), controversial (0.97 %) and isolated (0.97%).

**Table-9** : Sociometric Status and Father's Occupation.

Variables	Ag. n=1040	Labour N=524	Business n=1084	Service n=1368
Popular	384 (36.92)	156 (29.77)	416 (38.38)	480 (35.09)
Rejected	260 (25.00)	148 (28.24)	288 (26.57)	344 (25.15)
Average	356 (34.23)	196 (37.40)	372 (34.32)	484 (35.38)
Isolated	32 (3.08)	8 (1.53)	4 (0.37)	36 (2.63)
Controversial	8 (0.77)	16 (3.05)	4 (0.37)	24 (1.75)

Analysis of table-9 unveils that; maximum percentages (36.92%) of popular children's fathers were doing agriculture followed by average (34.23%), rejected (25.00%), isolated (3.08%) and controversial (0.77 %). Table further shows that, maximum percentages (37.40%) of average children's fathers were labour followed by popular (29.77%), rejected (28.24%), controversial (3.05 %) and isolated (1.53%). Further, maximum percentages (38.38%) of popular children's fathers were in business followed by average (34.32%), rejected (26.57%), controversial

(0.37 %) and isolated (0.37%). Again it can be seen in same table that, maximum percentages (35.38%) of average children's fathers were in service followed by popular (35.09%), rejected (25.15%), isolated (2.63%) and controversial (1.75 %).

**Table-10** : Sociometric Status and Mother's Education.

Variables	Illiterate n=2532	Pri.-Se.Sec. n=468	Graduate/PG n=1016
Popular	904 (35.70)	168 (35.90)	364 (35.83)
Rejected	648 (25.59)	116 (24.79)	276 (27.17)
Average	900 (35.55)	164 (35.04)	344 (33.86)
Isolated	56 (2.21)	4 (0.85)	20 (1.97)
Controversial	24 (0.95)	16 (3.42)	12 (1.18)

Education is one of the most important variables which influence the status, behaviour, attitude, belief and outlook towards life of respondents in the society.

The result pertaining to sociometric status on the basis of mother's education has been incorporated in Table10. The table revealed that, 35.70 percent popular children were having illiterate mothers followed by average children (35.55%), rejected children (25.59%), isolated children (2.21%) and controversial children (0.95 %). Further it was depicted in same table that, 35.90 percent popular children were having educated mothers whose education was up to senior secondary level followed by average (35.04%), rejected (24.79%), controversial (3.42%) and isolated children (0.85 %). Further, 35.83 percent popular children were having graduate/PG mother followed by average children (33.86%), rejected children (27.17%), isolated children (1.97%) and controversial children (1.18 %).

**Table-11** : Sociometric Status and Fathers' Education.

Variables	Illiterate n=2472	Pri.-Se.Sec. n=452	Graduate/PG n=1092
Popular	884 (35.76)	156 (34.51)	396 (36.26)
Rejected	636 (25.73)	116 (25.66)	288 (26.37)
Average	880 (35.60)	148 (32.74)	380 (34.80)
Isolated	56 (2.27)	8 (1.77)	16 (1.47)
Controversial	16 (0.65)	24 (5.31)	12 (1.10)

The table-11 revealed that, maximum percentages (35.76%) of popular children were having illiterate father followed by average (35.60%), rejected (25.73%), isolated (2.27%) and controversial children (0.65 %). Further it was depicted in same table that, 32.74 percent average children were having fathers whose education was up to senior secondary level



followed by popular children (34.51%), rejected children (25.66%), controversial children (5.31%) and isolated children (1.77%). Further, maximum percentages (36.26%) of popular children were having graduate/PG father followed by average (34.80%), rejected (26.37%), isolated (1.47%) and controversial children (1.10 %).

**Table-12 :** Sociometric Status and No. of earning members.

Variables	one n=3288	Two n=728
Popular	1196 (36.37)	240 (32.97)
Rejected	832 (25.30)	208 (28.57)
Average	1160 (35.28)	248 (34.07)
Isolated	64 (1.95)	16 (2.20)
Controversial	36 (1.09)	16 (2.20)

Result revealed that, 36.37 percent popular children were having one earning member in their family followed by average children (35.28%), rejected children (25.30%), isolated children (1.95%) and controversial children (1.09%). Further, 34.07 percent average children were having two earning member in their family followed by popular children (32.97%), rejected children (28.57%), isolated children (2.20%) and controversial children (2.20%) (Table-12).

**Table-13 :** Sociometric Status and Monthly Income.

Variables	500-4500 N=2308	4500-8500 n=1248	8500 & > n=460
Popular	804 (34.84)	464 (37.18)	168 (36.52)
Rejected	600 (26.00)	320 (25.64)	120 (26.09)
Average	840 (36.40)	420 (33.65)	148 (32.17)
Isolated	40 (1.73)	24 (1.92)	16 (3.48)
Controversial	24 (1.04)	20 (1.60)	8 (1.74)

Table-13 revealed that, 36.40 percent average children were having 500-4500 rupees per month in their family followed by popular children (34.84%), rejected children (26.00%), isolated children (1.73%) and controversial children (1.04%). Further it was seen that, 37.18 percent popular children were having 4500-8500 rupees per month in their family followed by average children (33.65%), rejected children (25.64%), isolated children (1.92%) and controversial children (1.60%). Further, 36.52 percent popular children were having 8500 & above rupees per month in their family followed by average children (32.17%), rejected children (26.09%), isolated children (3.48%) and controversial children (1.74%).

**Table-14 :** <sup>2</sup> Values between sociometric status and different personal and socio-economic variables under study.

Different Personal Variable	<sup>2</sup>	d.f	Significance at 5% level
Age	2.69	8	NS
Sex	034	4	NS
Birth Order	14.30	8	NS
No. of Siblings	13.75	8	NS
Family Type	2.34	4	NS
Family Size	18.26	8	S
Mother's Occupation	18.85	8	S
Father's Occupation	59.05	12	S
Mother's Education	23.95	8	S
Father's Education	68.48	8	S
No. of Earning Members	10.43	4	S
Monthly Income	13.02	8	NS

As evident from the table 14, Chi ( <sup>2</sup> ) values were calculated to test association of sociometric status and different personal and socio-economic variables with sociometric status-independent of association of attributes. Out of twelve values six were significant at 0.5 level. Hence null hypothesis for the independence of association of attributes may be rejected. It may be calculated that sociometric is associated with family size, mother's occupation, father's occupation, mother's education, father's education and number of earning members. Whereas six values were not significant, hence null hypothesis for age, sex, birth order, number of siblings, family type and monthly income. These variables were accepted. Hence it may be calculated that sociometric status of 6-8 years old children were independent of their age, sex, birth order, number of siblings, family type and monthly income.

## CONCLUSIONS

Result of this study shows that, sociometric is associated with family size, mother's occupation, father's occupation, mother's education, father's education and number of earning members. Whereas six values were not significant, hence null hypothesis for age, sex, birth order, number of siblings, family type and monthly income. These variables were accepted. Hence it may be calculated that sociometric status of 6-8 years old children were independent of their age, sex, birth order, number of siblings, family type and monthly income.

## REFERENCES

1. Asher, S.R., Singleton, L.C., Tinsley, B.R. and Hymel, S. (1979). A reliable sociometric measure for preschool children. *Development Psychology*. 15: 443-444.
2. Balda, S., S. Punia and D. Punia. (2003). "Correlates of sociometric status in 5-6 years old rural children." *Journal of Family Ecology*. 5(1&2): 93-95.
3. Caspi, A., Elder, G.H. and Bem, D.J. (1988). Moving away from the world : Life-course patterns of shy children. *Developmental Psychology*, 24: 284-831.
4. 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.
5. Dodge, K.A. (1983). Behavioral antecedents of peer social status. *Child Development*. 54 : 1386-1399.
6. Hartup W.W. 1983. Peer Relationship and later Personal Adjustment; *Personality and Social Development*. New York; *John Wiley and Sons*, pp. 103-196
7. Negi M.(1999). Factor associated with the sociometric status of 6-8 years old children, *Master's Thesis, CCS HAU, Hissar*. Pp. 70-75.
8. Negi, M., S. Balda (2003). "Social behavior and socio-personal factors associated with the sociometric status of 6-8 years old boys." *Behavioral Scientist*.4(2): 117-120.
9. 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.