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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine a way of identifying high-risk maladjusted students in order that they may receive counselling services before their problems become extreme. The study also attempted to obtain a specific description of attributes which characterize elementary school students with adjustment problems. This information would help teachers and counsellors to plan intervention programs suited to the needs of these children.

The classroom teachers identified students in Grades 6 and 7 who had been referred for counselling because of school adjustment problems and they also identified students whom they considered to be well-adjusted to school. The study included 40 students, boys and girls.

The California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, Form AA, was administered to the students in order to determine their level of personal adjustment, social adjustment, and total adjustment. A sociogram was drawn up for each classroom to determine the sociometric status of the target group. The students were also compared on measures of family type, birth order, and family mobility.

The results indicated that the problem students differed significantly from the well-adjusted students on measures of personal adjustment, social adjustment, total adjustment, sociometric status, and family mobility. Family
type and birth order measures yielded non-significant results.

The study showed that teacher identification of students with school adjustment problems was accurate. The study also indicated that the California Test of Personality, the sociogram, and a measure of family mobility were valid instruments for identifying high-risk students who were in need of counselling. These results can be of help to teachers and counsellors in collecting objective data on possible problem students and in identifying high-risk problem students early.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Historical Background

Counselling the elementary school student is a relatively new phenomenon in Canada. It appears that those counselling programs which exist now were conceived in the late 1960's. Although there is no accurate data available at present, there are indications to show that a large percentage of the elementary school population in Canada does not receive counselling services (Merchant & Zingle, 1977). This situation is discouraging to those educators who believe in the importance of preventive counselling. It is especially discouraging when surveys show that there are still school districts in British Columbia which do not employ any counsellors for elementary school students (Allan, 1976).

The lack of counselling services in the elementary schools has important educational and social implications. Marx, Redding, and Smith (1967) stated that early treatment of problem children is very important since unresolved conflicts compound the child's problem. For example, emotional problems lead to learning problems, learning
problems lead to social problems, and social problems intensify the emotional problems. Combs (1964) also believed that untreated problems in a student's functioning ability in school will tend to increase the distance between the problem student and his/her teachers and between the problem student and his/her peers. Clarizio (1970) stated that all "normal" children have some adjustment problems at some time. However, he believed very strongly that these "normal maladjustments" should not be left to self-resolution since they cause considerable distress to both children and adults. Clarizio cited three studies which documented that untreated school maladjustment does not improve significantly with the passage of time alone.

Looking at these studies in light of the counselling situation in British Columbia, one must conclude that there are many children in elementary school whose school adjustment problems are not dealt with. These students must wait until they reach secondary school before they can obtain counselling. By that time the students' problems have escalated and, in some cases, the counselling interventions are probably too late to help the student become well-adjusted to school.

Because of the novelty of elementary school counselling in Canada, very little research has been conducted which focuses on counselling the elementary school student. Consequently, elementary school counsellors do not know the relative effectiveness of their intervention techniques.
There is also a lack of objective and specific information regarding the characteristics of the problem students. Counsellors find themselves in the position of having to rely on conjecture and trial-and-error methods in dealing with elementary school students who have been referred for counselling.

The situation in the United States regarding counselling for elementary school students is somewhat brighter. People were shocked into awareness in 1963 when it was found that the man who assassinated President Kennedy had a history of social maladjustment going back to his early years in school. Most teachers who had come in contact with Lee Harvey Oswald during his elementary school years had labelled him as having school adjustment problems (Engel, 1972). As a result of Oswald's action, there was a flurry of interest around the issue of counselling the young child. People began asking questions such as: "How soon can you identify problem children?" "How do you best deal with problem children?" (Engel, 1972). This focus on the mental health of the young child was undoubtedly responsible for almost doubling the number of counsellors in elementary schools in the United States between 1968 and 1970 (Merchant & Zingle, 1977).

There was also an increase in the amount of research dealing with counselling conducted at the elementary school level in the late 1960's in the United States. The bulk of this research is concerned with evaluation of treatment
methods. A quick overview of the evaluative studies leaves the reader confused and discouraged. A number of studies indicated that counselling did not alleviate the students' problems (Kranzler, 1968; Mayer, Kranzler, & Matthes, 1967). In addition, comparative studies of different treatment methods often showed inconclusive results (Alper, 1970; Harris, 1976).

Issues in Counselling

These research findings are frustrating for counsellors who are attempting to function in an environment which often does not consider counselling to be an important educational priority (Allan, 1976). Some educators, like Kranzler (1968), go as far as asking: "Should we quit counselling?" Such a question is mischievous when one considers the short time span in which counselling the young child has been regarded a worthwhile endeavour. In fact, the contradictory research findings are not surprising when one is aware of the readily apparent flaws in elementary school counselling. This writer agrees with Aubrey (1967) who stated that the major weakness of elementary school counselling is the absence of a theory underlying the methods.

The question is how can one formulate a theory of counselling the elementary school student when so little is known about the client? According to Clarizio (1970),
researchers have been hesitant to delve deeply into children's psyches and evaluate their behaviour because of the following reasons:

1. Prevalence of childhood problems in all children;
2. Nonpersistence of some developmental problems;
3. Inappropriateness of many measuring instruments for children.

These problems notwithstanding, it is important to continue to make an effort to research personality characteristics of children who are referred for counselling. Only by understanding children's needs and perceptions can one begin to provide services which will alleviate the problems which the students face.

Despite our knowledge of child development (Erikson, 1963; Piaget, 1973), we treat children as though they were little adults. Counsellors use watered-down versions of adult counselling techniques with elementary school students. This practice persists despite evidence which indicates that methods which are applicable to counselling adults are inappropriate, and may even be harmful, for counselling children (Leventhal & Kranzler, 1968; Matthes, Kranzler, & Mayer, 1968).

Almost every book on education talks about working with the "whole child" (Holt, 1970; Phanidis & Duncan, 1975). Indeed, this expression has become a truism. Because of the
insufficient counselling services in elementary schools, much of the burden of helping the maladjusted student falls on the shoulders of the classroom teacher. Many teachers do not have the time nor the skills to deal adequately with the special problems of maladjusted students and can often only use a band-aid approach to the problem. Similarly, counsellors who have a heavy client load frequently resort to using one type of intervention for all problem students. All too often teachers and counsellors attempt to "cure" underachievement by assigning additional homework and they try to solve behaviour problems by applying a rigid set of consequences. These techniques may be highly effective when they constitute one aspect of intervention with a specific child but as a total program they are doomed to failure because they involve only part of the child and focus simply on the observed symptom (Abidin, 1971; Combs, 1964). It is important for teachers and counsellors to realize that helping a student with adjustment problems is a difficult and time-consuming task. A counsellor cannot write out a prescription and heal the student. S/he must have information about the whole child who is referred for counselling and then plan an intervention strategy in cooperation with the student, the teacher, and the parent.

The only information which most counsellors receive about children who are referred for counselling is that they have school adjustment problems. Counsellor referrals in elementary school are generally made by the classroom
Teacher. Teachers usually identify children with school adjustment problems according to the following criteria:

1. Underachievement not due to identified organic, neurological, or cultural differences;
2. Social problems. The child has difficulty in interacting with peers or adults; and
3. Emotional problems. The child is chronically unhappy or depressed and is generally dissatisfied with him/herself.

It seems likely that a child exhibits school adjustment problems because of certain personal, social, and family background factors. The question is, are there measurable characteristics which are common to the group of students identified as having school adjustment problems? Further, how do these problem students differ from students who are identified as being well-adjusted to school? Is it possible to identify some distinguishing characteristics between problem students and well-adjusted students? There are a number of different variables which have been identified by theorists and researchers as contributing to a student's success at school. Self-concept is an element which is the subject of many research studies (Attwell, 1968; Combs, 1964; Coopersmith, 1959; Lewis, 1968; Wattenberg & Clifford, 1962). Attwell (1968) suggested that some children are underachievers because of feelings of inadequacy which lead
them to believe that they are incapable of learning. Combs (1964) found that a major determinant in how well a student functions is his/her feeling of capability of functioning. Coopersmith (1959) showed that children with low self-esteem exhibit greater defensiveness than students with high self-esteem. Lewis (1968) stated that a child with a negative self-concept fears, but also expects, failure. Wattenberg and Clifford (1962) found that a measure of self-concept made at the beginning of kindergarten proved to be more predictive of reading achievement two years later than was a measure of mental ability. These studies suggest that a positive self-concept is essential if a student is to be happy and successful at school.

Another variable which seems to influence children's level of adjustment to school is their ability to get along with others, to make friends, and to be accepted by their peers. Coopersmith (1959) showed that students with low sociometric status also scored low on self-esteem and exhibited greater defensiveness than those students who scored high on sociometric status. Gade (1977) suggested that peer relations are very important in a child's life. The social status of a student within a classroom tends to develop early and remains fairly constant over time. Bessel and Palomares (1970), echoing Adler (1963) and Maslow (1968), stated that one of the basic drives of people is to gain acceptance by others. Positive social interaction is thus essential to a child's well-being. It is clear that a
student's social relations play an important role in his/her attitude towards school.

As well as personal factors such as self-concept and social factors such as sociometric status, it is logical to suggest that a child's family background will influence his/her ability to adjust to school. Is the risk of school maladjustment greater if a child comes from a one-parent family rather than from a two-parent family? Little research has been conducted with elementary school children to determine the effect of living with one parent on school adjustment. The study by Thomas (1968) showed that there was no difference in level of self-concept and peer relations between children aged 9-11 who lived with both parents and children who lived with their mothers only. Burchinal (1964) indicated that children from unbroken homes scored lower on absenteeism from school than students from broken homes. However, there was no significant difference in scores on a personality measure between students from unbroken, broken, and reconstituted families. One of Burchinal's conclusions from the study was that children from broken homes are better adjusted than children from unhappy, unbroken homes. It is difficult to state with any certainty what effect a one-parent family structure will exert on a child's ability to adjust to school.

Another family background factor which has been suggested as an important influence in a child's adjustment is birth order (Adler, 1931; Dreikurs, 1958). Adler (1931)
wrote at length about the effect of birth order on personality development. Warren (1966) commented on the preponderance of firstborns among eminent men. He suggested that firstborns were more dependent and susceptible to social pressure than laterborns. MacDonald (1971) conducted a study with college students and found that firstborns scored higher on a measure of social responsibility than laterborns. Newhouse (1974) conducted a study with students in Grades 4-6 which measured level of responsibility. His study did not support the conclusions reached by MacDonald. Newhouse's findings did not indicate a significant difference in level of responsibility between firstborns and laterborns. There seems to be no conclusive evidence on the role which birth order plays in school adjustment.

A further possible influence on a child's ability to adjust to school is family mobility. If a child attends a number of different schools rather than remaining in one school, is s/he more likely to experience school adjustment problems? Chaskel (1964) suggested that the causes and effects of moving are mainly economic and limits his study to this topic. Gathercole (1967) stated that moving can be a method of dealing with conflict. He suggested that when moving is done for this purpose, the effect on the family is likely to be negative. Whalen and Fried (1973) reviewed numerous studies of the effects of geographical mobility on
student achievement. The studies fell into three categories: 1. moving had a negative effect on student achievement; 2. moving had a positive effect on student achievement; 3. moving had no effect on student achievement. Splete and Rasmussen (1977) suggested that moving can have negative effects on elementary school students. They urged counsellors to give special support to incoming children. There seems to be some evidence to suggest that in certain circumstances moving affects children's school adjustment negatively.

The foregoing discussion has highlighted some possible factors which may contribute to school adjustment problems in elementary school pupils. These were: personal factors, especially self-concept; social factors including sociometric status; and family background factors such as family type, birth order, and family mobility.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to obtain a description of specific attributes which characterize elementary school students with school adjustment problems. The study sought to determine whether or not there are measurable characteristics which distinguish students with adjustment problems from students who are identified as being well-adjusted to school. The students were compared on several variables: personal adjustment, social adjustment, sociometric status, family type, birth order, and family mobility. These
variables were chosen because they constitute factors which are of considerable interest to counsellors. The obtained data give a counsellor important information for carrying out an effective counselling program in an elementary school.

The study also served as a verification of teacher accuracy in identifying students who were in need of counselling. In addition, the study used several measurement instruments which could possibly serve as predictive indicators for identifying high-risk problem students.
CHAPTER 2

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Counselling the elementary school student is a concept which, at present, seems of dubious importance to educators. Allan (1976) has documented that few elementary school children in British Columbia receive adequate counselling services and the provision of these services is not considered to be an educational priority for the majority of educators in the school system. This situation makes it difficult for those counsellors who are actively trying to improve counselling services to children or attempting to present empirical evidence to show that counselling improves students' problems. Because of inadequate formal training (Allan, 1976; Merchant & Zingle, 1977) or impossible client loads (Allan, 1976), few counsellors are in a position to carry out research projects which could document that their interventions reduced student problems. Further, there are special problems when one attempts to do research with children. Clarizio (1970) stated that research findings were often contradictory because of the nonpersistence of some developmental problems. Another serious problem in conducting research with children is the lack of suitable measurement instruments. Harris (1976) and Mayer et al (1967) suggested that one reason for some non-significant
findings was the brevity of most intervention programs carried out at the elementary school level. Most research studies run 8-12 weeks, perhaps not long enough to allow children to change attitudes or behaviours.

Despite these difficulties, some research has been carried out with elementary school students. In this chapter, a number of findings which are of particular significance to this study, are examined.

The research studies will be discussed under the following general headings:

1. Personality Characteristics
2. Social Characteristics
3. Family Background
4. Counselling Techniques

**Personality Characteristics**

There are several studies which deal with personality characteristics of children who are labelled "problems" because of underachievement, social difficulties, or emotional difficulties. Williams and Cole (1968) conducted a thorough investigation of elementary school students' self-concept as it related to school adjustment. Their hypothesis was that children's conception of school was related to their conception of themselves. They used 80 Grade 6 students in their study. They administered the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, The California Test of Personality, and
a sociometric measure. Results of the study indicated positive correlations between measures of self-concept and measures of conception of school, social status, emotional adjustment, and mathematical achievement. Williams and Cole hypothesized that there is probably a reciprocal cause-effect relationship between self-concept and academic achievement. They suggested that a child's academic success is not determined by one variable alone, that is, intellectual ability; self-esteem seems to be another major determinant.

Coopersmith (1959) conducted a study to determine different types of self-esteem. His subjects consisted of 87 students 10-12 years old. Coopersmith concluded that those students who scored low on self-esteem exhibited greater defensiveness than those students who scored high on self-esteem.

Lewis (1968) dealt with defensiveness in relationship to self-concept and learning. He stated that children with a negative self-concept fear and expect failure. These children suffer from an inhibiting anxiety and use their energy for defense rather than exploration. Lewis referred to Maslow's (1968) hierarchy of needs. When there are conflicting needs the child will deal with the basic need for survival; therefore, a child with a negative self-concept will choose security over growth. Lewis quoted the study by Wattenberg and Clifford (1962) to emphasize the relationship between self-concept and learning. Wattenberg
and Clifford found that measures of self-concept made at the beginning of kindergarten were more predictive of reading achievement two years later than were measures of mental ability.

The Combs' study (1964) dealt with the topic of perception of self in the academically capable underachiever. This study was conducted with two groups of adolescent boys, one group consisted of academically capable boys who were underachievers, the other group was composed of equally capable boys whose scholastic achievement was satisfactory. The boys were compared on the Combs Apperception Test and the Thematic Apperception Test. The underachievers differed from the achievers on the following points:

1. saw themselves as less adequate
2. saw themselves as less acceptable
3. saw their peers as less acceptable
4. saw adults as less acceptable
5. their approach to problem solving was less effective
6. they had less freedom of expression.

Combs saw a basic thread running though all his results, namely, that a major determinant of how well one functions is one's feeling of capability of functioning.
Attwell (1968) studied various factors which contribute to underachievement in school. This research singled out self-concept as a most important factor to consider when dealing with children who are underachieving. One must be aware of the children's feelings of inadequacy which may be a major reason for their learning difficulty. The studies dealing with personality characteristics of students seem to confirm the hypothesis that self-concept is closely related to school adjustment. Students who have adjustment problems seem to score lower on measures of self-concept or self-esteem. Counsellors, therefore, must have the skills necessary to deal with personality problems.

Social Characteristics

Social characteristics deal with the social skills a person learns by living in society, the ability to get along with others and to be accepted by others. The school is an institution where social skills are a necessity if a student is to adjust well to the environment. Studies conducted with students who have school adjustment problems often show that these students score low on sociometric measures (Combs, 1964; Coopersmith, 1959; Williams & Cole, 1968).

These same studies point towards a very close relationship between the self-concept and the sociometric status of a student. Combs' (1964) results indicated that the problem students saw themselves as being less acceptable, and also
considered their classmates to be less acceptable, than did their well-adjusted peers.

Coopersmith (1959) also found that students who scored low on measures of self-esteem tended to score low on measures of sociometric status.

The Williams and Cole (1968) study found a definite relationship between self-concept and social characteristics. Measures used were the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, The California Test of Personality, and a sociometric measure. The researchers found that self-appraisal was closely related to group appraisal. Williams and Cole suggested that one way of altering self-concept is to change social status.

Bessel and Palomares (1970) considered social skills an essential ingredient in being a well-adjusted person. They stated that one of the basic needs of humans is to be accepted by others and to gain their approval. Bessel and Palomares have devised a program called "The Magic Circle" which attempts, among other things, to help children learn how to get along with others and to be accepted by them.

Dinkmeyer (1970) also dealt with the issue of social skills, making and keeping friends. He believed that children must be taught these social skills if they are to become well-adjusted citizens. Dinkmeyer produced a teaching aid called "Developing Understanding of Self and Others". This activity kit focusses on the skills needed to relate positively to others in society.
Gade (1977) discussed the use of sociometry in elementary school counselling. Teachers and counsellors must be aware of students' social status within the classroom since this factor greatly affects their attitude towards school. Gade also stated that children tend to develop a social status early which remains fairly constant over time. If any problems exist in the area of social skills they must be diagnosed and treated as soon as possible.

This discussion of social skills seems to indicate that there is a strong relationship between self-concept and sociometric status. It appears that if children feel positive about themselves, others will feel positive towards them, and they will feel positive towards others. Clearly social skills are a second very important factor in a student's ability to adjust well to school.

Family Background

Research has shown that personality characteristics and social skills contribute significantly to a student's ability to adjust well to the school environment. The child's family background, however, must also be considered to exert an important influence on school adjustment. There are a number of approaches which could be followed when investigating family background influences. For example, the tone in a family, or the family atmosphere, would seem to be an important factor. Method of discipline in the home likely influences children a great deal. Unfortunately, it
is almost impossible for a researcher to gather data in these areas. Davids (1972) reported some difficulties encountered in administering the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, a questionnaire assessing family atmosphere by measuring hostility-rejection and authority-control. Davids reported parental reluctance in answering questions regarding child-rearing practises. He doubted the validity of the test results, wondering whether the parents answered the questions in a way that indicated their preferred method of child-raising rather than reporting about what was actually happening at home. Davids suggested that a more reliable measure of family atmosphere would be direct observation by the investigator. This method would undoubtedly result in more accurate data; however, would a researcher be able to convince enough families to allow this intrusion into their homes?

Since direct observation and personal questionnaires yield uncertain results, family background factors could be studied by examining those variables in family life which can be measured objectively and without invading people's privacy. This study attempted the task of identifying variables in family background by focussing on the following areas: Family Type, Birth Order, and Family Mobility.

Studies which dealt with these three areas are now examined.
Family Type

In recent years there has been a dramatic change in the structure of the family. With divorce and separation becoming increasingly common occurrences, the number of children living in non-traditional family settings is growing. More and more children do not grow up with two permanent parents. Some children are exposed to several different parent figures and some children live with only one parent. What effect, if any, does living in a non-traditional family structure have on a child's school adjustment?

Schlesinger (1975), in his annotated bibliography, reported that the 1971 census showed 9.44 per cent of all Canadian families, or 477,525 families, headed by one parent. Interestingly, Schlesinger's bibliography cited only a small number of studies which concern themselves with the effects on the child of living in a one-parent family. The majority of studies focus on the adult who is raising children alone.

One study which focussed on children with absent fathers was conducted by Thomas (1968). Thomas chose 47 children, aged 9 to 11 years, who belonged to a low socioeconomic group and lived with their mothers. The control group consisted of 47 children of the same age and same socioeconomic bracket who lived with their mothers and fathers. The children were given the California Test of
Personality to measure several factors including self-concept and peer relations. No significant difference was found between the groups on either variable. Thomas explained the lack of significant results by suggesting that the years between 9 and 11 are a relatively quiescent stage in children's personality development. Also, in the absent-father group, the fathers had been absent for at least two years and the children had probably adjusted to their home situation. However, it is difficult to determine whether or not the absence of a father in a low socioeconmic group would have been perceived as a major emotional loss by the children. Perhaps other conditions at home had a greater impact on the children's lives.

Burchinal (1964) looked at adolescents from unbroken, broken, and reconstituted families. Burchinal administered the Minnesota Test of Personality and a questionnaire to assess social relationships of the students. The study showed that there were no differences in personality characteristics between the three groups. There were only two factors which indicated significant differences, school attendance and number of friends. The students from the broken homes missed more school days and indicated that they liked fewer school-mates than the students from the unbroken and reconstituted groups.

The limited number of studies dealing with the effects on students of living in a 'split family makes it difficult to make any assumptions as to what extent this variable
influences a student's ability to adjust well to the school environment. One may argue that the emotional upheaval in a family experiencing divorce or separation would create special problems for elementary school children which could be reflected in their ability to adjust to school, but because of the limited research carried out in this area, one can only speculate about causes and effects.

Birth Order

Birth order has been a popular subject in Adlerian writings. Adler (1931) suggested that each person constructs for him/herself a unique lifestyle which, in large measure, depends on the ordinal position in which the individual is born. Birth order is thought to be an important influence in determining the behaviour and personality of an individual. If this hypothesis is true, birth order should also have an effect on how well a child is able to adjust to school. The research on birth order shows some very interesting results.

Warren (1966) did a study of birth order in adults and found a preponderance of first-borns among eminent men, for example, U.S. Presidents and astronauts. He concluded that first-borns are more dependent and more susceptible to social pressure. MacDonald (1971) conducted a study on birth order of undergraduate students and their personality characteristics. He found no difference in measures of locus of control, dogmatism, ambiguity and tolerance, and
need for approval. However, there were significant differences on measures of social responsibility and rigidity. On measures of the former, only-children scored highest, first-borns next, and later-borns scored lowest. On measures of rigidity, first-borns scored highest, later-borns scored next, and only-children scored lowest.

Newhouse (1974) did a study with elementary school students measuring the relationship between birth order and locus of control. His sample consisted of 800 randomly selected students from Grades 4-6. Analysis of the results revealed two major findings. First, only-children seemed to assume less responsibility for success than first-borns or later-borns. Second, first-borns were not significantly more responsible than later-borns. The second finding contradicts the earlier studies by MacDonald (1971) and Warren (1966).

It is apparent that the research described presents an incomplete picture of the role of birth order in personality development. Studies which were done with adults contradict the results which were found with children (MacDonald, 1971; Warren, 1966). It is worthwhile to investigate further whether or not birth order does indeed influence academic achievement and social success.

Family Mobility

Stability of home location is a further variable which influences a child's life (Engel, 1972). The research,
however, seems to be divided on the issue of geographic mobility as having a positive or negative effect on a child's school adjustment. Whalen and Fried (1973) summarized several studies dealing with school achievement of students who had moved to new schools. The research fell into three categories, studies which showed that moving had a negative effect on students, studies which showed that moving had a positive effect on students, and studies which showed that moving had no effect on students. Whalen and Fried hypothesized that there are many different factors relating to family mobility which determine school adjustment. For their study they isolated two factors, socioeconomic status and I.Q. The results of their study indicated that low or high socioeconomic status did not affect the students' achievement. I.Q. was found to be a significant variable. Students with I.Q. scores greater than 110 performed better when they were mobile than when they did not change schools. Students with I.Q. scores less than 110 performed better when they did not change schools rather than when they were mobile. Since the majority of students obtain I.Q. scores of less than 110, one might be tempted to conclude that, for the average student, mobility is dysfunctional to school achievement. However, Whalen and Fried cautioned the reader about their results. They speculated that there are more important variables than I.Q. and socioeconomic status when family mobility and student achievement are considered. The researchers suggested that
parental attitudes towards moving and family size are two such significant variables.

Two other studies confirm Whalen and Fried's suggestion that there are many factors within a family which determine whether mobility has a positive or negative effect on children. Chaskel (1964) suggested that those families who have a healthy family structure are better able to adjust to mobility. Gathercole (1967) suggested that mobility is dysfunctional when it becomes a way of handling conflict by separating from it.

The studies on family mobility indicate that, for some students, changing to a new school can adversely affect their school life. The question is to find out for which students and under which circumstances moving to a new school results in school maladjustment.

Counselling Techniques and Evaluation

The previous discussion of the literature highlighted several important factors which have been found to contribute to school maladjustment in elementary school students. These were: personality characteristics, social characteristics, and family background. It seems obvious that counsellors must be able to deal with all of these areas if they are to make any effective interventions. Most counsellors, however, ignore the total living environment of people (Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1975). This attitude is understandable when one considers that most counsellors are not
trained to deal with social problems such as ineffective child rearing and family breakdown. Also, many people are not yet comfortable with the concept of home and school sharing responsibility for the welfare of the child. Often a counsellor's attempts at working with parents is viewed as meddling.

Aubrey (1967) raised two serious problems which beset the elementary school counsellor:

1. The lack of both theory and research which raises questions as to direction and methods.

2. The training, preparation and models of elementary school counsellors are those originally devised for secondary school pupils.

Considering the first of Aubrey's statements, there are several researchers who have attempted to grapple with the idea of methods and direction for counselling in the elementary school. Abidin (1971) stated that one reason counsellors were ineffective was their insistence on using one type of intervention, for example behaviour modification, for all children in all circumstances. Keat (1974) also stressed that effective counselling must be based on an evaluation of the child's present level of functioning and on factors in his/her environment.

Alper and Kranzler (1970) compared the effectiveness of two intervention strategies, behavioural counselling and client-centered counselling, for the behaviour problems of elementary school children. The researchers treated 36
children for out-of-seat behaviour. They conducted individual counselling sessions with the students over a 4-week period. Neither group showed any significant improvement. Alper and Kranzler concluded that out-of-seat behaviour was a situational rather than an intrapsychic problem. They felt that talking to children in the privacy of the counselling office about behaviour which was occurring elsewhere was a waste of time. Alper and Kranzler urged counsellors to discard the traditional counselling methods. However, the researchers did not offer a definitive alternate approach for counsellors of elementary school students.

Aubrey's second concern deals with the fact that most counsellors are trained to deal with adults and adolescents and try to adapt these methods to their work with children. This practice is of dubious value. The Matthes, Kranzler, and Mayer (1968) study shed some light on one aspect of counselling which is supposedly crucial to promoting change in the client, namely, client perception of counsellor unconditionality of regard (Rogers, 1957). Matthes et al worked with 22 elementary school students once a week for 6 weeks in individual counselling sessions. The measurement instruments used were the Barrett-Lennard scale to measure perceived counsellor unconditionality of regard, the Michigan Student Questionnaire to assess attitude toward school, and a sociometric test to determine sociometric status. The results of the study showed no positive relationship between clients' perception of counsellor
unconditionality of regard and a change in the students' sociometric status, attitudes, and social skills. Matthes et al wondered whether it was possible that, with elementary students, counsellor acceptance served to reinforce the students' negative behaviour.

Leventhal and Kranzler (1968) conducted an exploratory study into the relationship between depth of intrapersonal exploration and constructive personality change. The researchers found that, for elementary school children, there was no positive relationship between the two variables. In fact, Leventhal and Kranzler felt the need to caution counsellors when working with children about intrapersonal issues. Counsellors cannot assume that a child's disclosing of personally relevant material is therapeutic. The authors thought it was possible that disclosure could be detrimental to the child and to the development of his/her personality.

Aubrey's criticism of elementary school counselling, that is, the lack of a theory and effective methods, emphasized the point that before one can formulate a theory of counselling for elementary school children, one must have a thorough understanding of the children's needs. The relevant literature clearly points out that there are many attributes of children which are not understood. Much of the research which is available on elementary school students is inconclusive or contradictory. If counselling services for children are to be improved, there must be a
greater emphasis on assessing children's needs and evaluating the effectiveness of various intervention programs.

Hypotheses

The literature which has been discussed in this chapter points to several factors which influence a student's ability to adjust to school:

1. Personal characteristics
2. Social characteristics
3. Family background

The substantive hypotheses investigated in this study are:

1. Students who have school adjustment problems will score lower on measures of personal adjustment than students who are well-adjusted to school.
2. Students who have school adjustment problems will score lower on measures of social adjustment than students who are well-adjusted to school.
3. Students who have school adjustment problems will have a lower sociometric status than students who are well-adjusted to school.
4. Students who have school adjustment problems will have a greater probability of coming from a one-parent family than students who are well-adjusted to school.
5. Students who have school adjustment problems will have a lesser probability of being a first-born child than students who are well-adjusted to school.
6. Students who have school adjustment problems will have attended a greater number of schools than students who are well-adjusted to school.

This study attempted to gather specific information about the characteristics of students with school adjustment problems by focussing on the factors addressed in the substantive hypotheses.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Previous studies have suggested a number of variables which influence a child's ability to adjust to the school environment. Not much research has been done, especially in Canada, which focussed on the elementary school student who is identified as having school adjustment problems. This study was an attempt to learn more about the characteristics of the problem students in order to obtain information which would help counsellors understand and deal with this group of students more effectively.

In this chapter the methodology used to carry out the study is described under the following headings: Design, Population and Sample, Procedure, Measurement Instruments, Hypotheses, and Data Analysis.

Design

This study is a descriptive field study. Elementary school students who were referred for counselling because of school adjustment problems were compared to students who were identified as being well-adjusted to school. The study sought to describe the characteristics of the problem students and attempted to determine how these students differed from their well-adjusted peers.
The population for this study was those students in Grades 6 and 7 who were identified as having school adjustment problems. The study was limited to students in the upper elementary grades since younger children show a greater variance of school adjustment than do older students. School adjustment is related to the developmental process in children and, by the time students reach Grade 5 or 6, their school behaviour has stabilized considerably (Clarizio, 1970).

A relatively large school district in the greater Vancouver area was chosen for the study. The participating schools were chosen by considering the following criteria:

1. School population -- The student enrolment in each school from kindergarten to Grade 7 totalled at least 350 students.

2. Socioeconomic level -- Schools were chosen which were located in middle-class neighbourhoods. This consideration reduced the probability of including children in the study who lived in extreme poverty or who came from extremely wealthy homes.

3. Culture -- Schools were chosen where the majority of students were of Anglo-Saxon background. This criterion was used to avoid situations where the students' school adjustment problems could be mainly due to cultural factors.
4. School type -- The schools reflected a traditional school organization with self-contained classrooms.

There were five schools in the district which satisfied these criteria. Two schools were randomly selected to participate in the study. The principals of both schools readily agreed to cooperate with the study and seven teachers of Grades 6 and 7 also were interested in helping with the study.

The classroom teachers were asked to identify the sample students. They were asked to generate the names of those students who had been referred for counselling for one or more of the following reasons:

1. Poor academic achievement. Standardized achievement tests and class work indicate that the student's performance is below the appropriate grade level. Poor academic achievement is not due to identified organic, neurological, or cultural factors.

2. Social problems. The child has difficulty in interacting with peers or adults.

3. Emotional problems. The child is chronically unhappy or depressed and is generally dissatisfied with him/herself.
The teachers identified 23 students in the school adjustment problems category.

The teachers were also asked to select a group of students whom they considered to be well-adjusted to school according to the following criteria: (Note: Students had to demonstrate all of these characteristics.)

1. Academic achievement as indicated by standardized achievement tests and class work is at (or above) the appropriate grade level.
2. Socially the child interacts well with peers and adults.
3. The child feels generally satisfied with himself/herself and has realistic self expectations.

After the teachers had identified the well-adjusted students, the researcher randomly selected 23 to participate in the study controlling for grade level and sex. The classroom teachers were asked to identify the participating students because teacher identification of problem students has been shown to be reasonably accurate. Bower and Lambert (1961) asked teachers to identify and rate maladjusted students. The students were subsequently given individual assessments by experienced clinicians. The results indicated that the teachers' judgements were found to be 90 per cent accurate when compared to the clinicians' assessments.
Letters of permission were sent out to the parents whose children had been chosen for the study sample (see Appendix A). Three parents requested that their children not participate in the study. One child moved away, and one student was ill while the study was in progress. One child in the problem group was randomly eliminated from the study in order to keep the numbers in each group equal. The final number of the students was 20 in the problem group and 20 in the well-adjusted group. Sex and grade level were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Problem Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Well-adjusted Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

There are a number of personality characteristics and family background factors which were used in this study to compare the group of problem students with the group of well-adjusted students. The variables are defined and a description is given of how each was measured.
Personal Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Total Adjustment

These three variables, personal adjustment, social adjustment, and total adjustment, were measured using an objective personality inventory, The California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, California Test Bureau, Thorpe and Clark (1953). The instrument was individually administered to each student by the researcher. Standardized instructions were given to the participants (see Appendix B). Each test was scored by the researcher after all tests had been administered. Personal adjustment, social adjustment, and total adjustment level was determined by arriving at a numerical score; a low numerical score indicated a low level of adjustment and a high numerical score indicated a high level of adjustment.

Sociometric Status

Sociometric status was defined as the number of choices a student received from his/her peers on a sociometric measure which was administered to each participating classroom. The classroom teacher was asked to administer this exercise. In this way, the task would be seen by students as a part of the regular classroom routine, no bias would be introduced as a result of experimenter effect.

The teachers were asked to give the students each a piece of paper and then proceed with the following instructions:
1. Put your first and last name at the top of the paper.
2. Write the names of three people in this classroom with whom you would like to sit.
3. Fold your paper once and hand it in.

The researcher collected the raw data from the teacher and constructed a sociometric matrix for each classroom. The scores for the target students were then recorded.

Family Type
Family type was defined on the basis of the number of parents, biological or adoptive, with whom the child presently lives. There were one-parent and two-parent family types. This information was obtained by the researcher from school records.

Birth Order
Birth order was defined according to the ordinal position a child holds in the family. Two types of ordinal positions were determined: firstborns and only children, and laterborns. This information was obtained by the researcher from school records.

Family Mobility
Family mobility was measured by the number of different schools a student had attended since starting kindergarten.
This information was obtained by the researcher from school records.

**Measurement Instruments**

Personal adjustment, social adjustment, and total adjustment were measured by means of a personality inventory. Keat (1974) considered personality testing to be an extremely difficult task due to the nature of the child during the elementary school years. Keat listed only 2 tests which he considered suitable instruments for use with children aged 8-12. One of these tests is The California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8.

For this study the California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, Form AA, was used to measure personal and social characteristics. The most important reason for using this test is that it has been used in many research projects and has a very good record of validity and reliability. Secondly, the format of the test consists of what Kerlinger (1973) labels agreement-disagreement items permitting one of two possible responses. Therefore, the directions are simple and straightforward and unlikely to confuse young children. In addition, the test supplies 15 different scores for very specific personality traits.
Description of The California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, Form AA

The test is divided into two main parts, personal adjustment and social adjustment. Each major section is further subdivided to yield 6 separate, valid, and reliable subscores:

**Personal Adjustment**

Self-reliance
Sense of Personal Worth
Sense of Personal Freedom
Feeling of Belonging
Withdrawing Tendencies
Nervous Symptoms

**Social Adjustment**

Social Standards
Social Skills
Anti-social Tendencies
Family Relations
Social Relations
Community Relations

**Total Adjustment**

The test consists of 144 descriptive questions to which the child responds "Yes" or "No". Scores are computed for
each subtest to yield scores for personal adjustment and social adjustment. Personal adjustment and social adjustment scores added together yield a total adjustment score. The scores may be transformed into percentile ranks which were normed with 4,562 pupils in Grades 4 to 8 inclusive in schools in Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Massachusetts, and California. The sampling cases constituted a normal distribution for mental ability and typical age-grade relationships.

Reliability

The reliability coefficients have been computed with the Kuder-Richardson formula. A description is presented in Table 3.1.

Validity

The main purposes for which the California Test of Personality was designed are the following:

1. To provide a frame of reference (including a conceptual structure and a sampling of specific types of thinking, feeling, and acting patterns) regarding the nature of personality determinants and their relationship to each other and to the total functioning personality;

2. To provide information about individuals which is useful in understanding their problems and improving their adjustment;
TABLE 3.1

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY - ELEMENTARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Form AA or BB</th>
<th>Both Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Self reliance</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sense of Personal Worth</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sense of Personal Freedom</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Feeling of Belonging</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Withdrawing Tendencies</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Freedom from)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Nervous Symptoms</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Freedom from)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Social Standards</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Social Skills</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Anti-social Tendencies</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Freedom from)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Family Relations</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. School Relations</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Community Relations</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjustment</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. To serve as an instrument of research for obtaining other types of information.

There is considerable evidence available which supports the validity of the California Test of Personality. Syracuse University found that the test correlated more closely with clinical findings than any other test (Summary of Investigations, 1949). Jackson (1946) compared the relative effectiveness of the California Test of Personality and the interview technique for evaluating personal and social adjustment. Jackson concluded that the California Test of Personality provided a more accurate evaluation as well as being more efficient than interviews. The California Test of Personality is used extensively in research studies. The Summary of Investigations, Number One,Enlarged Edition, California Test of Personality, lists and describes some 90 of these studies.

The California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, seemed a logical choice for use in this study to measure personal and social characteristics of problem students and well-adjusted students in Grades 6 and 7. The test has a good record of validity and has been used fairly frequently in research projects. The time requirement for administering the test is not onerous, approximately 30 minutes per child. The testing situation is comfortable for the children; they are assured of the confidentiality of their responses and need to interact with the tester only as much as they
desire. The California Test of Personality was used because it seemed to generate a considerable amount of valid and reliable information in a relatively objective and non-threatening manner.

Sociometric Status

Kerlinger (1973) defined sociometry as the study and measurement of social choice. Keats (1974) described several reasons for using sociometry with children some of which are:

1. Sociometric scores can be used in conjunction with teachers' ratings to provide a basis for screening and assessing social desirability factors.
2. The procedure generates teacher interest and involvement.
3. It can be utilized as a criterion for behaviour change before and after active intervention.

This study used sociometry for the first reason stated. The study compared the number of choices which problem students and well-adjusted students received in response to the request: "Write the names of three students in this classroom with whom you would like to sit". In other words, this study measured the social desirability of problem students as compared to well-adjusted students. Also, since social problems constituted one of the definitions of school
maladjustment, the study served to verify the teachers' criteria for referring students for counselling.

A sociometric matrix was used to establish the students' sociometric status. Kerlinger (1973) stated that sociometry is useful for classifying individuals and groups. He further stated that sociometry is a simple, economic, and natural testing method which works as well for kindergartners as for atomic scientists. There is compelling evidence to suggest that a sociometric matrix was a desirable measure to use in evaluating the sociometric status of Grade 6 and 7 students.

Null Hypotheses

The null hypotheses for the study are the following:

1. There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in mean personal adjustment scores as measured by the California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

2. There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in mean social adjustment scores as measured by the California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

3. There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in mean total adjustment scores as
measured by the California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

4. There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in sociometric status between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

5. There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in family type between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems;

6. There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in birth order between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

7. There is no statistically significant difference (alpha=.05) in family mobility between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

Data Analysis

Demographic Data

A description of the sample has been given, including the number of students in each grade, and the number of male and female students.
Inferential Data

1. Personal adjustment
   The personal adjustment scale is ordinal-interval. A t-test was run to determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the groups. Alpha was set at the .05 level.

2. Social adjustment
   The social adjustment measure is an ordinal-interval scale. A t-test was run to determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the groups. Alpha was set at the .05 level.

3. Total adjustment
   The total adjustment measure is an ordinal-interval scale. A t-test was run to determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the group. Alpha was set at the .05 level.

4. Sociometric status
   The number of choices a student received from his/her peers determines his/her sociometric status. The chi-square test was used to determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference in number of choices in each group. Alpha was set at the .05 level. A 2x3 grid was constructed as follows:
Number of choices by peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - 1</th>
<th>2 - 3</th>
<th>4 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-adjusted Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Family type

Family type refers to one-parent and two-parent families. The chi square test was used to determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference in the number of one-parent versus two-parent families in each group. Alpha was set at the .05 level. A 2x2 grid was constructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>One-parent</th>
<th>Two-parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-adjusted Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Birth order

Birth order was measured on the basis of first-born and only children, and laterborns. The chi-square test was used to determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference in the number of firstborn/only children and laterborns in each group.
Alpha was set at the .05 level. A 2x2 grid was constructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Order</th>
<th>Firstborns/only</th>
<th>Laterborns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-adjusted Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Family mobility

Family mobility was measured by the number of different schools a student has attended since kindergarten. The chi-square test was used to determine whether or not there is a statistically significant difference in the number of schools attended in each group. Alpha was set at the .05 level. A 2x2 grid was constructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Schools Attended</th>
<th>1 - 2</th>
<th>3 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-adjusted Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Chapter 3 has dealt with the methodology which was used to conduct this study. A description was given of the research design, the population, and the procedures which were followed in carrying out the study. A rationale was
given for choosing the specific measurement instruments which were used in the study and a detailed description of both the California Test of Personality, Grades 4–8, and the sociometric matrix are included. Also in this chapter the null hypotheses to be tested in this study were listed and the data analysis is explained. The next chapter focusses on the obtained data and includes a discussion of the results of this study.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter describes the parametric and non-parametric procedures/statistics which were used to analyze the collected data. Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were tested using a t-test to compare the scores between the problem group and the well-adjusted group. Considering the characteristics of the sample groups — two independent samples with sigma unknown, df equals 38(n + n - 2) — the following formula was used to analyze the data:

\[ t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_p^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_p^2}{n_2}}} \]

where:
- \( \bar{x}_1 \) = mean score of the well-adjusted group
- \( \bar{x}_2 \) = mean score of the problem group
- \( n_1 \) = no. of students in the well-adjusted group
- \( n_2 \) = no. of students in the problem group
- \( S_p^2 \) = pooled variance.

The pooled variance was computed as follows:

\[ S_p^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)(S_{1}^2) + (n_2 - 1)(S_{2}^2)}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \]
Hypothesis 1:
There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in mean personal adjustment scores as measured by the California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

Personal adjustment was measured by six subtests with the results illustrated by Table 4.1. The null hypothesis is rejected since there is evidence that elementary school students with school adjustment problems score significantly lower on measures of personal adjustment than students who are identified as being well-adjusted to school.

The t-scores for the six subtests which contribute to the Personal Adjustment score are presented in Appendix C. It is interesting to note the slight difference in scores which measure freedom from nervous symptoms. This result seems to indicate that the problem students generally show the same developmental pattern as the well-adjusted students in terms of displaying nervous symptoms. Clarizio's research (1970) indicated that most children experienced some nervous symptoms at some stage, such as nightmares, stomach aches, lack of appetite, but that the majority of these symptoms disappear by the time a child reaches age 9. This study seems to point out that pupils with school adjustment problems mature at about the same rate as well-adjusted students in terms of outgrowing nervous symptoms.
TABLE 4.1
PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT, SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT, TOTAL ADJUSTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Problem Group</th>
<th>Well-adjusted Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Mean Deviation</td>
<td>Standard Mean Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>10.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>10.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjustment</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>19.338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at the .05 level; t-critical equals ±2.021 with 38 df.
Hypothesis 2:

There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in mean social adjustment scores as measured by the California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

Social adjustment was measured by six subtests with the results illustrated by Table 4.1. The null hypothesis is rejected since there is evidence that elementary school students with school adjustment problems score significantly lower on measures of social adjustment than students who are identified as being well-adjusted to school.

The t-scores for the subtests which form the basis of the Social Adjustment score are presented in Appendix D. In this series of tests the one measuring family relations is a notable exception in failing to approach a significant difference between the two groups. It is possible that the family relations of the students in both the problem group and the well-adjusted group are similar. It is also possible that the types of questions which were asked were too personal and, perhaps, threatening to elementary school students. For example, a child could feel a conflict of loyalties in answering questions such as: "Do you like both of your parents about the same?" "Do you sometimes feel like running away from home?" "Do you feel that no one at home loves you?"
Leventhal and Kranzler (1968) cautioned counsellors about elementary school students' fragile psyches and recommended extreme sensitivity when dealing with children's intrapersonal issues. Perhaps the family relations test is an example of questioning which was inappropriate for the given situation, considering that the examiner had not established a counselling relationship with the students.

**Hypothesis 3:**

There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in mean total adjustment scores as measured by the California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

The total adjustment scores are presented in Table 4.1. The null hypothesis is rejected since there is evidence that elementary school students with school adjustment problems score significantly lower on measures of total adjustment than students who are identified as being well-adjusted to school.

Hypotheses 4, 5, 6, and 7 were tested using a non-parametric procedure, the chi-square test. The chi-square test is a test of the independence of variables; it indicates whether or not a difference in results is statistically significant or merely a chance result. The formula for calculating chi-square is the following:
Hypothesis 4:
There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in sociometric status between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

A sociogram was constructed for each participating classroom and yielded the results shown in Table 4.2. The null hypothesis is rejected since there is evidence that elementary school students with school adjustment problems score significantly lower on a measure of sociometric status than students who are identified as being well-adjusted to school.

Hypothesis 5:
There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in family type between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

Family type was defined as one-parent and two-parent families. The results are illustrated in Table 4.3. The null hypothesis is not rejected since there is no evidence of a statistically significant difference in family type
TABLE 4.2

NUMBER OF CHOICES BY PEERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>4 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-adjusted group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 18.11 \ast \]

\* significant at the .05 level; \( \chi^2 \) critical equals \( \pm 5.991 \) with 2 df.
between students who have school adjustment problems and students who are well-adjusted to school.

**Hypothesis 6:**

There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in birth order between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

Birth order was divided into two categories: firstborn and only children, and laterborns. The results are presented in Table 4.4. The null hypothesis is not rejected since there is no evidence of a statistically significant difference in birth order between elementary school students who have school adjustment problems and students who are well adjusted to school.

**Hypothesis 7:**

There is no statistically significant difference (alpha = .05) in family mobility between elementary school students with and without school adjustment problems.

Family mobility was determined by counting how many different schools a child had attended since starting kindergarten. The results are presented in Table 4.5. The null hypothesis is rejected since there is evidence of a
### TABLE 4.3

**FAMILY TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One-parent family</th>
<th>Two-parent family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-adjusted group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.125 \]

\( \chi^2 \)-critical equals ±3.841 at the .05 level with 1 df.
TABLE 4.4

BIRTH ORDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Firstborn/Only</th>
<th>Laterborn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-adjusted group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.96 \]

\( \chi^2 \)-critical equals ±3.841 at the .05 level with 1 df.
### TABLE 4.5

**NUMBER OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - 2</th>
<th>3 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem group</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-adjusted group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.53 * \]

* significant at the .05 level; \( \chi^2 \)-critical equals \( \pm 3.841 \) with 1 df.
statistically significant difference in family mobility between students who have school adjustment problems and students who are well-adjusted to school.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there are measurable differences in certain variables between elementary school students who are identified by their classroom teachers as having school adjustment problems and those students who are identified as being well-adjusted to school. The collected data indicate that the problem students scored significantly lower than the well-adjusted students on measures of personal adjustment, social adjustment, and total adjustment. The problem students also scored lower on a measure of sociometric status. In addition, the problem students scored significantly higher on a measure of family mobility than the well-adjusted students.

The null hypothesis was accepted for two variables: family type and birth order. The differences in frequency of one-parent families and two-parent families between the two groups of students were not significant. There was also no significant difference between the problem group and the well-adjusted group in terms of the relative frequency of firstborn/only children and laterborns.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

The literature on counselling has shown that the services to elementary school students are inadequate (Allan, 1976; Merchant & Zingle, 1977) and often seem to be ineffective (Alper & Kranzler, 1970; Kranzler, 1968; Mayer et al., 1967). Aubrey (1967) listed factors such as lack of a counselling theory and inappropriate training programs for elementary school counsellors as contributing in large part to the difficulties which counsellors are experiencing when working with problem students. Merchant and Zingle (1977) called for a greater research effort in determining children's needs so that counsellors would be given some directions for intervention.

This study sought to determine the characteristics of students who have been identified as having school adjustment problems and to ascertain how these problem students differ from their well-adjusted peers. The results of the study showed that the problem students shared a number of characteristics which distinguished them from the well-adjusted students.
Personal Characteristics

The results of the California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, showed that, regarding personal adjustment, problem students scored lower on tests measuring personal worth, feeling of belonging, and freedom from withdrawal tendencies. These results seem to indicate that the problem students have a sense of personal inadequacy. They feel alienated from their classmates and, possibly, exhibit a greater sense of personal insecurity than the well-adjusted students. This insecurity could inhibit their participation in classroom activities which would create a gap between the problem students and their peers and teachers.

Social Characteristics

The California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, social adjustment scale indicated that the problem students scored lower on tests measuring social standards, social skills, school relations, and community relations than the well-adjusted group. These results suggest that problem students do not know or do not accept some of the social ethics which are a part of our culture. The results also show that the problem students identify to a lesser degree with the school and with their community than do the well-adjusted students.

The sociogram showed that the problem students received significantly fewer choices from their peers than did the well-adjusted students. The problem students are therefore considered a "problem" not only by their teachers but also
by their peers who show their disapproval by not accepting them.

Family Background

The measure of family mobility showed that the problem students attended a greater number of schools than the students in the well-adjusted group. This evidence seems to indicate that some of the problem students have little chance to develop a feeling of belonging to a certain school and community since they often change their environment. An interesting fact which emerged post hoc was the evidence that, though some of the students had changed schools, their residence had not changed. Upon further investigation, the researcher learned that some students who had encountered difficulties were placed in another school in the hope of improving the students' problems. Obviously, in some cases, the practice did not prove to be successful. In retrospect, it would have been useful to include this information on school transfer in this study.

Additional Results

This study also verified the classroom teachers' identification procedure in selecting students who are in need of counselling. The problem group scored significantly lower on a measure of total adjustment which indicates that this group definitely needed specialized help in order to deal more effectively with their problems.
The California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, and the sociogram were found to be valid instruments for identifying students with school adjustment problems. Counsellors and teachers could administer these measures in order to identify high-risk students early and to plan suitable intervention strategies.

Non-significant Results

birth order:

Birth order, a measure of the number of firstborn/only children and laterborns in the two groups, did not show a significant difference. It is possible that the sample used in the study was not large enough to get a true representation of birth order. It is also possible that birth order differences show up more distinctly in older persons. The studies by MacDonald (1971) and Warren (1966) which showed birth order differences were conducted with adults.

family type:

Family type, one-parent families versus two-parent families, was a second variable which showed no significant difference between the problem group and the well-adjusted group. Possibly this evidence supports the theory suggested by Thomas (1968) that the age of the child and the length of absence of the second parent play a major role in determining the lack of a significant outcome. Burchinal (1964), on
the other hand, felt that children from broken homes are better adjusted than children from unhappy, unbroken homes. It is possible that the type of relationship which exists between the parent and child is more important than the number of parents a child has. Perhaps researchers have been in error when looking at the one-parent versus the two-parent family. It may be more productive to look at family situations, regardless of the number of parents, which seem to produce well-adjusted children and attempt to identify some common elements. Areas such as family atmosphere, childrearing practices, attitudes and personality characteristics of the parents could be examined. Researchers working in this area would probably face difficulties regarding issues such as invasion of privacy and breach of confidentiality. However, it would be extremely beneficial to discover the common elements of the families of well-adjusted students.

Summary

This study indicated that a student who exhibits school adjustment problems differs from a student who is identified as being well-adjusted to school. There is evidence to show that the problem students feel insecure about their personal worth and that they have few close contacts among their peers. These students feel alienated from the school environment and do not consider themselves to be worthwhile and contributing members of the school. The problem students
have little sense of identification with the school or feel that they do not really belong to the school and to the community.

Limitations

This study was conducted with elementary school students in Grades 6 and 7 who could be described as living in a middle-class environment. The results of this study may not be generalizable to students who live in extreme socio-economic levels, to minority group children, or to much older or much younger children. School maladjustment due to deprivation, racial problems, or age-related developmental problems is a separate issue.

A second limitation was the relatively small number of subjects in the study, a total of 40 students, 20 in the problem group and 20 in the well-adjusted group. A larger n would have added greater weight to the results.

Implications for Counselling and Recommendations

The results of this study have definite implications for counsellors who are working with elementary school students. The question "How soon can you identify problem children?" posed by Engel (1972) can be answered to some degree. The study showed that problem students in Grades 6 and 7 can be identified by administering The California Test of Personality, Grades 4-8, to them, and by constructing a classroom sociogram. It is possible that the personality
test could be used effectively with younger children, for example, Grade 4 students. Further research with younger students would be useful since early detection and intervention is seen to be important in helping students to adjust to school (Clarizio, 1970; Lewis, 1968).

This study also supported findings which claim that a relationship exists between self-concept, school adjustment, and school achievement (Coopersmith, 1959; Lewis, 1968; Williams & Cole, 1968). Unfortunately, the school systems seem to concentrate on school achievement and deal only superficially with the issues of self-concept and school adjustment. Most school districts administer I.Q. and achievement tests but very few attempt to provide valid, reliable measures of self-concept (Williams & Cole, 1968). Counsellors must make educators aware of the importance of the relationship between self-concept, school adjustment, and school achievement and utilize self-concept measures to a greater degree in their assessment procedures.

The studies by Allan (1976) and Merchant and Zingle (1977) documented graphically how scarce the service of elementary school counselling is. Many counsellors had impossible client loads and a large number of elementary school students received no counselling services whatsoever. This study showed that identification of problem students need not be a time-consuming, expensive undertaking. Individual assessments are not necessary. The California Test of Personality can be administered to a whole class in
approximately 30 minutes. Similarly, a sociogram can be conducted in a very short time. The implication here is that a teacher could undertake the process of identifying the problem students, thus leaving the counsellor free to concentrate on intervention strategies.

A further result of this study is the verification of the teachers' judgments in identifying problem students. The students who were referred for counselling scored significantly lower on measures of total adjustment and socio-metric status than the well-adjusted students. This result underscores the importance of a close liaison between teacher and counsellor. Both individuals in their different roles play an important part in dealing with problem students.

Engel's (1972) second question: "How do you best deal with problem children?" can also be discussed in light of the results of this study. Indications are that a counsellor must work in all areas of the child's life, personal, social, and environmental if the student is to benefit from counselling and if school adjustment problems are to be alleviated.

In the personal area, the counsellor would work with individual children to discuss issues of security and personal worth. The teacher and parents would also be involved in helping the child to attain a positive self-concept.

In the area of social adjustment, the counsellor could initiate group or classroom discussions centering around
social issues. The teacher could do valuable preventive work by using materials such as "The Magic Circle" by Bessel and Palomares (1970) or "The D.U.S.O Kit" by Dinkmeyer (1970). The teacher could also administer a sociogram periodically in order to obtain objective data on the social interactions of the pupils. Further research could be conducted in this area by evaluating the effects of a program in affective and social education on the school adjustment of elementary school students.

The third area where a counsellor would intervene has been labelled environmental, referring to the school situation in very general terms. What seems to be needed is an affirmative program to help students who are new to a school to adjust to their unfamiliar surroundings. The writer has been unable to find a school which has such a program. Splete and Rasmussen (1977) definitely recommended that counsellors should take a leadership role in this area and, with the help of school personnel, devise a program to suit the individual school to assist their new students. Emphasis should also be given to teaching the established students how to welcome new students and how to include them in school activities.

A further recommendation would be to evaluate the practice of transferring problem students from one school to another. Follow-up studies could be conducted to determine whether or not a student's problems are alleviated by the transfer. Also, the question of which types of problems are
diminished and which ones are exacerbated by a new environment should be addressed.

Conclusion

The results of this study give an indication of some of the needs of elementary school students who are identified as having school adjustment problems. The implications for counsellors support the theory of those researchers who stated that intervention must be with the whole child in his/her individual environment (Alper & Kranzler, 1970; Combs, 1964; Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1975; Keat, 1974). The study also gives support to Lewis' (1968) statement which indicated that a counsellor must assist children by helping them to understand society. A counsellor must help the child correct faulty assumptions regarding self-concept. And finally, a counsellor must help students and teachers understand each other.
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APPENDIX A

PARENTAL CONSENT LETTER
Parental Consent Letter

Dear Mr./Mrs.__________________:

I am a teacher in North Vancouver presently completing a Master's program with the Faculty of Education at UBC. I am asking your permission to allow your son/daughter to participate in a research project sponsored by Dr. Stephen Marks, Faculty of Education, UBC, and approved by the ________ School District. The study is intended to increase understanding of the level of personal and social adjustment of elementary school students in Grades 5-7. It is a well-documented fact that school adjustment, which includes a student's social interaction and perception of the school experience, influences his/her performance in the core subjects, especially language arts and mathematics. The purpose of the research project is to determine what children think and feel about everyday situations in order to facilitate their school adjustment and to improve their academic performance.

Your child has been chosen as a participant in this study. The task for the students will be to fill out a standardized questionnaire responding "Yes" or "No" to statements which will ask their opinion on how they usually think, how they usually feel, or what they usually do in everyday situations. The task will take about 45 minutes. Your child will not put his/her name on the questionnaire since I am interested in group performance rather than individual responses. All data will be kept completely confidential; I will be the only person administering and scoring the questionnaires. The raw data will be destroyed as soon as the study is completed.

I would be pleased to answer any questions or provide further information about any aspect of the study. Please have your child return the enclosed consent form to the school as soon as possible. Also, be assured that should your child wish to withdraw from the study at any time before or during the session, he/she will be free to do so.

I would appreciate your agreement in assisting me with this research study and I thank you for considering this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Ilse Link

Principal's Signature
APPENDIX B

REQUEST FOR SUBJECT PARTICIPATION
Request for Subject Participation

(to be read to each subject individually prior to completing questionnaire)

You may know from the letter that was sent to your parents that you were one of the students in North Vancouver chosen to take part in a research project. The project is being done to learn more about how elementary school students think about everyday things.

Remember that you do not put your name on the questionnaire which you will be asked to fill out. No one will know which is your paper and only I will see any of the questionnaires.

I want you to know that you do not have to fill out this questionnaire and that you do not have to answer any one particular question. Also, you can stop at any time if you wish, but I would appreciate your help with this project.

Before we start, are there any questions you would like to ask?
APPENDIX C

t-SCORES FOR SUBTESTS OF PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE
t-SCORES FOR SUBTESTS OF PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>t-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td>1.7828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Personal Worth</td>
<td>3.9457 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Personal Freedom</td>
<td>1.7835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Belonging</td>
<td>3.4132 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawing Tendencies (Freedom from)</td>
<td>2.6536 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous Symptoms (Freedom from)</td>
<td>0.4149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>3.3291 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at the .05 level; t-critical equals ±2.021 with 38 df.
APPENDIX D

t-SCORES FOR SUBTESTS OF SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE
### t-SCORES FOR SUBTESTS OF SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>t-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Standards</td>
<td>2.0432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>3.7442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Tendencies (Fdm)</td>
<td>1.3937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relations</td>
<td>0.8588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Relations</td>
<td>4.2804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.6281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>3.4490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at the .05 level; t-critical equals ±2.021 with 38 df.
APPENDIX E

MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT
PREVIOUSLY Copyrighted MATERIAL
IN APPENDIX E, LEAVES 87-94.
NOT microfilmed.

Elementary grades 4,5,6,7,8, form AA
California Test of Personality
1953 Revision

May be obtained from:

CTB/McGraw-Hill
Del Monte Research Park,
Monterey, California
93940
Elementary • Grades 4-5-6-7-8 • form AA
California Test of Personality
1953 Revision
Devised by
LOUIS P. THORPE, WILLIS W. CLARK, AND ERNEST W. TIEGS

Do not write or mark on this booklet unless told to do so by the examiner.

(CIRCLE ONE)
Name................................. Last First Middle
Grade..................... Boy Girl

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

Date of Birth........... Month Day Year

INSTRUCTIONS TO PUPILS:
This booklet contains 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.
INSTRUCTIONS TO PUPILS

DO NOT WRITE OR MARK ON THIS TEST BOOKLET UNLESS TOLD TO DO SO BY THE EXAMINER.

You are to decide for each question whether the answer is YES or NO and mark it as you are told. The following are two sample questions:

SAMPLES
A. Do you have a dog at home? YES NO
B. Can you ride a bicycle? YES NO

DIRECTIONS FOR MARKING ANSWERS

ON ANSWER SHEETS
Make a heavy black mark under the word YES or NO to show your answer. If you have a dog at home, you would mark under the YES for question A as shown below. If you cannot ride a bicycle, you would mark under the NO for question B as shown below.

A  YES  NO
B  YES  NO

Remember, you mark under the word that shows your answer. Now find Samples A and B on your answer sheet and show your answer for each by marking YES or NO. Do it now. Find answer row number 1 on your answer sheet. Now wait until the examiner tells you to begin.

ON TEST BOOKLETS
Draw a circle around the word YES or NO, whichever shows your answer. If you have a dog at home, draw a circle around the word YES in Sample A above; if not, draw a circle around the word NO. Do it now.

If you can ride a bicycle, draw a circle around the word YES in Sample B above; if not, draw a circle around the word NO. Do it now.

Now wait until the examiner tells you to begin.

After the examiner tells you to begin, go right on from one page to another until you have finished the test or are told to stop. Work as fast as you can without making mistakes. Now look at item 1 on page 3. Ready, begin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you usually keep at your work until it is done?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you usually apologize when you are wrong?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you help other boys and girls have a good time at parties?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you usually believe what other boys or girls tell you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is it easy for you to recite or talk in class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When you have some free time, do you usually ask your parents or teacher what to do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you usually go to bed on time, even when you wish to stay up?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is it hard to do your work when someone blames you for something?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Can you often get boys and girls to do what you want them to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do your parents or teachers usually need to tell you to do your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If you are a boy, do you talk to new girls? If you are a girl, do you talk to new boys?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Would you rather plan your own work than to have someone else plan it for you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do your friends generally think that your ideas are good?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do people often do nice things for you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you wish that your father (or mother) had a better job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are your friends and classmates usually interested in the things you do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do your classmates seem to think that you are not a good friend?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do your friends and classmates often want to help you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Are you sometimes cheated when you trade things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Do your classmates and friends usually feel that they know more than you do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do your folks seem to think that you are doing well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Can you do most of the things you try?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Do people often think that you cannot do things very well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Do most of your friends and classmates think you are bright?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Do you feel that your folks boss you too much?  
   YES  NO

26. Are you allowed enough time to play?  
   YES  NO

27. May you usually bring your friends home when you want to?  
   YES  NO

28. Do others usually decide to which parties you may go?  
   YES  NO

29. May you usually do what you want to during your spare time?  
   YES  NO

30. Are you prevented from doing most of the things you want to?  
   YES  NO

31. Do your folks often stop you from going around with your friends?  
   YES  NO

32. Do you have a chance to see many new things?  
   YES  NO

33. Are you given some spending money?  
   YES  NO

34. Do your folks stop you from taking short walks with your friends?  
   YES  NO

35. Are you punished for lots of little things?  
   YES  NO

36. Do some people try to rule you so much that you don't like it?  
   YES  NO

37. Do pets and animals make friends with you easily?  
   YES  NO

38. Are you proud of your school?  
   YES  NO

39. Do your classmates think you cannot do well in school?  
   YES  NO

40. Are you as well and strong as most boys and girls?  
   YES  NO

41. Are your cousins, aunts, uncles, or grandparents as nice as those of most of your friends?  
   YES  NO

42. Are the members of your family usually good to you?  
   YES  NO

43. Do you often think that nobody likes you?  
   YES  NO

44. Do you feel that most of your classmates are glad that you are a member of the class?  
   YES  NO

45. Do you have just a few friends?  
   YES  NO

46. Do you often wish you had some other parents?  
   YES  NO

47. Is it hard to find friends who will keep your secrets?  
   YES  NO

48. Do the boys and girls usually invite you to their parties?  
   YES  NO
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49. Have people often been so unfair that you gave up?  YES NO

50. Would you rather stay away from most parties?  YES NO

51. Does it make you shy to have everyone look at you when you enter a room?  YES NO

52. Are you often greatly discouraged about many things that are important to you?  YES NO

53. Do your friends or your work often make you worry?  YES NO

54. Is your work often so hard that you stop trying?  YES NO

55. Are people often so unkind or unfair that it makes you feel bad?  YES NO

56. Do your friends or classmates often say or do things that hurt your feelings?  YES NO

57. Do people often try to cheat you or do mean things to you?  YES NO

58. Are you often with people who have so little interest in you that you feel lonesome?  YES NO

59. Are your studies or your life so dull that you often think about many other things?  YES NO

60. Are people often mean or unfair to you?  YES NO

SECTION 1 F

61. Do you often have dizzy spells?  YES NO

62. Do you often have bad dreams?  YES NO

63. Do you often bite your fingernails?  YES NO

64. Do you seem to have more headaches than most children?  YES NO

65. Is it hard for you to keep from being restless much of the time?  YES NO

66. Do you often find you are not hungry at meal time?  YES NO

67. Do you catch cold easily?  YES NO

68. Do you often feel tired before noon?  YES NO

69. Do you believe that you have more bad dreams than most of the boys and girls?  YES NO

70. Do you often feel sick to your stomach?  YES NO

71. Do you often have sneezing spells?  YES NO

72. Do your eyes hurt often?  YES NO
73. Is it all right to cheat in a game when the umpire is not looking? **YES NO**

74. Is it all right to disobey teachers if you think they are not fair to you? **YES NO**

75. Should one return things to people who won’t return things they borrow? **YES NO**

76. Is it all right to take things you need if you have no money? **YES NO**

77. Is it necessary to thank those who have helped you? **YES NO**

78. Do children need to obey their fathers or mothers even when their friends tell them not to? **YES NO**

79. If a person finds something, does he have a right to keep it or sell it? **YES NO**

80. Do boys and girls need to do what their teachers say is right? **YES NO**

81. Should boys and girls ask their parents for permission to do things? **YES NO**

82. Should children be nice to people they don’t like? **YES NO**

83. Is it all right for children to cry or whine when their parents keep them home from a show? **YES NO**

84. When people get sick or are in trouble, is it usually their own fault? **YES NO**

85. Do you let people know you are right no matter what they say? **YES NO**

86. Do you try games at parties even if you haven’t played them before? **YES NO**

87. Do you help new pupils to talk to other children? **YES NO**

88. Does it make you feel angry when you lose in games at parties? **YES NO**

89. Do you usually help other boys and girls have a good time? **YES NO**

90. Is it hard for you to talk to people as soon as you meet them? **YES NO**

91. Do you usually act friendly to people you do not like? **YES NO**

92. Do you often change your plans in order to help people? **YES NO**

93. Do you usually forget the names of people you meet? **YES NO**

94. Do the boys and girls seem to think you are nice to them? **YES NO**

95. Do you usually keep from showing your temper when you are angry? **YES NO**

96. Do you talk to new children at school? **YES NO**
SECTION 2 C

97. Do you like to scare or push smaller boys and girls?  
   YES NO
98. Have unfair people often said that you made trouble for them?  
   YES NO
99. Do you often make friends or classmates do things they don’t want to?  
   YES NO
100. Is it hard to make people remember how well you can do things?  
   YES NO
101. Do people often act so mean that you have to be nasty to them?  
   YES NO
102. Do you often have to make a “fuss” or “act up” to get what you deserve?  
   YES NO
103. Is anyone at school so mean that you tear, or cut, or break things?  
   YES NO
104. Are people often so unfair that you lose your temper?  
   YES NO
105. Is someone at home so mean that you often have to quarrel?  
   YES NO
106. Do you sometimes need something so much that it is all right to take it?  
   YES NO
107. Do classmates often quarrel with you?  
   YES NO
108. Do people often ask you to do such hard or foolish things that you won’t do them?  
   YES NO

GO RIGHT ON TO THE NEXT COLUMN

SECTION 2 D

109. Do your folks seem to think that you are just as good as they are?  
   YES NO
110. Do you have a hard time because it seems that your folks hardly ever have enough money?  
   YES NO
111. Are you unhappy because your folks do not care about the things you like?  
   YES NO
112. When your folks make you mind are they usually nice to you about it?  
   YES NO
113. Do your folks often claim that you are not as nice to them as you should be?  
   YES NO
114. Do you like both of your parents about the same?  
   YES NO
115. Do you feel that your folks fuss at you instead of helping you?  
   YES NO
116. Do you sometimes feel like running away from home?  
   YES NO
117. Do you try to keep boys and girls away from your home because it isn’t as nice as theirs?  
   YES NO
118. Does it seem to you that your folks at home often treat you mean?  
   YES NO
119. Do you feel that no one at home loves you?  
   YES NO
120. Do you feel that too many people at home try to boss you?  
   YES NO

GO RIGHT ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
### SECTION 2 E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121. Do you think that the boys and girls at school like you as well as they should?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Do you think that the children would be happier if the teacher were not so strict?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. Is it fun to do nice things for some of the other boys or girls?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. Is school work so hard that you are afraid you will fail?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Do your schoolmates seem to think that you are nice to them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Does it seem to you that some of the teachers “have it in for” pupils?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. Do many of the children get along with the teacher much better than you do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. Would you like to stay home from school a lot if it were right to do so?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. Are most of the boys and girls at school so bad that you try to stay away from them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. Have you found that some of the teachers do not like to be with the boys and girls?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. Do many of the other boys or girls claim that they play games more fairly than you do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132. Are the boys and girls at school usually nice to you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 2 F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133. Do you visit many of the interesting places near where you live?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. Do you think there are too few interesting places near your home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. Do you sometimes do things to make the place in which you live look nicer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. Do you ever help clean up things near your home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. Do you take good care of your own pets or help with other people’s pets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. Do you sometimes help other people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. Do you try to get your friends to obey the laws?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. Do you help children keep away from places where they might get sick?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. Do you dislike many of the people who live near your home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. Is it all right to do what you please if the police are not around?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. Does it make you glad to see the people living near you get along fine?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. Would you like to have things look better around your home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>