IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 23, Issue 9, Ver. 3 (September. 2018) 48-60
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

A Study of Temperament of School Going Adolescents Belonging To Different Sociometric Groups

Dr. Ram Singh,
Assistant Professor in Education Government Degree College Samba, J&K, India
Corresponding Author: Dr. Ram Singh,

Abstract: Temperament refers to the reaction of the person toward emotional situation. By knowing temperament of the person, one can estimate personality of the person because this is related to the consistency or mental imbalance and considered as one of the important factors of personality. From temperament, character is built under the touch of experience and the guidance of increasing knowledge and intelligence. In the present study, temperament of below average, neglected, rejected and isolated groups of students was compared on fifteen different dimensions. These dimensions are: sociability, ascendance, secretive, reflective, impulsive, placid, accepting, responsible, vigorous, cooperative, persistence, warmth, aggressive, tolerance and tough minded and total scores for temperament. The overall initial sample consisted of 500 students from various schools selected at random, out of which 160 students were picked on the basis of fixed sociometric criteria comprising of an equal number of boys and girls. The sociometric groups of students viz. below average, neglected, rejected and isolates were identified by using the Sociometric Questionnaire prepared by Dr. A.N Sharma**.** Dimensions of Temperament scale (DTS) prepared by Dr. N. K. Chadha and Ms. Sunanda Chandana was employed on the identified sociometric groups of students. The data was analysed by using statistical techniques viz. Mean, S.D and Critical Ratio

Date of Submission: 02-09-2018 Date of acceptance: 18-09-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

Research in education is assuming greater urgency because of the rapid expansion and democratization of education, especially in India, during the past few decades. New educational problems have arisen and many old problems in various fields have become more complicated and acute. For a successful solution to the multitude of old and new problems, it is realized that research work, adequate both in quantity and quality, should be carried out. Since the focus of educational research is the development of the pupil's temperament and his academic achievement, it is obvious that studies on subjects like "temperament and sociometric status" should contribute to the major area of educational research. It is, therefore, important to know how the results of the present research can influence the prevailing educational theories and practices in order to justify its worthwhileness, urgency and value to educators. Research evidence is available to show that student learn more when their teachers possess a great deal of information about them as individuals. The teacher can learn much about the social development of the child by knowing the friends he has and his capabilities of forming friendships. The teacher, by making a study of the temperament of his pupils and their sociometric status, may be able to understand the causes for their social acceptance or rejection. This will help him understand the social life of his pupils by an idea of their likes and dislikes for other students. It will also show the formation of groups and cliques in the classroom.

The present study will also alert the teacher as to what his pupils consider to be their relative group positions. The teacher will come to know about the personality patterns of his pupils. Such knowledge can also be useful for a teacher who desires to know where to begin the work of improving the general effectiveness of the school educational programme. It will also enable him to understand how far the temperament will affect their learning.

From the behavioural point of view it has become increasingly clear that the students* personality traits are influenced by experiences outside the school as well as by those in the school. A teacher can work more effectively if he knows the out-of-school experiences of the students, of which the home environment for instance, has a powerful impact in shaping a personality. Furthermore, parents have recognised that it is difficult to understand and guide the child's behaviour at home unless they have some knowledge of his experiences at school.

This means that schools and parents have a Joint responsibility for the personality development of the students. This sociometric study will enable the teachers to guide the parents about the general behaviour of

their children at school. Children's low achievement or certain personality characteristics can give some insight into the causes of events, which should help them provide effective guidance to their children.

In the view of this, the present investigation was undertaken to study the temperament of school going adolescents belonging to different sociometric groups. The adolescent students belonging to below average, neglected, rejected and isolate sociometric groups were compared on fifteen dimensions of temperament and total temperament scores in the general view.

Objectives of the study

1. To identify below average, neglected, rejected and isolate adolescent boys and girls on the basis of sociometric status scores.
2.To study and compare the significance of differences of mean scores on fifteen different dimensions of temperament (sociability, ascendance, secretiveness, reflective, impulsivity, placid, accepting, responsible, vigorous, cooperative, persistence, warmth, aggressiveness, tolerance and tough minded) and total score for temperament between the below average & neglected; below average & rejected; below average &isolate, neglected & rejected; neglected &isolate and rejected & isolate sociometric groups of adolescents respectively.

Hypotheses

There will be no significance of differences of mean scores on fifteen different dimensions of temperament (sociability, ascendance, secretiveness, reflective, impulsivity, placid, accepting, responsible, vigorous, cooperative, persistence, warmth, aggressiveness, tolerance and tough minded) and total score for temperament between the below average & neglected; below average & rejected; below average & isolate, neglected & rejected; neglected & isolate and rejected & isolate sociometric groups of adolescents respectively.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The study was restricted to high school students studying in class X of schools located in Kathua town of J &K State only.
2. The study was confined to co-educational High schools only.
3. The study was confined to schools recognized by J & K Government and affiliated to JKBOSE.
4. The study was confined to below average, neglected, rejected and isolate sociometric groups of students only.
5. The students in different sociometric groups were identified on a three criteria three choice sociometric questionnaire using Bronfenbrenner's fixed frame of reference only.
6. The study was limited to only Hindi knowing students as the tools used were in Hindi language.

Plan and Procedure

Population

The entire population of the present study comprised of the X class students studying in various Government and Private co-educational institutions located in district Kathua.

Sample

The overall initial sample consisted of 500 students from various schools selected at random, out of which 160 students were picked on the basis of fixed sociometric criteria (Below average: 40, Neglectee: 40, Rejected: 40, Isolate: 40) comprising of an equal number of boys and girls (20 each) from each sociometric category.

Table.1 Sociometric categorization out of the Sample Pool

S.No.	Name of the School	Class enrolment	Sample Category and Size							
			Below Average		Neglectee		Rejectee		Isolate	
			Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
1	Govt. High School, Govindsar, Kathua	49	3	4	4	2	1	2	1	0
2	Govt. High School, Kharote, Kathua	45	3	3	3	2	1	2	3	4
3	Govt. Girls Higher Secondary School, Kathua	46	5	0	5	0	3	0	2	0
4	Govt. Girls Higher Secondary School, Kathua	40	5	0	6	0	5	0	5	4
5	Govt. Boys Higher Secondary School, Kathua	44	0	7	0	6	0	2	0	2
6	Govt. Boys Higher Secondary School, Kathua	43	0	8	0	4	0	3	0	5
7	Govt. High School, Lakhanpur, Kathua	49	3	6	1	2	3	3	6	2

8	Govt. High School, Lacchipur, Kathua	44	3	4	2	4	3	6	2	4
9	Govt. High School, Khokhyal, Kathua	50	5	3	1	1	2	3	4	9
10	Govt. High School, Logate, Kathua	46	2	6	4	3	2	3	2	0
11	Govt. High School, Nagri, Kathua	44	5	4	3	1	4	3	4	1
Total 500		**Students**	**34**	**45**	**29**	**25**	**24**	**27**	**29**	**31**

Table 2 Students selected for temperament studies from sociometric categories

S. No.	**Name of the School**	**Class enrolment**	**Sample Category and Size**							
			Below Average		**Neglectee**		**Rejectee**		**Isolate**	
			Boys	**Girls**	**Boys**	**Girls**	**Boys**	**Girls**	**Boys**	**Girls**
1	Govt. High School, Govindsar, Kathua	49	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	0
2	Govt. High School, Kharote, Kathua	45	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2
3	Govt. Girls Higher Secondary School, Kathua	46	4	0	3	0	3	0	1	0
4	Govt. Girls Higher Secondary School, Kathua	40	3	0	3	0	4	0	3	3
5	Govt. Boys Higher Secondary School, Kathua	44	0	4	0	3	0	2	0	2
6	Govt. Boys Higher Secondary School, Kathua	43	0	4	0	4	0	2	0	3
7	Govt. High School, Lakhanpur, Kathua	49	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	2
8	Govt. High School, Lacchipur, Kathua	44	2	1	2	3	2	4	2	3
9	Govt. High School, Khokhyal, Kathua	50	2	3	1	1	1	2	3	4
10	Govt. High School, Logate, Kathua	46	1	1	3	3	2	2	2	0
11	Govt. High School, Nagri, Kathua	44	3	1	2	1	4	2	3	1
Total Students			**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**

Tools used

a) Sociometric Questionnaire: In the present study, sociometric Questionnaire prepared by Dr. A. N. Sharma was used to identify three sociometric groups of students viz. below average, neglected, rejected and isolate. It simply asks the students to choose from amongst themselves companions or partners for activity or occasion that is dear to them and also to name those whom they would like least to have companions or partners for that activity or occasion.

b) Dimensions of Temperament scale (DTS): In the present study, Dimensions of Temperament Scale (DTS) was employed which is prepared by Dr. N. K. Chadha and Ms. Sunanda Chandana. It is constructed to measure the different dimensions of temperament viz. sociability, Ascendance, Secretiveness, Reflective, Impulsivity, Placid, Accepting, Responsible, Vigorous, Co-operative, Persistence, Warmth, Aggressiveness, Tolerance and Tough minded. The scale contains 152 items in all. All the items of this scale are constructed according to the Personality dimensions of temperament. The answers to the items are to be given in the Answer sheet of DTS by marking tick (√) to either "Yes" or"No".

Statistical techniques used:
Mean , S.D. and Critical Ratio

Analysis of Data and Presentation of Results
Analysis of data helps the researcher to develop an alert flexible and open mind. No similarities, differences, trends and outstanding factors are allowed to go unnoticed. This stage involves studying the data from different angles to find out new facts.

1. Identification of Sociometric Categories and Analysis of Sociometrices
The first objective of the present study was to identify the sociometric categories in the study sample. Sociometrices and sociograms based on the sociometric questionnaire (which was given to the students to sort out categories of students, i.e. populars, above average, average, below average, neglectees, isolates and

rejectees) were prepared. Out of the six categories referred to above only four were taken up for the present investigation. These were Below average, Neglectee, Rejectee and Isolate.

2. Mean comparison between different Sociometric Groups of Adolescent Students with regard to different Dimensions of Temperament

The second objective of the present study was to study and compare the significance of differences of mean scores of fifteen different dimensions of temperament (sociability, ascendance, secretiveness, reflective, impulsivity, placid, accepting, responsible, vigorous, cooperative, persistence, warmth, aggressiveness, tolerance and tough minded) and total score for temperament between the below average & neglectee; below average & rejectee; below average & isolate, neglectee & rejectee; neglectee & isolate and rejectee & isolate sociometric groups of adolescents students respectively. The findings on different dimensions of the temperament in the students of the above mentioned sociometric groups are presented in the tables 3 to 18.

Table 3: Mean comparison of SOCIABILITY as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	6.0250	1.1655	0.1843	0.2642	4.0692**
	Neglectee	40	4.9500	1.1972	0.1893		
2	Below Average	40	6.0250	1.1655	0.1843	0.2503	3.7951**
	Rejectee	40	5.0750	1.0715	0.1694		
3	Below Average	40	6.0250	1.1655	0.1843	0.2531	3.1605**
	Isolate	40	5.2250	1.0975	0.1735		
4	Neglectee	40	4.9500	1.1972	0.1893	0.2540	0.4921 ns
	Rejectee	40	5.0750	1.0715	0.1694		
5	Neglectee	40	4.9500	1.1972	0.1893	0.2568	1.0709 ns
	Isolate	40	5.2250	1.0975	0.1735		
6	Rejectee	40	5.0750	1.0715	0.1694	0.2425	0.6185 ns
	Isolate	40	5.2250	1.0975	0.1735		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 4: Mean comparison of ASCENDANCE as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	4.9000	1.1277	0.1783	0.2511	3.8826**
	Neglectee	40	3.9250	1.1183	0.1768		
2	Below Average	40	4.9000	1.1277	0.1783	0.2881	3.6443**
	Rejectee	40	5.9500	1.4313	0.2263		
3	Below Average	40	4.9000	1.1277	0.1783	0.2402	4.2680**
	Isolate	40	3.8750	1.0175	0.1609		
4	Neglectee	40	3.9250	1.1183	0.1768	0.2872	7.0508**
	Rejectee	40	5.9500	1.4313	0.2263		
5	Neglectee	40	3.9250	1.1183	0.1768	0.2391	0.2092 ns
	Isolate	40	3.8750	1.0175	0.1609		
6	Rejectee	40	5.9500	1.4313	0.2263	0.2777	7.4730**
	Isolate	40	3.8750	1.0175	0.1609		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 5: Mean comparison of SECRETIVENESS as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	5.1500	1.5450	0.2443	0.3132	0.3990 ns
	Neglectee	40	5.2750	1.2401	0.1961		
2	Below Average	40	5.1500	1.5450	0.2443	0.3470	3.3858**
	Rejectee	40	6.3250	1.5589	0.2465		
3	Below Average	40	5.1500	1.5450	0.2443	0.3075	5.0408**
	Isolate	40	6.7000	1.1810	0.1867		
4	Neglectee	40	5.2750	1.2401	0.1961	0.3150	3.3338**
	Rejectee	40	6.3250	1.5589	0.2465		
5	Neglectee	40	5.2750	1.2401	0.1961	0.2708	5.2627**
	Isolate	40	6.7000	1.1810	0.1867		
6	Rejectee	40	6.3250	1.5589	0.2465	0.3092	1.2127 ns
	Isolate	40	6.7000	1.1810	0.1867		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 6: Mean comparison of REFLECTIVE as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	4.9750	1.8465	0.2920	0.3531	2.0534*
	Neglectee	40	4.2500	1.2558	0.1986		
2	Below Average	40	4.9750	1.8465	0.2920	0.3589	1.9504 ns
	Rejectee	40	4.2750	1.3202	0.2087		
3	Below Average	40	4.9750	1.8465	0.2920	0.3424	2.7016**
	Isolate	40	4.0500	1.1311	0.1788		
4	Neglectee	40	4.2500	1.2558	0.1986	0.2881	0.0868 ns
	Rejectee	40	4.2750	1.3202	0.2087		
5	Neglectee	40	4.2500	1.2558	0.1986	0.2672	0.7484 ns
	Isolate	40	4.0500	1.1311	0.1788		
6	Rejectee	40	4.2750	1.3202	0.2087	0.2749	0.8185 ns
	Isolate	40	4.0500	1.1311	0.1788		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 7: Mean comparison of IMPULSIVITY as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	4.5250	1.3395	0.2118	0.3566	0.9816 ns

	Neglectee	40	4.8750	1.8143	0.2869		
2	Below Average	40	4.5250	1.3395	0.2118	0.2725	1.9263 ns
	Rejectee	40	5.0500	1.0849	0.1715		
3	Below Average	40	4.5250	1.3395	0.2118	0.2625	1.0477 ns
	Isolate	40	4.2500	0.9806	0.1550		
4	Neglectee	40	4.8750	1.8143	0.2869	0.3342	0.5236 ns
	Rejectee	40	5.0500	1.0849	0.1715		
5	Neglectee	40	4.8750	1.8143	0.2869	0.3261	1.9167 ns
	Isolate	40	4.2500	0.9806	0.1550		
6	Rejectee	40	5.0500	1.0849	0.1715	0.2312	3.4599**
	Isolate	40	4.2500	0.9806	0.1550		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 8: Mean comparison of PLACID as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	5.1000	1.6610	0.2626	0.3776	4.8337**
	Neglectee	40	6.9250	1.7155	0.2712		
2	Below Average	40	5.1000	1.6610	0.2626	0.3402	0.9552 ns
	Rejectee	40	4.7750	1.3679	0.2163		
3	Below Average	40	5.1000	1.6610	0.2626	0.3218	4.2725**
	Isolate	40	6.4750	1.1764	0.1860		
4	Neglectee	40	6.9250	1.7155	0.2712	0.3469	6.1974**
	Rejectee	40	4.7750	1.3679	0.2163		
5	Neglectee	40	6.9250	1.7155	0.2712	0.3289	1.3682 ns
	Isolate	40	6.4750	1.1764	0.1860		
6	Rejectee	40	4.7750	1.3679	0.2163	0.2853	5.9593**
	Isolate	40	6.4750	1.1764	0.1860		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 9: Mean comparison of ACCEPTING as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	4.0500	0.9594	0.1517	0.2262	0.4421 ns
	Neglectee	40	3.9500	1.0610	0.1678		
2	Below Average	40	4.0500	0.9594	0.1517	0.2422	3.9226**
	Rejectee	40	3.1000	1.1940	0.1888		
3	Below Average	40	4.0500	0.9594	0.1517	0.2246	1.6698 ns
	Isolate	40	3.6750	1.0473	0.1656		
4	Neglectee	40	3.9500	1.0610	0.1678	0.2526	3.3657**
	Rejectee	40	3.1000	1.1940	0.1888		
5	Neglectee	40	3.9500	1.0610	0.1678	0.2357	1.1667 ns

	Isolate	40	3.6750	1.0473	0.1656		
6	Rejectee	40	3.1000	1.1940	0.1888	0.2511	2.2897*
	Isolate	40	3.6750	1.0473	0.1656		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 10: Mean comparison of RESPONSIBLE as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	4.7750	0.9195	0.1454	0.2119	5.3080**
	Neglectee	40	3.6500	0.9753	0.1542		
2	Below Average	40	4.7750	0.9195	0.1454	0.2531	2.1729*
	Rejectee	40	4.2250	1.3105	0.2072		
3	Below Average	40	4.7750	0.9195	0.1454	0.2294	2.7248**
	Isolate	40	4.1500	1.1220	0.1774		
4	Neglectee	40	3.6500	0.9753	0.1542	0.2583	2.2262*
	Rejectee	40	4.2250	1.3105	0.2072		
5	Neglectee	40	3.6500	0.9753	0.1542	0.2351	2.1271*
	Isolate	40	4.1500	1.1220	0.1774		
6	Rejectee	40	4.2250	1.3105	0.2072	0.2728	0.2750 ns
	Isolate	40	4.1500	1.1220	0.1774		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 11: Mean comparison of VIGOROUS as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	6.6250	1.6747	0.2648	0.4138	1.0874 ns
	Neglectee	40	6.1750	2.0113	0.3180		
2	Below Average	40	6.6250	1.6747	0.2648	0.3684	1.3571 ns
	Rejectee	40	6.1250	1.6202	0.2562		
3	Below Average	40	6.6250	1.6747	0.2648	0.3483	3.0862**
	Isolate	40	5.5500	1.4313	0.2263		
4	Neglectee	40	6.1750	2.0113	0.3180	0.4084	0.1224 ns
	Rejectee	40	6.1250	1.6202	0.2562		
5	Neglectee	40	6.1750	2.0113	0.3180	0.3903	1.6012 ns
	Isolate	40	5.5500	1.4313	0.2263		
6	Rejectee	40	6.1250	1.6202	0.2562	0.3418	1.6822 ns
	Isolate	40	5.5500	1.4313	0.2263		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 12: Mean comparison of COOPERATIVE as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	6.7000	1.3243	0.2094	0.2961	4.8125**
	Neglectee	40	8.1250	1.3241	0.2094		
2	Below Average	40	6.7000	1.3243	0.2094	0.3061	4.9819**
	Rejectee	40	5.1750	1.4122	0.2233		
3	Below Average	40	6.7000	1.3243	0.2094	0.3276	2.8240**
	Isolate	40	5.7750	1.5931	0.2519		
4	Neglectee	40	8.1250	1.3241	0.2094	0.3061	9.6380**
	Rejectee	40	5.1750	1.4122	0.2233		
5	Neglectee	40	8.1250	1.3241	0.2094	0.3275	7.1749**
	Isolate	40	5.7750	1.5931	0.2519		
6	Rejectee	40	5.1750	1.4122	0.2233	0.3366	1.7825 ns
	Isolate	40	5.7750	1.5931	0.2519		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 13: Mean comparison of PERSISTENCE as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	4.7750	1.1433	0.1808	0.2516	0.1987 ns
	Neglectee	40	4.8250	1.1068	0.1750		
2	Below Average	40	4.7750	1.1433	0.1808	0.2454	7.3348**
	Rejectee	40	2.9750	1.0497	0.1660		
3	Below Average	40	4.7750	1.1433	0.1808	0.2512	4.0797**
	Isolate	40	3.7500	1.1036	0.1745		
4	Neglectee	40	4.8250	1.1068	0.1750	0.2412	7.6703**
	Rejectee	40	2.9750	1.0497	0.1660		
5	Neglectee	40	4.8250	1.1068	0.1750	0.2471	4.3499**
	Isolate	40	3.7500	1.1036	0.1745		
6	Rejectee	40	2.9750	1.0497	0.1660	0.2408	3.2181**
	Isolate	40	3.7500	1.1036	0.1745		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 14: Mean comparison of WARMTH as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	8.9000	1.8784	0.2970	0.4221	4.9746**
	Neglectee	40	6.8000	1.8974	0.3000		
2	Below Average	40	8.9000	1.8784	0.2970	0.3911	7.9910**

	Rejectee	40	5.7750	1.6091	0.2544		
3	Below Average	40	8.9000	1.8784	0.2970	0.3922	7.9035**
	Isolate	40	5.8000	1.6204	0.2562		
4	Neglectee	40	6.8000	1.8974	0.3000	0.3934	2.6058**
	Rejectee	40	5.7750	1.6091	0.2544		
5	Neglectee	40	6.8000	1.8974	0.3000	0.3945	2.5348*
	Isolate	40	5.8000	1.6204	0.2562		
6	Rejectee	40	5.7750	1.6091	0.2544	0.3611	0.0692 ns
	Isolate	40	5.8000	1.6204	0.2562		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 15: Mean comparison of AGGRESSIVENESS as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	5.3250	1.4031	0.2218	0.3086	0.4861 ns
	Neglectee	40	5.1750	1.3566	0.2145		
2	Below Average	40	5.3250	1.4031	0.2218	0.3071	5.8608**
	Rejectee	40	7.1250	1.3433	0.2124		
3	Below Average	40	5.3250	1.4031	0.2218	0.3244	3.2369**
	Isolate	40	6.3750	1.4968	0.2367		
4	Neglectee	40	5.1750	1.3566	0.2145	0.3019	6.4599**
	Rejectee	40	7.1250	1.3433	0.2124		
5	Neglectee	40	5.1750	1.3566	0.2145	0.3194	3.7570**
	Isolate	40	6.3750	1.4968	0.2367		
6	Rejectee	40	7.1250	1.3433	0.2124	0.3180	2.3585*
	Isolate	40	6.3750	1.4968	0.2367		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 16: Mean comparison of TOLERANCE as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	6.5750	1.3183	0.2084	0.3032	0.0825 ns
	Neglectee	40	6.6000	1.3923	0.2201		
2	Below Average	40	6.5750	1.3183	0.2084	0.2871	6.6188**
	Rejectee	40	4.6750	1.2483	0.1974		
3	Below Average	40	6.5750	1.3183	0.2084	0.3026	3.0565**
	Isolate	40	5.6500	1.3877	0.2194		
4	Neglectee	40	6.6000	1.3923	0.2201	0.2957	6.5107**
	Rejectee	40	4.6750	1.2483	0.1974		
5	Neglectee	40	6.6000	1.3923	0.2201	0.3108	3.0565**
	Isolate	40	5.6500	1.3877	0.2194		
6	Rejectee	40	4.6750	1.2483	0.1974	0.2951	3.3037**
	Isolate	40	5.6500	1.3877	0.2194		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 17: Mean comparison of TOUGH-MINDED as one of the dimensions of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	4.2000	0.9115	0.1441	0.2109	5.8089**
	Neglectee	40	2.9750	0.9737	0.1540		
2	Below Average	40	4.2000	0.9115	0.1441	0.2557	5.0840**
	Rejectee	40	2.9000	1.3359	0.2112		
3	Below Average	40	4.2000	0.9115	0.1441	0.2169	6.5706**
	Isolate	40	2.7750	1.0250	0.1621		
4	Neglectee	40	2.9750	0.9737	0.1540	0.2614	0.2869 ns
	Rejectee	40	2.9000	1.3359	0.2112		
5	Neglectee	40	2.9750	0.9737	0.1540	0.2235	0.8947 ns
	Isolate	40	2.7750	1.0250	0.1621		
6	Rejectee	40	2.9000	1.3359	0.2112	0.2662	0.4695 ns
	Isolate	40	2.7750	1.0250	0.1621		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

Table 18: Mean comparison of Total Score of Temperament between different Sociometric Groups of adolescent students

S.No.	Sociometric Group	N	M	SD	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Below Average	40	82.6000	7.2706	1.1496	1.3991	2.9484**
	Neglectee	40	78.4750	5.0433	0.7974		
2	Below Average	40	82.6000	7.2706	1.1496	1.4218	6.3827**
	Rejectee	40	73.5250	5.2914	0.8367		
3	Below Average	40	82.6000	7.2706	1.1496	1.4716	5.7930**
	Isolate	40	74.0750	5.8106	0.9187		
4	Neglectee	40	78.4750	5.0433	0.7974	1.1558	4.2828**
	Rejectee	40	73.5250	5.2914	0.8367		
5	Neglectee	40	78.4750	5.0433	0.7974	1.2165	3.6168**
	Isolate	40	74.0750	5.8106	0.9187		
6	Rejectee	40	73.5250	5.2914	0.8367	1.2426	0.4426ns
	Isolate	40	74.0750	5.8106	0.9187		

N=number of students; M=mean; SD=standard deviation; SEM=standard error of mean; SEDM=standard error of differences between two means; CR=critical ratio
* Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level; ns = non-significant

II. MAIN FINDINGS

A. Sociability

- Below average students differ significantly from rest of the sociometric groups of adolescent students in terms of Sociability. Below average are more social compared to neglectee, rejectee and isolate students.
- Neglectee, Rejectee and Isolate students have almost same sociability
- Rejectee students are least social.

B.**Ascendance**

- Rejectee students tend to be highly dominating and show significantly very high differences from rest of the sociometric groups of students, which can be the reason behind other students rejecting them.
- Neglectee and Isolate students have least and nearly same ascendance.

C.Secretiveness

- Isolate followed by Rejectee sociometric groups are most secretive and show significantly very high differences in terms of secretiveness from Below average and Neglectee students.
- Below average and Neglectee students are least secretive.

D.Reflective

- There is not much difference between different sociometric groups but Below average are still the most Reflective group and differ significantly from Neglectee and Isolates.
- Isolate students are least reflective off all the sociometric groups.

E.Impulsivity

- Rejectee students are found to be highly impulsive and isolates are least impulsive.
- Neglectee and Rejectee students are equally impulsive.

F.Placid

- Neglectee and Isolate students are very placid and differ significantly from rest of the sociometric groups in terms of their calmness.
- Rejectee students are least placid as are the below average students.

G. Accepting

- Below average students are most accepting group.
- Rejectees are the least accepting students and show significantly very large differences from rest the groups in terms of this behaviour.
- Not significant difference is there between Below average, Neglectee and Isolate students in terms of 'Accepting' behaviour.

H.Responsible

- Below average students are most responsible and Neglectee students are least responsible among all the groups.
- Rejectee and isolate students tend to have almost same behaviour in terms of'Responsible' dimension.

I.**Vigorous**

- All groups are almost similar in behaviour in terms of 'Vigorous' dimension.
- Though, Below average students were most vigorous and Isolates were least vigorous

J.Cooperative

- Neglectee adolescents are most cooperative and the Rejectee are least cooperative of all the groups.
- Isolate adolescents have same behaviour as Rejectee adolescents in terms of Cooperativeness.

K.Persistence

- Neglectee and Below average adolescent students are highly persistent and differ significantly from other groups.
- Rejectees adolescents are least persistent.

L.Warmth

- Although any of the groups do not fare well in terms of their warmth, Below average students show more warmth for fellow students and others compared to other groups.
- Rejectee and Isolate students are least warm of all the groups, which may be the reason behind receiving rejections or not being selected by other students for performing various activities.

M.Aggressiveness

- Below average and Neglectee adolescents are the least aggressive groups.

- Maximum aggressiveness is found in Rejectee students.

N.Tolerance

i) Neglectee and Below average adolescent students are highly tolerant and differ significantly from other groups.
ii) Rejectee adolescents are least tolerant of all the groups.

O.Tough-minded

- In terms of the dimension 'Tough-minded' the Below average adolescents are at top
- Neglectee, Rejectee and Isolates are almost similar to each other with respect to this dimension.
- Isolates are least Tough-minded.

P. Comparison of total scores of temperament of adolescent students

- Below average students are found to be good in temperament followed by Neglectee students.
- Rejectee and Isolate adolescents show an overall bad temperament, which might be the reason behind them being rejected or not selected by fellow students for different activities.

Educational Implications

The findings of the present study have a bearing for the researchers, planners, administrators, mental hygienists, counsellors, guidance workers, parents and teachers in such a way that the needs of isolate students in general and rejected students in particular may be taken into account because this unacceptable behaviour in a social set up of a class has bearing on the personality of such students.

The findings of the present study were regarding the temperament of different sociometric groups of students. Out of all, the rejectee group of adolescents had the poorest temperament. They were less social, had less ascendance, were less reflective, less warm, less placid, less vigorous, less responsible, less accepting, less cooperative, less persistence and less tolerant temperament. They also had more impulsivity, more aggressiveness and more secretive temperament. To promote the mental health of the rejected adolescent, the modern teacher must have an understanding of group life in the classroom. In every classroom there are forces at work which influence positively or negatively the temperament of each student. Classrooms groups are known to have significant influence upon adolescents who are already suffering from poor temperament. The ability of the teachers to handle class groups skilfully and effectively will tend to minimize the number of disturbed students with poor temperament and classroom problems.

The study suggests that proper arrangement of guidance and counselling should be provided to isolate and rejected adolescents. The scholarships and other facilities as incentives should be provided to these students if they perform well. This will generate a competitive spirit in them. They should be properly guided so that they make progress on the basis of hard work and emerging self-confidence rather than mere luck, chance or other influences. Sociometric seating appears to be a useful technique of improving interpersonal relationships with in a group. It appears to weaken the barriers, which stand in the formation of cohesive class.

This study revealed that the use of identifying unaccepted students in every school must be made compulsory practice in the school system. Efforts should be made to make such students average at least. Only then we can claim of providing education to each and every student in a school. Moreover oral and face-to-face interaction with the students also helps a teacher to know who is more accepted and least accepted by his/her peer group. Recognising that a closely-knit clique of pupils is disrupting the efficiency of classroom, regrouping procedures may be utilized by the teacher. Identifying cleavages between social, religious, rural-urban or Socio-economic status groups may indicate the necessity of putting special emphasis on programmes to integrate the divided fractions. A general lack of mutual attraction among pupils and a disintegrated group structure might reflect a highly competitive and hostile classroom atmosphere arising from autocratic teaching procedures. Better integration may result from introduction of group work and teacher-pupil planning.

BIBILIOGRAPHY

[1]. Arora, I.P. (1967): A study of Personality characteristics of socially accepted and unaccepted pupils of class X in two schools of Delhi.M.Ed dissertation (unpublished) Cenrtral Institute of education, Delhi University, Delhi.
[2]. Booney, M.E. (1943): Personality traits of socially successful and socially unsuccessful children.J. of Edul.Psy,34: 449-472.
[3]. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1944): A constant frame of reference for Sociometric Research. Buss, A. H., & Plomin, R. (1984).Temperament: Early developing personality traits. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum

[4]. Chess, S., & Thomas, A. (1991): Temperament and the concept of goodness-of-fit.In J. Strelau & A. Angleitner (Eds.), Explorations in temperament: International perspectives on theory and measurement (pp.15-28). New York: Plenum.
[5]. Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (2008): Temperament: An organizing paradigm for trait psychology. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), Handbookof personality: Theory and research (3rd ed., pp. 265–286). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
[6]. Cohen, A.R. (1954): Personality and Sociometric choice. Unpublished manuscript Uni. Of Michigan,.
[7]. Garret, H.E. (1973): Statistics in Psychology and Education. Published by G.V. Mehta for Vakils, Feffer and Simons Pvt. Ltd., 8th Indian Reprint, P. 125.
[8]. Grounlund, N.E. (1959): Sociometry in classroom. University of Illinois Harper and Brothers New 136nst, PP. XVII 1-6, 12, 14-15, 64-67, 190.
[9]. Grounlund, N.E. and L. Anderson (1957):Personality Characteristics of socially accepted, socially neglected and socially rejected Junior high School pupils.Edu., Adm. And supr. 43, 329-338.
[10]. Guinouard, D.E. and Rychlak, J.F. (1962): Personality Correlates of Sociometric popularity in elementary School children. Personal Guidance Journal, 40, 438-4.
[11]. Jennings. H.H. (1951) Sociometry in group Relations. Washington D.C. American counsil of Edu.
[12]. Kidd, J.W. (1953): Personality traits as Barrier to Acceptability in College. Man's Residence
[13]. Hall. Jl. Of Psychology, 38, 127-130.
[14]. Kohn, M. and Clausen J. (1955): Social isolation and Schizophrenia.American Sociological Review, 20, 265-273.
[15]. Kuhlen, R.G and B.J. Lee (1943): Personality Characteristics and Social Acceptability in Adolscents.Jl.of Educational Psy, 34: 321-340.
[16]. Kury, H. and Bauerle, S.(1987): The personality structure of Popular and unpopular school children. Psychologic in Erzlehung and untesricht (Psy.In edu. And instruction) 1977, 24(4), 244-247.
[17]. Lindzey, G. and J.A. Urdan (1954):Personality and Social Choice.Sociometry17: 47-63.
[18]. Madhosh, A.G. (1989): Personality correlates of Sociometric Status: A study of sub cultural group differences. Indian Educational Review, Vol. 24(1), 1-16.
[19]. Malhotra, S. (1989):Temperament characteristics of children with conduct and conversion disorders.Indian Journal of Psychiatry.
[20]. Pathak, R.D. (1972a): Sociometric Status and Personality dimensions of adolescents.Psychological Studies, 16(1), 21-25.
[21]. Prasad, R. (1966): A Comparative study of PersonalityPatterns of two adolescent groups with Social-acceptable and non-acceptable Behaviour Patterns.Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation, University of Delhi, Delhi.
[22]. Rothbart, M. K., & Ahadi, S. A. (1994): Temperament and the development of personality. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 103, 55-66.
[23]. Rothbart, M. K., & Derryberry, D. (2002):Temperament in Children. In C. von Hofsten & L. Backman (Eds.), Social, Developmental and Clinical Perspectives: Psychology at the Turn of the Millennium (pp. 17-35). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
[24]. Sharma, A.N. (1975): Sociometry: A handbook for teachers and counselors, N.C.E.R.T, New Delhi.
[25]. Shiner, R. L., & Caspi, A. (2012).Temperament and the development of personality traits, adaptations, and narratives.In M. Zentner & R. L. Shiner (Eds.), Handbook of temperament (pp. 497–516). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
[26]. Thomas, A., & Chess, S. (1977). Temperament and development. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Dr. Ram Singh." A Study of Temperament of School Going Adolescents Belonging To Different Sociometric Groups." IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 23 no. 09, 2018, pp. 48-60.