

A SURVEY OF THE PERSONALITY  
TRAITS OF THE PUPILS OF A  
SMALL HIGH SCHOOL

by

LEE ALEXANDER POWELL

A THESIS

submitted to the

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

June 1941

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

---

Professor of Educational Psychology

In Charge of Major

Redacted for Privacy

---

Head of School of Education

Chairman of School of Education Graduate Committee

Redacted for Privacy

---

Chairman of State College Graduate Council

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. H. R. Laslett, Professor of Educational Psychology at Oregon State College for his many helpful suggestions, constructive criticism, interpretation and manuscript organization throughout this study. I am grateful to Dr. Edgar A. Doll, Director, Department of Research, of the Training School at Vineland, New Jersey, for having sent his bibliography and reprints published on the Vineland Social Maturity Scale. I also wish to thank Mr. Wesley Oliver, Mrs. Ruby Mishler, Miss Mildred Deal, Mrs. Esther Bodner, Mr. Herbert Summers, Miss Louise Hyde, and Mrs. Garland M. Powell for their help in the use of the rating scales.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I	Page
Introduction . . . . .	1
Chapter II	
A Partial Survey of the Field of Personality and Social Maturity . . . . .	8
Chapter III	
A Study of 100 High School Pupils on Two Personality Scales . . . . .	53
Chapter IV	
Summary and Conclusions . . . . .	89
Bibliography . . . . .	94
Appendix I	
The Vineland Social Maturity Scale . . . . .	98
The Personality Rating Scale for the Adolescent in the School . . . . .	103

## Tables

	Page
Table I - Scores Made by the Pupils on the Hayes Scale . . . . .	59
Table II - Relation to Others Generally . . . . .	62
Table III - Respect for the Rights of Others . . . . .	64
Table IV - Relation to Teacher . . . . .	65
Table V - Relation to Other Pupils . . . . .	66
Table VI - Initiative . . . . .	67
Table VII - Health Habits . . . . .	68
Table VIII - General Interests . . . . .	69
Table IX - Scholarship and Study Habits . . . . .	70
Table X - Tentative Age-Score Conversion Table . . . . .	72
Table XI - Means and S.D.'s on the Doll Scale in Terms of the Social Quotient . . . . .	74
Table XII - Total Data on the Tenth Grade Girls . . . . .	76
Table XIII - Total Data on the Tenth Grade Boys . . . . .	77
Table XIV - Total Data on the Eleventh Grade Girls . . . . .	78
Table XV - Total Data on the Eleventh Grade Boys . . . . .	78
Table XVI - Total Data on the Twelfth Grade Girls . . . . .	79
Table XVII - Total Data on the Twelfth Grade Boys . . . . .	79

# A Survey of the Personality Traits of the Pupils of a Small High School

## Chapter I

### Introduction

The purpose of this thesis was the analysis of the personality and other traits of the 100 pupils composing the entire sophomore, junior, and senior classes of a small high school. This was undertaken in order to obtain a more complete picture of the local conditions that enhance or detract from the success of this particular high school in the all-around education of the pupils attending it. Out of this analysis, the writer hoped (a) to be able to set up a more complete program of pupil-development within the high school, (b) to correlate better the efforts of the school and the community in this pupil-development, and (c) to stimulate the community to a more alert and better balanced program for the development of its young people.

A study of the personality development, or the social maturity, of these pupils seemed desirable in order that the cause or causes for lack of initiative in scholastic work and of personal ambition in social and vocational preparation and later accomplishment might be discovered and, if possible, corrected for the benefit of the pupils and the improvement of the community as a place in which

to live. This inertia and unresponsiveness of many of the pupils has been apparent to others than the writer of this thesis. Speakers from outside of the community in which the high school is located have remarked upon the seeming lack of interest of the pupils in their school assemblies, regardless of the abilities and the efforts of these speakers. In the student-body meetings, the pupils have shown a lack of initiative in that they have taken little or no part in the discussions of their own school plans or plans for their entertainments. They have depended upon the teachers and a few active pupils to propose plans and, then, to carry them out. The majority of the pupils have had little scholastic ambition, but have just drifted along doing only what was required of them without much comprehension of the purposes behind the training. Relatively few of those who have completed the high school work have proceeded to more advanced training even though they have had the intelligence and the financial means which would have enabled them to do so. Of those who have continued their training beyond the high school, some have not achieved what was easily possible for them because their personalities were not impressive even for their ages. Of those who have completed their formal training at the end of the high school course, the majority of the boys have entered local or nearby unskilled or semi-skilled work and the girls have married and "settled down" in the

local community.

It seems evident to the writer and to others who know this community that the outstanding reason for the lack of aggressiveness and initiative of the high school pupils is the attitude of the community itself. The people who make up and who direct the community are, in many cases, retired from active earning efforts and live on the incomes from their investments plus the products of their gardens, fruit trees, cows, and chickens. Even in times of financial expansion, such people are likely to be unresponsive to community needs or desires. In times of financial contraction, they are likely to be still more unresponsive. When a strongly protestant church spirit and the self-isolation that good roads have brought to many small and old communities is added to this, the result is a reserve or a passivity that is bad for community activity. During the school year, the young people have had no forms of entertainment or activities to keep them busy and alert except those provided by the school. Dancing in the school has been prohibited because a large number of the older people still maintain the traditions of the early protestant churches. Moving picture shows and tennis on Sunday have been frowned upon locally, but sometimes rowdy baseball games have not been. The town library facilities are good but have been poorly managed to the extent that there has been little encouragement for the people to read or even



to know what is available for them to read. There have been no young people's clubs or other organizations which they might join to occupy their leisure time or stimulate them to more worth-while activities. About all that there has been for the young people to do is to go to the pool hall or soda fountain, roam the streets, or go to neighboring towns for the movies or to go to the pool halls or the soda fountains or to roam the streets.

With this sort of community social horizon, perhaps one should not expect too much initiative and aggressiveness among the high school pupils. If they have nothing available for constructive activity during their leisure hours, if the printed matter coming to their homes has been of such a nature that it has not stimulated aspirations in them, and if there has been a local tradition of non-activity probably the young people should not be blamed so much as helped in the correction of their deficiencies. Some form or way of increasing the initiative and improving other personality traits of the pupils is as essential in this local educational program as are the academic subjects. It is the belief of the writer that an improvement in one will bring about an improvement in the other. In fact, during the course of this study this has already been found to be true.

During the last year a club program has been established in connection with vocational home economics.

A club for young unmarried women was organized, meeting bi-weekly to discuss personal problems, community problems and betterment, and the problems of the family and parenthood. Each week one member has acted as hostess and another one has planned and carried on the program until each has served her turn in each capacity. The results, as far as they went, were very favorable; however, only contacts with young women of town were made -- leaving out the young women of the neighboring rural communities altogether.

The development of an elaborate 4-H Club program with a large attendance in the various clubs has, during the last few years, reached pupils of both the grade school and high school, both those living in town and those in the surrounding rural communities, giving all of them a better foundation for alertness and preparation for meeting everyday problems.

In making this study, 100 pupils were rated by the five teachers of the high school and by two other members of the community who knew the pupils well. The Hayes Personality Rating Scale (23;211-15) and The Vineland Social Maturity Scale (15;16-30) were used in order that the advantages and limitations of the environments of the pupils, the extents of their home training, and the amounts of their social developments might be analyzed as completely and objectively as possible. The results of

these ratings, made in terms of comparative partial and total scores derived in many other communities will be used in guidance and mental hygiene work directly with the pupils - - if the study shows this to be desirable, and will be placed before the community leaders in tangible form if this is thought to be advisable. Even during the course of this study, both have been found to be important and some good though small results have already been obtained for both the pupils and the community. When some of the more obstreperous pupils have been shown their scores on the scales and have come to realize the way in which they look to others or when they have rated themselves on these scales as an experiment, they have made real efforts to become more acceptable to others in personality. Through the efforts of the high school, the pupils have become more familiar with the town library and are reading more and better material. Through this, it is hoped that their horizons will be widened and that they will be in the pool halls and on the streets less of the time.

To the compilation of the personality and the social maturity scores derived directly from this study have been added the intelligence test scores of these 100 pupils to make the pictures of the individual pupils as complete as possible and to show what might, reasonably, be expected of them.

Specimens of the Hayes Personality Maturity Scale for Adolescents and the Vineland Social Maturity Scale may be found in the Appendix of this study.

## Chapter II

### A Partial Survey of the Field of Personality and Social Maturity

Personality is a fascinating word, even though it is at present practically undefined by reason of its many, partial, and superficial definitions. More than any other field of psychology, the study of personality is handicapped by this confusion of meaning and introduction of "popular" terminology. We are lured and intrigued by the seeming mystery of it. Just what is that elusive quality that some people possess in such abundance and others lack so woefully? Half the people in the world are busy judging the other half, yet every individual is interested to a certain degree in himself. We try to define the qualities of other people that make them either attractive or repellent and consciously or unconsciously judge our own personalities by the qualities which other people have.

"Man (42:1) is most of all interested in himself, and of this engrossing topic he is particularly fascinated by what he commonly calls his personality. The term 'personality' is probably one of the most ambiguous in modern psychology. Practically every writer has his own notion of what it means and what definition should be attached to it. While we all recognize that each person possesses

a unique individuality, which is peculiar to him alone, we do not know exactly how to describe this individuality and so we have fallen into the habit of giving it a general unanalyzed label, viz., personality."

The word "personality" has its origin (4:2) in the Greek word "prosopon", used in Greek drama in which it signified a mask used by a player to hide his real self. Later, the Romans substituted the Latin word "persona" for it, which came to mean the wearer rather than the mask. Later, during the Middle Ages the meaning gradually changed and took on the connotation of the soul or self. Today personalities are still masks behind which individuals hide in facing society rather than the true selves which are hidden behind conventional behavior patterns. To support the statement that personalities are still masks behind which individuals hide, Shellow (37:1) wrote: "We find that 'personality' is the 'sum of qualities peculiar to some individual rational being'." "Our personalities (37:1) are certainly our masks. Personality is the expression of our inner selves, the way in which we show ourselves to the world. Sometimes the personality which others see is vastly different from the one we may think we express."

"In relatively pre-scientific times (42:2), when psychology was a branch of philosophy and before so-called 'psychic' concepts were accorded objective study

and treatment, personality was naturally regarded as something spiritual and metaphysical. It was thought of as some kind of unanalyzable central force which gave direction to action and meaning to experience." The situation is only slightly less obscure at the present time. However, "It cannot be said (7:3) of any human being that he has no personality. A personality may be weak or strong, simple or complex, balanced or unstable, organized or dissociated, but it cannot be altogether lacking. Personality of some sort everyone must have. On the other hand it is inaccurate to speak of the personality of a dog or a horse. Only persons have personality."

Current views regarding the concepts of personality might be classified first of all as popular and unacademic on the one hand and as psychological, biological, and more objective on the other. A third group might contain the social or sociological attitudes toward the definition of personality. In the first group fall such terms as "it" and "oomph" and the general and vague classification of people as possessing good or poor personalities without the slightest attempt at analysis or measurement having been made by the classifier. In the second group fall more satisfactory definitions. The sociological definitions are, to the writer, vague and partial in point-of-view.

Of the "popular" concepts of personality, Schwesinger

(36:93) has written : "The laymen is usually concerned with the externality of the person; his dress, his voice, his gestures, his manners, his motor-coördination, his charm, his versatility--and any reactions, in fact, which are socially important." In other words, the superficial observer does not try to look behind the intentionally or the unintentionally worn masks of others and usually does not perceive the real personalities there.

"Another subjective view (42:2) of personality holds that the integrating and synthesizing principle of life is the 'self' or 'ego'. This entity is said to exist in time, but not in space, and to give meaning to experience in the time-sequence sense. Exponents of this view are likely to be philosophical rather than scientific in their essays on education and psychology."

"Personality (9:371), apart from any intangible, metaphysical aspects, is the total organization of an individual's instinctive-, emotional-, and habit-reaction systems, together with his own more physical differentiating characteristics. It is the integrated total of all his possibilities of response, and, of course, includes traits hindering suitable adaptation as well as those furthering it. Often the integration is loose and faulty, and many traits are present which lessen the individual's effectiveness."

"As the final test of personality (12:297) we must



ascertain, first, the degree of efficiency with which he administers his own interests; whether he has learned to work and to utilize the fruits of his labor for his own personal upbuilding; second, whether he has dedicated his efficiency to the service of society and pays in the count of his labor for the nurture he has received at its hands. Whether he has come out on that high plateau of vision from which he can see something of the meaning of the world-order, and whether his own system of plans telescopes with the larger system of society and the divine order."

Among the more psychological, biological, and analytical concepts of personality Roback (35:159) has written: "It is evident that in due course, the charm of these physical qualities wears off from the friend of long standing, and the deeper or inner personality begins to stand out. It is therefore this phase of personality which should claim our attention rather than its superficial aspects."

Briggs (8:370) has stated: "It would not be far from the truth to say that character is the sum of one's emotional attitudes." If one adds to this meaning estimates of character, intelligence, and physical qualities, he might have a fairly good definition of the term "personality".

Thorpe (42:5) has said: "Probably the most common approach to the meaning of personality is the practice of

regarding it as an aggregate of integrated components..... As a matter of fact, it is now generally acknowledged, even by those who do not espouse the organism-as-a-whole view in its extreme gestaltist form, that the organism is essentially a unified mechanism which is something more than the sum of its parts, and that all aspects thereof have meaning and properties only in relation to all other aspects."

Woodworth has given a provisional meaning to the term, "personality", by saying that it does not refer to any specific activity but that a person can reveal his personality by the manner in which he performs particular activities. "When we think (44:552-3) of his personality, we have in mind some quality of his total behavior. Personality, then, is the quality of the individual's total behavior, it is how he acts, when his activity is taken as a whole." Symonds is somewhat more specific. "Personality (40:560-1) refers to a more complete description of the constitutional make-up including physique, intelligence, temperament and character. More specifically it sometimes refers to the adequacy of personal adjustment, also, especially in social relationships."

Brooks puts forth several ideas on concepts of personality which underlie the many uses of the term and its wide diversity of meanings. "Personality (9:349) has been regarded by some as a final nucleus or core, as an inner essence of the individual which resists analysis; as spirit,

self-consciousness, the unconscious, a bit of soul-substance which exists independent of the stream of consciousness--of the thoughts, feelings, emotions, and other conscious (and unconscious) activities--but is the force or entity which integrates them."

"The term (9:349) is also used to connote merely the stream of ideas, feelings, and emotions--a use for which inadequate justification is found, as revealed by the discussions of the radical empiricists and their critics. It fails to account for that sequential continuity or organization of experience about a central system (or systems) of purposes whose existence and fundamental importance are attested to by observation and reflection."

"A third view, well expressed by Tracy (Psychology of Adolescence, Pp. 121-22), considers the self or ego as the principle of unity, synthesis, and constructive interpretation, by which the phenomena become intelligible and the mental world presents itself as a cosmos instead of a chaos."

"Personality, according to the fourth definition (9:350), is the individual's peculiar integration of instinctive-, emotional-, and habit-reaction systems, together with his merely physical differentiating characteristics."

"In normal personality (9:350) are found a power of inhibition, a rational balance (which perhaps is best dis-

played in following a guiding line or principle of conduct throughout life), emotional control or stability (consisting in the ability to maintain uniformity and continuity of feeling), and superior durability."

If one looks back upon one of the renowned authorities in the field of psychology, he finds William James saying in his chapter on the way in which consciousness flows on throughout life: "We notice immediately four important characters (24:152) in the process, of which it shall be the duty of the present chapter to treat in a general way; (a) Every 'state' tends to be part of a personal consciousness. (b) Within each personal consciousness states are always changing. (c) Each personal consciousness is sensibly continuous. (d) It is interested in some parts of its object to the exclusion of others, and welcomes or rejects--chooses from among them, in a word--all the while.

"In considering these four points successively, we shall have to plunge in medias res as regards our nomenclature and use psychological terms which can only be adequately defined in later chapters of the book. But every one knows what the terms mean in a rough way; and it is only in a rough way that we are now to take them."

"What I wish to lay stress (24:154) on is this, that no state once gone can recur and be identical with what it was before." "It seems a piece of metaphysical sophistry to suggest that we do not; and yet a close attention to the

matter shows that there is no proof that an incoming current ever gives us just the same bodily sensation twice."

"I can only define 'continuous' as that (24:157-8) which is without break, crack, or division. The only breaches that can well be conceived to occur within the limits of a single mind would either be interruptions, time-gaps during which the consciousness went out; or they would be breaks in the content of the thought, so abrupt that what followed had no connection whatever with what went before."

"Consciousness (24:159), then, does not appear to itself chopped up in bits. Such words as 'chain' or 'train' do not describe it fitly as it presents itself in the first instance. It is nothing jointed; it flows. A 'river' or a 'stream' are the metaphors by which it is most naturally described. In talking of it hereafter, let us call it the stream of thought, of consciousness, or of subjective life."

Prince proposed a concept of personality based on the instinct hypothesis. He (32:530-32) considered personality to be "a composite structure built by experience upon the foundation of preformed, inherited, psycho-physiological and dynamic mechanisms, containing within themselves their own driving forces." This represents the psychiatric point-of-view, and it is doubtful that any group has a better right to speak of personality than the psychiatrists who delve among its vagaries and malfunctions. This may be

accepted as true even though some individuals within the group may have been guilty of loose thinking and even though the future development of psychiatry is likely to be much greater than its past accomplishments.

Laird (26:1) has written: "Experiments are indicating that the most serviceable classification of personality is one discovered by psycho-analysts.....Diseased personalities indicated.....that humans could be separated into two rough classes, introverts and extroverts. Introverts are characterized by their emotional outlets being expressed largely within themselves; that is, their emotions are introverted. Daydreaming is an instance where the emotional outlets are introverted."

"The extroverts, in contrast, express their emotional outlets in action and associating with others. They might be called men of action while the introverts are men of thought."

An additional exposition of the psychiatric point of view is that of Richmond. "The psychopathic type may be (34:205-6) regarded as a narcissistic type which has crystallized at an infantile level and carries with it to the end the extreme self-centeredness of the young child. The psychopath may have many other traits, pleasant or unpleasant, but his distinguishing feature is his egocentricity. He is incapable of any real love or affection except for himself. He faces life with the calm

ruthlessness of the young child, who has no notion but that the universe exists to satisfy his needs; no matter how often his position is proved false, he can not, apparently, abandon it. Because of this attitude the psychopath is always in trouble with his environment. In extreme cases he is the criminal who, no matter how many times he is apprehended and punished, persists in criminal conduct. In mild cases he is the fellow who merely disregards the wishes or welfare of his friends if they do not coincide with his own. He is always a law unto himself; his world is his own and he lives in it to the end, resisting all attempts of reality to teach him differently."

"The other rigid type, the paranoid (34:206-7), may be regarded as a crystallization at the level of early adolescence. The frequency with which these types develop on a homosexual basis, or show homosexual delusions, has often been remarked, but in addition they are characterized by the over-sensitivity and the heightened sense of self-importance of the young adolescent. The 'paranoid' person is one who sees slights where none are intended, who is oversuspicious and jealous, who believes that people are unfair to him and that he can not get a square deal. He refuses to accept his own inadequacies and projects them upon other people. It is not he who is incompetent, but the boss, who blames it on him; it is not his own lack of preparation that causes his examination failure, but the

teachers, who are themselves incompetent or who 'have it in' for him. Such a person is often said to have a superiority complex', because of his overestimation of himself and his own importance." This point of view is well taken in that one finds cases of it creeping out in schoolroom classes which are, apparently, carry-overs from this type of previous experience.

Another view of personality is that of the control of personality in terms of the operation and balance of the glands of internal secretion. Supporting this idea, Berman (5:235-6) has written: "If a single gland can dominate the life history of an individual it becomes possible to speak of endocrine types, the result of the endocrine analysis of the individual." By this type of analysis, one may divide the extremes among mankind into "the adrenal-centered (5:236), the thyroid-centered, the thymus-centered, the pituitary-centered, and the gonad-centered, and their combinations."

"The endocrine glands (3:47) are interdependent, acting together upon each other. Undoubtedly their function has basis in heredity, but they are also affected by states of health and by mental and emotional conditions. The action of the endocrine glands provides another illustration of the complex interplay of heredity and environment."

Attempted analysis of personality into another group of "types" has been made by Valentine. "It is a common belief



(43:152) that people fall into natural types--that we can, in fact, classify each and every individual in one circumscribed group or another. The popular fancy usually has it that there are opposed types of dreamer and doer, positive and negative, stern and easy-going, cheerful and brooding, practical and impractical, and so on. Ordinary language goes even further than this, and has a type for every word that may be used to describe people. Thus we hear of the athletic type, the studious type, the adventurous type, the emotional type, the pale type, or the gluttonous type."

"We frequently meet (43:153), nevertheless, a deep-seated conviction that there are certain fundamental types, a few basic preformations of character, which are antagonistic to each other in nature and into one or another of which every individual may be placed. It will be interesting to consider some of these."

The four types of personality that Valentine (43:153-173) proposed are (a) temperamental types; (b) doing, feeling, and thinking types; (c) introvert and extravert types; and (d) endocrine types.

The social or sociological attempts at definition are far from satisfactory. They are partial, in the first place, and view personality as an inert and uncontrolled quality in the second. One's personality may reflect the personalities of those around him; but it is not the inanimate reflection which a mirror gives, nor is it always a

direct reflection. It may as easily be an antagonistic reflection as a sympathetic one. Moreover, one's self is never entirely withdrawn from the picture, and it may be very much a present factor. Nevertheless, Allport (1:101) holds that "with the exception of a few traits, personality may be defined as the individual's characteristic reactions to social stimuli, and the quality of his adaptation to the social features of his environment." But, "It should be noted that this view (42:4) does not make personality all inclusive nor synonymous with the functioning of the total integrated system of organism components." Viewed from another angle, one's personality must be consistent if he wants to get along well with other people. A person who tries to be everything to everybody usually ends up by being nothing to anybody.

Gilliland also takes the partial view of personality as the social self. "With this usage personality (19:370) is to be contrasted with: (a) temperament, which by most writers is used to refer to the more stable, emotional tendencies of the individual; (b) character, which is sometimes used as synonymous with personality and sometimes implies more of the moral phases of conduct; (c) self, which generally refers to the whole individual. This is the usage of James, who classifies self into the material, the social, and the spiritual self. Personality is the same or similar to James' social self. While there is no inherent

virtue in any definition other than that of clarity and delineation from other terms, it seems best to use the term personality to mean the social aspect of one's self."

"There are many ways (19:370-1) in which an individual may be analyzed or studied just as there are many different dimensions to any solid. Like the measurements of an irregular solid some of these mental measurements are more significant than others in a description of the individual. One aspect of this classification is the physical form of the individual. Any individual may be classified as to height, strength, weight, etc. Another classification might be his general mental make-up, that is, his sensory equipment, instincts, higher thought processes, etc. Closely related to this latter problem is one phase of his mental make-up and that is the way in which he is related to other individuals socially."

May (27:82) has written: "According to the original meaning of the term, personality is that which makes one effective, or gives one influence over others. In the language of psychology it is one's social stimulus value. Every individual may be regarded as a stimulus to every other individual with whom he comes in contact."

"An absolutely complete analysis of personality (18: 2), then, would involve all of the individual's social relations to his environment. We are especially interested in the way in which he would adjust to changes, and in the

smoothness and lack of confusion in his adjustment to these changes." This is asking a great deal. Not only does it involve the complete analysis of the individual but of the environment as well, with all of the manners of the social behavior and attitudes of the other people in that environment, the advantages and limitations of the natural and the artificial components of the inanimate environment, and the traditions, mores, and aspirations of its social factors. Practically, this concept is useful as a concept, and little more.

The social point-of-view neglects or omits entirely the fundamental concept of the long established bases of personality of which each social contact or social expression is only one slight fragment or tiny facet. The extreme social point-of-view would make personality to be a thing without cause, continuity, or coherence.

The complete description of one individual's personality would require the listing of all of the situations he had experienced and a statement of the way in which he had felt and thought in response to these happenings. Thorndike (41:1) has written: "To describe even one man's intellect and character fully, at even any one time, it would be necessary to list all the world's happenings that he might possibly encounter, and to state in each case how he would feel and think and act in response to that happening.....We have (41:27) seen that millions upon millions

of different conditions of traits may exist; that a large fraction of them do exist; that they do not divide naturally into distinct types, but probably vary around one type; and that efficiency in one respect is positively correlated with efficiency in others."

Rebeck (35:159) is more vaguely inclusive and defines personality as, "The sum total of all our cognitive, affective, conative and even physical tendencies. The sum total here does not mean a simple addition but an integration." Morrison (30:239) speaks of personality as "the sum total of what an individual has come to be by learning the cultural products of social evaluation." According to Valentine (43:21) "Personality is the sum total of one's habit dispositions.....A morbid mind produces a morbid body, and a morbid body produces a morbid mind."

Similarly, James (24:179) has written: "Properly speaking, a man has as many social selves as there are individuals who recognize him and carry an image of him in their mind."

It is obvious from the preceding references that "personality" is a fascinating word, and that each writer in the field of personality has a different and often conflicting viewpoint from most of the others. However much may have been accomplished in the field of personality study and personality development, it is doubtful that any definite terminology can be adopted at this time because

of the present impossibility of knowing what personality really is---since it is so intangible. In other words: "Personality is a living, ever-changing tapestry. (3:fly-leaf) Its warp is fashioned out of our human potentialities; its woof is spun from the world of people and things. We weave the pattern as we live from day to day."

"Our democratic social order (3:flyleaf) is the product of humanity's experience in building an environment in which we may all achieve self-realization through the weaving of rich and well-integrated patterns of personality."

"If all that is known about the human personality (3:flyleaf) were applied in planning and directing our lives, there would doubtless be as momentous changes wrought in them as have already been effected in our physical environment."

When the child starts to school for the first time, he is already equipped with a considerable and basic part of his education. The numerous situations which he has experienced since from babyhood have been given some direction by his parents, who may or may not conform to the social demands under which the youngster now finds himself. Thus, as soon as the child begins to express his desires, he comes into contact with society and its demands. This social accumulation the child finds about him is the product of what his parents and their parents have experienced before him, whether good, bad or indifferent. The child

comes under the influence of these situations and is, to a considerable degree, guided by them. They are the basis on which he forms the external expression of his personality. The story of the individual's progress from infancy toward personality is the story of his early education.

In the development of personality, schools could play an important part yet, at the present time, many schools devote most of their time to the transposition of knowledge. The main functions of the school, as many educators understand them, are the imparting of knowledge, the improvement of the techniques of learning, and the increasing of the power of thought. Other aspects are held by many to be outside of the scope of the school to a great degree; yet it should be the obligation of the school to set up a constructive environment that, from its inception, holds the integrating of personality as one of its chief objectives.

Interest on the part of the teacher or parent is quite often so directed along academic lines that a decided lack of progress by the child in other directions may be ignored until it results in some maladjustment. As a result of such near-sightedness, one finds many adults who are warped and unbalanced in their modes of living and outlooks on life, although no one seems to know exactly why they have become so odd. The schools are not to blame for all of this. Probably they are to blame for very little of it;

but an ideal that should be before all teachers is that of preventing as much personality maladjustment as possible and of correcting as much as they can.

From a consideration (45:250) of the personality problems of children and of the development of personality, we are led to a consideration of the role of the school in regard to personality integration. The role of the school is primarily that of controlling the environment so as to provide the best opportunities for the development of constructive habit patterns and to assist the individual to gain insight into his own problems so that he will be able to face reality squarely and thus preserve a normal personality."

"Personality", according to Crane (46), "is that range of possibilities in a growing child which is the constant concern of parents and educators. It is that subtle something which they feel must be discovered, released, stimulated, nurtured, guided, and controlled. It gives evidence of its qualities at birth but it is the supreme achievement of a life time. It is the joint product of heredity and experience and is revealed in its making at every shifting change of its development. It is continually made and remade and yet is the cumulative result of all that it ever was and is becoming. Each individual personality is to a large degree a reflection of the personalities with whom he has



interactions. He is different from all others but is shaped and modified by each one with whom he has any significant relationship."

Burnham (10:226-7) has written: "With the training in adjustment and the pressure of convention and formal education, as represented by modern methods of formal training, acceleration, and the like, mental hygiene emphasizes the truth that in all this education, this drawing out of the child's abilities, the child should not lose his own soul. Modifying Hall's slogan, mental hygiene goes back to the more original form of the question: What shall it profit a child if he gain the whole world of conventional adjustments and lose his own personality, or what shall a child give in exchange for his soul?"

"The simple essentials mentioned (10:226-7), a task, a plan, and liberty, involve the most fundamental problems in human education and human society. Weak, finite, the victim of unknown forces over which he has no control, man, facing the reality of such facts, develops either a wholesome sense of dependence, the essential of the religious consciousness, or else he acquires a sense of inferiority and loses his grip in the inevitable conflict. If rightly educated, he adjusts to his physical and social environment, and if rightly trained, he integrates his powers to meet the problems that beset him."

"Something more (10:227) than what is usually

understood by adjustment results from training. Although weak, and the sport of unknown conditions and forces, with a span of life too short even to study intensively the personal problems of his own existence and his own health, it is possible for man to develop a wholesome integration which enables him to coordinate his powers to meet any situation, however difficult, and to do the best possible within the limitations of his own personality, and at least to make a fight worth while for its own sake. And again by right training he is able to develop wholesome social relations and integrate his own little contribution with that of the social groups of which he is a member."

Personality development is, in part, a matter of habit formation. It involves the development of new habits or the breaking of old ones. Daily behavior consists principally of habits which people no longer think about. In order to form a habit, one must first have a conviction that the habit is the right thing to do. If the new habit is to be in a new field of activity or is antagonistic to older habits, a strong will and plenty of determination to carry it through may be required to establish it as a habit. Other, possibly equally strong habits, may have grown without any particular attention.

Whether traits or habits are the fundamentals of personality is a debatable question. Traits are generally defined as innate and, therefore, changed in their

expression only with difficulty. Habits may or may not be so definitely established as to be equally difficult to change.

In order to arrive at some description of personality which involves the idea of an aggregate of components it seems necessary that one should study the nature of these so-called traits. If one thinks of a trait as being some particular behavior pattern limited by a trait name, no one's actions are entirely consistent.

Along this same line Morgan (29:30-1) has given this view: "In order for a child to mature into a well-adjusted adult he must make progress along several lines.....In the first place, the child must adjust his primitive impulses to the restrictions of the physical and social order in which he finds himself." He learns to connect the fulfillment of his desires with certain acts of his own. His first lessons are something of a shock to his ego, for instance, he reacts with favor toward anything that hinders his desires, and thus begins to learn to adjust himself to life situations.

"It has been shown (42:10) that as a rule a response is influenced as much or more by the exigencies of a situation as by any guiding principle of behavior that may be possessed by the reacting individual"; but, "If on the other hand (42:11), one regards behavior as being almost wholly specific he finds it difficult to locate any

definite traits or unified components of any kind with which to describe a given person's personal qualities."

"Probably (42:11-12) the sensible position would be that of regarding behavior as being at first very specific, owing to limited experience and the obvious absence of controlling factors, such as standards, ideals of virtue, comprehended social codes, etc., but progressively more consistent as the individual matures and conforms to the sanctions and mores of his group. Thus, personality should not be thought of as a collection of closely unified blocks of behavior called 'traits' or a sum of discrete and independent responses called 'specifics'. Although psychologists know that personality cannot be regarded as simply the sum total of so many traits, they do frequently endeavour to provide an insight into personality by studying an individual's traits, regarded as a more or less loosely organized systems of tendencies to act, in relation to each other in the whole pattern or response."

Stagner (38:48-9) in his treatment of personality traits has stated: "The term 'personality structure', however, is not common and requires some elaboration. Technically, by structure we mean all those habits, both overt and mental (implicit), which the personality has acquired in the course of its development up to the time we study it. Thus examples of personality structure are: ways of talking; ways of thinking; ways of gesturing; ways of

meeting emotional situations; and so on. Specifically, such bits of behavior as day-dreaming, becoming angry when criticized, blushing in front of a crowd, scratching one's head when puzzled, making excuses for failure, etc., enter into the structure of the personality."

Along the line of personality traits Brooks (9:378) has made the following contribution: "By the time of puberty the youth has gone far along the road to maturity--farther than we often realize. He is nearer maturity in some respects than in others. Many habits are well established and will be modified but little during the teens, whereas other traits are loosely fixed and may be greatly changed during these years. The changes in the various traits proceed at different rates, thus altering their relative strength in the total personality at the close of this period."

The traits which Brooks lists are the physical, the mental, and the moral and social traits. "The young adolescent (9:379-80) has been developing such moral habits as truthfulness, trustworthiness, honesty, unselfishness, kindness, cheerfulness, conscientiousness, respect for authority, social adaptability, and other traits such as initiative, self-confidence, coöperation, leadership, courage, physical self-control; or he may have been developing their opposites. At the worst, his training during infancy and childhood has tended to build up and

establish undesirable habits, to strengthen selfish, anti-social impulses, and to form many wrong moral ideas. At the best, the youth of thirteen or fourteen has formed many necessary and desirable habits and ideals."

"It is commonly agreed (33:117), as I think must be admitted, that, from a descriptive point of view, personality is the sum-total of traits, and that differences of personality depend upon differences in traits, on the one hand, and on the varying combinations of them, on the other."

"But what are traits? All writers (33:117-8) do not mean the same thing by traits and consequently do not accept the same definition. What one would include as a trait, another would not. In the present discussion, from a purely descriptive point of view, by traits is meant the sentiments and ideals with their meanings for the individual; the more complex habits; the fixed acquired beliefs and prejudices and likes and dislikes; the accepted ethical and social codes of conduct; the aspirations and enduring desires; the innate cravings, or urges, or impulses and appetites and inherited tendencies in general; and many other analogous characteristics of human nature, all of which, according to their varying combinations, distinguish one individual from another and determine behavior."

"All of those I (33:118) have mentioned, however, are

not basic and primary. Some are secondary in that they are compounds of primary traits or resultants and modes in which the primary basic traits find expression. In any case, the terms are descriptive and not explanatory."

"Let us be a little more specific (33:118), and for this purpose turn to a few historical personages for illustrative traits."

"Bismarck's will-to-power, his pugnacity, his contempt for his political foes and his colleagues as well as the masses; his egotism and sense of superiority; his distrust of the people; his ruthless ambition to dominate every situation for the aggrandizement of Prussia; his fearlessness and courage to grasp power and responsibility; his assertion of personal dictatorship; his rancorousness, impatience and irritability when thwarted, and his resentment of opposition; his sentiment of love for his wife and children and dogs and the forest; his aversion to his mother, his pride of self and caste and Prussia; his reverence for monarchy and hatred of democracy; his lust for revenge even to cruelty; his egotistic domestic habits, his habits of deceit, trickery and actual lying to achieve diplomatic ends, and his belief in 'blood and iron' to accomplish political aims, were all traits of his personality; and they manifested themselves in characteristic behavior."

"It requires no psychologist (33:118-9) to recognize these peculiarities of the man as traits. But for the most

part they were not basic. Rather many of them were the mode of expression, the resultants, so to speak, of, and secondary to, other more fundamental units of personality, such as his self-assertion, his belief in the divine right of his king to rule, his political ideals of government, his aspirations for the hegemony of his native state over all Germany, etc. Some of these fundamental units were instinctive and inherited. Others were acquired in the course of life's experiences. These instinctive urges, sentiments and systems of ideas were the true basic traits out of which sprang the many qualities for which he was noted and which determined the behavior that bullied his world of politics and social life. So his traits may be defined in terms of behavior or of the basic mental and instinctive springs of action."

"Likewise, we all recognize (33:119), to take another historical illustration, that Lincoln's personal uncouth habits, his sense of humor and tendency to melancholic moods, his moral ideals and faith in God, his charitableness, intellectual honesty, sympathy with the unfortunate and the slave, his abnegation of self and absence of pride, his moderation and marvelous patience and tolerance of opposition, his hatred of slavery but reverence for law, the constitution and the Union, his faith in the common people and belief in democracy and government by the people, his 'hatred of violence in any form or by anybody', his



'passion for fairness' and his abhorrence of 'iron and blood' were traits of his personality."

"Could there be any greater contrast than that (33:119) between the personalities of Bismark and Lincoln? An appraisal of these two great statesmen by the standard of ethical values would beyond question award to Lincoln the greater character. But for psychology, which takes no account of such values, Bismark had the most interesting and intriguing personality. And can it be denied that the personality of each was the sum-total of its traits?"

"The traits of personality (33:120) are the springs of action, the principal motivating forces that determine the logical and other intellectual processes of thought. Some of them consciously--others, such as desires, aversions, fears, and sentiments of self, of hatred and affection and pride, subconsciously, and therefore unwittingly marshal associated memories, originate, guide and control processes of creative imagination and other processes of thought, which carry the urge of the traits of fulfillment and determine behavior."

Murphy lists sympathetic behavior as a personality trait. In this, she is in accord with the older "instinct" psychologists. She holds the opinion that "Human society (31:3) is based largely upon the capacity of individual human beings to interpret and respond to the behavior of other human beings; the more coöperative and closely knit

the structure of a given society becomes, the more demands are put upon individuals to respond to the needs of others. Sympathy, when it is sensible and genuine, not merely a projection of the sympathizer's anxiety or a way of dominating others, is intimately connected with all the other responses of a friendly and constructive nature that are the foundations of a coöperative society. It appears in very young children; yet it has scarcely been studied at all. We have almost no scientific material even on such questions as the age at which children sympathize in different ways, and none at all on the cultural or personality factors that are tied up with different sorts of sympathetic behavior."

Strecker (39:80) has called attention to the part played by the emotions in personality. "There is close integration not only with the structure of the nerve system, but also with the intelligence and, indeed, with the whole fabric of the personality. Nevertheless, the emotions are strongly dynamic, imparting necessary and constructive motive power to ideas. However, all too frequently they tyrannize the personality into precipitate and perhaps destructive behavior."

"Studies of intelligence and intelligent behavior (28:23) do, I believe, have a part to play, not only for their contribution to an understanding of the basic problem of social adjustment and to the prediction of probable

educational or occupational success, but also for what they may contribute to the understanding of the personality as a whole and to the specific descriptive analysis and classification of the mental behavior, whether of normal, psychopathic, or psychotic individuals. Intelligent or unintelligent behavior, as observed by the psychologist, includes postural, manual, and verbal activity, and may involve evidences of visual, cutaneous, kinesthetic, or auditory sensitivity, influenced at the same time by emotional conditions, physical status, or other factors."

Gilliland (19:371-73) has listed the following traits which, for him, constitute "personality": (a) intelligence, (b) aggressiveness or forcefulness, (c) sociability, (d) personal appearance, and (e) morality. Woodworth's (44:553-56) list included (a) physique, (b) temperament, (c) individual limitations, and (d) intelligence. Fry and Haggard (17:17-30) have listed (a) physique, (b) impulse or driving force, (c) intelligence, (d) temperament, and (e) ego as constituting the primary elements of the personality.

Bogardus (6:31-37) has written: "Three sets of personality traits may be suggested: (a) those that come from physical energy, (b) those that may be attributed to intelligence, and (c) those centering in what is commonly called character." For him, energy traits are those involving endurance, enthusiasm, and courage; intellectual

traits are the ability to observe accurately, curiosity, systematic and logical thinking, and ability to form accurate judgments; and character traits consist of behavior toward companions (honesty, sincerity, frankness, etc.), sympathy, poise, tact, sense of humor, loyalty, faith, and leadership.

As an explanation of the procedure used in setting up a tentative list of attitudes, Briggs (8:416) has written: "As a beginning for the preparation of a list of attitudes, a group of graduate students of education, each one examining some twenty pages of the dictionary, recorded all the adjectives which they considered represent desirable traits of mankind. It is probable that very few important ones were omitted. On this list of nearly 700, some 350 other graduate students indicated what they considered the first, second, and third ten in the order of importance." The composite list of the first thirty adjectives follows:

honest	efficient	reliable
coöperative	appreciative	courageous
democratic	courteous	home-loving
healthy	alert	accurate
thrifty	sincere	progressive
tolerant	conscientious	competent
industrious	just	loyal
intelligent	resourceful	capable
public-spirited	self-controlled	truthful
dependable	trustworthy	tasteful

Morrison's (30:239-290) theory of "structure in personality" included the six groups: (a) structures learned in infancy, (b) the volitional structure, (c) the thought

structure, (d) the moral structure, (e) humanistic values, and (f) intelligence.

Burnham has stated: "The different kinds (10:52-3) and types of personality are subjects for laboratory investigation and researches in social psychology. These are concerned with studies of intelligence by observation and the various intelligence tests and the behavior of the individual, one's instinctive and emotional equipment, one's attitudes, interests and habits, one's social adaptability, one's prejudices and peculiarities, one's general behavior and methods of work, one's mental defects and disorders, and especially with one's physiological, psychological, social, moral, and pedagogical ages, as well as with one's individuality and special abilities and peculiarities."

The student of human psychology is continually confronted with the question of the relative influence of so-called "innate" factors in personality as compared with those acquired from the social inheritance by individual experience and training. Any thorough-going analysis of the nature of personality must rest on a sound consideration of the nature and relative influence of the biological heredity as well as that of the social inheritance and experience.

Heredity and environment are two factors that play an important role in personality development. At birth, we

have only hereditary traits. These are potentialities and predispositions out of which environment must mold the type of personality which experience will finally complete. Surely, heredity plays an important part in each individual's personality for there must be something out of which experience is to mold a personality. If one is to accept heredity as the sole basis for personality, he would have to accept some sort of fatalism, benevolent or otherwise. If one accepts environment as the sole basis of personality, he loses all possible basis for the explanation of things as they are. If, however, environment is held to start in where heredity leaves off, hope for the improvement of mankind and the value of effort loom up in importance since hope of some accomplishment is possible for the individual to hold to as a goal.

In other words, we might say that what man can be depends upon his heredity; and what he will be depends upon his environment and the way he reacts to it. To ask whether heredity or environment is responsible for certain behavior is like asking whether it is the engine or the gasoline that makes the car go.

If personality is the product of both heredity and environment, it is many-sided. Some factors within both parts are used in each situation; other factors in other situations. "Most commonly, perhaps, traits (32:122) are defined in terms of behavior. From this point of view,

a trait may be defined as a specific habitual characteristic of the individual in given situations." If one is to take this view of traits, he must be broad and include both mental and physical behavior; preceding events and reactions, and the situation itself.

Allport (2:106) has presented his views in the following manner: "Personality = (Heredity) X (Environment). The two causal factors are not added together, but are interrelated as multiplier and multiplicand. If either were zero there could be no personality.....The newborn infant lacks personality, for he has not yet encountered the world in which he must live, and has not developed the distinctive modes of adjustment and mastery that will later comprise his personality. He is almost altogether a creature of heredity."

"The sources of personality (7:6-7) are in original nature. The newly born child is mainly a product of heredity, although even the infant has been affected by the interuterine environment and prenatal nutrition. And a baby has a personality. It is a functionally integrated organism and has also the beginnings of neural organization. It is affected by and responds to stimulation. The influences of the environment continue to impinge upon this rudimentary personality, leaving indelible impressions, modifying the affective reactions, and forming patterns of behavior, until the plastic life is moulded

to adult shape."

"The human personality (22:12) is founded on an organism, but it is built up by developing emotional bonds which link to it a home, a business or professional career, a number of loved people, a community whose approval is craved, a set of ideas and beliefs, and a variety of composite interest-complexes.....The expanded personality (22:15) consists in the physical organism of a human being, plus the belongings, loved ones, social organizations, ideas, habits, memories, and purposes toward which the individual gives reactions similar to those which he gives to his own body."

"Personality (37:18) does not just happen. It is built up bit by bit as a great monument is built, stone upon stone. No experience is unimportant. Every act, every thought, every desire has its place in the shaping of the personality, just as each scrap of masonry makes its contribution to the final structure and strength of a building.....Even before we are born, there exist factors which will be important in shaping our personalities. The controversy over which is more important, heredity or environment, is no nearer solution now than it was in the time of Darwin."

"Inborn tendencies (37:21) may be facilitated or retarded in their development, due to the conditions under which an individual grows. The child with a musical



talent may never have the opportunity to develop or display it. His gift may always lie dormant, while by necessity he becomes a bricklayer. And conversely, thousands of dollars spent and agonizing hours of practice will not produce a musical genius where no inborn talent lies."

Heredity, naturally, plays an important part in personality development for everything must have a source or foundation. In his idea of heredity, Jennings (25:18-: 272) went straight to the gene principle when he wrote, "Experimental biology has shown that at its beginning the organism is a complex thing, containing a great number of separate substances--what we call the genes. By the interaction of these thousand substances with each other, with the cytoplasm, with materials brought in from the outside, with the forces of the environment---development takes place, the individual is produced with all his later characteristics."

Human behavior depends almost entirely upon biology for its contributing forces. The study of biology has helped in many different ways, most perhaps, in its development of a more complete viewpoint in regard to conduct. Confirming this idea, Groves (21:8) has written: "Biologically we act to accomplish adjustment to environment. A person's behavior therefore is his effort to accomplish purposes. Good activity is proved by its efficiency."

If biological heredity were to be used as the sole term with which to explain the superior power of development of some children over others, little would be done to surround the different children with situations that would assist them toward well rounded personalities. Should any active interest in the matter be taken, it would naturally be to insure the development of "firm timber"; but those who regard the child's environment as the sole factor in personality development would be less interested in eugenics and would try to bring about good social backgrounds to develop children along the lines of acceptable character growth.

Both heredity and environment should be regarded as of the utmost importance in planning a program of child development. It would be impossible to produce an actual individual without an environment. By the same token, no environmental medium, no matter how great, could bring about an individual without the aid of some agent that is capable of producing life and growth. Obviously the two factors must be available and be compounded into a single unique source of growth. Gray (20:655-57) brings out that all an organism is at any given time is "what its inherited genes have been able to make it under the control of its environment up to that time". "In other words (42:42), what we inherit is genes and what the genes manage to accomplish is determined not only by their internal

constitution but, to a great extent, by the environmental conditions under which they develop. Furthermore, no trait, physical or otherwise, is exclusively inherited. Inheritance and environment become amalgamated in organic life and each loses its identity."

"What may be called the sociological methods (34:28) of personality study put stress upon environmental factors as most important in shaping the personality. Studies of the influence of climate and topography, temperature and humidity, belong here, but what is of special importance is the social or cultural environment--the mass of customs, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, and so on to which the child is subjected from the moment of his birth, and indeed which have begun to act upon him, through their influence upon his parents, long before he actually enters the world."

"There are other groups (34:29) whose approach to the study of personality is through the manipulation of the environment. The behavioristic school, already discussed, are vociferous exponents of the idea that personality is the result of environmental pressures, and the psycho-analytic school is often accused of being purely 'environmentalist'."

Berg (4:309) perhaps, takes a better view of the method of study of personality when he sums it up by saying: "Our search through the many fields of the science of

human life has disclosed to us that personality and character are the integration of many and diverse forces. No longer may we with intelligent assurance look upon personality as a purely psychological or a purely sociological manifestation; we must rather see it with the eyes of all the sciences. And we must see, too, that heredity and environment, those forces that make human life what it is, are as faces of Janus, seeing both past and future."

With all the disputes over the theories of what personality is and the ways in which it develops and with no definite proof of which is right and which is wrong or whether they are all trying to say the same thing in different words with the same meaning, the child still exists and must continue to exist. The study of child psychology and child development, adolescence, delinquency, and character education places many additional facts and theories on personality and social behavior at our disposal but these, too, are far from unitary and coherent at the present time. Interpretations of children's behavior in response to other persons are often only comparisons with the socially approved forms of adult conduct. It is not only doubtful that such comparisons are always desirable, but it is possible that occasionally they are harmful because social standards change from age to age and adults may even forget that they have not always lived up to the standards they now hold. It is a difficult task to acquire the

social techniques that make for a satisfactory adjustment to a social group and, at the same time, to keep one's individuality. If, for example, certain standards of leadership, popularity, honesty, politeness, and independence, are forced upon the child in its early years of life, these may become forced standards and either rebelled against or imperfectly understood. The child may be put through the forms and yet have only a set of stereotyped responses to specific situations without developing an understanding of the varied responses required to meet varying situations with the proper social behavior. It is not always unselfish to give up a toy to another child. It may be a form of display or martyrdom or it may be an undue submission -- all weaknesses in personality.

Maladjustments in adults are usually traceable to certain prescribed rules of conduct in childhood or to uncontrolled behavior, both of which may have failed to offer opportunity for self-initiated and self-controlled activities that are acceptable to society as proper for the child's age-group. Approval and disapproval from others, immediately given, are strong factors in the development of individual standards of social conduct. Unless the child is made aware of the effects of his conduct upon others and their attitudes toward him, he cannot develop the complex traits that are designated as standards for his age-group and are basic to future development. The

behavior of others is influential in stimulating the child to various forms and degrees of activity. If children of different age levels play together and are engaged in the same activities, the older children will be engaged in the activity while the younger children look on or the older children will have to do the same things the younger children are able to do. The child who cries easily or whines a great deal is dubbed "a baby"; while the one who snatches things or fights at the slightest provocation is termed "a bully" and may soon find a group combination pitted against him. Wise guidance by adults will assist children to work these problems out for themselves, but care should be provided that no physical or personality harm results while they are doing this. If no fighting or scratching standards are met with, the child will fail to learn their behavior effect upon him and be unable to present a proper course of action if he should meet them later.

The various traits that are stressed as desirable in adults or as making up desirable social behavior are complex and involve intellectual knowledge in the coördination and modification of the emotional, personal, and social responses that, it is hoped, will result in reactions that are acceptable in social relationships. Learning to coördinate these responses into behavior that is satisfactory in different social groups is difficult and the stages of learning in childhood should be recognized.

Lying, cheating, and irritability, for example, are often considered as serious character defects in children. In a particular case, they may or may not be. The goals of training for social behavior are the opposites of lying, cheating, and irritability; but in order that a child may understand these situations better, he should not be restrained altogether from saying or doing such things nor should he be overprotected from them in others. If he is, he may be deprived of valuable training on which to build socially acceptable responses in the future and be unable to meet such behavior adequately or with understanding. Either undue restraint or serious neglect may hinder the child from associating a motive with an act or understanding either the motive or the act.

Learning to accept forms of behavior as socially acceptable appears to proceed in a manner similar to that of the acquisition of knowledge and of skill in other forms of response or activity. Specific forms of response are learned for specific situations and specific environments. If the varying environments are consistent in their approval of specific forms of behavior, the child builds an increasing number of specific responses that approach generalized social traits. As the social experiences of the child are widely varied, his responses will become flexible and will be modified in adaptation to different persons if he has sufficient intelligence, initiative, and experience

to make the required adaptations. Otherwise, he will withdraw from some available environments by physical removal or self-infolding or will fail to take a satisfactory place in those situations in which he is forced to remain and which he can not or will not meet. It is first essential, however, that training should be directed toward the specific responses of children and not toward the response patterns of adults because children should live within their age-groups and can not understand patterns of behavior far beyond these. The influence of the home and of companions upon the child in learning social behavior appear to be the most important single influences through the approval of the forms of conduct required in the minor routine activities. Sometimes the one is the more important, sometimes the other.

If the general conditions which a child meets are such that the child's desires have approved forms of satisfaction, the fundamentally desirable social reactions are fairly well established by school age. If not, either the behavior patterns are not established or undesirable patterns become fairly well fixed--to the discomfort of the child and the school. Desires to be active, to be free from tension, to be popular, to get out of mistakes with as little loss of prestige as possible, and other similar traits are fundamental human tendencies that are striven for in all normal human beings. These develop in various



ways in accordance with conditions. When a person speaks, his appearance becomes a secondary element of personality. If his speech is pleasant and his conversation interesting, he will be considered charming. If his voice is unpleasant and his English poor, his physical beauty will not help the impression he is making as long as he is talking. Poise is the foundation of a charming personality. The amount of poise can be measured by the maturity of behavior and integration of one's reactions to social situations. Dress, frequently, has a psychological effect upon the individual by giving him assurance. Proper adjustment to social situations is the chief requisite of a successful life.

The objective measurement of personality is, at present, impossible. The personal inventory or rating scale is the best instrument available at this time for the measurement of personality. The next chapter of this thesis presents the average ratings of all of the members of the sophomore, junior, and senior classes of a small high school on two such inventories by as many as seven different raters for most of these pupils.

### Chapter III

#### A Study of 100 High School Pupils on Two Personality Scales

The purpose of this study was the functional one of applying to the members of the sophomore, junior, and senior classes of a small high school two scales or measures of personality development in an effort to determine whether or not, from the results from these scales, the reason or reasons for an apparent lack of initiative on the parts of these pupils could be found; to measure their social-mindedness or degrees of social development in all the ways furnished by these scales; and to try to formulate some plan, within the school and the community, that would stimulate more alertness and aggressiveness on the parts of the pupils and, possibly, of the adults within the community.

The two scales chosen were the Hayes (23:211-15) "Personality Rating Scale for the Adolescent in School" and the Doll (15:16-30) "Vineland Social Maturity Scale." One might raise the question of the choice of these two from among the considerable number of such scales and questionnaires. The Hayes Scale was chosen because it was based upon actual observation of pupils in school, was carefully tested out in actual school situations by the author, and was designed for use with adolescents, that is, young

people of high school age. The Vineland Scale was chosen for similar reasons and because it had been used in other research studies, thereby furnishing means of comparison of this school population with other more or less similar groups.

Due to the large number of tests and rating scales, it would be impracticable in this paper to give such a list. Quite complete information regarding these scales may be found in the Educational Index on Personality Tests (16) for 1923-1940 and in Buros' Bibliography (11) of Tests, 1933-1936.

According to the author, the Hayes (23:208-17) Personality Rating Scale for the Adolescent in School was made up from 200 one-hour diary records of the behavior in school of twenty adolescent pupils. Analysis of these records furnished 221 items of behavior. These were evaluated in terms of "seriously bad" or "desirably good" behavior by 100 students in advanced psychology on a scale ranging from minus three through zero to plus three. The same material was then evaluated by a group of twelve experts in the fields of education and psychiatry. A correlation of  $+0.95$  was found between the mean values assigned the items by the two groups. The list of items was cut down (a) by the elimination of all items questioned as ambiguous or of doubtful value by the two groups of

evaluators; (b) by the elimination of all items whose mean values lay between  $+ .6$  and  $- .6$  in the scoring of the evaluators; (c) by the dropping of all items whose mean values were less than four times their standard deviations, as indicating too much scatter in the values attached to them; and (d) by dropping out one of each set of several items which were opposites of the same mode of behavior. A final selection of 100 items was retained. These were grouped, for diagnostic purposes, under eight headings: (a) relations to others generally, (b) respect for the rights of others, (c) relation to the teacher, (d) relation to other pupils, (e) initiative, (f) health habits, (g) general interests, and (h) scholarship and study habits. The manual of directions supplied a table, which gave the mean scores for each "T", "F", or "U" (uncertain or unknown) rating. The reliability coefficient of the scale, obtained by an odd-even check from 100 papers chosen at random from within a larger group, was  $+ .88 \pm .015$ . This became  $+ .94$  when the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was applied. While the scores (23:217) assigned by two student-teachers who had known the pupils scored for eight weeks correlated only  $+ .33$ , it is probable that a higher reliability would have been obtained if the raters had been more experienced teachers and better acquainted with their pupils. "Personality (23:216) is a matter of the individual's inter-

action with the environment, the most significant part of which is the personalities of other individuals. Very close agreement among raters is not to be expected."

Norms for the Hayes Scale were obtained from 801 ratings in ten different states, from urban and rural schools, and from large and small schools. Separate norms for boys and for girls are supplied, and a form for the drawing of personality profiles is illustrated. Norms are also supplied for the different chronological ages within the scale's limits. These are chronological ages 10 to 20, inclusive.

The Vineland Social Maturity Scale (15:16-30) provides a definite outline of detailed performances in respect to which children show a progressive capacity for looking after themselves and for participating in those activities which lead toward ultimate independence as adults. The items of the scale are arranged in order of increasing average difficulty, and represent progressive maturation in general self-help, self-direction, locomotion, occupation, communication, and social relations. This maturation in social independence may be taken as a measure of progressive development in social competence.

The items of the Vineland Scale are arranged in order of average age norms, and are numbered from one to 117. They have also been separated into year groups according to

the average age scores obtained from the scale as a whole. The norms extend from chronological age ten through the adult years. Sex differences in item difficulty and in average age scores were found to be so small as to be negligible for practical purposes. The Vineland Scale is not a rating scale and scores are not based on mere opinions, according to Doll (15:1-30). The pupil does not make the scoring judgment. This is done by the examiner after he has obtained from the pupil as much detail as practicable regarding the facts of behavior which reveal the manner and extent of the subject's actual performance on each item. The reliability of the Vineland Scale was not given, but may be taken somewhat for granted from the reputation of its author.

In addition to the personality scales used, the mental ages and the intelligence quotients of the pupils used in this thesis were found from the Otis Self-Administering Test of Mental Ability, Higher Examination, Form A. This test was administered in the usual way by a tester who had had sufficient training to administer and score group tests satisfactorily. In employing the Hayes' Scale, all of the scoring was done by the writer of this paper, who has known the pupils for a number of years, and checked by the writer and two other people qualified in this field. The scoring was done without the knowledge of the pupils, with the

exception that, at a later date after the scores had been compiled, a few of the lower scoring pupils were allowed to rate themselves and then in some cases given a revised score by this writer. This seemed to be an incentive for an effort toward improvement of the personality on the parts of these pupils. With the Vineland Scale, the scoring was done by the same method as above.

The chronological ages of the pupils used in this thesis ranged from fifteen years to twenty years at the time that these scales and tests were employed. The mean age in years for these 100 pupils was  $17.09 \pm 1.19$ . Their mental ages ranged from fourteen years to twenty years, with a mean of  $16.87 \pm 1.36$ . Their I.Q.'s ranged from 82 to 123, with a mean of  $101.62 \pm 9.52$ . Intellectually, this group of pupils was normal but not above normal. The seeming small discrepancy between their chronological and mental ages on the one hand and their I.Q.'s on the other is doubtless due to the fact that their ages were recorded in years only.

Table I gives the distribution of the scores of the pupils rated on the Hayes Scale by the writer and his assistants, the number of pupils studied by the writer who made these different scores, and the percentile ranking for each class range as set up by Hayes (23:21b).

TABLE I

Scores Made by the Pupils on the Hayes Scale

Scores	Number Pupils	Percentile Norms	Scores	Number Pupils	Percentile Norms
950-974	5	99	375-399	0	34
925-949	1	99	350-374	0	32
900-924	3	98	325-349	3	30
875-899	4	97	300-324	2	27
850-874	2	96	275-299	0	25
825-849	5	95	250-274	0	23
800-824	1	93	225-249	0	21
775-799	4	91	200-224	1	18
750-774	3	88	175-199	1	16
725-749	6	86	150-174	0	14
700-724	3	82	125-149	0	12
675-699	7	80	100-124	1	10
650-674	15	76	75- 99	0	9
625-649	6	73	50- 74	1	8
600-624	5	69	25- 49	0	6
575-599	6	64	0- 24	0	5
550-574	8	59	- 1- 25	0	4
525-549	1	55	- 26- 50	0	3
500-524	1	51	- 51- 75	0	2
475-499	2	47	- 76-100	0	1
450-474	1	44	-101-125	0	1
425-449	2	41	-126-150	0	0
400-424	0	37	-151-175	0	0
			-176-200	0	0

The higher scores in this table are for the more desirable personality trait groupings; and the lower scores, the less desirable personalities. The mean score for the girls rated by the writer on the Hayes Scale was  $653.900 \pm 192.000$ . This is located on the 76th percentile of the Hayes norms. The mean score for the boys on this scale was  $640.900 \pm 194.000$ . This is located on the 73rd percentile of the Hayes' norms. The mean score for the



entire group on this scale was  $646.500 \pm 192.000$ , located on the Hayes' 73rd percentile.

Hayes (23) does not give a table of norms for girls alone. She states that the median score for all of the girls rated by her and her associates was 553. These girls were between chronological ages ten and twenty. The Hayes' median score for girls was about half (.53) of a standard deviation below the mean score found by the writer. This may mean that (a) the writer rated his group too high, (b) the writer's group was less selfishly aggressive and antagonistic toward school and toward other people than the group rated by Hayes and her associates, or (c) the chronological age distributions of the groups rated by Hayes and by the writer were different enough to make at least a part of the difference in the Hayes' median score and the writer's mean score. The range of chronological ages of the group studied by the writer was fifteen to twenty, inclusive. On the other hand, Hayes (23) stated that the older pupils, both boys and girls, were likely to make lower scores than the younger pupils. The writer found this to be true of his data except in a general way on the part entitled "initiative."

The median score for boys between chronological ages ten and twenty on the Hayes' norms was 448. She did not give a table of percentiles for the boys alone. This

median score was almost a whole standard deviation (.99) below the mean of the group rated by the writer. The only reasons which the writer can find for this difference have already been stated in the preceding paragraph.

The median score for both boys and girls found by Hayes was 507. This is in contrast with a mean score of 646.5 found by this writer. The difference between these two is .73 of a standard deviation from the mean found by this writer, and in a lower direction or toward the less desirable scores. Again, the only reasons which the writer can find for this difference have been stated above.

The Hayes Scale was divided into eight parts, each having to do with one trait or one set of habits. These eight parts were: (a) relation to others generally, (b) respect for the rights of others, (c) relation to teacher, (d) relation to other pupils, (e) initiative, (f) health habits, (g) general interest, and (h) scholarship and study habits. Unfortunately, Hayes did not give any tables of norms for these diagnostic parts. For comparative purposes among the pupils studied by the writer and for individual counseling, this writer worked out tables for each of these parts, showing the means and standard deviations for the boys and for the girls and for both combined for each of the grades studied, that is, the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades. These tables are

presented as Tables II-IX, inclusive, in the pages which follow.

The first of these tables is Table II which presents the data available on "Relation to Others Generally."

TABLE II  
Means and S.D.'s of This Group on  
"RELATION TO OTHERS GENERALLY"

Group	Means	S.D.	Number
Twelfth Grade Girls	162.823	55.04	13
Twelfth Grade Boys	186.900	60.48	15
Twelfth Grade Total	177.464	60.48	28
Eleventh Grade Girls	195.636	32.72	14
Eleventh Grade Boys	184.490	49.02	19
Eleventh Grade Total	186.238	42.94	33
Tenth Grade Girls	194.125	38.42	16
Tenth Grade Boys	179.535	56.12	23
Tenth Grade Total	183.656	50.16	39
Entire Group of Girls	182.001	46.01	43
Entire Group of Boys	183.718	59.52	57
Entire Group Total	181.920	55.18	100

The possible score on "Relation to Others Generally" on the Hayes Scale is 258. The mean score for the entire group rated by the writer is  $181.920 \pm 55.18$ . This is probably a little high, although one cannot be sure in the absence of comparative figures. It is, however, about halfway between the midscore, 129, and the highest possible score.

The mean score for the entire group is less than the mean score of either the entire group of girls or the entire group of boys. This is probably due to either the small group rated or to the wide variation from the mean score by a few pupils. The boys had a higher mean score than the girls. This was due largely to the low scores of the twelfth grade girls. The eleventh grade girls made the highest mean score of any group, with the tenth grade girls next. The twelfth grade boys were less consistent than any other group, that is, the standard deviation around the mean was larger for this group than for any other group.

Table III, page 64, presents the data on "Respect for the Rights of Others," in the same form as Table II.

The possible score on "Respect for the Rights of Others" on the Hayes Scale is 57. The mean score for the entire group studied by this writer is  $39.750 \pm 19.25$ . The writer believes that this is above what the average should be as it is above the seventy-five percentile distance from the least positive score to the highest possible score; and more than that distance from the lowest possible score, minus 93, to plus 57. The eleventh grade mean for both boys and girls is the highest in this table. The tenth grade mean is second, and the twelfth grade total mean last. The twelfth grade is again found to show greater

variation than either of the other two groups.

TABLE III  
Means and S.D.'s of This Group on  
"RESPECT FOR THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS"

Group	Means	S.D.	Number
Twelfth Grade Girls	34.200	23.00	13
Twelfth Grade Boys	30.000	34.00	15
Twelfth Grade Total	31.600	31.50	28
Eleventh Grade Girls	47.494	14.14	14
Eleventh Grade Boys	53.060	5.65	19
Eleventh Grade Total	49.285	10.64	33
Tenth Grade Girls	48.500	10.08	16
Tenth Grade Boys	44.780	13.65	23
Tenth Grade Total	45.005	11.85	39
Entire Group of Girls	39.520	17.20	43
Entire Group of Boys	39.725	19.75	57
Entire Group Total	39.750	19.25	100

Table IV gives the data on "Relation to Teacher," in the same form as the two preceding tables.

The highest possible score on the Hayes Scale for "Relation to Teacher" is 39; the lowest is minus 35. The mean score for the entire group studied by the writer is  $23.080 \pm 10.53$ . The writer feels it is not much more than the average should be. The mid-score of the possible scores is four. The mean score for the entire group is higher than the mean score of either the girls or boys. This is probably due to the small sampling or to the wide

variation in the different scores. The tenth grade girls scored highest and the twelfth grade girls lowest in this group. The tenth grade total was highest, the eleventh grade total second, and the twelfth grade total lowest and least consistent as a group.

TABLE IV  
Means and S.D.'s of This Group on  
"RELATION TO TEACHER"

Group	Means	S.D.	Number
Twelfth Grade Girls	17.652	10.00	13
Twelfth Grade Boys	19.271	14.62	15
Twelfth Grade Total	18.709	12.35	28
Eleventh Grade Girls	22.713	11.16	14
Eleventh Grade Boys	19.737	4.05	19
Eleventh Grade Total	19.905	9.18	33
Tenth Grade Girls	27.000	7.90	16
Tenth Grade Boys	21.588	8.88	23
Tenth Grade Total	23.196	7.84	39
Entire Group of Girls	22.533	10.44	43
Entire Group of Boys	21.689	10.66	57
Entire Group Total	23.080	10.53	100

Table V gives the data on "Relation to Other Pupils." The highest possible score on "Relation to Other Pupils" on the Hayes Scale is 79; the lowest is -109. The mean score for the entire group total is  $59.270 \pm 15.64$ . The entire group is more consistent on this part of the scale than on any other except "health habits." The writer believes that

this score is not much too high, due to the good fellowship that exists in the school and the absence of "cliques" among the pupils. The lower grades in this school made the better scores. The tenth grade total was highest, and the twelfth total lowest, but no large variation existed among the classes.

TABLE V  
Means and S.D.'s of This Group on  
"RELATION TO OTHER PUPILS"

Group	Means	S.D.	Number
Twelfth Grade Girls	59.684	9.36	13
Twelfth Grade Boys	59.740	16.20	15
Twelfth Grade Total	58.216	14.40	28
Eleventh Grade Girls	61.293	17.85	14
Eleventh Grade Boys	59.760	13.10	19
Eleventh Grade Total	60.100	15.47	33
Tenth Grade Girls	64.500	8.94	16
Tenth Grade Boys	57.178	19.20	23
Tenth Grade Total	60.612	16.00	39
Entire Group of Girls	61.514	12.75	43
Entire Group of Boys	59.028	17.28	57
Entire Group Total	59.270	15.64	100

Table VI presents the material on "Initiative." The highest possible score on "Initiative" on the Hayes Scale is 283; the lowest is minus 27. The mean for the entire group studied by this writer is  $120.960 \pm 54.00$ . The writer believes that these pupils are below average on

this part of the Hayes Scale, and that this deficiency is probably due to home and local environmental conditions. The mid-score of the range of possible scores on this trait is 126--seven points above the mean score for the group rated. The table shows that the higher grades in this school made the better scores, but the writer can offer no explanation for this.

TABLE VI  
Means and S.D.'s of This Group on  
"INITIATIVE"

Group	Means	S.D.	Number
Twelfth Grade Girls	106.095	56.67	13
Twelfth Grade Boys	144.900	57.54	15
Twelfth Grade Total	134.934	59.89	28
Eleventh Grade Girls	120.574	22.66	14
Eleventh Grade Boys	107.714	45.44	19
Eleventh Grade Total	110.588	41.92	33
Tenth Grade Girls	117.750	56.10	16
Tenth Grade Boys	101.064	53.82	23
Tenth Grade Total	110.836	47.38	39
Entire Group of Girls	119.388	45.12	43
Entire Group of Boys	118.512	56.70	57
Entire Group Total	120.960	54.00	100

Table VII gives the data on "Health Habits," as these are found from the Hayes Scale.

The possible score on "Health Habits" is 37; the lowest possible score is minus 59. The mean score for the



entire group is  $28.500 \pm 9.87$ . The writer feels this is above the average. This high rating is due, mainly, to the fact that a large percentage of the pupils come from country homes where they get more fresh air and physical exercise and that, as a group, they are interested in good health. The untidy dress of a number of pupils caused them to be rated low. The tenth grade group scored highest and the twelfth grade lowest, but the writer can give no reason for this decrease of score for the older pupils.

TABLE VII  
Means and S.D.'s of This Group on  
"HEALTH HABITS"

Group	Means	S.D.	Number
Twelfth Grade Girls	24.257	13.97	13
Twelfth Grade Boys	25.908	13.08	15
Twelfth Grade Total	25.500	13.44	28
Eleventh Grade Girls	31.500	7.26	14
Eleventh Grade Boys	29.679	9.79	19
Eleventh Grade Total	29.668	8.47	33
Tenth Grade Girls	30.840	8.66	16
Tenth Grade Boys	34.804	3.36	23
Tenth Grade Total	31.389	7.01	39
Entire Group of Girls	28.183	10.25	43
Entire Group of Boys	28.968	9.46	57
Entire Group Total	28.500	9.87	100

The data on "General Interests" are shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII  
Means and S.D.'s of This Group on  
"GENERAL INTERESTS"

Group	Means	S.D.	Number
Twelfth Grade Girls	40.342	37.54	13
Twelfth Grade Boys	48.400	26.91	15
Twelfth Grade Total	44.789	26.95	28
Eleventh Grade Girls	49.782	10.31	14
Eleventh Grade Boys	32.170	16.56	19
Eleventh Grade Total	39.586	19.06	33
Tenth Grade Girls	52.500	24.12	16
Tenth Grade Boys	35.274	20.88	23
Tenth Grade Total	45.833	23.94	39
Entire Group of Girls	51.652	22.50	43
Entire Group of Boys	38.878	12.14	57
Entire Group Total	42.420	23.23	100

The highest possible score on "General Interests" on the Hayes Scale is 93; the lowest, minus 29. The mean score of the pupils rated is  $42.420 \pm 23.23$ . The writer believes the pupils are below average on this part of the scale although the data do not support this contention. The mid-score of the range of possible scores on this part of the Hayes Scale is plus thirty-two; and the mean score of the group rated by this writer and his associates is forty-two. The apparent reason for this deficiency, if it exists, is the absence of any local conditions that would arouse the pupils to any great heights of endeavor. The three class groups were all fairly close in mean scores,

but there were wide differences among the groups of boys and of girls.

Table IX gives the data on "Scholarship and Study Habits."

TABLE IX  
Means and S.D.'s of This Group on  
"SCHOLARSHIP AND STUDY HABITS"

Group	Means	S.D.	Number
Twelfth Grade Girls	117.940	70.40	13
Twelfth Grade Boys	147.358	36.66	15
Twelfth Grade Total	119.910	31.46	28
Eleventh Grade Girls	152.064	37.44	14
Eleventh Grade Boys	134.130	42.90	19
Eleventh Grade Total	142.410	41.40	33
Tenth Grade Girls	159.500	29.28	16
Tenth Grade Boys	135.891	35.24	23
Tenth Grade Total	140.975	43.29	39
Entire Group of Girls	140.420	26.64	43
Entire Group of Boys	145.300	42.80	57
Entire Group Total	147.500	44.00	100

The highest possible score on "Scholarship and Study Habits" on the Hayes Scale is 196; the lowest, minus 16. The mean score of the pupils rated is  $147.500 \pm 44.00$ . The writer believes the entire group which he and his associates rated is actually about average on this part of the scale and that this score from the use of the Hayes Scale is too high. These pupils have proved themselves to be

only an average group in intelligence and in scholastic attainment. The twelfth grade girls were by far the least consistent; due probably to a few very able pupils, a few very poor, a few in between, and the small number in the whole group.

The Vineland Social Maturity Scale by Doll (15:16-30) provides a definite outline of detailed performances in respect to which the individual shows progress in looking after himself and in participating in those activities that lead to independence as an adult. These have been arranged in an order of increased difficulty and social significance and have been chosen to represent practical achievement in self-help, self-direction, locomotion, occupation, communication, and social relations. The items represent the rapid development of the individual's progress toward controlling his environment. The underlying principles involved in the construction of the scale are much the same as those employed by Binet and Simon in the construction of their intelligence scale, in that each item represents a fairly definite and measurable growth. In the one test, this was in intelligence; in the other, in social responsibility. A complete and annotated bibliography on the Vineland Social Maturity Scale (15:123-132) can be found in a recent issue of Journal of Consulting Psychology. (14).

Doll (15:30) worked out an age-order-of-difficulty table as a guide to the use of the scores obtained from his scale. This table gives the ages at which the individual, if normal, should have certain definite scores, at each age from one to twenty. This age is the social age of the individual.

Table X is the table given by Doll (15:30) for this age score conversion.

TABLE X  
Tentative Age-Score Conversion Table (15:30)

Age	Score	Age	Score
1.0	15	11.0	76
2.0	31	12.0	79
3.0	42	13.0	82
4.0	48	14.0	85
5.0	54	15.0	88
6.0	60	16.0	91
7.0	66	17.0	94
8.0	69	18.0	97
9.0	72	19.0	99
10.0	74	20.0	102
		30.0	112

The social quotient, as used by Doll, represents the measurement of the social responsibility and social development of the individual just as the intelligence quotient represents the measurement of the intellect of the individual. The S.Q., or social quotient, of the average

person should be about 100, just as the I.Q. of the average individual will be about 100. In other words, the S.Q. is to the social relations of the individual just about what the I.Q. is to his mental capacity.

If the social age is found from the age-conversion table, the social quotient can be obtained by dividing this social age by the chronological or life age and multiplying the product by one hundred. The formula for the social quotient would then be  $SQ = \frac{SA}{CA} \times 100$ . If a person rated on the Doll Scale is an average individual, his S.A. will equal his C.A., and the division of the S.A. by the C.A. will equal one. If this is multiplied by 100, his S.Q. will obviously equal 100.

Table XI gives the mean social quotients and their standard deviations of the pupils rated by the writer and his associates on the Doll Scale in groups by sexes and grades. The table includes the tenth grade boys, tenth grade girls, and the total tenth grade; the eleventh grade boys, the eleventh grade girls, and the total eleventh grade; and the twelfth grade boys, twelfth grade girls, and the total twelfth grade. In addition, the mean S.Q.'s and their standard deviations are given for the entire group of boys, the entire group of girls, and the entire group of both boys and girls. By recording these data in this manner, quite direct comparisons with the Hayes Scale were

made possible.

TABLE XI  
Means and S.D.'s on the Doll Scale in  
TERMS OF THE SOCIAL QUOTIENT

Group	Means	S.D.	Number
Twelfth Grade Girls	99.134	7.25	13
Twelfth Grade Boys	104.170	12.90	15
Twelfth Grade Total	99.927	11.44	28
Eleventh Grade Girls	100.642	2.72	14
Eleventh Grade Boys	96.000	3.90	19
Eleventh Grade Total	98.316	3.60	33
Tenth Grade Girls	100.750	5.15	16
Tenth Grade Boys	103.128	6.82	23
Tenth Grade Total	102.970	6.72	39
Entire Group of Girls	98.792	5.67	43
Entire Group of Boys	100.900	8.60	57
Entire Group Total	98.750	8.14	100

The mean S.Q. for the entire local group was  $98.750 \pm 8.14$ . The mean S.Q. found, or established, by Doll and his associates was 100. The slight difference between the means of Doll and of the writer shows that the local group was average or normal in social development as measured by the Vineland Scale.

The mean S.Q. for the twelfth grade boys was the highest among the six groups measured by the writer. This mean S.Q. of 104.179 represents a social age of twenty years, while the average C.A. of the group was only 18.46.

The mean S.Q. of the tenth grade boys was only slightly lower, or  $103.128 \pm 6.82$ . This also falls within the twenty year old "interpolation" (15:10-15) of social ages and social quotients although the average C.A. of these boys were only 16.17. The eleventh grade boys had the lowest S.Q. among the six groups. The girls in all three grades were closely approximate in S.Q. mean scores and in individual scores--as shown by the small standard deviations of the three groups of girls. The mean score for the entire group of fifty-seven boys was slightly higher than that for the entire group of girls, but the standard deviation for the boys was also larger. This shows that there were wider variations in score among the boys than among the girls, especially among the twelfth grade boys.

Tables XII to XVII include the combined data from the Doll Scale, that is, the Doll Scale Scores, the resultant social ages and social quotients; plus the Hayes Scale Scores, and the chronological ages, the mental ages, and the intelligence quotients for the tenth grade boys and girls, the eleventh grade boys and girls, and the twelfth grade boys and girls.



TABLE XII

## Total Data on the Tenth Grade Girls

Grade 10 Girls	Age	M.A.	S.A.	S.Q.	I.Q.	Scores	
						Hayes	Doll
1	15	15.1	16.0	106	101	672	91
2	16	15.6	16.0	100	98	690	91
3	15	15.3	16.0	106	102	929	91
4	16	15.6	15.7	97	98	730	90
5	16	15.4	16.0	100	103	730	91
6	16	18.5	16.6	104	116	816	93
7	16	18.5	18.3	114	116	918	98
8	16	16.6	16.3	101	104	677	92
9	16	15.5	15.7	97	97	640	90
10	16	15.0	15.7	97	94	311	90
11	16	15.5	16.3	101	96	624	92
12	17	18.3	16.0	95	108	792	90
13	16	16.0	14.5	91	100	573	87
14	16	16.4	16.3	101	103	876	92
15	17	15.9	15.7	90	94	683	90
16	16	15.0	16.3	101	94	574	92

TABLE XIII

Total Data on the Tenth Grade Boys

Grade 10 Boys	Age	M.A.	S.A.	S.Q.	I.Q.	Scores	
						Hayes	Doll
17	15	17.2	16.3	108	115	900	92
18	16	15.4	17.0	106	96	871	94
19	16	17.9	18.0	112	112	957	97
20	18	16.0	17.3	96	89	760	95
21	16	14.0	15.7	97	88	330	90
22	17	15.9	16.3	96	94	604	92
23	15	15.6	16.0	106	104	697	91
24	18	15.1	15.7	89	84	420	90
25	17	16.4	17.0	100	97	578	94
26	16	16.9	16.0	100	106	653	91
27	16	14.7	15.7	98	92	566	90
28	16	15.3	16.3	102	96	484	92
29	17	14.6	15.3	90	86	329	89
30	16	15.6	16.0	100	98	653	91
31	16	17.1	17.0	110	107	668	94
32	17	16.5	16.0	95	97	651	91
33	15	17.2	16.0	108	108	716	91
34	15	17.4	15.3	102	116	51	89
35	17	16.6	15.7	92	96	658	90
36	16	17.6	17.7	110	110	830	96
37	16	17.6	17.7	119	119	734	96
38	16	17.3	16.0	100	102	650	91
39	16	15.3	15.7	97	96	626	90

TABLE XIV

Total Data on the Eleventh Grade Girls

Grade 11 Girls	Age	M.A.	S.A.	S.Q.	I.Q.	Scores	
						Hayes	Doll
40	17	16.8	17.0	100	99	685	94
41	16	19.6	17.0	106	123	880	94
42	17	16.6	17.0	100	98	747	94
43	17	18.5	18.3	102	109	734	95
44	17	19.2	17.0	100	113	333	94
45	17	18.5	16.0	95	109	696	91
46	17	20.2	18.0	106	119	662	97
47	17	19.0	17.0	100	112	676	94
48	17	16.1	16.7	98	95	651	93
49	17	16.6	17.0	100	98	797	94
50	17	17.1	17.3	101	101	764	95
51	18	18.9	17.0	95	105	651	94
52	16	15.6	16.0	100	98	552	91
53	16	18.7	17.0	106	117	641	94

TABLE XV

Total Data on the Eleventh Grade Boys

Grade 11 Boys	Age	M.A.	S.A.	S.Q.	I.Q.	Scores	
						Hayes	Doll
54	16	14.4	16.0	100	90	553	91
55	18	16.5	17.0	95	92	540	94
56	17	17.3	17.0	100	102	792	94
57	19	19.7	16.0	85	104	616	89
58	17	17.8	16.0	95	105	594	91
59	16	15.6	16.0	100	98	616	91
60	19	18.4	18.0	95	97	617	97
61	16	16.5	17.0	92	95	456	94
62	18	18.9	18.0	100	105	834	97
63	18	18.9	18.0	100	105	756	97
64	18	18.0	17.7	98	100	507	97
65	18	16.5	17.0	95	92	697	94
66	17	16.4	17.0	100	97	668	94
67	18	18.8	17.3	95	105	502	95
68	20	19.0	17.0	85	90	442	94
69	17	18.3	17.0	100	108	779	94
70	17	17.6	16.7	98	104	671	93
71	19	17.6	17.3	91	93	623	95
72	17	16.0	17.0	95	89	451	94

TABLE XVI

## Total Data on the Twelfth Grade Girls

Grade 12 Girls	Age	M.A.	S.A.	S.Q.	I.Q.	Scores	
						Hayes	Doll
73	18	16.9	15.3	85	94	599	90
74	16	17.8	15.3	96	117	177	90
75	18	17.8	17.3	96	99	580	95
76	18	19.8	19.3	105	110	993	100
77	18	20.1	19.5	105	112	838	101
78	17	15.3	17.5	103	90	499	96
79	18	18.9	16.5	91	105	223	92
80	19	15.5	15.0	79	82	308	88
81	19	18.4	17.3	90	97	644	95
82	16	16.0	17.0	106	100	570	94
83	18	19.2	19.3	106	107	876	100
84	16	14.2	18.0	100	84	723	98
85	17	16.1	17.0	100	107	589	94

TABLE XVII

## Total Data on the Twelfth Grade Boys

Grade 12 Boys	Age	M.A.	S.A.	S.Q.	I.Q.	Scores	
						Hayes	Doll
86	19	18.2	17.0	89	96	168	94
87	18	21.0	25.0	134	117	970	105
88	18	18.3	17.5	97	102	710	96
89	18	19.0	17.5	97	106	645	96
90	19	19.3	20.0	105	102	742	103
91	18	20.8	20.3	113	116	843	103
92	19	20.9	17.5	92	110	112	96
93	18	21.2	25.0	135	118	1010	106
94	19	20.9	19.0	100	110	672	100
95	18	18.0	17.3	96	100	569	95
96	18	20.8	19.0	105	116	912	99
97	19	18.6	18.3	96	98	574	98
98	18	16.1	17.5	95	101	662	96
99	18	17.8	18.3	100	99	832	98
100	20	18.4	17.0	85	92	582	94

The scores on the Doll and Hayes Scale do not run uniformly for each individual pupil. A pupil may be high in one and low in the other. The social quotient and the intelligence quotient do run more or less uniformly with the exception of a few cases. These cases are due to some special factor, such as, a physical handicap, or to having more responsibility than usual in the home as the result of the loss of one or both parents. The mental ages and the social ages vary slightly among the pupils, but are largely similar. The chronological ages, of course, vary generally inversely with the social and the mental ages, that is, the older pupils are likely to be retarded both mentally and socially.

These tables are useful, as they enable one to get a visual picture of each individual pupil for guidance and counseling work, and to help the individual with his or her social and mental problems. In other words, they give a sort of profile of each pupil that was rated by the writer and his assistants.

Unlike the measurement of intelligence which has a number of well standardized tests, the measurement of personality variables is still in the experimental stages--however many scales may be available. It is hard to get accurate ratings of individuals' personalities because different descriptive terms mean different things to

different people. The terms employed in personality scales should be carefully defined so that everyone using the scales will employ, as nearly as possible, the same meanings for the terms used in the scales.

According to Gaskill (18:36-45), "Devices for the measurement and evaluation of personality may be classified as follows: (a) the biographical method, (b) the experimental and clinical methods, and (c) the paper-and-pencil-test methods, of which there are: (a) rating scales and check lists, (b) questionnaires, and (c) objective tests.

"The biographical method involves the case-history method. The conversations between counselors and students, and between personnel officers and applicants for employment, are in this category."

The experimental method involves actual observation of the individual under certain conditions. This method has not been used to any extent because it is too complex and laborious.

Of rating scales, Gaskill (18:36-45) has written: "Many of the personality traits lend themselves to description, and are therefore admirably adapted to use in a rating scale. The purpose of the rating scale is to obtain a judgment from an acquaintance or from an associate who is familiar with the person being rated. A judgment is sought, for example, about the degree of tactfulness which

the man being rated possesses or displays. We could, of course, ask for this judgment in the course of a conversation, but to ask for it by the use of a rating scale makes the results more usable, and, moreover, the degree of objectivity is likely to be greater than it would be in conversation. The judgments themselves are, of course, subjective, and the results obtained from a rating scale are necessarily estimated and not measured units. But quantitative units have not been applied to traits like leadership, tact, trustworthiness, loyalty, and initiative."

The data which the writer has derived from the use of the Hayes Social Maturity Scale lead to the following conclusions:

(a) The items in the Hayes Scale were quite subjective and hard to score with any feeling of certainty, but they do give information that can be used as a check-up on certain phases of personality development in which pupils are clearly low or high.

(b) The Hayes Scale did not give a complete picture of the pupils' personalities, perhaps because it is impossible to do this with only a hundred questions. No two communities are alike, nor are any two individuals alike. Such a short scale cannot provide a very complete picture of any one individual. It does, however, give a better

picture than a single judgment could do, and does give a good picture of the group as a whole.

(c) The Hayes Scale hinted in places at the involvement of the idea of moral development but employed nothing very specific on the topic.

(d) Among the diagnostic parts of the Hayes Scale, the part entitled, "In Relation to Others Generally" showed the group studied by the writer to be very good as a whole; the part, "Respect for the Rights of Others" showed them to be an average group; the part, "Relation to Teacher" showed that they rated as average. To the writer the scale missed the mark in giving so much credit for being eager to do little things for the teacher. The writer believes that this is not always a good criterion for judgment of personality since this type of behavior may be calculated self-seeking. In "Relation to Other Pupils," the group was above average--due mainly to their being a small homogeneous group. They were dependent on each other only at school, had very little tendency to form cliques or other closed groups that would cause friction among themselves, and were generally tolerant of each other. On "Initiative," they were below average; due, perhaps, to the passive attitudes of the local community and the homes. The part of the scale dealing with initiative analyzed the academic and social side well, but failed to bring in anything about



physical initiative. Little was mentioned about the actions of the group in respect to athletics, sportsmanship, and ability to entertain themselves; but much emphasis was placed on the type of literature read in the school and in the home, along with the analysis of leadership among the pupils and their comprehension of their own social problems. The results of this part of the scale show a definite need for training in the type of literature read and for training in the enjoyment of organizations and in leadership. On "Health Habits" the group was average; but, as the scale had only eight questions on this topic, it told little about the real health habits of the group. In "General Interest," the group scored a little above average. Nevertheless, the writer believes that they show a definite need for some educational program to improve this condition. The reason for this lack of training is due to the local conditions in a retreating community. In "Scholarship and Study Habits," they were about average, but with a wide range of scores which showed a wide diversity of both ability and interests.

(e) Intelligence, which makes up a large part of most people's personalities, was not always closely related to high or low score, on the Hayes Scale. Perhaps it should not be as extremes of good and poor personalities may be found at almost every intelligence level. The Hayes com-

posite score did, in actuality, rate high only the pupils who had the more desirable personalities.

(f) The pupils with the low scores on the Hayes Scale were invariably those from homes with poor environmental conditions.

(g) An effort was made by the writer to give some of the pupils who were shown as lacking in initiative opportunities to participate actively in pupil affairs during the year. Some very good results were obtained from this encouragement. The school has made a rule that a pupil may hold only one class or school office at any one time and may be in only one activity at one time. While little in the way of good results is expected from the rule by itself, the writer hopes to accomplish more by individual interest in and encouragement of the pupils who have not heretofore taken active parts in the pupil affairs.

(h) A reading club among the pupils was established, but the better pupils were chiefly the ones who responded. These were the pupils who needed it least, but such an outcome is usually the one found in practice.

(i) In some cases in which the scores on the Hayes Scale were unusually low, the pupils have been rescored after individual counseling had been given. In one case more than 400 points difference was found between the two scores. This shows that no permanent scores for individu-

al pupils can or should be established.

The writer believes that, if the whole group were to be rescored on the Hayes Scale at the present time, the mean scores and the individual scores generally would be closely similar to those which have been presented in the different tables, thus establishing a good degree of reliability for the scale. The validity of the scale is believed by the writer to be quite high for a scale although the validity of any scale lies very largely in the knowledge which the rater has of the pupils, his conscientiousness in his ratings, and the closeness with which the rater and the scale-maker use the same meanings for the same descriptive terms within the scale. The writer hopes, through active counseling, to bring about such improvement in the personalities of the pupils in the school next year that an employment of the Hayes Scale in the spring would show improved individual scores and an increased mean score for the entire group then in attendance.

The data the writer has derived from the use of the Vineland Scale for Social Maturity seem to him to show the following conclusions:

(a) On the Vineland Scale, the pupils all completed the elementary part of the scale. These items involved such simple things as "self-help-general," "self-help-eating," "self-help-dressing," "communication," and "lo-

emotion."

(b) Many of the pupils failed on Question 98 and those above this item, that is, in "Occupation--Has a job or continues schooling beyond high school." Only a small per cent of these pupils will go on to any college since the town has no occupations that encourage the pupils to do this. Most of these pupils will remain in or near the town--if they do as the pupils in years gone by have done. While the pupils are still in high school this question is naturally beyond them and their present achievements. All of the rest of the questions after item 98 are still more advanced, that is, for older people. As a result, the pupils could not have made the higher scores under any circumstances.

(c) In "Self-Direction," the majority of pupils failed on Question 100 and above. Very few high school pupils control their major expenditures because very few make enough money in the first place and few are allowed unlimited spending money which they themselves do not earn.

(d) In the part of the scale on "Socialization," very few passed the statement, "Assumes responsibilities beyond own needs." This, too, is beyond the general high school accomplishment level.

(e) The results of the Doll Scale showed the average social age of the group rated by the writer to be 17.05,

and the chronological age to be 17.00. This group as rated on the Doll Scale by the writer is strictly average.

(f) The Social Quotient of this group, as rated by the writer was 98.750. The average S.Q. is 100, showing such a slight variation below the average person of the ages found in this group that it is negligible.

(g) The mean Intelligence Quotient of the group, however, is 101--so slightly above the general average of 100 as to be negligible.

(h) The Social Quotients and the Intelligence Quotients of this group are closely similar in nearly all cases. The writer believes this to be only a coincidence, however, and not an indication that the Vineland Scale scores are based upon intellectual ability except in a most general way. The scores on the Hayes Scale, however, were not closely correlated with either the Social Quotient or the Intelligence Quotient.

(i) The Vineland Scale is good for rating social maturity as it develops in children and youth, in rating the advancement they make, and in discovering that they are or are not developing up to their chronological age levels. It was not made for use in rating personality or personality development except as social maturation makes up a part of personality.

## Chapter IV

### Summary and Conclusions

This study had as its purpose the rating of one hundred pupils in a small high school to see, if possible, what was lacking among their educational opportunities in the field of personality and of social maturity development and the use they were making of the opportunities they had, and to make suggestions for giving them better opportunities to overcome any present weaknesses in such training. Two rating scales were used, the Hayes Personality Rating Scale (23:211-15), and the Vineland Social Maturity Scale (15:16-30). In going over the literature in the field of personality and social maturity studies, one gets the impression that such scales are still in their infancy; but they appear promising enough to be worthy of use and even of standardization.

Granting that personality techniques have not progressed very far, much may still be accomplished by using scales in the detection of personality differences among pupils so that school, or other similar, programs can be enriched to meet some of the needs which may have been found.

From a survey of existing literature in the field of personality study, the writer has drawn the following

conclusions:

(a) Personality is still lost in the chaos of undefined terminologies that have as many different meanings as there are writers in this field.

(b) Heredity and environment are both essential in the development of personality.

(c) It is possible for personality to change over a period of time.

(d) Personalities may be undesirable as well as desirable, since society has made rules by which one may judge personalities--often vaguely and incorrectly, however.

(e) Personality traits do exist, but no definite lists have been established--due to the differences of opinion on their hereditary and environmental sources, as effective proportions of both are held to be involved; and to the unwillingness or inability of people to agree upon definitions of the traits which have been recognized enough to be given names.

(f) There exist certain general types of personalities into which all people will probably fall.

From the investigation made by the writer, using the Hayes and the Vineland Scales, the following summary is made:

(a) Personality rating scales are helpful aids in

finding what pupils lack in their development.

(b) The pupils rated by the writer and his associates were a normal group, with the exception of initiative and, possibly, of general interests.

(c) The literature in the homes of the pupils is not the type that encourages vigorous mental and moral growth.

(d) Intelligence is not necessarily a good criterion by means of which to estimate personality, but may be a good criterion of social maturity. Notwithstanding the similarity between the results from the Otis Self-Administering Test and the Vineland Social Maturity Scale, the writer believes this to be a coincidence rather than due to a significantly important common factor.

(e) The pupils rating highest in both scales were the pupils with the highest intelligences.

(f) Both scales may be used as survey scales and for diagnostic purposes.

(g) A larger number of different people rating the same pupils on the same scales should give more accurate information if the raters had known the pupils equally well and used the descriptive terms of the scales in the same ways.

(h) Clues may be obtained from the scales that will be helpful in making a more complete and effective school program.



(1) In all of the other diagnostic parts of the Hayes Scale except initiative and possibly general interests, the group studied seemed to be average for their chronological ages and school grades. From the data from the Vineland Scale, one should consider the group rated as average or normal in all of the traits rated.

A public high school has very little to say in the selection of the pupils that go to make up its membership. This membership is limited only as the lack of intelligence of individuals tends to weed out the mentally deficient as they reach the maximum levels of their development and as disciplinary measures eliminate the morally undesirable. An important problem with which the high school is confronted is the consideration of ways in which it may contribute directly or indirectly to the personality development and social growth of its pupils.

In carrying out a program of personality and social improvement, it is essential that the high school have a good staff of teachers who possess desirable personalities themselves, who will inspire the pupils, who are enthusiastic in their fields of endeavor and who have the ability to make their subjects of value to the pupils. It is essential for the school to have good equipment, such as charts, models, demonstration materials, and other visual equipment; an extracurricular program that includes all

the school membership on a willing basis; a well supervised social program for all pupils, both during their school time in and as much of their leisure time as is not otherwise cared for; a functional guidance program that includes a testing program, the use of rating scales and other records, and headed by a counselor who inspires the confidence of the pupils; a good library in which may be found the best current periodicals, with a thorough introduction of the pupils to the many uses a "living" library may have; the organization of educational clubs for people who have closed their formal educations at the end of the high school or even before this; and the organization of a good physical education and recreational program that meets the demands of the community.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, F.H. Social psychology. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., p. 453, 1924.
2. Allport, G.W. Personality, a psychological interpretation. New York, Henry Holt, p. 588, 1937.
3. Bennett, Margaret E., and Hand, H.C. Designs for personality. New York, McGraw-Hill, p. 222, 1936.
4. Berg, Louis. The human personality. New York, Prentice-Hall, p. 321, 1933.
5. Berman, Louis. The glands regulating personality. New York, Garden City Pub. Co., p. 341, 1928.
6. Bogardus, E.S., and Lewis, R.H. Social life and personality. New York, Silver Burdett Co., p. 561, 1936.
7. Bridges, J.W. Personality, many in one. Boston, The Stratford Co., p. 215, 1932.
8. Briggs, T.H. Secondary education. New York, The Macmillan Co., p. 577, 1935.
9. Brooks, Fowler D. The psychology of adolescence. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., p. 652, 1929.
10. Burnham, William H. The normal mind. New York, D. Appleton and Co., p. 702, 1924.
11. Buros, O.K. Bibliography of tests 1933-1936. Educational, psychological, and personality tests of 1933/34. Studies in education, No. 7. Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, New Jersey.
12. Coffin, J.H. Personality in the making. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., p. 314, 1923.
13. Conklin, E.G. Heredity and environment (6th Ed.). Newark, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, p. 379, 1923.
14. Doll, Edgar A. Annotated bibliography on the Vineland Social Maturity Scale. Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol IV, No. 4, p. 123-132, July-August, 1940.

15. Doll, Edgar A. The Vineland Social Maturity Scale. The Training School at Vineland, New Jersey, Dept. of Research Series 1936, No. 3, p. 1-30, April 1936.
16. Educational Index. Personality Tests. New York, H.W. Wilson Co., 1923-1940.
17. Fry, C.C., and Haggard, H.W. The anatomy of personality. New York, Harper and Bros., p. 30, 1936.
18. Gaskill, H.V. Personality. New York, Prentice-Hall, p. 52, 1936.
19. Gilliland, A.R. Problems of personality. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 23:370-373, 1928.
20. Gray, J.S. A biological view of original nature. Educational Administration and Supervision, 16:655-57, 1930.
21. Groves, E. R. Personality and social adjustment. New York, Longmans, Green and Co., p. 353, 1931.
22. Hart, Hornell and Hart, Ella B. Personality and the family. New York, D.C. Heath and Co., p. 381, 1935.
23. Hayes, Margaret. A scale for evaluating adolescent psychology. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 44, 206-222, 1934.
24. James, William. Psychology. New York, Henry Holt, p. 478, 1893.
25. Jennings, E.S. Health progress and race progress, are they incompatible? Journal of Heredity, 18-:272, 1927.
26. Laird, D.A. How personalities are found in industry. New York, Industrial Psychology, Vol. 1, No. 10, p. 1, 1936.
27. May, M.A. The foundations of personality in psychology at work. P.S. Achilles (Ed.), Whittlesey House, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1932.
28. Miles, Catharine C. Intelligence and social adjustment. The National Committee for Mental Hygiene, New York, 1938.

29. Morgan, John J.B. The psychology of the unadjusted school child. New York, The Macmillan Co., p. 300, 1936.
30. Morrison, H.C. Basic principles in education. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., p. 452, 1934.
31. Murphy, Lois Barclay. Social behavior and child personality. New York, Columbia University Press, p. 344, 1937.
32. Prince, Morton. The unconscious. New York, The Macmillan Co., p. 549, 1921.
33. Prince, Morton. Clinical and experimental studies in personality. Cambridge, Mass., Sci-Art Pub., p. 559, 1929.
34. Richmond, Winifred V. Personality its development and hygiene. New York, Farrar and Rinehart, p. 279, 1937.
35. Roback, A.A. The psychology of character. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co., p. 605, 1927.
36. Schwesinger, G.C. Heredity and environment. New York, The Macmillan Co., p. 484, 1933.
37. Shellow, Sadie M. How to develop your personality. New York, Harper and Bros., p. 308, 1932.
38. Stagner, Ross. Psychology of personality. New York, McGraw-Hill, p. 465, 1937.
39. Strecker, E.A. Beyond the clinical frontiers. New York, W.W. Norton and Co., p. 210, 1940.
40. Symonds, P.M. Diagnosing personality and conduct. New York, D. Appleton-Century Co., p. 602, 1931.
41. Thorndike, Edward L. Individuality. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., p. 55, 1911.
42. Thorpe, Lewis P. Psychological foundations of personality. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., p. 602, 1938.
43. Valentine, P.F. The psychology of personality. New York, D. Appleton and Co., p. 394, 1931.

44. Woodworth, R.S. Psychology. New York, Henry Holt, p. 580, 1929.
45. Zachry, Caroline B. Personality adjustments of school children. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, p. 306, 1929.
46. Crane, G. W. Psychology Applied. Chicago, Northwestern University Press, p. 631, 1938. \* was impossible to locate book.

Copyright, 1936  
The Training School at  
Vineland, New Jersey  
Department of Research

Experimental Form B  
Revised 1/15/36

# VINELAND SOCIAL MATURITY SCALE

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ M.A. \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Descent \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Grade \_\_\_\_\_ I.Q. \_\_\_\_\_ Born \_\_\_\_\_  
 Occupation \_\_\_\_\_ Yrs. exp. \_\_\_\_\_ Class \_\_\_\_\_ Res. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Father's occupation \_\_\_\_\_ Class \_\_\_\_\_ Schooling \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mother's occupation \_\_\_\_\_ Class \_\_\_\_\_ Schooling \_\_\_\_\_  
 Informant \_\_\_\_\_ Relationship \_\_\_\_\_ Recorder \_\_\_\_\_  
 Remarks: Basal score\* \_\_\_\_\_  
 Additional pts. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Total score \_\_\_\_\_  
 Age equivalent \_\_\_\_\_  
 Social quotient \_\_\_\_\_  
 Informant's est. \_\_\_\_\_

O-1

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "Crows"; laughs \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Balances head \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Grasps objects within reach \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Reaches for familiar persons \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Rolls over \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Reaches for nearby objects \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Occupies self unattended \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Sits unsupported \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Pulls self upright \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. "Talks"; imitates sounds \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Drinks from cup or glass assisted \_\_\_\_\_

\* For method of scoring see Manual of Directions.

- 12. Moves about on floor
- 13. Grasps with thumb and finger
- 14. Demands personal attention
- 15. Stands alone
- 16. Does not drool
- 17. Follows simple instructions

## I-II

- 18. Walks about room unattended
- 19. Marks with pencil or crayon
- 20. Masticates food
- 21. Pulls off socks
- 22. Transfers objects
- 23. Overcomes simple obstacles
- 24. Fetches or carries familiar objects
- 25. Drinks from cup or glass unassisted
- 26. Gives up baby carriage
- 27. Plays with other children
- 28. Eats with spoon
- 29. Goes about house or yard
- 30. Discriminates edible substances
- 31. Uses names of familiar objects
- 32. Walks upstairs unassisted
- 33. Unwraps candy
- 34. Talks in short sentences

## II-III

- 35. Asks to go to toilet
- 36. Initiates own play activities
- 37. Removes coat or dress
- 38. Eats with fork
- 39. Gets drink unassisted
- 40. Dries own hands
- 41. Avoids simple hazards
- 42. Puts on coat or dress unassisted
- 43. Cuts with scissors
- 44. Relates experiences

## III-IV

- 45. Walks downstairs one step per tread
- 46. Plays cooperatively at kindergarten level
- 47. Buttons coat or dress
- 48. Helps at little household tasks
- 49. "Performs" for others
- 50. Washes hands unaided



## IV-V

- \_\_\_\_ 51. Cares for self at toilet \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 52. Washes face unassisted \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 53. Goes about neighborhood unattended \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 54. Dresses self except tying \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 55. Uses pencil or crayon for drawing \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 56. Plays competitive exercise games \_\_\_\_\_

## V-VI

- \_\_\_\_ 57. Uses skates, sled, wagon \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 58. Prints simple words \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 59. Plays simple table games \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 60. Is trusted with money \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 61. Goes to school unattended \_\_\_\_\_

## VI-VII

- \_\_\_\_ 62. Uses table knife for spreading \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 63. Uses pencil for writing \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 64. Bathes self assisted \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 65. Goes to bed unassisted \_\_\_\_\_

## VII-VIII

- \_\_\_\_ 66. Tells time to quarter hour \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 67. Uses table knife for cutting \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 68. Disavows literal Santa Claus \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 69. Participates in pre-adolescent play \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 70. Combs or brushes hair \_\_\_\_\_

## VIII-IX

- \_\_\_\_ 71. Uses tools or utensils \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 72. Does routine household tasks \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 73. Reads on own initiative \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 74. Bathes self unaided \_\_\_\_\_

## IX-X

- \_\_\_\_ 75. Cares for self at table \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 76. Makes minor purchases \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 77. Goes about home town freely \_\_\_\_\_

## X-XI

- \_\_\_\_ 78. Writes occasional short letters \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ 79. Makes telephone calls \_\_\_\_\_

- \_\_\_\_ 80. Does small remunerative work \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 81. Answers ads; purchases by mail \_\_\_\_\_

## XI-XII

- \_\_\_\_ 82. Does simple creative work \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 83. Is left to care for self or others \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 84. Enjoys books, newspapers, magazines \_\_\_\_\_

## XII-XV

- \_\_\_\_ 85. Plays difficult games \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 86. Exercises complete care of dress \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 87. Buys own clothing accessories \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 88. Engages in adolescent group activities \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 89. Performs responsible routine chores \_\_\_\_\_

## XV-XVIII

- \_\_\_\_ 90. Communicates by letter \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 91. Follows current events \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 92. Goes to nearby places alone \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 93. Goes out unsupervised daytime \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 94. Has own spending money \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 95. Buys all own clothing \_\_\_\_\_

## XVIII-XX

- \_\_\_\_ 96. Goes to distant points alone \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 97. Looks after own health \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 98. Has a job or continues schooling \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 99. Goes out nights unrestricted \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 100. Controls own major expenditures \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 101. Assumes personal responsibility \_\_\_\_\_

## XX-XXV

- \_\_\_\_ 102. Uses money providently \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 103. Assumes responsibilities beyond own needs \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 104. Contributes to social welfare \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 105. Provides for future \_\_\_\_\_

## XXV+

- \_\_\_\_ 106. Performs skilled work \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 107. Engages in beneficial recreation \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 108. Systematizes own work \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 109. Inspires confidence \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ 110. Promotes civic progress \_\_\_\_\_

- 111. Supervises occupational pursuits
- 112. Purchases for others
- 113. Directs or manages affairs of others
- 114. Performs expert or professional work
- 115. Shares community responsibility
- 116. Creates own opportunities
- 117. Advances general welfare

TABLE I

## PERSONALITY RATING SCALE FOR THE ADOLESCENT IN THE SCHOOL

Item		Mean	Group A S.D.
I Relation to Others Generally			
T F U	1 Often does little things to make others happy	+2.4	.70
T F U	2 Usually thinks of consequences both to self and others	+2.2	.60
T F U	3 Usually accepts responsibility when the occasion arises	+2.2	.65
T F U	4 Often shares with others	+2.1	.73
T F U	5 Usually does his share in any group activity	+2.0	.65
T F U	6 Often plays "hookey" from school	-1.9	1.08
T F U	7 Usually does the work expected of him	+1.7	.69
T F U	8 Usually defends his friends only when they are in the right	+1.7	1.33
T F U	9 Usually makes friends easily	+1.7	.82
T F U	10 Often starts fights	-1.7	.81
T F U	11 Usually quickly forgives wrongs done to him	+1.6	.94
T F U	12 Often uses vulgar or profane words	-1.4	1.03
T F U	13 Usually eats lunch with a group	+1.3	.76
T F U	14 Often brings flowers or other decorative objects for the school-room	+1.3	.91
T F U	15 Often fights when attacked by others	+1.3	.92
T F U	16 Is usually on time	+1.3	.79
T F U	17 Usually comes in or goes out of classroom with group which is making unnecessary noise. Takes part in disturbance	-1.3	.77
T F U	18 Often quarrels with others	-1.3	1.05
T F U	19 Usually comes in or goes out of classroom with group talking and laughing and taking part in talking and laughing. No unnecessary noise	+1.2	.97
T F U	20 Often makes disturbing noises	-1.2	.71
T F U	21 Usually chooses friends because of their wealth or social standing	-1.1	.94

T F U 22	Often pretends to know more than he really does, or to have something that he does not have	-1.1	.97
T F U 23	Often offers comments voluntarily when the majority of the class are commenting freely	+1.0	.87
T F U 24	Often complains about school conditions	- .9	.79
T F U 25	Usually defends his friends, whether they are right or wrong	+ .8	1.50
T F U 26	Often chews gum or other objects during class	- .8	.87
T F U 27	Often allows other people to impose on him without becoming angry	- .7	1.19
T F U 28	Often boasts of accomplishments that he really has	- .6	.86

## II Respect for Rights of Others

T F U 29	Often steals	-2.5	.94
T F U 30	Often cheats	-2.5	.80
T F U 31	Usually pays close attention while other pupils recite	+2.1	.94
T F U 32	Usually tells the truth	+1.8	.73
T F U 33	Usually cleans up and puts away school materials voluntarily	+1.8	1.05
T F U 34	Usually becomes angry when he cannot do what he wishes	-1.7	1.00
T F U 35	Often makes critical remarks about other children	-1.5	.96
T F U 36	Often laughs when another pupil makes a mistake	-1.1	.85

## III Relation to Teacher

T F U 37	Is usually courteous to teacher and other adults	+1.7	.68
T F U 38	Often starts a whispered conversation during class period about something other than the lesson	-1.4	.90
T F U 39	Often eagerly performs small tasks at request of teacher	+1.3	.80
T F U 40	Often asks teacher unnecessary questions about the assignment	-1.1	.64
T F U 41	Often joins in whispered conversation during class period about something other than the lesson	-1.0	.71
T F U 42	Often shows his work to the teacher of own accord	+ .9	1.09

## IV Relation to Other Pupils

T F U 43	Is usually courteous to other children	+2.1	.64
T F U 44	Often neglects his own work to do the work of others	-2.1	.66
T F U 45	Often annoys other children by pulling at them, pinching and so forth	-1.6	.94
T F U 46	Usually comes in or goes out of classroom alone	-1.5	.91
T F U 47	Often tells on other pupils	-1.5	.92
T F U 48	Often looks on another pupil's paper while both are doing a class assignment	-1.5	1.08
T F U 49	Often smiles when humorous passage is read in class	+1.4	.60
T F U 50	Often starts a conversation with another pupil during free period	+1.2	1.01
T F U 51	Often makes "smart" remarks to other pupils during class	-1.2	.91
T F U 52	Often smiles at other pupils first in school	+1.1	1.07
T F U 53	Often smiles in response to smiles of other pupils	+1.1	.73
T F U 54	Often talks with another pupil during free period (conversation started by another pupil)	+1.0	.67
T F U 55	Often borrows objects from other pupils	- .8	.75
T F U 56	Usually definitely avoids the other sex	- .7	1.07

## V Initiative

T F U 57	Often does a piece of original, creative work of own accord	+2.7	.57
T F U 58	Usually tries to solve own problems and not escape them	+2.6	.57
T F U 59	Has organized or helped to organize school club during the past year	+2.5	.69
T F U 60	Often undertakes extra projects voluntarily	+2.4	.62
T F U 61	Often starts activities in which others join	+2.2	.76
T F U 62	Often asks questions showing interest when majority of the class are not asking questions	+2.1	.87
T F U 63	Often holds office in school clubs	+2.1	.62

T F U 64	Leads in sports (heads team or holds office in athletic organization)	+2.0	.86
T F U 65	Often offers comments voluntarily when the majority of the class are not commenting	+1.7	1.13
T F U 66	Usually goes ahead after the first suggestion	+1.7	1.03
T F U 67	Often initiates pleasant surprises for the teacher	+1.7	1.06
T F U 68	Usually finds own materials instead of asking teacher	+1.7	.80
T F U 69	Often leads the conversation in a free group	+1.5	.85
T F U 70	Often asks questions showing interest when the majority of the class are also asking questions	+1.4	.70
T F U 71	Often holds up hand in response to a question of the teacher when he does not know the answer	-1.2	.98

#### VI Health Habits

T F U 72	Is usually happy	+1.9	.91
T F U 73	Usually dresses neatly and keeps himself clean	+1.8	.80
T F U 74	Often becomes easily upset	-1.5	1.14
T F U 75	Often bites fingers or fingernails, rubs eyes, picks at fingernails, taps pencil on desk, drums on desk, or taps feet rhythmically on floor	-1.3	.88
T F U 76	Often puts feet on seat during class	-1.0	.92
T F U 77	Often changes from feeling happy to feeling unhappy	- .7	.95
T F U 78	Often yawns during recitation	- .7	.69
T F U 79	Often sits in a slouched position during class	- .7	.74

#### VII General Interests

T F U 80	Often reads good books in free time in school	+2.1	.76
T F U 81	Usually takes an active part in club activities in school	+2.1	.69
T F U 82	Often does a piece of creative work guided by another person	+1.7	.66
T F U 83	Often talks about what he wishes to do when he grows up (Voc. Int.)	+1.4	.93

T F U	84	Takes an active part in sports	+1.4	.85
T F U	85	Often walks aimlessly around the classroom	-1.1	.78
T F U	86	Often writes aimlessly on the board or draws before class	- .9	.73
T F U	87	Often looks around the classroom in an apparently aimless manner	- .9	.57
T F U	88	Often shows his work to a visitor of his own accord	+ .6	1.35

## VIII Scholarship and Study Habits

T F U	89	Usually works well without seeking praise	+2.2	.79
T F U	90	Usually pays close attention to instructions and explanations of teacher	+2.2	.62
T F U	91	Usually pays no attention to distractions while working	+2.0	.92
T F U	92	Usually works eagerly on class assignment	+1.9	.59
T F U	93	Often asks questions for information	+1.9	.94
T F U	94	Usually works very hard	+1.9	.66
T F U	95	Usually carefully takes down assignment	+1.8	.69
T F U	96	Usually does work neatly and carefully	+1.7	.66
T F U	97	Usually gives up as soon as a difficulty arises	-1.6	.91
T F U	98	Usually does class assignments correctly	+1.4	.93
T F U	99	Usually works as well after twenty minutes of effort as after two minutes of effort	+1.4	1.04
T F U	100	Usually answers questions correctly	+1.4	.98