

AFFECTIONAL AND AGGRESSIVE
BEHAVIOR IN RELATION TO
PEER ACCEPTANCE

By

KAROL ALYNE BURTON,
"

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts

Chickasha, Oklahoma

1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1971

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
DEC 31 1971

AFFECTIONAL AND AGGRESSIVE
BEHAVIOR IN RELATION TO
PEER ACCEPTANCE

Thesis Approved:

Frances Stromberg
Thesis Adviser

Josephine Hoffer

D. Durban
Dean of the Graduate College

803830

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No study of the type described herein can be successfully executed without the unselfish collaboration of numerous people. These small words of appreciation are little recompense for the arrangements individuals made and the work they did on behalf of this study. For her indispensable interest, encouragement, and assistance, I would like to extend my appreciation to my adviser, Dr. Frances Stromberg. I wish to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Josephine Hoffer and Dr. James Walters, for their critical reading of the manuscript and for their helpful suggestions.

I am sincerely appreciative of the support given throughout my graduate studies by the members of the faculty in the Department of Family Relations and Child Development. Special appreciation is given to Mrs. Opal Collins for her invaluable personal interest and assistance. Finally, I am extremely grateful to my family who have provided me with supportive understanding and encouragement throughout this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	1
Purposes of Study	2
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Value Development	4
Behavior Associated with the Democratic Form of Government	6
Techniques for Quantifying Behavior	8
Summary	11
III. PROCEDURE	13
Subjects	13
Selection of Instruments	13
Administration and Scoring	15
Collection of Data	17
Observer Reliability	17
Coder Reliability	18
Analysis of Data	19
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	20
Summary of Findings	22
V. SUMMARY	23
Recommendation for Future Research	24
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	26
APPENDIX A - ORIGINAL INSTRUMENTS	31
APPENDIX B - AMENDED INSTRUMENTS, SOCIOMETRIC SCORES	35

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem

This study concerns a comparison of the amount of affectional and aggressive behavior with peer acceptance among young children in a free play situation. Self-government has long been a major concern of human groups. Political attitudes and values are not the exclusive property of adults. Hess and Easton (1962) reported that political attitudes and values are evident by the time a child enters elementary school, and these attitudes tend to persist. The enfranchised adult marking his ballot is influenced by values conceived in early childhood; nevertheless, little investigation has been done regarding the development of attitudes and behavior among young children which contribute to successful living in a democracy.

Leeper et al. (1968) believe that education for facing social problems cannot be delayed until the child is older; instruction must begin in the years before the first grade when social values are developing. The capacity to participate as a contributing member of a society is best learned through experience (Coe, 1924; Torney and Hess, 1969). In an experiment conducted by Turner (1957), children of nursery school age learned to participate in and eagerly accepted a program of self-government.

Hunt (1969) has identified values essential for the competence for life in the mainstream of a democratic society. They are values and controls upon which a peaceful, organized, technological society depends and are more fundamental than class values or matters of taste. These include a concern for others and the recognition of violence and destruction as ineffective solutions to problems. The use of violence as a tactic in solving social problems appears to be spreading (Janssen, 1968; Ulrich and Wolfe, 1969). Parents and teachers must assume a greater responsibility for helping children to develop both democratic values and behavior patterns which contribute to the successful functioning of a democratic form of government, including the values that democracy seeks: cooperation by persuasion, not by force or compulsion, and skills in relating to peers.

According to Kawin (1969) if one's goals are truly democratic, satisfactions come from love and friendships, from giving as well as receiving, from cooperating as well as competing. Moore and Updegraff (1964) and Frymier (1969) have indicated that affectional behavior appears to be positively related to peer acceptance. Evidence found in the literature gave rise to the belief that an exploration of children's attempts to meet the demands of the peer group through affectional and aggressive behavior and the degree of peer acceptance might provide insight into some of the values and behaviors which are basic to successful participation in a democracy.

Purpose of Study

The major purpose of this study was to compare the amount of affectional and aggressive behavior during free play with the degree of

peer acceptance for a group of children less than six years of age.

Another purpose of this study was to develop a method for recording observed behavior, particularly specific phenomena in a general social setting, which would be more efficient than traditional time-sampling methods.

The specific hypothesis to be tested in this study was:

That peer acceptance will be independent of:
age, sex, amount of affectional behavior observed during free play, amount of aggressive behavior observed during free play, proportion of affectional behavior in relation to aggressive behavior, and amount of non-participating social behavior.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature will include (1) a definition of values and a discussion of the role which values have in a democracy, (2) literature based on common observation or informal evidence which delineates appropriate and inappropriate behavior associated with a democratic form of government, and (3) techniques for quantifying behavior.

Value Development

Martin (1954) and Berrien and Turner (1969) defined values as concepts which are heavily weighted with emotions. Values are the concepts of the desirable which influence the child's selection from available modes, means, and ends of action. Because values are primarily subjective, they are stronger predispositions of behavior than concepts with less emotional weighting. Pressures placed on the child at home and later in the peer group help him to develop values that are approved in the social group with which he is identified.

According to Frasier (1966) values may be viewed in terms of an ultimate or ideal value which determines one's goals. Values are revealed by actions since they are an integral part of everyday living experiences. It is generally agreed that the ultimate value for our culture is the dignity and worth of the human being.

The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education

Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators (1951) listed nine values on which the American People are agreed as essential if the individual personality is to remain supreme. These values are as follows: (1) each person should feel responsible for the consequences of his own conduct; (2) institutional arrangements are the servants of mankind; (3) mutual consent is better than violence; (4) the human mind should be liberated by access to information and opinion; (5) excellence in mind, character, and creative ability should be fostered; (6) all persons should be judged by the same moral standards; (7) the concept of brotherhood should take precedence over selfish interests; (8) each person should have the greatest possible opportunity for the pursuit of happiness, provided only that such activities do not substantially interfere with the similar opportunities of others; and (9) each person should be offered the emotional and spiritual experiences which transcend the materialistic aspects of life.

The rather general statements of a democratic society just listed are the type of statements often quoted to young children as a means of teaching them democratic values. These statements are far too abstract for young children to understand. Jahoda (1964) concluded that highly abstract categories whose boundaries are not directly related to any physical cues may remain vague to the child. The difficulty seems to lie in the child's lack of understanding of the characteristics and limits of subtle social categories rather than with incomplete mental development for understanding categories which are not based on easily perceived physical units.

Because of the young child's difficulty in understanding the char-

acteristics and limits of abstractions Greenstein (1965) and Fraenkel (1968) urge teachers to be conscious of the child's need for more precise explanations of democratic values. Most teachers avoid teaching values overtly; however, value education is unavoidable through the teacher's actions, sayings, discussions, and reading assignments. Hess and Torney (1967), Easton and Dennis (1969), and Torney and Hess (1969) agreed that if the child learns appropriate behavior in the classroom this deep-seated value orientation may later be generalized into other realms, including the political system.

Behavior Associated with the Democratic Form of Government

Affection

Walters, Pearce, and Dahms (1957) defined affectional behavior as:

...behavior directed toward another person which indicated warm regard, friendliness, sympathy, or helpfulness (page 15).

Children who show the most affectional behavior appear to be the best liked by their peer group (Moore and Updegraff, 1964). In a study of nursery school children which was done by Emmerich (1964) it was found that certain basic interpersonal orientations, such as positive and negative attitudes, become established early in life and are sustained over time in either their original or slightly changed forms. The findings reported by Emmerich (1964) concur with the opinions of Berman (1969), Frymier (1969), Galloway (1969), and Menninger (1969) whose articles stress the need for teaching love or affection if our society is to continue.

Aggression

Appel (1943) defined aggressive behavior as:

...an actual attack, or a threatened attack .
(by way of gesture or words) upon the person
of another child, interference with his
activities, or hostile or provocative lan-
guage directed towards (sic) another (page
185).

One of the objectives of an experiment carried out by Ford and LaChapelle (1970) was to attempt to get children to recognize their hostile reactions to disruptive behavior. The children did seem to see their unfriendly responses, but did not seem to know an alternate response. The findings of Ford and LaChapelle (1970) concur with Appel (1943) and Blau and Rafferty (1970) who found that teacher intervention is sometimes necessary in children's conflicts in order to give children an increased understanding of each other, and to foster a willingness to cooperate.

Aggression and Violence

Ulrich and Wolfe (1969) found that laboratory animals which were given a number of aversive stimuli responded with aggressive behavior which appeared spontaneously. The animals had no opportunity to learn this aggressive behavior previously. The researchers have implied that there is a relationship between the response of the laboratory animals and humans in their response to aversive stimuli. This study suggested the need for further study into the antecedents of violence which preclude adequate functioning of individuals and society.

Techniques for Quantifying Behavior

Observational Methods

One of the most commonly used observation methods in studies of preschool children is time-sampling in which social interactions are observed and recorded during free play time. The observations are made at brief time intervals over a time period of days or weeks. The samples of behavior are recorded in a diary or they may be coded according to predetermined categories at the time the observation is made.

Sellitz et al. (1959) have pointed out that in determining time-sampling units to be used it "may not be sensible" to use a time unit of two minutes to rate the constructiveness of a child's play. Loomis (1931) suggests that a five-minute time sampling would give a better picture of the child's behavioral pattern. In studies of preschool children, Beaver (1932) and Emmerich (1964) used five-minute time samples of social relations in the group.

The observational researcher is often concerned that his presence in the classroom will prevent a valid observation of the child's behavior. However, Masling and Stern (1969) studied the effect of the observer in the classroom and reached two alternative conclusions: (a) the teacher and pupil variables under study occur episodically and are more important than observer influences; (b) the effects of the observer are extremely complex and affect various aspects of the classroom behavior differently. If the observer ignores the children's attempts to initiate a conversation, the children quickly begin to disregard the observer's presence (Katz, Peters, and Stein, 1968).

Caldwell (1969) and Honig, Caldwell, and Tannenbaum (1970) reported on a newly developed method for recording observations of behavior. The method, APPROACH, is aimed at permitting careful study of social behavior in a completely non-artificial situation. The researcher whispers into a tape recorder while observing the subject(s). APPROACH (A Procedure for Patterning Responses of Adults and Children) enables the researcher to code the observed information in a simplified manner by breaking each observation into behavioral clauses, which include a subject, predicate, objects and a few selected qualifiers. This method permits detailed and meticulous delineation of behavioral events without necessitating the learning of a complicated coding language or the need for sifting a great deal of extraneous information.

Peer Acceptance

Northway and Weld (1957) indicated that it is a human impossibility to like everyone equally although such might be the case in an ideal society. We must accept the facts of preferences which are the basis of social reality. These lines of preference form the structure which underlies society and enables a true democracy, full of interest and liveliness, to develop.

Dunnington (1957) found that highly aggressive children had low peer status. She also discovered that aggression shown by popular children was accepted by peers, largely because their peers felt that this aggressive behavior was appropriate and understandable. This finding appears to confirm the opinion of Lippett (1941) that adults and children judge popularity on a different basis. Therefore, a teacher rating of the individual child's peer acceptance may not be

highly correlated with the child's actual value rating by his peer group.

There would appear to be a relationship between popularity and friendliness. A positive relationship has been found between nurturance-giving and social status within the child's peer group. The child who is nurturant is high in social status, while the child who is dependent upon adults is rated low in social status and social participation (McCandless and Marshall, 1957; Wann, Dorn, and Liddle, 1962; Moore and Updegraff, 1964).

Moreno (1942) found that the degrees of peer preference among preschool children are not obvious from observational methods alone. The child may be prevented from associating with his preferred peers by the intimidations of a child whose strong control over the group holds sway.

A sociometric test is a technique used by investigators to determine the social relations within a group or to determine the social importance a child may have to his peers. Byrd (1951) found that among school age children there exists a high correlation between hypothetical choices and choices made in real situations which provide immediate consequences. The implications are that the young child needs a perceivable, concrete, situation in order to make a valid peer preference choice.

Lindzey and Borgatta (1954), in a discussion of sociometric literature, have stated the requirements for a sociometric test. A well constructed sociometric test should: (1) define the limits of the group; (2) permit an unlimited number of choices and rejections; (3) provide for the indication of choices and rejections in terms of a

specific criteria; (4) provide an opportunity for some course of action related to the choices; (5) permit private choices to be made; and (6) gauge the questions to the subjects' level of understanding.

Starkweather (1962) developed and statistically validated a technique for measuring sociometric status among nursery school children. This test is more easily administered and scored than most of the tests which are presented in the literature and meets the criteria set forth by Lindzey and Borgatta (1954). This sociometric technique involves presenting a picture of each child in the group (to be tested), asking the subject to choose three children in the group to whom they would like to give a gift and then asking the child to place a small toy on the picture of the children whom they have chosen. The scoring involves a 2-1-1 weighting of raw scores, with the first child chosen receiving two points.

Walters, Pearce, and Dahms (1957) studied affectional and aggressive behavior in preschool children. After exhaustive investigation, an instrument was developed on the basis of time sampling for the purpose of recording the behavioral responses of the child whom they were observing. This instrument clearly segregates affectional and aggressive responses. The four categories of the instrument, physical affection, verbal affection, physical aggression, and verbal aggression, are especially useful in describing behavioral responses since the categories include numerous non-verbal interactions which are an integral part of social intercourse.

Summary

In summary the review of literature indicates:

1. Values of appropriate behavior which are developed in early childhood influence the political behavior of the adult.
2. There is a need for a curriculum which includes value education necessary for competent living in a democratic society.
3. Education for living in a democratic society should be gauged to the child's level of understanding.
4. Successful living in a democracy requires the individual to solve his social problems by peaceful rather than violent means.
5. Children often need adult interpretation of ways to peacefully solve conflict situations.
6. Friendliness rather than aggression is often not recognized by young children as preferable behavior in gaining peer acceptance.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 28 preschool children, 14 boys and 14 girls ranging in age from four years two months to five years six months. These children were in attendance at a private day care center located in Stillwater, Oklahoma. They were the children of local business and professional men, university students, or skilled laborers and are primarily of the middle socio-economic status.

Instruments

Selection of Instruments

Sociometric Test. The Three-Choice Sociometric Test developed by Starkweather (1962) was selected for use in the present research. This instrument which is based upon the assumption that an individual wants to benefit a person he likes enables the subject to make real life choices of preferred peers by presenting a small toy to each of his three best friends.

The Three-Choice Sociometric Test was reported by Starkweather (1962) to be valid at the .01 level when the 2-1-1 weighting of raw scores was compared with raw scores on the paired-comparisons sociometric test. It is generally agreed that the reliability of a socio-

metric test is more dependent upon the variable being examined than upon the instrument utilized in testing (Lindzey and Borgatta, 1954). McCandless and Marshall (1957) have reported that children's sociometric scores remain relatively stable over a period of time.

Categories of Affectional and Aggressive Behavior. The present investigator has adapted the instrument developed by Walters, Pearce, and Dahms (1957) to serve as a categorized listing of the affectional and aggressive responses of the subjects. However, on the basis of a pilot study with five subjects, the category system was judged to be incomplete for the purposes of this study. It was felt that an item for generalized friendly verbalization was needed in the category of Verbal Affection and an item for annoys or teases verbally was necessary in the Verbal Aggression category in order to more concisely describe the subjects' responses. A miscellaneous category was also added to the instrument in order to record the social involvement of those children who were unoccupied, onlookers, or remained withdrawn from social interaction, since it is believed that this solitary behavior influences the child's acceptance by his peers. The original instrument developed by Walters, Pearce, and Dahms (1957) may be seen in Appendix A, while the amended instrument may be seen in Appendix B.

Coding Method. The APPROACH coding method developed by Caldwell et al. (1969) was chosen to use as a means of recording the observed behavior of the subjects. All observations were broken into behavioral clauses, which included a subject, predicate, objects, and a few selected modifiers. Each of the four components of the behavioral clause was translated into a numerical code and grouped into a final five-digit statement reflecting the entire behavioral clause. The first

digit describes the subjects. The second and third digits represent the verb, and the fourth digit identifies the object of the action. The fifth digit represents the modifier which may or may not be used for clarity.

For the present research, the second and third digits (00 through 54), representing the verb, were assigned to the adapted categories developed by Walters, Pearce, and Dahms (1957). This investigation is concerned only with the affectional and aggressive responses of the subjects; therefore, the use of all of the general social activities identified by Caldwell seemed inappropriate. The adaptation of the category system for identifying behavior with the appropriate digits assigned to each category to allow the use of a modified APPROACH system for coding observed behavior may be found in Appendix B.

Administration and Scoring

Sociometric Test

The investigator had visited in the day care center to take the pictures needed for the Three-Choice Sociometric Test. The same person served as E for all subjects. The peer preference test was administered immediately after the pilot study of recording observations of aggressive and affectional behavior by means of the modified APPROACH method. The subjects were individually invited to accompany E to a quiet room where S could privately make his peer-choices. A poster board upon which a picture of each individual child in the group had been mounted was placed in front of the S. E remained seated beside the S while E gave a brief explanation of the "game."

The E then asked S to "Name the pictures of the children on the board," and if S did not respond, E said "His name is _____." After the child had demonstrated his acquaintance with the children in the group, E presented S with four identical toy cars. S was informed that E was giving S one toy car to keep for himself. Next, E instructed S to place a toy car on the pictures of the three children to whom he would most like to give the toy cars. No indication was given S that he was right or wrong, and there was no time limit. Within the view of the S, the toy cars were placed in small paper bags which were indicated as belonging to the children whom S had chosen. Finally, E assured S that his choices would not be divulged to the other children unless S decided to give the information.

The scoring of the sociometric test involved a 2-1-1 weighting of choices. The first choice was considered to be of greater value than subsequent choices. A child was given two points for each time that he was the first choice of another child, and he was given one point for every other time he was chosen.

Subjects in the upper quartile and the lower quartile in terms of peer preference as identified by Starkweather's Three-Choice Sociometric Test were identified. Refer to Appendix B for the scores of all subjects.

Observation and Recording of Affectional and Aggressive Behavior.

Observations were made of the behavior observed among the subjects who were identified as the upper quartile and lower quartile according to the amount of peer preference in the Three-Choice Sociometric Test. Seven children in the upper quartile and seven children in the lower

quartile were listed and their names were assigned random numbers to determine order for periods of observation.

Eight, non-consecutive, five-minute observations of behavior during a free play period were made on each S by the E. The observations were recorded orally using a portable cassette tape recorder. The observations of behavior were made within a period of 10 days.

After the observations were completed, the records of behavior of the subjects were coded and recorded using the adapted instruments of Walters, Pearce, and Dahms (1957) and Caldwell et al. (1969). A sample score sheet may be found in Appendix A.

Collection of Data

The data were collected during the last part of the 1971 Spring semester. This particular time seemed appropriate since the children would have had time to become well acquainted with each other. The peer preference test was administered to each child individually after the child was situated in a quiet private room. The total testing time was approximately eight minutes for each subject.

The observational data were collected during the free play period of the regular day care program. Some of the free play was conducted inside the school building, while the other free play occurred in the play yard. If adult intervention occurred while a child was being observed, the observation was abandoned until that subject's name was again in order on the random listing.

Observer Reliability

In order to establish observer reliability, the investigator must

provide a means of insuring that all of the information which is pertinent to the study, both verbal and non-verbal information, is recognized and recorded. A constant awareness on the part of the investigator that there is a tendency to take things for granted may prevent, to some degree, the investigator's ignoring of his blind spots. It is generally agreed that the best way to establish observer reliability is to have two persons independently observe and record their observations. Later, a comparison may be made to determine the degree of agreement.

In this study, observer reliability was established by having the researcher and a second person independently observe and tape record observations on five subjects for five minutes each. Before the observations were made, the limits of behavior to be observed were established. A comparison was made of the observations of each observer by dividing the record of the child's behavior into one minute segments. Consideration was given to the degree of agreement between the two observers as to the behavioral phenomena and social interaction of the subjects. An observer reliability was established by obtaining an agreement between the independent observers of 85 per cent.

Coder Reliability

Since interpretation of behavior is a subjective process, it was necessary to determine previous to the observations the definitions of the behavior to be observed. Two individuals seldom agree exactly on interpretation of behavior, however, an agreement of at least 85 per cent is generally considered to be an adequate amount of agreement. For this study, coder reliability was established by having the investigator and a second person, who was not the second observer, indepen-

dently listen to the recordings and code the data using the digit identification of behavioral clauses according to the modification of APPROACH described previously. The coding was accomplished by each coder's interpreting the information from the tape recordings of the observed behavior into a numerical statement for each one minute segment of the time sampling unit. A coder reliability was established by obtaining an inter-coder agreement of 85 per cent.

Analysis of Data

Nonparametric statistical tests were used for examining all of the hypothesis of this study. The Mann-Whitney U was used in all cases, except for the hypothesis that peer preference is not related to age. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation was used for determining the relation between these two variables.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The major purpose of this research was to compare the amount of affectional behavior and the amount of aggressive behavior during free play with the degree of peer acceptance for a group of 28 children less than six years of age.

First, in analyzing the data, the Mann-Whitney U Test was used to compare peer preference among the 28 children in relation to sex differences. It was found that sex was not significantly related to peer preference in this group of subjects, as reflected by a U of 129, $p = .10$. These findings concur with those of Moore and Updegraff (1964) who found that sex differences are not related to popularity among preschool children.

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient Test was used to examine the relationship between the degree of peer preference and the age of the children in the group. The resulting rho was .26, indicating no significant relationship. Although some studies, such as Moore and Updegraff (1964), have found a positive correlation between the age of the child and the child's popularity within the group, the results of this test concur with those of Lippitt (1941) who found no relationship between the age of the child and the degree of the child's acceptance by his peers.

In examining the hypothesis that peer preference was not related

to the amount of aggressive behavior observed the Mann-Whitney U Test was used. The resulting U of 19, which is not significant, leads to the conclusion that peer preference was not related to the amount of observed aggressive behavior among this group of subjects. The lack of significant difference in amount of aggressive behavior between the most chosen and the least chosen children is contradictory to the findings of Dunnington (1957).

The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to determine if peer preference was related to the amount of non-participating social behavior. Although the resulting U of 12.5 was not judged to be statistically significant, there appeared to be a slight relationship since the level of significance was $p = .064$. The lack of social participation may be reflected in lack of notice by peers in a play group and, consequently, lack of being chosen among the first three choices in a sociometric test. Further consideration of the relation between these factors seems indicated.

There was only a slight suggestion of a trend that peer preference was related to the amount of affectional behavior of the subjects in this study. The level of significance of $p = .10$ was found by using the Mann-Whitney U Test. In view of the reports in the literature of a significant relation between affectional behavior and being chosen as a friend, further consideration should be given to the role of affectional behavior in attracting peers.

By means of the Mann-Whitney U Test, results indicate that children who showed a greater proportion of affectional behavior than aggressive behavior are more frequently chosen as friends. The level of significance in this comparison was $p = .02$. This finding agrees with

the finding of Dunnington (1957) whose study indicated that high status children exhibit a greater proportion of positive behavior.

No significant relationship was found between peer preference and the amount of active social participation, total affectional and aggressive responses, among the subjects of this study. This finding which was obtained by using the Mann-Whitney U Test, agrees with the finding of Emmerich (1964) who demonstrated that peer preference is based on the quality of the personal interaction rather than on the number of social contacts.

Summary of Findings

1. Peer preference was independent of sex among this group of subjects.
2. Peer preference was independent of the amount of observed affectional behavior.
3. Peer preference was independent of the amount of observed aggressive behavior.
4. Peer preference may be slightly independent of the amount of non-participating behavior.
5. There appeared to be a positive trend between peer preference and the amount of affectional behavior exhibited.
6. Peer preference was significantly independent of a greater proportion of affectional behavior than aggressive behavior during free play.
7. The total amount of active social participation did not influence peer preference status.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The major purpose of this research was to compare the amount of affectional and aggressive behavior during free play with the degree of peer acceptance among a group of 28 preschool children. The children used as subjects in this study consisted of 14 boys and 14 girls. The age range within this group of subjects was from four years two months to five years six months. The children were in attendance at a private day care center in Stillwater, Oklahoma.

An additional purpose of this study was to develop a method for recording observed behavior, particularly specific phenomena in a general social setting, which would be more efficient than traditional time sampling methods. The APPROACH method of recording observed behavior was utilized in this study to determine whether it could facilitate the recording of discrete segments of behavior.

A peer preference test was individually administered to each child. Following the sociometric test, observations were made of the children who ranked in the upper quartile and the lower quartile as determined by peer preference. A record was made of the observed social behavior in a free play situation for the subjects. Observed behavior was listed in specific categories of verbal affection, physical affection, verbal aggression, physical aggression or non-participating social behavior.

The data were examined to determine if a relationship existed between peer preference and sex differences, age differences, aggressive behavior, affectional behavior, and non-participating behavior. The data were also analyzed to determine if peer preference was based upon the amount of difference between exhibited affectional or aggressive behavior.

The findings of this research are as follows:

1. Peer preference was not related to sex in this group of subjects.
2. Peer preference was not related to age among this group of children.
3. Peer preference was not related to the amount of observed aggressive behavior.
4. Peer preference may be slightly related to the amount of non-participating social behavior.
5. There appeared to be a positive trend between peer preference and the amount of affectional behavior exhibited.
6. Peer preference was significantly related to a greater proportion of affectional behavior than aggressive behavior during free play.
7. The total amount of active social participation did not influence peer preference status.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings in this research indicate that only a few of the pre-school children have internalized the social value of using affectional behavior rather than aggressive behavior. This result reflects a need

for further study to develop methods of assisting children to recognize the advantages of affectional behavior.

In this study, as well as others, children who exhibited frequent aggressive behavioral patterns were often preferred by their peers. Further consideration is needed to determine the reason why aggressive behavior among preschool children is not negatively related to peer preference.

This research indicated that children do not understand the relationship between affectional behavior and forming friendships. The implications of this finding is that further study is needed to explore the role of affectional behavior in winning friends.

Since a slight negative relationship existed between non-participating behavior and peer preference, an investigation could be undertaken to determine the reasons which underlie this behavior. Further study into methods for helping young children initiate successful social interaction are greatly needed.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appel, M. H. "Aggressive Behavior of Nursery School Children and Adult Procedures in Dealing with Such Behavior." Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 11 (1943), 185-199.
- Beaver, A. P. The Initiation of Social Contacts by Preschool Children. Child Development Monographs, No. 7. New York: Bureau of Publications Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932, 35-38.
- Berman, L. M. "Teaching Love as Co-response." Theory into Practice. Vol. 8 (April, 1969), 96-100.
- Berrien, F. K. and F. D. Turner. Values and Public Dissent: I-Preliminary Measures. New Brunswick: Rutgers, The State University, 1969.
- Blau, B. and J. Rafferty. "Changes in Friendship Status as a Function of Reinforcement." Child Development, Vol. 41 (March, 1970), 113-121.
- Byrd, E. "A Study of Validity and Constancy of Choices in a Sociometric Test." Sociometry, Vol. 14, No. 2 (August, 1951), 175-181.
- Caldwell, B. M. "A New 'APPROACH' to Behavioral Ecology," in J. P. Hill (ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology, Vol. 2. Minneapolis, Minn.: The University of Minnesota Press, 1969, 74-109.
- Coe, G. A. Law and Freedom in the School. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1924, 69-71.
- Dunnington, M. J. "Behavioral Differences of Sociometric Status Groups in a Nursery School." Child Development, Vol. 28, No. 1 (March, 1957), 103-111.
- Easton, D. and J. Dennis. Children in the Political System: Origins of Political Legitimacy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969, 73-107.
- Educational Policies Commission, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators, 1951.

- Emmerich, W. "Continuity and Stability in Early Social Development." Child Development, Vol. 35 (1964), 311-332.
- Ford, J. and T. LaChapelle. "Are Children Cruel?" Educational Leadership, Vol. 27 (April, 1970), 733-734.
- Fraenkel, J. R. Teaching Strategies for Value Education in Social Studies: A Theoretical Position. San Francisco: San Francisco State College, 1968.
- Frasier, R. C. "Moral Values in Today's World." A Guide for Study and Discussion. Cooperative Extension Service, Oregon State University, 1966.
- Frymier, J. R. "Teaching the Young to Love." The National Elementary Principal, Vol. 49 (November, 1969), 19-25.
- Galloway, C. M. "Love is What It Is." Theory into Practice, Vol. 8 (April, 1969), 114-116.
- Greenstein, F. I. Children and Politics. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965, 5.
- Hess, R. D. and D. Easton. "The Role of the Elementary School in Political Socialization." The School Review, Vol. 70 (Autumn, 1962), 257-265.
- Hess, R. D. and J. V. Torney. The Development of Political Attitudes in Children. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969, 212-221.
- Honig, A. S., B. M. Caldwell, and J. Tannenbaum. "Patterns of Information Processing Used By and With Young Children in a Nursery School Setting." Child Development, Vol. 41, No. 4 (December, 1970), 1045-1065.
- Hunt, J. M. The Challenge of Incompetence and Poverty. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969, 156-158.
- Jahoda, G. "Children's Concepts of Nationality: A Critical Study of Piaget's Stages." Child Development, Vol. 35, No. 4 (December, 1964), 1081-1092.
- Janssen, P. "Campus Rebels: Who, Why, What?" Newsweek, Vol. 72 (September 30, 1968), 63-68.
- Kawin, E. Parenthood in a Free Nation, Vol. I: Basic Concepts for Parents. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963.
- Katz, L. G., D. L. Peters, and N. S. Stein. "Observing Behavior in Kindergarten and Preschool Classes." Childhood Education, Vol. 44 (February, 1968), 400-405.

- Leeper, S. H., R. J. Dales, D. S. Skipper, and R. L. Witherspoon. Good Schools for Young Children. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968, 237-238.
- Lindzey, G. and E. Gorgatta. "Sociometric Measurement," in G. Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. I. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954, 405-448.
- Lippert, R. "Popularity Among Preschool Children." Child Development, Vol. 12, No. 4 (December, 1941), 305-331.
- Loomis, A. M. A Technique for Observing the Social Behavior of Nursery School Children. Child Development Monograph, No. 5. New York: Bureau of Publications Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931, 87.
- Martin, W. E. "Learning Theory and Identification: The Development of Values in Children." Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. 84 (1954), 211-217.
- Masling, J. and G. Stern. "Effect of the Observer in the Classroom." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 60 (October, 1969), 351-354.
- McCandless, B. R. and H. R. Marshall. "A Picture Sociometric Technique for Preschool Children and Its Relation to Teacher Judgments of Friendship." Child Development, Vol. 28, No. 2 (June, 1957), 139-147.
- Menninger, K. "This Medicine, Love." Theory into Practice, Vol. 8 (April, 1969), 124-125.
- Moore, S. and R. Updegraff. "Sociometric Status of Preschool Children Related to Age, Sex, Nurture-Giving, and Dependency." Child Development, Vol. 35 (1964), 519-524.
- Moreno, F. B. "Sociometric Status of Children in a Nursery School Group." Sociometry, Vol. 5, No. 4 (November, 1942), 395-411.
- Northway, M. L. and L. Weld. Sociometric Testing--A Guide for Teachers. Toronto, Canada: The University of Toronto Press, 1957, 57-59.
- Sellitz, C., M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S. W. Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1959, 200-234.
- Starkweather, E. K. "A Comparison of Two Techniques for Measuring Sociometric Status Among Nursery School Children." Proceedings of the Oklahoma Academy of Science, Vol. 42 (1962), 199-205.
- Torney, J. V. and R. D. Hess. Teachers, Students, and Political Attitude Development. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1969.

Turner, M. E. The Child Within the Group. Stanford, Dalifornia: The Stanford University Press, 1957.

Ulrich, R. and M. Wolfe. "Research and Theory on Aggression and Violence." The Science Teacher, Vol. 36 (May, 1969), 24-28.

Wann, K. D., M. S. Dorn, and E. A. Liddle. Fostering Intellectual Development in Young Children. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1969, 65-82.

Walters, J., D. Pearce, and L. Dahms. "Affectional and Aggressive Behavior of Preschool Children." Child Development, Vol. 28, No. 1 (March, 1957), 15-26.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
ORIGINAL INSTRUMENTS

ORIGINAL INSTRUMENT DEVELOPED BY

WALTERS, PEARCE, AND DAHMS

Physical Affection:

- a. Compliant, i.e. conforms to another's desire or request;
- b. Kisses;
- c. Pats, Fondles, Hugs;
- d. Smiles, Laughs with Someone;
- e. Helpful, Shares, i.e. gives assistance to another, divides materials with others;
- f. Sympathetic.

Verbal Affection:

- a. Accepts, i.e. receives with favor, approves;
- b. Asks Permission, Requests;
- c. Speaks in Friendly Manner, i.e. talks with another in such a manner so as to reassure, to express warm feelings for the person;
- d. Compliments, Praises;
- e. Offers to Compromise, Share, Cooperate.

Physical Aggression:

- a. Annoys, Teases, Interferes;
- b. Hits, Strikes;
- c. Competes for Status, i.e. attempts to "show up" another by performing better;
- d. Threatening Gesture;
- e. Pursues, i.e. runs after or follows with the intent of inflicting a blow;
- f. Snatches or Damages Property of Others;
- g. Negativism, i.e. refuses to work with or conform to the directions of another;
- h. Pushes, Pulls, Holds.

Verbal Aggression:

- a. Commands, Demands;
- b. Cross-Purposes, i.e. conflict over ways of using equipment;
- c. Disparages, i.e. makes remarks indicating dislike for another person, finds fault with or censures or condemns another's behavior, humiliates, laughs at another's misfortune, mocks, expresses desire that another be the victim of imperious events, attributes bad qualities to another;
- d. Injury via Agent, i.e. entices another person to injure a third person;
- e. Refuses to Comply;
- f. Rejects, i.e. denies activity or privilege to another;

- g. Shifts Blame;
- h. Tattles;
- i. Claims Possession;
- j. Threatens.

Original Instrument Developed by
Caldwell, Honig, and Tannenbaum

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR APPROACH BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES
AND THE NUMBERS ASSIGNED EACH IN THE CODE

-
- I. Subject of behavioral clause (first digit):
- 0 Central figure (CF)
 - 1 The environment
 - 2 Female adult
 - 3 Female child
 - 4 Item
 - 5 Male child
 - 6 Group, including CF
 - 7 Group, excluding CF
 - 8 Male adult
 - 9 Setting alert
- II. Behavioral predicates (second and third digits):
- a) Environmental contact (00-09)
 - 00 Ignores
 - 01 Attends
 - 02 Establishes or maintains contact
 - 03 Terminates contact
 - 04 Scans
 - b) Information processing (10-19):
 - 10 Confirms
 - 11 Shows (to) or demonstrates (for)
 - 12 Communicates or converses
 - 13 Writes or draws (for)
 - 14 Reads (to)
 - 15 Corrects or disconfirms
 - 16 Inquires
 - 17 Informs or teaches
 - 18 Informs about culture
 - 19 Role plays (with)
 - c) Food behavior (20-24):
 - 20 Gives food (to)
 - 21 Takes or handles food
 - 22 Prepares food (for)
 - 23 Transports food (to)
 - 24 Disorganizes with food
 - d) Manual activities (25-29):
 - 25 Transfers item (to or toward)
 - 26 Handles item
 - 27 Manipulates item
 - 28 Transports item (to)
 - 29 Throws or rolls item (to)
 - e) Negative reinforcement (30-39):
 - 30 Withholds sanction (from)
 - 31 Shows discomfort
 - 32 Expresses displeasure (to)
 - 33 Criticizes or derogates
 - 34 Expresses hostility
 - 35 Interferes or restricts
 - 36 Resists or rejects
 - 37 Threatens or frightens
 - 38 Assaults
 - f) Positive reinforcement (40-49):
 - 40 Permits or sanctions
 - 41 Expresses solicitude
 - 42 Shows pleasure
 - 43 Approves, encourages
 - 44 Expresses affection
 - 45 Facilitates
 - 46 Excuses
 - 47 Bargains, promises
 - 48 Protects, defends
 - g) Body activities (50-59):
 - 50 Increases or accelerates
 - 51 Decreases or retards activity
 - 52 Perioralizes
 - 53 Acts in situ
 - 54 Adjusts or accommodates
 - 55 Provides kinesthetic stimulation
 - 56 Locomotes (toward)
 - 57 Engages in large muscle activity
 - 58 Marches, dances, or rhythmoizes
 - 59 Voids or excretes
 - h) Miscellaneous (60-69):
 - 60 Acts or occurs
 - 61 Caretakes
 - 62 Consummates activity
 - 63 Consummates activity, with failure
 - 64 Disorganizes
 - 65 Disintegrates emotionally
 - 66 Makes ambio (with)
 - 69 Garbled record
 - i) Control techniques (70-79):
 - 70 Suggests
 - 71 Requests
 - 72 Inhibits
 - 73 Forbids
 - 74 Offers
- III. Object of behavioral clause (fourth digit):
- 0-8 Same as for first digit
 - 9 No information or self
- IV. Supplementary information (fifth digit):
- 0 Ineptly
 - 1 Accompanied by verbalization (or with sound if subject is 1 or 4)
 - 2 Involving interpersonal physical contact
 - 3 With intensity
 - 4 In a specified manner, place, or time
 - 5 In a manner, place, or time other than that specified
 - 6 Imitatively
 - 7 In continuation
 - 8 Complexity
 - 9 No information

APPENDIX B
AMENDED INSTRUMENTS
SOCIOMETRIC SCORES

Amended Instrument of Walter, Pearce, and Dahms
and Caldwell, Honig, and Tannenbaum

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR APPROACH BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES AND THE
NUMBERS ASSIGNED EACH ACCORDING TO THE MODIFIED CODE

I. Subject of behavioral clause (first digit):

- 0 Central figure (CF)
- 1 The environment
- 2 Female adult
- 3 Female child
- 4 Item
- 5 Male child
- 6 Group, including CF
- 7 Group, excluding CF
- 8 Male adult
- 9 Setting alert

II. Behavioral predicates (second and third digits):

Physical Affection:

- 00a. Complaint, i.e. conforms to another's desire or request;
- 01b. Kisses;
- 02c. Pats, Fondles, Hugs;
- 03d. Smiles, Laughs with Someone;
- 04e. Helpful, shares, i.e. gives assistance to another,
divides materials with others;
- 05f. Sympathetic.

Verbal Affection:

- 10a. Accepts, i.e. receives with favor, approves;
- 11b. Asks Permission, Requests;
- 12c. Speaks in Friendly Manner, i.e. talks with another in
such a manner so as to reassure, to express warm feel-
ings for the person;
- 13d. Compliments, Praises;
- 14e. Offers to Compromise, Share, Cooperate;
- 15f. Generalized friendly verbalization.

Physical Aggression:

- 20a. Annoys, Teases, Interferes;
- 21b. Hits, Strikes;
- 22c. Competes for Status, i.e. attempts to "show up" another
by performing better;
- 23d. Threatening Gesture;
- 24e. Pursues, i.e. runs after or follows with the intent of
inflicting a blow;
- 25f. Snatches or Damages Property of Others;
- 26g. Negativism, i.e. refuses to work with or conform to the
directions of another;
- 27h. Pushes, Pulls, Holds.

Verbal Aggression:

- 30a. Commands, Demands;
- 31b. Cross-Purposes, i.e. conflict over ways of using
equipment;
- 32c. Disparages, i.e. makes remarks indicating dislike for
another person, finds fault with or censures or con-
demns another's behavior, humiliates, laughs at an-
other's misfortune, mocks, expresses desire that an-
other be the victim of imperious events, attributes
bad qualities to another;
- 33d. Injury via Agent, i.e. entices another person to in-
jure a third person;
- 34e. Refuses to Comply;
- 35f. Rejects, i.e. denies activity or privilege to another;
- 36g. Shifts Blame;
- 37h. Tattles;
- 38i. Claims Possession;
- 39j. Threatens;
- 40k. Annoys or teases verbally.

Miscellaneous:

- 50a. No overt social interaction;
- 51b. Ignores friendly verbal approach by another;
- 52c. Ignores friendly physical approach by another;
- 53d. Ignores unpleasant verbal approach by another;
- 54e. Ignores unpleasant physical approach by another.

III. Object of behavioral clause (fourth digit):

- 0-8- Same as for first digit
- 9 No information or self

IV. Supplementary information (fifth digit):

- 0 Ineptly
- 1 Accompanied by verbalization (or with sound if subject is
1 or 4)
- 2 Involving interpersonal physical contact
- 3 With intensity
- 4 Mildly
- 5 Somewhat playfully
- 6 Imitatively
- 7 In continuation
- 8 Complexity
- 9 No information

CHILDREN'S SCORES FROM THE
SOCIOMETRIC TEST

Child's Code No.	Sex	Age Yrs.-Mos.	Peer Preference		Aff.	Observed Behavior (Frequency)		
			Scores	Status		Agg.	Non-part.	Total
23	F	4 - 4	2-2-2-2-2-1-1-1	28	24	11	7	42
10	F	5 - 6	2-2-2-1-1-1	27	16	20	6	42
22	M	5 - 3	2-2-1-1-1-1	26	19	17	8	44
07	F	4 - 6	2-1-1-1-1-1-1	25	22	6	14	42
25	F	5 - 5	2-2-1-1-1	24	24	2	16	42
20	F	4 - 8	2-2-1-1	22.5	28	2	10	40
18	M	5 - 4	2-2-1-1	22.5	9	13	18	40
15	M	4 - 7	1-1-1-1-1-1	21				
13	F	4 - 9	2-2-1	20				
04	F	4 - 5	2-1-1-1	18				
09	F	5 - 3	2-1-1-1	18				
17	M	5 - 6	2-1-1-1	18				
05	F	4 - 3	2-2	16				

Child's Code No.	Sex	Age Yrs.-Mos.	Peer Preference Scores	Status	Aff.	Observed Behavior (Frequency)		
						Agg.	Non-part.	Total
28	M	4 - 2	2-1-1	15				
02	F	5 - 6	2-1	13.5				
12	M	5 - 2	2-1	13.5				
19	M	5 - 4	1-1-1	12				
26	M	5 - 6	2	11				
08	F	5 - 2	1-1	9				
27	M	5 - 0	1-1	9				
14	M	4 - 8	1-1	9				
06	F	4 - 6	1	5.5	15	7	18	40
21	F	5 - 0	1	5.5	29	8	4	41
24	M	4 - 4	1	5.5	13	10	17	40
03	M	4 - 8	1	5.5	19	13	9	41
11	F	4 - 10	0	2	14	2	25	41
01	M	4 - 4	0	2	10	10	21	41
16	M	4 - 4	0	2	12	9	20	41

SAMPLE SCORING SHEET FOR ENCODED

OBSERVATIONS OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Total Response Code: N--aggressive response
 P--affectionate response
 L--no social interaction
 O--ignores friendly approaches
 A--ignores unpleasant approaches

Child: F-11

Observation No.	Minute No.	Subject	Predicate	Object	Mood	Total Response	Observation No.	Minute No.	Subject	Predicate	Object	Mood	Total Response
1	1		50			L	5	1	O	04	5	L	P
	2		50			L		2	O	30	3	L	N
	3		50			L		3	O	00	3	L	P
	4		50			L		4	O	11	5	L	P
	5		54	5	4	A		5	O	03	5	L	P
2	1		50			L	6	1		50			L
	2		50			L		2		50			L
	3		50			L		3		50			L
	4		50			L		4		50			L
	5		50			L		5		50			L

Observation No.	Minute No.	Subject	Predicate	Object	Mood	Total Response	Observation No.	Minute No.	Subject	Predicate	Object	Mood	Total Response
3	1	0	15	5	4	P	7	1	0	03	3	3	P
	2	0	15	3	4	P		2	0	03	3	3	P
	3	0	15	3	4	P		3		50			L
	4		50			L		4		50			L
	5	0	15	5	4	P		5		50			L
4	1		50			L	8	1		50			L
	2		50			L		2	0	11	3	4	P
	3		50			L		3	0	00	3	4	P
	4	0	53	5	4	A		4	0	15	7	4	P
	5		50			L		5	0	00	6	4	P

Total Responses: 41
 N-- 2
 P--14
 L--23
 O-- 0
 A-- 2

VITA

Karol Alyne Burton²

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: AFFECTIONAL AND AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR IN RELATION TO PEER
ACCEPTANCE

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Durant, Oklahoma, December 20, 1932, the
daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Milton J. Burton.

Education: Graduated from Miami High School, Miami, Oklahoma, in
May, 1951. Graduated from The University of Oklahoma School
of Nursing, in August, 1954. Attended The University of
Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, 1960. Graduated from Brooks
School of Aerospace Medicine, Flight Nurse Course, San
Antonio, Texas, in May, 1964. Attended Oklahoma College of
Liberal Arts, Chickasha, Oklahoma, from 1967 to 1969, re-
ceived the Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics in
August, 1969. Completed requirements for the Master of
Science degree in July, 1971.

Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu, Southern Association for
Children Under Six.