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ABSTRACT

This research was conducted among students in the grades 9 to 12 at a Toronto high school. It attempted to study the effects of Status Consistency upon each pupil's selection of friends, his choice of a seat and his degree of satisfaction with the social systems of the school and of one particular class.

Applying Lenski's formula, Status Consistency scores were based on each student's popularity, his grades for that subject and his overall academic performance, his participation in school organizations and his father's occupational position in relation first, to students in that class and second, to students in the entire sample.

The findings indicated that the degree of Status Consistency per se was not an important determinant of friendship patterns nor did it play a vital role in the decision to sit in any particular area of the classroom. Initially, the degree of Status Consistency did appear to affect the degree of satisfaction with both social systems under study but this relationship disappeared when the grade level of the students was controlled.

A secondary analysis examined one extreme Status Consistency profile – that of high consistency and its relation to the three dependent variables. The results showed that consistency at a high level influenced the choice of friends.
and the degree of satisfaction with the social systems of the school and the class. No relationship was found between high consistency and where the pupils sat.

In summary, the degree of Status Consistency does not appear to be a factor which by itself has a critical influence on classroom behavior but could be considered an important variable when specific status consistency profiles are studied.
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INTRODUCTION

Teachers at the high school level will agree that at the beginning of the school year there is a surge by pupils for certain seats while others are repeatedly left for the latecomers. This was evident throughout my years as a young student and later as a substitute teacher with the Montreal Catholic School Commission. With the first days of school, the bell would ring, the doors would open, and invariably each entering pupil would follow a set direction as if by instinct to a pre-selected desk.

This behavior was not primarily an individual activity; often student cliques would have areas singled out in advance. In the event that competition developed over one particular location it became a matter of first-come, first-served. Finally, after several weeks of jockeying for positions, a seating pattern would be established and this in turn would put an end to the sprints.

When asked about such student actions, both teachers and pupils would usually cite one of three explanations: because of the appeal of the teacher or in many cases the lack of it. 'Appeal' was always defined as either the teacher's friendliness with students or his competence. Second, because of the desire of students to sit near friends; or finally, for
the simple reason that some students preferred the front of the class, others the back or the middle and so on. The first two of these reasons were easily enough understood but the third always remained vague.

Teachers, like students were also quick to recognize the importance of seating location and made strategic use of who sat where. On occasion they would incorporate this principle into their disciplinary techniques. For instance, if, during the course of the year problems of maintaining order or of encouraging pupils to devote more of their attentions to the academic side of the lessons arose, one favorite procedure used by the instructor was to rearrange the seating pattern in such a way as to break up student clusters. This new system would be in effect until signs of disrupting restlessness or inattention would once again erupt. As soon as the problem was diagnosed by the teacher, the remedy became apparent — another seating change.

This tactic would disturb many of the students. The feelings of comfort that had developed through familiarity not only with those around each student but also with the little things that came to be taken for granted: the position of the blackboards, of the door, of the clock, of the windows, gave way to a sense of personal dislocation. In many cases students would become angry at having been seated next to someone they disliked or at having been placed in the direct line of the instructor's view without benefit of the camouflage once provided by the heads and shoulders of other students. Similarly,
students who preferred to have themselves openly visible could find themselves in seats over to one side of the room or even buried somewhere in the back rows.

The days following the new seating plan also demanded that the teacher undergo a period of readjustment. Those co-operative faces that had willingly occupied the front of the classroom in most cases were replaced by disgruntled, nervous pupils. No longer could the teacher address his or her comments to those supportive individuals who either nodded with each point of information or were readily available to respond when questions failed to bring forth a show of hands.

Although the system of having the students remain in one classroom between periods while the teachers moved from one class to the next has given way to a new one of mobile students and teachers whose schedules call for their meeting together at a certain class on a certain day and at a certain hour, the emphasis which both factions place on who will sit at which desk remains unchanged.

It was after viewing this one aspect of classroom behavior as a student and a teacher that the relevance of seating location to the daily interaction between teachers and pupils became more apparent and important.

The decision to study the seating habits of high school students complemented a developing interest in the theory of Status Consistency. It was therefore decided to integrate these two areas into one study. But would this theory which first compared an individual's ranking on each
of several relevant statuses with the rankings of everyone in the sample and then examined the degree of consistency between his statuses further the knowledge of classroom behavior. Primarily, would Status Consistency have some effect upon where he chose to sit, upon his selection of school friends, upon his degree of satisfaction as a member of that school or class? These were some of the questions that advanced this topic to the stage where it became the theme of this thesis.
CHAPTER I

Review of the Literature

Seating Position:

Prior to 1960 few social scientists conducted studies on seating position as a social variable. But with the publication of The Silent Language in 1959, Hall provided an impetus for such studies which popularized the study of non-verbal communication. His premise was that communication between individuals occurs not only on the verbal plane but also on the symbolic plane, that ideas are transmitted by the manner in which a conversation takes place, by the distance between the speakers, by the tone of voice used, and even by the stance of the speakers. Throughout the next decade numerous articles continued to show that communication was more than just an oral process. In 1970, Body Language by Julius Fast attempted to interpret literally every facet of human movement as a physical signal meant for those with whom we interact.

It was during this eleven year period that sociology as well as psychology turned to the study of where a person sits and why he chooses a particular seat. Winnick and Holt (1961) saw the choice of seat as a psychological projection of an individual's personality. Their findings indicated that folding chairs, as opposed to those in fixed positions, were more likely to be selected by psychologically insecure people.
The selection of a soft seat over a hard one gave forth equally informative data, as did color—red signifying "a hot seat" and blue "a cool seat". Winnick and Holt also reported on the potential insight gained through examining posture:

"... the posture of the patient in his chair—for instance, whether he has his feet firmly planted on the floor, or tucked under him, or stretched out toward the center of the group—may also serve as nonverbal communication."

Sociological studies on seating position were predominantly featured in works analyzing the behavior of individuals in small-group situations. The pattern advanced by researchers was that dominant subjects are more apt to choose centrally located seats (Hare and Bales 1963). These findings were supported by Lott and Sommer (1967) in their analysis of seating and status. The authors studied the seating habits of persons positioned around a rectangular table and discovered that people associated a high or a low status with a particular seat. The head position was usually thought to give its occupant high status. The farther one sat from the head chair the less status he assumed ("status-distance relationship"). Lott and Sommer concluded that not only is there an underlying process of identification of status with each seating location but also that people are aware of this association and therefore sit "farther from both high and low status individuals than they did from their peers".

Hare and Bales (1963), in the article previously
referred to, maintained that besides choosing the more centrally placed chairs, dominant individuals do most of the talking. These usually faced the largest number of persons (Ward 1968) and direct the majority of their comments to them (Strodtebeck and Hook 1961) (Steinzer 1950). Ward's study also showed that those who do most of the talking are more likely to emerge as the recognized leaders of the group.

In summary, it appears that dominant personalities select the more central positions, carry on most of the conversation and are rewarded by being thought of as leaders of the group.

Turning our attention to the educational system, an area where one would expect many studies dealing with seating arrangements, we find a noticeable shortage of sociological research. Maisonneuve et al (1952), Byrne and Bruehler (1955) and Byrne (1961) simply compared the directional flow of conversation and acquaintance patterns with the studies previously conducted in laboratory settings. These all bore similar findings: that students would by nature of the amount of personal contact direct most of their remarks and thus gain the friendship of those students occupying neighboring seats. Maisonneuve and his researchers as an additional fact suggested

Although Hare and Bales stated that people tend to talk to the person next to them, thus seemingly contradicting other findings, they obtained similar results when they seated the five-man discussion groups around three sides of a rectangular table.
in their study that older students traditionally lined the back rows of the classroom while social isolates, defined through sociometric testing, sought out desks located at the back corners of the room.

Serious questions have been raised over the past years regarding the effects of a teacher's private opinion of a student's capabilities and the latter's subsequent academic performance. Palardy (1968) and Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) brought to light the workings of the "self-fulfilling prophecy" within the classroom setting. They showed, for example that a teacher, informed that Pupil X is a poor student (even when this was not true) would treat that student as such. The latter would respond in a manner that reinforced the teacher's initial belief - with lower grades.

Schwebel (1969) made use of the self-fulfilling prophecy among pupils when he showed that seating position was an important factor in many of the teacher's first opinions. He discovered that students placed in the front rows of the classroom were characterized by their fellow classmates as well as by their teacher as more likeable, as better pupils, as more attentive and industrious. And this was reflected in their output. Similarly, those relegated to the back of the class were negatively labelled along the lines mentioned above and to this they responded as predicted - with lower grades. The paradox of this theory was its consistency. When students who had formerly sat in front and were the prima donnas of the classroom were moved to the back while those from the back
were placed up front, both groups experienced a transformation. "A child moved forward was now more likely to be perceived (by the teacher and pupils) more positively than one who was moved backward." In this new location not only was the student's public image altered but also his private self-image at least in terms of his grades which became noticeably lower than before.

Schwebel also pointed out that behavior patterns varied with seating position, that "a front row location affects children's behavior in a positive manner", they are less disruptive and tend to spend their time engaged in curricular work. This reference echoes Byrne's (1961) statement that

"... classroom seating arrangements are clearly important in determining some aspects of classroom behavior. Further implications and influences remain to be explored."

Status Consistency:

In any social setting an individual possesses certain social characteristics (statuses) which are relevant, if not vital, to the carrying out of that role. These statuses may be ascribed or they may be achieved.

When a general role, for instance, that of "a student" is shared by a number of individuals, it is possible for some status attributes which define the actors as "students" to be at the same level (as when all the students are in the tenth grade, or all are in a pre-college program). Other
status attributes may, on the other hand, be incompatible; Pupil 1 may be an A student, Pupil 2 a C student and so on. In the event that these status attributes are all at a similar level throughout the classroom, the group can be defined as congruent in terms of those statuses. Where there are notable differences from one student to the next in terms of age, marks, class level and other statuses which pertain to the role of student, the group is then considered incongruent.²

Just as a group may be classified by its degree of consistency, so may an individual in relation to others in that setting. Again using the classroom as our example, the grades of one student may be higher than the class average while his attendance at school may be below average. Thus he is ranked high on the first status variable and low on the second variable. When all his statuses are ranked at a similar level, either all low, average, or high then he is 'consistent'. In the literature this is defined as the state of 'status consistency', 'status congruency', or 'status crystallization'. Whenever the statuses are not aligned to each other, for example, the combination of a high ranked status with a low ranked status, the individual is 'inconsistent'.

Over the past three decades the principal approach of sociologists has been to study the immediate effects of

²Adams (1953-54) studied the effects of status congruency on group performance and group harmony. Using bomber crews as his Subjects, he showed that as group congruency increases group harmony also tends to increase but at the eventual expense of group performance.
status inconsistency. Their findings generally indicated that the state of inconsistency is undesirable (Benoit-Smullyan 1944), that it leads to tension which intensifies during social interaction (Fenchel et al 1951), to anxiety bordering on neurosis (Jackson 1960, Lenski 1964, Segal 1969), or to frustration and stress\(^3\) (Broom and Jones 1970, Rush 1967).

However, other researches have challenged these findings on the grounds that such tensions are not present when a person's expectations are in accord with the situation. Parker (1963) and Sampson (1963) referred to the case of a black doctor who through past experiences has become accustomed to be defined by his white patients first by his racial status then by his professional status. In such circumstances, although one status is considered low while the other high, these authors contend that the tension and frustration do not necessarily occur.

Another related question concerns the effect of inconsistencies between ascribed and achieved statuses. This particular argument takes the position that the extent of tension is dependent upon a person's consistency profile, that is, the type of inconsistency. Thus Broom and Jones (1970) report that:

\(^3\)The theory advanced to explain these effects concerns the expectations of the inconsistent individual during his interacting with others - he seeks to be accepted in terms of his higher status yet believes that others react to him on the basis of his lower status. The consequences of this rejection are usually more apparent if the person is socially mobile.
"... inconsistency between high ascribed and low achieved status was especially likely to be associated with high (stress) symptomization."

while:

"... inconsistency among achieved statuses may generate less stress than inconsistency between achieved and ascribed status characteristics."

Segal (1969) added further support to this viewpoint.

As a reaction to this unwelcomed state of inconsistency the individual, "if he perceives the possibility of changing the lower factors, he will tend to raise such status factors which are evaluated as lower." By this process of "status equilibration", a term coined by Bencit-Smullyan (1944), the individual seeks to remedy the ill feelings aroused by his inconsistent statuses and thereby, mould a more favorable public and private image of himself.

As is frequently the case, not all inconsistent statuses can be rectified. If age is the dysfunctional factor, there is obviously no immediate means to bring this status into sudden alignment with the rankings of the other statuses.

How the individual copes with his inability to improve upon his lower status variable again depends upon the degree and nature or type of inconsistency. The literature identifies active and passive reactions. The most drastic of

---

the former takes place when the inconsistency "so overcomes
the individual that he resorts to suicide" (Gibbs and Martin
1958). More common and more moderate responses are a dissat-
isfaction with the immediate surroundings or with the socio-
political structure in which the individual finds himself.
To examine this second proposition, sociologists analyzed the
political attitudes and voting patterns of status inconsistencies.
These studies showed that inconsistencies are politically left-
wing oriented and that they favor those parties which repre-
sent a change from the established order. Lenski (1955, 1967)
demonstrated this in the Metropolitan Detroit area and sugges-
ted similar findings throughout the United States. Segal
(1970), in his analysis of Canadian voting habits, likewise
arrived at the same conclusions.

In a separate study by Rush (1967), his findings did
not concur with those cited above. He found that status inco-
sistent are politically conservative. In his explanation of

5Sokol (1961) listed eight circumstances in which
a reaction to status consistency would be more probable:
i) when an individual perceives his statuses are inconsistent
and feels strain because of this awareness.
ii) when he has the attitude that rank statuses should be
consistent.
iii) when he is class conscious.
iv) when he is upward mobility-oriented.
v) when he is more integrated into a community.
vi) when he tends to be sensitive to certain discomforts in
social interaction.
vii) when he is intolerant of ambiguity.
viii) when certain types of statuses are inconsistent rather
than others.

6Pellegrin and Bates (1959) noted that incongruent
Subjects expressed dissatisfaction with their work.
these differing results, Rush stated

"... it is possible that the crucial factor may be certain configurations of consistent statuses as opposed to others."

Here again he touched upon a central approach to the study of status consistency, that just as the degree of tension may vary, depending on which variable is ranked high and which low, so may the other effects of status inconsistency.

Geschwender (1967) applied Homans's 'cost-reward' theory ('distributive justice') to this left-wing, right-wing political preference dilemma and offered a plausible solution: if rewards (high income) are greater than costs (years of education) the individual, in spite of the tensions he may experience, will attempt to maintain the social and political structure as it is. Hence political conservatism. But given the reverse factors of high costs (high level of education) combined with low rewards (a menial position), the individual would express discontent directed at the occupation itself, at the company, or even at the society which provides that occupation. He would then seek social changes through participating in left-wing movements or by voting for a party that featured such changes in its platform.

Anderson (1966) studied yet one other outward manifestation of inconsistent statuses - nationalism. Quoting from Lipset's The Political Man the axiom that

"... tension requires immediate alleviation (which) is frequently found in the venting of hostility against a scapegoat".
he cited prejudice as a by-product of the nationalism caused by the stress of status inconsistency.

Up to this point the active effects of status inconsistency have been reviewed. But there are yet responses that are clearly passive in so far as the individual becomes estranged from his immediate social surroundings. Sokol (1961), Lenski (1955, 1956, 1964), Jackson (1960), Lachenmeyer (1968) and others have all noted that dissatisfaction, personal withdrawal and social isolation from group or societal involvement have been primary defense mechanisms against the strains of inconsistency. Unable to resolve the cause of their unequal statuses, unable to cope with the produced stress, dissatisfied with their mild resistance through the political process, they turn into themselves. Geschwender (1968) and Lenski (1954, 1955, 1966) showed that these individuals held fewer memberships in voluntary associations, had a lower participation rate and held fewer office and committee posts in the organizations to which they did belong.
CHAPTER II

Theory

The literature encouraged the opinion that Lenski's theory could readily be applied to the classroom setting as long as relevant status-defining variables were selected. There was no particular reason to believe that participants in this social system would be immune to the effects of Status Consistency, that students whose statuses were at different levels would not experience some uneasiness or dissatisfaction with their immediate environment. Theoretically, these inconsistencies, as well as those whose statuses were consistent, should manifest their feelings in some overt way that would be open to analysis.

It was assumed that inconsistent students would, to alleviate as much of the tension of their inconsistent state as possible, prefer as friends other students who were in a similar inconsistent state. In the same way it was expected that consistent pupils would seek each other out and establish friendship ties.

A more visible display of consistency or inconsistency was suspected in the seating patterns that emerged in the various classrooms. The expectation here was that students who were consistent and therefore satisfied with their social surroundings (the school and the classroom) would want to be
a functioning member of that social system. Thus they would prefer those desks closer to the front of the classroom. Likewise the students who were inconsistent and therefore dissatisfied would not wish to be an active part of this social system; they would try to minimize their dealings with it. One possible way to do this, especially in a classroom, would be to sit in an area where the amount of interaction with the teacher and other pupils is less. They would, therefore, prefer the back rows of the classroom.

The application of the theory of Status Consistency requires the use of variables which reflect the social system under study and from which the Subjects have been chosen. These variables should be status-conferring, recognized and accepted as such by the participants of that social system and sought after by these members. These variables should be "indicators of positions crucial to the maintenance of social order" (Broom and Jones, 1959). Thus, Adams (1953-4), when studying military bomber crews, used as relevant factors: age, military rank, amount of flying time, education, reputed ability, popularity, length of service, combat time and position importance. Other studies when dealing with a more general aspect of society have based status consistency scores on more general variables: education, occupation, income, ethnic origin, religion, race.

The question raised at this point is which variables can be considered vital to the social system operating within
any high school? C.W. Gordon, in his 1957 study, drew attention to the three subsystems which he felt simultaneously act upon high school students. These he defined as:

(a) the formal subsystem which consists of the principal, the teachers and the pupils; its primary function is to educate. Here status is acquired by how well this goal is achieved. Therefore, the aim of the pupil is to absorb and retain as much of the instructed material as possible. The degree of the student's success is measured by his ability to pass tests and quizzes. The higher the grades the pupil attains, the higher his standing and his prestige in this formal subsystem.

(b) the semi-formal subsystem is made up of the school's clubs and organizations which are for the most part under the direction of teachers who have volunteered their after-school hours to these various activities. Status in this subsystem is accorded more to members of one organization than to those of another. For instance, for male students, participation in sports activities, especially 'making' those teams which publicly represent the school, is a highly sought after goal. At the opposite end are those organizations which have special appeal only to a few students who specialize in that area; these would include the stamp, coin and chess clubs etc. Here status is minimal.

Whether or not the individual club member holds an office in an organization—is also an important social criterion. The captain of the school football team, the presi-
dent of the debating club and the school's student president all inherit additional recognition in the eyes of their fellow students.

(c) the informal subsystem: this is defined as the student cliques and peer groups that are found in the school. Just as every student is not able to join a high-ranking school organization, so also is selectivity practised among student cliques. If one clique is closed to a certain student then he tries to establish himself in another with the ultimate aim of finding a personal circle of friends. From this, a distinct identification develops. As Hargreaves (1967) has stated:

"... small groups who interact regularly and frequently reveal patterns in their behavior. Usually the members are conscious of who is 'in' the group and who is not and those who are 'in' can be differentiated from those who are 'out'."

Again quoting C.W. Gordon (1957):

"... the dominant motivation of the high school student is to achieve and maintain a general social status within the organization of the school",

we may conclude that good grades, participating in and especially holding office in school clubs and popularity are indicators of the student's status in each of the educational subsystems.

In addition to these three status variables, the literature cites social class, measured by the father's occu-
pation as an important factor because of its positive relationship to each of the three initial variables:

(a) **social class and grades**: the evidence indicates that the higher the father's occupational ranking the greater the likelihood that his children will achieve higher grades than the children of a man in a lesser occupation. Mann and Burgoyne (1969) examined this social fact in Britain. Rossi (1961), Davis (1962), and Bell (1962) showed that in the United States the children of lower class families did not attain the academic success that the children of the middle class did. In the homes of the latter, the opportunity to read is ever present; when young, these children are encouraged to read for the pleasure of it. Thus, by the time they enter the primary school grades their reading abilities and vocabulary easily surpass those of the lower class children. In addition, the values emphasizing the importance of success in school differ. Middle class parents, unlike lower class parents, continually stress the need for their children to obtain good grades as a prelude to future college acceptance.

(b) **social class and participation**: The relationship between social class and participation of students in school clubs is similar to the above stated association between social class and grades. Mueller and Mueller (1962) noted the high degree of involvement in extra-curricular activities of middle class college students over students whose fathers held lower occupations. Montague's (1962) study of high school seniors
furthur supported the link between social class and the degree of participation and the holding of committee positions in school organizations.

(c) **social class and popularity:** The correlation between social class and this variable is similarly positive. C.W. Gordon (1957) stated that:

"... by occupation of the head of the family along the prestige continuum indicated the important relationship which exists between social position in school and the socio-economic position of the family."

Those children of middle and upper class parents are urged to achieve, to join after-school affairs and to seek posts in these clubs; all are a means to gaining popularity.

There is also the status gained from having access to a car and from being able to wear the most fashionable clothes. Both of these latter symbols of status are again more notably found among middle and upper class students (Montague 1962) (C.W. Gordon) (Coleman 1959). Only in an article by Dahlke (1953) was it shown that social class had no affect upon social relationships among students. However, in that case, the main factor was that the Subjects were pupils in an elementary school and at the age where their awareness of status differentials had not as yet developed.

Montague (1962) also stressed that pupils from lower class families when compared with those from middle and upper social strata are less adjusted to school in general and that they are likely to be more dissatisfied with all facets of
school life.

In summary:
The contention of Status Consistency theorists is that inconsistencies among appropriate variables (in this case: grades, degree of participation, degree of popularity, and the ranking of the father's occupation) will produce dissatisfaction among these students with regard to their social setting. Applying Diedrich and Jackson's (1969) findings that "dissatisfied boys express their discontent", this thesis hypothesizes that inconsistent statuses among male high school students will be expressed in certain classroom behavioral patterns - principally in the students' selection of desks and in the choice of friends.

Hypotheses: Specifically, it is hypothesized that:

1 (a) students choose as friends other students with the same degree of status consistency.

1 (b) students with similar degrees of status consistency sit in the same classroom area.

2 (a) status consistency leads to a sense of satisfaction with the social system of that school and conversely, status inconsistency leads to a sense of dissatisfaction.

2 (b) status consistency leads to a sense of satisfaction with the social system of that class and conversely, status inconsistency
leads to a sense of dissatisfaction.

3 (a) students whose statuses are consistent at a high level will be satisfied with the social systems of the school and the class while students whose statuses are consistent at a low level will be dissatisfied.

3 (b) students whose statuses are consistent at a high level will sit at the front of the classroom, while students whose statuses are consistent at a low level will congregate at the back of the classroom.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

After pretesting the questionnaire at a Windsor high school, the revised schedule was administered to students at a Metropolitan Toronto school. To control for the probable influence of sex and the possible effect of religion upon seating arrangements, an all-male, Catholic high school, whose administration and staff were predominately members of the Order of Christian Brothers, was selected. Initially, the objective was to acquire data from students representing the 9th, 11th, and 13th grades. Three classes from each grade were to be chosen. Unfortunately this study was conducted late in the school year when the senior students had already finished their classes and were home awaiting their final exams. To compensate for this difficulty, it was decided to include students from grades 10 and 11. Thus the final sample was composed of eight classes: two from each of the grades 9, 10, 11 and 12, providing 183 Subjects.

The ideal situation would have been to find one teacher who taught the same subject to all the students in the sample. This would have controlled for any differences in teaching techniques among teachers. However, the real setting often differs from the ideal. At this high school no one teacher instructed more than two grade levels. The one re-
mainling option was to standardize the subject matter so that any relationship between status consistency and seating location could not be attributed to the effects, i.e. the student's interest in different subjects. Therefore, four English teachers were approached and each readily consented to put aside two class periods for this study.

The testing procedure was as follows: the pupils assembled in their classrooms expecting the regular class to take place. Instead of the teacher, the researcher entered and informed the students that the period would be devoted to a survey. A questionnaire described to them as a "Student Opinion Questionnaire" was distributed along with assurances of confidentiality. While these were being answered a note was made of where each pupil sat. The completed questionnaire, which took the full class period, was then collected. Prior to the second visit to each class, the questionnaires were examined for omissions of pertinent information.

On the following day students who had filed omissions were asked to complete their questionnaires. When their answers were vague they were asked to clarify these. After this the students were then told the nature of the study and thanked for their co-operation. A brief discussion on the study topic followed.

Ways of measuring the four primary variables (father's occupation, grades, participation and popularity) were predetermined. The classification of the father's occupation
was based on Ostry's (1967) *The Occupational Composition of the Canadian Labour Force*. From this publication, nine broad categories were listed: i) the higher professions, ii) the lower professions and technical workers, iii) self-employed businessmen with the exception of small businesses, iv) managers and supervisors, v) clerical, sales and small businessmen, vi) craftsmen and foremen, vii) operatives, viii) service and household workers, and ix) labourers.

The academic standing for each pupil was derived by averaging his grades both for that particular subject (English) and his overall standing over the past two terms.

At the end of the first visit to each classroom, the names of the school's twelve clubs were listed in alphabetical order on the blackboard. The students were asked to indicate their preference for the clubs they would like to join. Individual value scores for each organization were then calculated as follows:

- the first three organizations listed received four points each.
- those named fourth to sixth received three points each.
- the seventh to ninth clubs received two points.
- the last three clubs received one point each.

If a student did not include all the organizations in his rankings, those which were omitted received a value of one. Thus, the desirability of participation in any one club was
attained by adding the score that that club had received from all the students in that class and then dividing this by the number of students making the selections.

Individual student participation scores were obtained by using an adjusted version of the Chapman Participation Scale (1952 edition) as discussed in C.W. Gordon's (1957) study. If a student simply belonged to any club he was credited with one point; if that student attended club meetings he earned another point; and if he held any office in that organization he was given an additional third point. The point tally was then multiplied by the preference value of that particular club. If the student took part in more than one organization, this procedure was repeated each time and the final tally represented his participation score.

Popularity scores for each student were based on the responses to the five sociometric questions each of which asked the student for the names of three other students in that classroom. The student listed first received three points, the second, two points, and the final name, one point. Thus, any one student's popularity score was simply indicated by the sum total of the points that he received.

Consistency scores\(^1\) were arrived at using Lenski's (1955) formula:

\[^1\text{An illustration of this method appears in Appendix B.}\]
100 - \sqrt{E (X - \bar{X})^2}

"... taking the square root of the sum of the squared deviations from the mean of the (four) hierarchy scores of the individual and subtracting the resulting figure from 100. The more highly consistent an individual's status, the more nearly his crystallization approached 100."

Questions 23 to 47 (see Appendix A) were designed to measure whether or not the students were satisfied with the social system of their particular school. At the outset, the sixty questions devised by Getzels and Jackson (1962) in their Student Opinion Poll were arranged into five groups: those specifically relating to teachers, classroom procedures, the student body at large, the curriculum and the school itself. From each category five distinct questions were chosen to encompass different aspects of each area. For instance, under the heading of "teachers", questions were included which dealt with the student's perception of the instructor's ability to 'get the subject across', his impression of the teacher's neutrality or fairness as his marker, and whether he viewed the teacher as friendly, approachable and so on.

Getzels and Jackson awarded a score of 1 for each question in which the student responded with "the most satisfactory reply". Thus in the question:

When a newcomer enters the school chances are that other students
a) go out of their way to accept him.
b) are quite willing to accept him.
c) tend to ignore him.
d) openly reject him.
only those students circling (a) would be classified as satisfied. However, for the purposes of this study, the question was not whether he was optimally satisfied but simply was he satisfied. Therefore, in addition to (a), those answering (b) were also given the 1 point score.

Questions 48 to 66 were more specific than those cited above in so far as they were concerned with the student's immediate class (English). This selection of questions, taken from the Course Evaluation Questionnaire of the University of Windsor was also based upon the five areas concerned. And again, one point was given to each response which reflected the student's satisfaction.

The method used to analyse the seating arrangements simply divided the classroom into nine areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blackboards</th>
<th>Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X - teacher's desk

X - door
For the purpose of cross-tabulation, in the first analysis when the emphasis was placed on 'rows', cells 1, 2 and 3 were collapsed to form the Front Row; cells 4, 5 and 6 became the Middle Rows, and cells 7, 8 and 9 formed the Back Rows. In the second computer run, when 'aisle' position was examined, cells 1, 4 and 7 became the Window Aisles, cells 2, 5 and 8 became the Middle Aisles and cells 3, 6 and 9 were grouped as the Blackboard Aisles.
CHAPTER IV

Findings

Hypothesis 1 (a): that students choose as friends other students with the same degree of status consistency.

To test this assumption, the responses to the five sociometric questions\(^1\) were examined along with each of the three status consistency scores\(^2\) computed for the questionnaire respondents and those they had selected.

When the first status consistency score ("A") was arranged into quintiles\(^3\) the 1011 names listed by the 183 students were distributed as follows:

\(^1\)See Appendix A, questions 67, 68, 68b, 69 and 70.

\(^2\)Throughout this chapter the Status Consistency Scores "A", "B", and "C" will refer to the following:

Status Consistency Score "A" was derived using the four variables: grades for that subject (English), participation in school clubs, popularity in that classroom and father's occupation in relation to students only in that class.

Status Consistency Score "B" was based on the variables: the student's overall grades, participation, popularity, and father's occupation again in relation to students in that class.

Status Consistency Score "C" was based on the student's overall grades, participation, popularity, and father's occupation in relation to the other 182 subjects in the sample.

\(^3\)Category 1 being those highly inconsistent, category 5, those highly consistent.
- 14.7% (149) of the students selected friends in the same quintile ranking.
- 33.5% (339) selected friends one quintile ranking apart.
- 32.7% (331) of the selections had a two rank deviation.
- 12.5% (127) showed a three-step deviation.
- 6.4% (65) had the extreme four quintile discrepancy.

This thesis also considered the argument that if status consistency was indeed important to these students then the impact of grades on the selection of friends was based not solely on the marks for this one subject but on the overall academic achievements of each student. If, for instance, the student averaged out other students' grades, viewing English as one of many subjects, then this could have a strong bearing on their choice of friends. This is a relevant factor especially where there is a wide gulf between an individual's standing in English and his total academic performance.

When our initial hypothesis was again tested, this time stressing overall academic standing instead of just the English grades (Status Consistency Score "B") the results were similar:

- 18.7% (189) of the students selected friends with no quintile difference.
- 29.9% (303) were one-step deviations.
- 29.8% (302) showed two-step deviations.
- 14.2% (144) of the selections had three-step deviations.
- 7.2% (73) featured four-rank deviations.

There is a third possibility: a student could consider his ranking on any one variable as high only when compared
with the rankings of students in that class but low when the entire school was taken into account. For instance, consider the variable of participation in school activities. A student's status could be classified as high if he took part in only one or two low-ranked school organizations, without holding office in either club or without attending many meetings. If, however, the rate of participation was greater in the other classes and if that student used the school average as his reference point he could come to view his participation status rank as below average (low). The same may be said for each of the other three variables. If this is true then perhaps friendships are also based not on the status rankings in relation to students in that one class but in the entire sample.

To explore this approach the relationship between status consistency and the selection of friends was reviewed a third time (Status Consistency Score "C"). These new consistency scores were again quintiled. Similar patterns once more emerged:

- 19.3% (196) of the 1011 sociometric selections featured friends with the same degree of status consistency.

---

Minor methodological changes were necessary. For the participation score, the 'preference value' of each organization (see Methodology chapter) was based on the average score that the eight classes assigned to that club. To make comparisons possible, the popularity score for each student was divided by the number of students in that classroom and the quotient was then multiplied by a factor of 10 to arrive at a workable score.
31.7% (321) showed a one-step deviation between the student and his choice.
24.9% (252) were two-step deviations.
16.0% (162) showed three-quintile differences.
7.9% (80) had the maximum four-step deviations.

Conclusion:

Friendship patterns in the classroom did not reflect primarily the pairing of students with similar degrees of status consistency. In each of the reported consistency score analyses, the pupils were more likely to choose as a friend a student who was at least one quintile ranking away than to select a student with a similar degree of status consistency. At least half of the listed names were of students whose status consistency scores were two to four quintile positions removed from that of the respondent's.

Analysis of One Status Consistency Profile and Its Effects Upon the Choice of Friends:

Originally a secondary goal of this thesis was to study the various status consistency profiles and their effects upon friendship patterns, upon the degree of satisfaction with the two social systems here studied (that of the school and that of the classroom), and upon seating locations. Would, for instance, a boy whose participation and popularity scores were ranked low while his grades and father's occupation were ranked high sit in the same area as another boy who displayed the opposite combination of status rankings: high participation and popularity scores and low grades and father's
occupational ranking? However, due to the small sample (183 pupils) and the large number of possible combinations (four variables, each divided into high, medium and low levels), the analyses would have had to be made on a few cases in each category. Therefore this idea was abandoned.

One possibility did present itself and proved to be of some interest. This occurred where those students who were highly consistent chose as friends other students who were also highly consistent. Of the 149 cases, in the above analysis of Status Consistency Score "A", where the quintile standing was similar between the respondent and his choice, only 31 (see Table 1) were shown to contain fifth quintile respondents selecting other fifth quintile students for their friends. Since this particular category, which is indicative of high consistency, could be further subdivided into groups containing those whose statuses were highly consistent at a low level (low grades, low participation score, low popularity score, and a low classification of their father's occupation), or at a medium level, or at a high level, it was decided to study just this one situation.

Of the 31 cases mentioned only in 17 were the student and his selection both highly consistent at a high, a medium, or a low level. The other 14 cases displayed mixed combinations, for example, students highly consistent at a high level selecting friends whose statuses were highly consistent but at a low or a medium level.
Of the 35 cases taking place when Status Consistency Score "B" was tested (again see Table 1), 15 featured mixed choices.

Of the 39 cases occurring when Status Consistency Score "C" was used (see Table 1), 26 were identical, 13 were mixed.

When Table 1 is further analyzed it appears that with each status consistency score only those students highly consistent at a high level preferred friends with a similar high status ranking. But among those who were highly consistent with either medium or low variable rankings, their choices of friends were predominately from the other two groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Consistency Score</th>
<th>His Choice</th>
<th>Highly Consistent Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot; (N=31)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot; (N=35)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;C&quot; (N=39)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary:

Contrary to the general conclusions which showed that Status Consistency when judged from an overall perspective did not affect the selection of friends, a relationship emerged here which indicated that this was not the case among highly consistent students who were consistent at a high level. When their selection of friends was restricted to only those pupils also highly consistent they tended to avoid those who were highly consistent at either a low or a medium level. They preferred the company and friendship of students who were also highly consistent and consistently high on each status variable.

Hypothesis 1 (b): that students with similar degrees of status consistency sit in the same classroom area.

Since it has already been shown that the degree of status consistency per se does not affect friendship choices in any of the eight classes studied, this part of the thesis is concerned with the degree of status consistency and its influences upon a student's selection of a desk. The question is: do students with a particular degree of consistency prefer to sit only in certain rows or aisles?

To test this second hypothesis the three separate consistency scores were again examined and related to each boy's seating location. When the analysis was based on score "A", the findings force the rejection of the hypothesis. Table
2 illustrates that when the dimensions of the classroom were viewed horizontally as cross-rows rather than as aisles, both status consistent and inconsistent showed a preference for the back areas with the trend slightly more pronounced among the latter group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Front rows</th>
<th>Middle rows</th>
<th>Back rows</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>27 (30%)</td>
<td>21 (23%)</td>
<td>43 (47%)</td>
<td>91 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>24 (28%)</td>
<td>27 (31%)</td>
<td>36 (41%)</td>
<td>87 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(not statistically significant at the .05 level)*

When the analysis was continued to note the effects of status consistency in each of the grade levels (Table 3), variations were more evident between individual grades than between status consistent and inconsistent within the same grade. In terms of row positions, both groups among the three more senior classes preferred their desk somewhere in the back rows of the classroom. In the remaining group, the grade nine pupils, the inconsistent followed the established pattern of favoring the back row seats while for unexplained reasons the consistent students sought the middle rows.
Table 3: Status Consistency Score "A" by Row Seating Location by Grade Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Front rows</th>
<th>Middle rows</th>
<th>Back rows</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>11 (44%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>11 (44%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td>8 (30%)</td>
<td>13 (48%)</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Status Consistency Score "B" was applied, the findings, as shown in Table 4, also did not support the hypothesis.

Table 4: Status Consistency Score "B" by Row Seating Location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Front rows</th>
<th>Middle rows</th>
<th>Back rows</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>25 (28%)</td>
<td>27 (30%)</td>
<td>38 (42%)</td>
<td>90 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consists</td>
<td>26 (30%)</td>
<td>21 (24%)</td>
<td>41 (46%)</td>
<td>88 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(not statistically significant at the .05 level)
Controlling for grade level (not shown here) failed to produce contrary results but rather substantiated the old. Once again the back rows attracted the higher percentage of consistent and inconsistent pupils and as before the percentage differences between consistents and inconsistents in each grade level was statistically insignificant.

The findings were no different upon examination of the third and final method of measuring each student's status consistency rating (see Table 5). They merely duplicated previous results. When the sample was controlled for the possible effects of grade level, the cell sizes became very small. The results indicated that the back rows of the eight classrooms were again more popular than either the front or the middle rows.

Table 5: Status Consistency Score "C" by Row Seating Location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Front rows</th>
<th>Middle rows</th>
<th>Back rows</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>30 (33%)</td>
<td>26 (29%)</td>
<td>34 (38%)</td>
<td>90 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>21 (24%)</td>
<td>22 (25%)</td>
<td>45 (51%)</td>
<td>88 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(not statistically significant at the .05 level)*

In yet another attempt to isolate a possible relationship between status consistency and seating area, the geography of the classroom was next viewed vertically, as aisles. The two aisles to the teacher's right were grouped as the
'window aisles', the two centered aisles became the 'middle aisles', while the remaining two, those to the left of the teacher's desk were labelled as the 'blackboard aisles'.

This second analysis, involving the same three consistency scores, produced similar results — that knowledge of a pupil's degree of status consistency failed to predict with any certainty where a student would sit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistency Score</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Window Aisle</th>
<th>Middle Aisle</th>
<th>Blackboard Aisle</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>40 (44%)</td>
<td>14 (15%)</td>
<td>37 (41%)</td>
<td>91 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>37 (42%)</td>
<td>18 (21%)</td>
<td>32 (37%)</td>
<td>87 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>42 (47%)</td>
<td>13 (14%)</td>
<td>35 (39%)</td>
<td>90 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>35 (40%)</td>
<td>19 (22%)</td>
<td>34 (38%)</td>
<td>88 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;C&quot;</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>42 (47%)</td>
<td>16 (18%)</td>
<td>32 (35%)</td>
<td>90 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>35 (40%)</td>
<td>16 (18%)</td>
<td>37 (42%)</td>
<td>88 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(not statistically significant at the .05 level)*

The above Table indicates that: (1) the majority of inconsistents and consists avoid the middle sections equally favoring both outside aisles while (2) the proportion of inconsistents and consists, although varying from aisle to aisle, was almost similar within each aisle grouping.

Even when the sample was broken down into the four
grade levels (Table 7) the results did not support the hypothesis once more. The null hypothesis was accepted as it was when Status Consistency Scores "B" and "C" (not shown) were likewise tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Window Aisle</th>
<th>Middle Aisle</th>
<th>Blackboard Aisle</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>9 (40%)</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>7 (44%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>11 (44%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>13 (48%)</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
<td>9 (33%)</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Status Consistency Score "A" by Aisle Seating Location by Class Level.

In summary:

Whether the classroom was divided into rows or aisles, status consistency was not a determinant of seating location. In both analyses particular areas of the classroom were popular with consistent and inconsistent pupils alike.
Hypothesis 2 (a): status consistency leads to a sense of satisfaction with the social system of the school and conversely, status inconsistency leads to a sense of dissatisfaction.

The theoretical basis of this proposition has been previously discussed in Chapter 1. To briefly review, the literature concludes that status inconsistents are more likely to be dissatisfied with the social system which emphasizes those particular statuses, in this case the social system of the school and the more immediate setting, the social system of the classroom. On the other hand, those students whose statuses are congruent would be expected to be satisfied participants in this social environment.

Table 8 tested the above hypothesis with the three consistency scores that were calculated for each boy.

The data initially, in two of the three status consistency scores ("A" and "C") supports the hypothesis. In both instances proportionately more students whose statuses are incongruent were somewhat more dissatisfied than were the consistent pupils (55% compared with 51% and 57% compared with 49%). On the other hand, a greater proportion of consistent students were satisfied (49% and 51%) than were inconsistent pupils (45% and 43% respectively).
Table 8: Status Consistency by the Degree of Satisfaction With the Social System of the School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Consistency Score</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot;*</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>50 (55%)</td>
<td>41 (45%)</td>
<td>91 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistsents</td>
<td>45 (51%)</td>
<td>43 (49%)</td>
<td>88 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot;*</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>48 (53%)</td>
<td>42 (47%)</td>
<td>90 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistsents</td>
<td>47 (54%)</td>
<td>42 (46%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;C&quot;*</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>51 (57%)</td>
<td>39 (43%)</td>
<td>90 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistsents</td>
<td>44 (49%)</td>
<td>45 (51%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (not statistically significant at the .05 level)

However, in spite of the fact that status consistency had a mild impact on a student’s degree of satisfaction, these results, as will be discussed in Table 10, did not persist when certain controls were applied. These findings will be discussed shortly.

Hypothesis 2 (b): status consistency leads to a sense of satisfaction with the social system of that class and conversely, status inconsistency leads to a sense of dissatisfaction.

Although Table 9 leads us to reject the hypothesis, the data supports just the opposite of what was predicted.
Table 9: Status Consistency by the Degree of Satisfaction With the Social System of the Class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Consistency Score</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot;^*</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>38 (42%)</td>
<td>53 (58%)</td>
<td>91 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>47 (53%)</td>
<td>41 (47%)</td>
<td>88 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot;^*</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>36 (40%)</td>
<td>54 (60%)</td>
<td>90 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>49 (55%)</td>
<td>49 (45%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;C&quot;^*</td>
<td>inconsistents</td>
<td>40 (44%)</td>
<td>50 (56%)</td>
<td>90 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consists</td>
<td>45 (50%)</td>
<td>44 (50%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(not statistically significant at the .05 level)*

As already stated Tables 8 and 9 present two opposing conclusions. Comparing consistent students with inconsistent ones it would seem that in the first Table a greater proportion of consists are satisfied with the social system of the school while a greater proportion of inconsistents are dissatisfied. Table 9, on the other hand, supports the opinion that when the social system of the classroom is analyzed then a greater proportion of consistent students are dissatisfied with the social system of that class, its teacher, the subject matter and the other pupils. Similarly, a greater proportion of inconsistents are satisfied.

One possible explanation is that both consists and inconsistents react differently to each social system.
However, when the grade level of each boy is controlled (Tables 10 and 11), the above associations between status consistency and satisfaction are eliminated. According to Table 10, in grades 9 through 11, the majority of students were dissatisfied. This fact held true with each of the three status consistency scores tested. The grade 12 students presented a totally different picture. In this subsample, regardless of the degree of consistency, most of these seniors were indeed satisfied with the way in which their school was organized, its teachers, the curriculum and the administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Consistency Score</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot; in inconsistents</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot; consistent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot; in inconsistents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot; consistent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;C&quot; in inconsistents</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;C&quot; consistent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When status consistency and the degree of satisfaction with the social system of the class were examined (Table 11) similarities between Tables 10 and 11 were evident again suggesting the negligible effects of status consistency. For the second time the pupils in grade 9 and grade 11 were dissatisfied whether their statuses were consistent or not. As before, the senior pupils in the sample were decisively satisfied with that one class.

When the findings for the tenth graders were examined not only was the hypothesis rejected but the very opposite tendency was again discovered. At this grade level the students who were consistent were more dissatisfied with the class and those who were inconsistent were more satisfied (statistically significant at the .1 level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Consistency</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dis.</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;C&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To explain these findings we must look elsewhere than to the theory of Status Consistency. When the degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the school's social system (Table 10) was examined by grade level, the two grade 9 classes in the sample fostered the highest percentage of dissatisfied students - 66% (35 of 53). Among the grade 10 classes, 51% (23 of 45) were not satisfied; the rate for the grade 11 classes was 52% (15 of 29). And as was noted before, the grade 12 students were the least dissatisfied - only 42% (22 of 52). The reasons for these variations may be found in the fact that the seniors had been in this school system for the longest period of time and had become adapted or had adapted themselves to the demands placed upon them. In addition, it must not be overlooked that these students were nearing the end of their high school program while the most dissatisfied, the least adapted pupils, the ones in grade 9 were just at the beginning of theirs. Also as grade 12 students they enjoyed the status of being seniors. Another explanation may be that the seniors had passed the legal age limit which compelled them to be in school. Hence, those in school were more apt to be students by choice.

These facts may also help to explain the percentage of pupils in each grade level who were dissatisfied with the social system of that particular classroom (Table 11). Among the grade 9 students the percentage of dissatisfied pupils was 64% (34 of 53), among the grade 10, 44% (20 of 45), for the
eleventh grades, a high 76% (22 of 29) and finally among the
grade twelves only 17% (9 of 52).

But explanations may also be found in addition to
those cited above in areas more pertinent to the classroom.
The influence of an individual teacher, the relevancy of and
the student's interest in the subject matter as well as the
presence of certain other pupils should be investigated in
any effort to understand a student's degree of satisfaction.

The final question that remains unanswered concerns
the unexpected findings among the grade 10 pupils (Table 11).
Why should status inconsistent in this group be satisfied and
to a lesser extent status consistent be dissatisfied?

In summary:

Neither hypothesis 2 (a) nor 2 (b) was supported.
Although apparent relationships were established between
Status Consistency and the degree of satisfaction with the
social systems of the school and of the classroom, these were
not maintained when the grade level of the students in the
sample was controlled. This latter variable, in fact, proved
to be more influential than status consistency.

Hypothesis 3 (a): students whose statuses are consistent
at a high level will be satisfied with
the social systems of the school and the
class while students whose statuses are
consistent at a low level will be dissatis-
fied.
Hypothesis 3 (b): students whose statuses are consistent at a high level will sit at the front of the classroom, while students whose statuses are consistent at a low level will congregate at the back of the classroom.

These two assumptions varied from the standard approaches of Status Consistency theorists in that they attempted to differentiate between students whose statuses were consistent and ranked high on each variable from those whose statuses were consistent and low. The notion that consistency per se produces one common positive response is open to question. Previous studies in the literature have treated status consistency as an indivisible concept and have presented generalizations without adequately investigating possible discrepancies between types of status consistencies. Instead the emphasis has been placed primarily on status inconsistency, especially on the results of differences between achieved and ascribed statuses.

From the original sample, the students whose consistency scores ranked in the top quartile - those whose statuses were the most consistent - were selected to test the above assertions. This group was then divided to distinguish those who were consistent and scored high on each of the four status variables from those who were also consistent but whose statuses all ranked low. The intermediate group, consisting of boys who were consistent but neither high nor low were not included in this subsample. Finally, the two satisfaction scores for each student (for the social systems of
that school and that class) and the 'row' seating location of these two groups were compared.

Of the hypotheses that have been put forth so far, hypothesis 3 (a) is the only one to be supported by the findings. As indicated by Table 12 a majority of the consistent students whose statuses ranked low were dissatisfied with the two social systems while the reverse was true for those students whose consistent statuses were all high. These latter pupils were satisfied. Although the strength of the relationship varied from Status Consistency Score "A" to "B" to "C", the basic pattern remained unchanged. In one-half of the cases the results as described are not statistically significant.

Table 12: High Status Consistency by the Degree of Satisfaction With the Social Systems of the School and the Class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Consistency Score</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>the School</th>
<th>the Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sat.</td>
<td>dis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot;&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot;&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;C&quot;&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the grade level was controlled, the findings were more in keeping with expectations. One brief example will suffice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Satisfied (N)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the other two consistency scores were tested the results were as predicted, again with the exception of those grade 12 students who were consistent and low. The same conclusions were reached when high status consistency (Scores "A", "B" and "C") and satisfaction with the social
system of the classroom were examined.

One explanation for this trend immediately comes to mind. Those students who were the least popular, whose grades were constantly at the tail end of the class, who did not choose to participate in school organizations and whose fathers occupied the lower occupational positions did not have the social credentials necessary to function effectively in this social environment. They lacked precisely those criteria that were stressed by the student body. They responded by blaming the system which they felt was responsible for their poor social standing. In many cases, the least dramatic, the least active opposition simply took the form of being critical of and dissatisfied with the existing social system. Here status consistency led to increasing stress and friction between the student and the school and the class.

Those who were at the other end of the spectrum, who were the most popular students, who participated and held office in one or several status-conferring school clubs, whose grades were respected by other students and teachers alike and whose fathers were professionals were satisfied members of this system.

It was for these same reasons that hypothesis 3 (b) was tested. The reasoning was that students who were consistently high on each status variable as the most satisfied members of both social systems would seek to involve themselves more fully in the activities of each class. It was
also assumed that to achieve this, they would sit closer to
the front of the classroom not only to have their view of the
front blackboard less obstructed but to increase the possi-
bility of interaction with the teacher. The opposite was
expected for the students whose statuses were consistent but
low. They were thought to shun all forms of classroom parti-
cipation and to isolate themselves in the back rows of the
class.

Table 14 presents data which does not support this
tory. The results paralleled those previously noted in
Tables 2, 4 and 5 (hypothesis 1 b), namely, that both groups
preferred the back rows and that the difference between the
number of those consistent and high and those consistent and
low who sat in each row was too small to leave room for valid
speculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Consistency</th>
<th>Degree of Consistency</th>
<th>Front rows</th>
<th>Middle rows</th>
<th>Back rows</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;C&quot;</td>
<td>consistent and low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistent and high</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(not statistically significant at the .05 level)
A case may be made when the preference of each group for only the front and middle rows is considered. However, in this instance assumptions may not be totally valid again due to the small numbers in each cell. Keeping this in mind, it appears that students whose statuses were consistent and high tended to select desks in the front rows rather than in the middle ones while those whose statuses were consistent and low favored the middle rows over the front rows.

In summary:

When one extreme Status Consistency profile — that of either a high or a low ranking in all of the four variables — was isolated and examined, the findings indicated that:

a) high status consistency was related to the degree of satisfaction with the two operating social systems. Even when the grade level was controlled, the students who were consistent and high were satisfied while those who were consistent but low were not.

b) high status consistency does not affect where a student will sit.
CHAPTER V

Conclusions

This thesis has attempted to relate two topics: Lenski's theory of Status Consistency and the seating habits of high school students. The purpose was primarily to discover whether the knowledge of a student's degree of status consistency, using his popularity, grades, participation in school clubs and his father's occupation, was a reliable indicator of where in the classroom he was likely to sit. The theoretical premise was that status inconsistency produced dissatisfaction with the immediate social system (a regular finding of previous studies) and that these feelings of dissatisfaction were expressed in the pupil's choice of a desk.

As such, this thesis was not simply concerned with why some students were prone to sit in certain seats to the exclusion of others nor was the purpose of this paper to offer explanations as to why some students were satisfied being members of that school or of that particular English class while others were not.

A further test was conducted to note whether Status Consistency was a relevant factor in the selection of friends from within any of the eight classrooms studied.

The decision to carry out the study in a high school setting was also made because it offered a variation to the
usual application of the Lenski theory. For one thing, a school setting provided the opportunity to study a "local social system". As such, it provided the chance to work with different variables, ones that were considered pertinent only to that system.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations for Future Studies:

Findings:

1. Status Consistency and the Selection of Friends:

   No relationship was found between these factors. Certain problems were evident which, if corrected, might have led to different results.

   a) In completing the sociometric questions, the students were required to nominate the names of other students who were in the class at the time of the survey. This did not take into account friends who were either absent or who were not members of that particular class. The first of these obstacles was unavoidable, the second was considered but as one of the secondary goals of this thesis was to note variations in the effects of Status Consistency on seating location between grade levels, sample classes were deliberately pre-selected.

---

As opposed to a "global social system". See Flowman et al. (1962). Since Lenski's original sample, drawn from the Metropolitan Detroit area, the majority of subsequent studies have dealt with inconsistent individuals representing whole countries: the U.S., Canada, Australia. Rarely have studies focused on smaller units.
to represent the grades 9, 10, 11 and 12.

The remedy would have been to include more classes and students into this study. This would have resulted in a study different from the one conducted here. But this was not done due to the limits of time and money.

b) Variables, other than the four incorporated into this study may have had more effect than the ones selected. Ethnic origin or age could have been more important than any of the four variables cited here. This suggests the need to pre-study each school to determine which status variables the students themselves perceive as important to their own social system rather than try to impose variables from other studies.

c) On the other hand, it is possible that these four factors of grades, popularity, participation and father's occupation were the main status-conferring variables. This may well have been the situation. However, these variables may not have been of equal significance to these students. Popularity may have been emphasized more than participation in school activities. Or grades may have been stressed more than popularity. This aspect of Status Consistency theory has not received sufficient attention in the literature. What may be called for, in fact, is a method of attaching weights to the variables to conform to the students' perception of the value of each of these variables and then from this devise the status consistency scores.
2. Status Consistency and the Selection of Seats:

Once again, no association was firmly established between the degree of status consistency and a preference for the front, the middle or the back rows of the classroom. A similar lack of results was found in relation to the pupil's choice of aisle.

Problems comparable to those discussed above were evident here:
- the choice of a desk may not have been decided by any of the factors used in this study. Other explanations may account for the preference for the back rows as well as the window and blackboard aisles of the classroom. These could have included the influence of the teacher, the pupil's interest in the subject matter, the student's reaction to who sat in neighboring desks, or the fact that he found his preferred seat already occupied. In the latter case, would he still choose to remain in that area or would he just randomly select any other seat regardless of its location?

A solution to these problems would have been to conduct the study not in any one classroom but to hand out the questionnaires inserting a blank map of a classroom and ask each pupil to indicate where he would want to sit without reference to a specific classroom, teacher or subject. This would have eliminated the need for certain controls which were exercised at the outset of this thesis, controls for the effects of sex or religion on seating location.
3. Status Consistency and the Degree of Satisfaction With the Social Systems of that School and that Class:

A relationship between consistency and the degree of satisfaction was not confirmed. In fact, grade level was discovered to be a more important variable. The higher the pupil's grade level, the more satisfaction was expressed.

4. Extreme Consistency Profiles and a) the Degree of Satisfaction with the Social Systems of the School and the English Class and b) the Selection of Friends:

As suggested in the analyses of the final two hypotheses, the study of status consistency per se is an area in the literature that remains an untapped source of information. This survey twice briefly touched upon this topic. First it showed that although the number of students whose four statuses were highly consistent was relatively small, the findings definitely pointed to an association between status consistency and satisfaction. Whether the measurement of satisfaction referred to either social system, the majority of students whose statuses were consistent and low were dissatisfied while satisfaction was a common response among consistents whose statuses were all ranked high. These results persisted when grade level was controlled.

In the second instance, this thesis examined the relationship between high consistency and friendship patterns. When the status profiles of students making the selections and
those whom they selected were both highly consistent, the
evidence clearly suggested that students who were consistent
and high on each status variable usually made friends with
other students whose status profiles were also consistent and
high. In those few cases where their selections were from the
other two groups, they almost always avoided those who were
consistent and low. Where the selectors were consistent and
low the majority of their friends were consistent but either
consistently medium or high. This last comment in itself
points to the possible relationship between status consistency
and social mobility.

An increase in the overall sample size may have
strengthened these relationships. Nevertheless, the results
that were discovered relating to status consistency are im-
portant because:

a) Attention has been directed to the fact that status consis-
tency should not be treated as a single, unified concept,
b) Different types of status consistency are possible
c) With each type of status consistency a different response
may be provoked,
d) Many of the social and psychological responses that have
been linked to status inconsistency (withdrawl, anxiety,
dissatisfaction and perhaps status quilibrium in so far as
the individual whose statuses are all low may attempt to raise
each of his statuses) may occur in some cases of status con-
sistency and not in others.
Recommendations:

When the idea for this thesis was first proposed, one objective was to study various status consistency profiles. Would, for instance, two students with similar status consistency scores but with differences as to which variables were ranked high and which were low react in similar ways? Unfortunately with the one exception, this question was never answered. There were just too many status consistency profiles with small numbers in each for our sample to provide valid conclusions as to the effects of particular profiles on behavior.

This approach was abandoned but remains one of the three primary recommendations for future studies. The second recommendation is that the total sample size should be increased while the number of status variables should be reduced from four to three. Finally, further investigations must pay more attention to status consistency. Such an approach will not only expand our knowledge of Status Consistency theory but also of one other aspect of human behavior.
APPENDIX A

STUDENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

In this questionnaire, I am interested in finding out how students in your particular grade feel about a number of topics that deal with the life of a student.

For research purposes, please put your name on this questionnaire. However, your answers will be strictly confidential and will not be shown to anyone in the school. Therefore I hope that you will answer ALL questions as honestly as you can. Also, to prevent yourself from being influenced by others, please do not discuss individual questions and answers until after you have finished.

Please read every question carefully to make sure you are circling the answer you really want to give. I hope you will find the questions interesting.

Thank you.
1. Name (please print clearly):

2. Age:

3. Religion:

4. Grade:

5. How long have you been a student in this class? _____ months.

6. What does your father do for a living? Please describe the kind of work he does. (If he is dead or retired, what did he do for a living?):

7. Your mother?

8. How many years of school did your father complete? Circle one of the following:
   a) under 8 years
   b) some high school
   c) completed high school
   d) completed vocational or technical school
   e) some college or university
   f) completed college or university
   g) post college
   h) don't know

9. Your mother?

10. At home, do you or your parents usually speak any language other than English?  
    a) yes      b) no
    If yes, which one(s)?

11. Are you taking this subject
    a) because it is a required course
    b) because it is an option
    If it is an option, why did you select this particular course?
12. What grades did you receive in THIS SUBJECT for the last 2 terms?
   a) first term: __________  b) second term: __________

13. How important is getting good grades IN THIS SUBJECT to you?
   a) very important  b) important
   c) not very important  d) not important at all
   e) don't know

14. On the average, how much time do you spend doing homework for this particular SUBJECT?
   ___________________________ hours per night.

15. What were your averages the last 2 terms for ALL YOUR SUBJECTS?
   a) first term: __________  b) second term: __________

16. How important is getting good grades IN SCHOOL to you?
   a) no importance at all  b) not very important
   c) important  d) very important
   e) don't know

17. On the average, how much time each night do you spend doing homework?
   ___________________________ hours per night.

18. Have you decided whether or not to go to college?
   a) definitely decided to go.
   b) definitely decided not to go.
   c) not yet decided.
   d) don't know.

19. Do you, or did you, belong to any school clubs or organizations, including sports, during the past year?
   a) yes  b) no (If no, go on to question 20)
   If yes, which one(s)?
   ___________________________  ___________________________
Do you, or did you hold office in any of these clubs or organizations?
   a) yes  b) no
If yes, which position(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many times per month do you or did you attend meetings or practices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th># of meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. If you did NOT belong to any school clubs or school organizations, which one(s), if any, would you have liked to join?

________________________________________________________________________________________

21. Do you, or did you belong to any clubs or organizations OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL during the past year?
   a) yes  b) no
If yes, which one(s)?

________________________________________________________________________________________
22. If you could be remembered here at school for 1 of the 3 things below, which one would you like it to be?
   a) brilliant student  b) sports star  
c) most popular student  d) other: ________

***** For each of the following questions, please CIRCLE the answer which best indicates the way YOU feel. Your answers will NOT be shown to anyone.

23. In matters relating to students, teachers IN THIS SCHOOL seem to be
   a) fair at all times
   b) generally fair in their practices
   c) occasionally unfair in their practices
   d) often unfair in their practices

24. In my opinion, the variety of subjects offered IN THIS SCHOOL is
   a) too broad
   b) just about right
   c) not broad enough

25. When a newcomer enters the school, chances are that other students
   a) go out of their way to accept him
   b) are quite willing to accept him
   c) tend to ignore him
   d) openly reject him

26. The freedom to contribute in any class without being called on by the teacher is
   a) discouraged more than it should be; students do not have enough opportunity to have their say
   b) encouraged more than it should be; students seem to be rewarded just for speaking even when they have little to say.
c) handled about right

27. In general, my attitude TOWARD THIS SCHOOL may best be described as.
   a) very favorable - I like it as it is, no changes are necessary
   b) more favorable than unfavorable - a few changes are necessary to make me happy
   c) more unfavorable than favorable - many changes are necessary before I can be entirely happy
   d) unfavorable - I frequently feel that this school is pretty much a waste of time

28. In general, the teachers I have had IN THIS SCHOOL seem to know their subject matter
   a) very well
   b) quite well
   c) fairly well
   d) not as well as they should

29. The things that I am asked to study are
   a) of great interest to me
   b) of moderate interest to me
   c) of limited interest to me
   d) of no interest to me

30. In my opinion, the emphasis which students IN THIS SCHOOL place on style of dress and appearance is
   a) too great.
   b) about right
   c) not great enough

31. In evaluating the written and oral work of students
   a) too much emphasis is placed on grammar and style and not enough on the value of what the student is trying to say
   b) the balance between style of expression and content is about right
c) so little emphasis is placed on grammar and style that students have difficulty learning how to express themselves

32. In addition to teachers, some school employ persons (e.g. guidance counselors) trained to help students with personal, vocational and educational problems. In my opinion this type of service IN THIS SCHOOL is:
   a) so plentiful that is is sometimes forced on you whether you want it or not
   b) adequate to meet the needs of the students
   c) so little that it is difficult to obtain even when you want it.

33. Some teachers are friendly and accepting to students; others are more detached and not involved with students. In general, the teachers IN THIS SCHOOL are:
   a) very friendly and accepting
   b) quite friendly and accepting
   c) somewhat friendly and accepting
   d) occasionally friendly and accepting

34. The content of different courses from year to year is:
   a) too repetitious - the same material seems to be worked again and again
   b) repeated just enough to allow a feeling of continuity
   c) so unrelated that new material does not seem to build on earlier work

35. The students who receive top grades IN THIS SCHOOL are likely to be:
   a) admired more than they should be by fellow students
   b) rejected more than they should be by fellow students
   c) neither admired nor rejected by fellow students
36. In the typical class, memory work and the learning of important facts are
   a) given too much emphasis
   b) given about the right amount of emphasis
   c) not given enough emphasis

37. In some schools the administration (principals, vice-principals, superintendents) have close contact with students, whereas, in other schools, such contacts are rare. It seems to me that IN THIS SCHOOL
   a) the administrators keep such close contact with student affairs that they frequently involve themselves in matters that do not require their attention
   b) the contacts between administrators and students are about right.
   c) the administrators have contact with students so rarely that they are unaware of many student problems

38. There is often a feeling that teachers "go too fast" to permit students to really understand what is going on. IN THIS SCHOOL, the rate at which teachers usually present material is
   a) too slow
   b) about right
   c) too fast

39. The extracurricular program OF THIS SCHOOL is
   a) very responsive to the needs and interests of students
   b) quite responsive to the needs and interests of students
   c) somewhat responsive to the needs and interests of students
   d) very unresponsive to the needs and interests
of students.

40. In my opinion, the student interest in social organizations, such as sports, clubs, etc. is
   a) too great
   b) about right
   c) not great enough

41. Homework assignments IN THIS SCHOOL are usually
   a) carefully thought through by the teacher and clearly related to classroom work
   b) consistent with what is going on in the classroom but not related to it in any way
   c) given without much thought and having little bearing to the classroom work
   d) unrelated to classroom work and chiefly of a "busy work" nature

42. Concerning the opportunities for getting together socially with other students in this school, my opinion is that
   a) there are too many things going on, so that you are constantly distracted from homework and other individual activities
   b) the opportunities for getting together socially are about right
   c) there are not enough opportunities for getting together with other students

43. In some classes the teacher is completely in control, with the students having little to say about the way things are run. In other classes the students seem to be the boss, with the teacher contributing little to the situation. In general teachers IN THIS SCHOOL seem to take
   a) too much control
   b) about the right amount of control
c) too little control

44. In general the subjects taught are
a) too easy
b) about right in difficulty
c) too difficult

45. In general, students IN THIS SCHOOL take their studies
a) too seriously
b) too casually
c) in a right proportion between a and b

46. Classroom seating arrangements IN THIS SCHOOL are
a) too flexible to suit me; you can never be sure where you will sit and who will sit next to you
b) just about right
c) too rigid to suit me; it is difficult to arrange the furniture to meet special needs

47. In general, my attitude toward the grades I have received IN THIS SCHOOL is
a) I always receive the grades that I deserve
b) I generally receive the grades that I deserve
c) I sometimes receive the grades that I do not deserve
d) I frequently receive the grades that I do not deserve

***** The following questions deal only with the situation IN THIS CLASS. Again, CIRCLE the answer which best describes the way YOU feel. And again, your answers are confidential.

48. As a result of this course, my desire to take further courses IN THIS SUBJECT has
a) increased a great deal
b) increased somewhat
c) remained the same
d) decreased somewhat
e) decreased a great deal

49. In my opinion, the students IN THIS CLASS seem to be satisfied having me as a fellow student
   a) strongly agree    b) agree
c) disagree           d) strongly disagree
e) don't know

50. The student who differs from the crowd IN THIS CLASS is likely to find that
   a) most students will tend to ignore or tease him for being different
   b) most students do not particularly care whether or not a person differs from the group
c) most students admire the person who is different

51. The classes are interesting and stimulating
   a) strongly agree    b) agree
c) disagree           d) strongly disagree

52. I learn more IN THIS CLASS than in most other classes in this school
   a) strongly agree    b) agree
c) disagree           d) strongly disagree

53. Compared to most other classes in this school, I feel more comfortable being a student IN THIS CLASS
   a) strongly agree    b) agree
c) disagree           d) strongly disagree

54. The emphasis on competition and co-operation among the students IN THIS CLASS seems to be
   a) too much on competition to suit me
b) too much on co-operation to suit me

c) a satisfactory balance between competition and co-operation

55. The textbook(s) promote an interest IN THIS COURSE
   a) strongly agree      b) agree
   c) disagree            d) strongly disagree

56. The teacher is easy to talk with
   a) strongly agree      b) agree
   c) disagree            d) strongly disagree

57. The students IN THIS CLASS who receive poor grades are likely
   a) to receive more sympathy from their fellow classmates than they deserve
   b) to be respected by their classmates more than they should be
   c) neither a nor b

58. Whenever I have personal, social, or academic difficulties, I discuss the problem with the teacher OF THIS SUBJECT
   a) always              b) sometimes
   c) rarely              d) never

59. The grading system FOR THIS SUBJECT measures the memorization of specific facts
   a) strongly agree      b) agree
   c) disagree            d) strongly disagree

60. In my opinion, the emphasis which students IN THIS CLASS place on style of dress and appearance is
   a) too great
   b) about right
   c) not great enough

61. The teacher encourages students to ask questions and
engage in class discussions
a) strongly agree  b) agree
  c) disagree      d) strongly disagree

62. The grading system FOR THIS SUBJECT is fair and impartial
a) strongly agree  b) agree
  c) disagree      d) strongly disagree

63. In general, students IN THIS CLASS take their studies
   a) too seriously
   b) too casually
   c) in a right proportion between a and b

64. The teacher is creative in his approach to teaching
   a) strongly agree  b) agree
   c) disagree      d) strongly disagree

65. On the overall, the teacher OF THIS SUBJECT is glad to
    have me as one of his students
    a) strongly agree  b) agree
    c) disagree      d) strongly disagree

66. In general, my attitude toward the grades that I have
    receive IN THIS SUBJECT is
    a) I always receive the grades that I deserve
    b) I generally receive the grades that I deserve
    c) I sometimes receive the grades that I do not
        deserve
    d) I frequently receive the grades that I do not
        deserve

**** For each of the following questions, please write in the
names of 3 students FROM THIS CLASS who are present today.
Names may be repeated from question to question. If you can
only think of 1 or 2 classmates then only write in their names.
67. With whom do you spend most of your recesses and lunch periods:
   a) ____________________________
   b) ____________________________
   c) ____________________________

68. If you had problems with the material in this or in any other subject, with whom would you discuss this difficulty?
   a) ____________________________
   b) ____________________________
   c) ____________________________

   b. Who would you ask for help?
      a) ____________________________
      b) ____________________________
      c) ____________________________

69. If you were to join a social club at school, who else would you like in the club?
   a) ____________________________
   b) ____________________________
   c) ____________________________

70. Who do you most admire in this class?
   a) ____________________________
   b) ____________________________
   c) ____________________________

71. Do you always sit where you are now?
   a) yes
   b) no
72. How did you happen to choose this particular seat?

THAT'S ALL - THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP
APPENDIX B

Calculating Status Consistency Scores

This is a detailed example of the procedure that was used to compute the Status Consistency scores for each pupil. Here, Status Consistency Score "C" for one pupil will be arrived at, using as the variables, his participation, his father's occupation, his overall grades and his popularity in relation to the other 182 students in this sample.

Our student's participation score, based on the method discussed in Chapter 3 was 50.1. With this score and the following chart, his consistency score for this one variable was 97:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of participation scores</th>
<th># of students in each range</th>
<th>cumulative frequency</th>
<th>consistency score for participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.1 and over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94.6 - 100%</td>
<td>97 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93.5 - 94.5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1 - 35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91.4 - 93.4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1 - 30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84.8 - 91.3</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1 - 25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74.5 - 84.7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 - 20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.8 - 74.4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 - 15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52.6 - 66.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 - 10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.7 - 52.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0 - 36.6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

183

* this is just the mid-point of the cumulative f.
As his father's occupation was listed as a higher profession, this student's consistency score for this variable was 99:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Occupations</th>
<th># of students in each range</th>
<th>cumulative frequency</th>
<th>consistency score for father's occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>higher pro.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.3 - 100%</td>
<td>99 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower pro &amp; tech.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76.6 - 97.2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-employed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0 - 76.5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manager/supervisors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59.9 - 74.9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerical/sales/small</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.5 - 59.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>craftsmen/foremen</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.2 - 35.2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operatives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2 - 10.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service/household</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9 - 6.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labourers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 - 2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This student's grades for all his subjects averaged out to 58. This was a consistency score of 19:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Grades</th>
<th># of students in each range</th>
<th>cumulative frequency</th>
<th>consistency score for grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91 - 95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 - 90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97.9 - 100%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89.2 - 97.8</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78.8 - 89.1</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63.5 - 78.7</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 - 70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42.2 - 63.4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, with a popularity score of 40, he was given a consistency score for this variable of 50:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Popularity Scores</th>
<th># of students in each range</th>
<th>cumulative frequency</th>
<th>Consistency score for Popularity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180.1 and over</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>96.3 - 100%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.1 - 180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94.1 - 96.2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.1 - 165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.5 - 94.0</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.1 - 150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89.8 - 93.4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.1 - 135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88.1 - 89.7</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.1 - 120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85.3 - 88.0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.1 - 105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82.4 - 85.2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.1 - 90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73.9 - 82.3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.1 - 75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66.8 - 73.8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.1 - 60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54.2 - 66.7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1 - 45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.8 - 54.1</td>
<td>50 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 - 30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.2 - 43.7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0 - 25.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

183
Therefore, the four consistency scores for this student's variables were: 97, 99, 19 and 50. Applying Lenski's formula we arrived at his Status Consistency Score:

\[
100 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{E} (X - \bar{X})^2}
\]

\[
100 - \sqrt{4515}
\]

\[
100 - 67.2
\]

\[
-33
\]

which indicated that the student was highly inconsistent.
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VITA AUCToris

1948 - born July 5 (Montreal)
1965 - graduated from Bishop Whelan High School,
      (Lachine, Quebec) receiving the school's
      prize for Latin.
1969 - B.A. from Loyola College (Montreal).
1970 - worked for the Montreal Catholic School
       Commission.
1971 - graduate student at the University of Windsor.
1976 - worked as Child Care Worker at Weredale House
       (Montreal).
1977 - M.A. (University of Windsor).