

“Academic Achievement of Adolescents Belonging to Different Sociometric Groups:A Comparative Analysis”

Dr. Ram Singh

Assistant Professor in Education Government Degree College Samba, J&K

ABSTRACT:Acceptance in the class gives the students a sense of belongingness which develops positive traits in him/or her. The development of such traits is conducive for desirable academic achievement. Academic Achievement has more or less positive relationship with the Sociometric status of pupils. Moreover the academic achievements of pupils have great impact on their social acceptance in the classroom group which, in turn, develops positive or negative feelings towards the existing schools situations or conditions. The rejection by the group members may be sufficient to develop undesirable personality traits in students which have direct relation with their adjustments in the school. This maladjustment to some extent has direct bearing on the academic achievement of students. In the present study, the adolescent students studying in class X belonging to different Sociometric groups viz. popular, neglected and rejected were compared on the academic achievement in the general view and in the boys as well as in the girls groups respectively. The significant sex differences were also studied among popular, neglected and rejected groups of students. The study was conducted on 120 students belonging to popular, neglected and rejected groups of students which were identified by administering Sociometric Questionnaire prepared by Dr. A.N. Sharma. Regarding the academic achievement, the investigator consulted the examination In charge of each selected school and enquired about the marks obtained by students in previous two annual examinations (IX and VIII classes).The data was analysed by using the statistical techniques viz. Mean ,S.D. and C.R. technique.

KEY WORDS:Acceptability, academic achievement, sociometric status, rejection, adjustment

Date of Submission: 22-11-2018

Date of acceptance: 08-12-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal attraction is the basis of all human social behaviour. Living in human social context and acceptance of an individual by group members is a boon and also a sign of normalcy. Rejection by the group may be sufficient to induce clinical symptoms in sufferer or disruptions of normal acquaintance process, may sometimes lead to unpleasant, aversive and much clinical depression as a result of rejection by other persons. Positive interpersonal attraction leads to a greater ease in managing a conflict, but negative interpersonal attraction may lead to a greater difficulty in managing a conflict. Happiness and growth of each individual student depends in a large measure on his personal security with his classmates. Feeling of isolation is common source of self-devaluation and discouragement. Every favourable behaviour, a token of social recognition gives the ego a boost bolster one in self-confidence and gives a great sense of belongingness. It is also beyond doubt that at any age, an accepted social status is an important requisite for satisfactory personal and social adjustments. Lack of such status frequently makes the way for misery and neurotic feelings whereas attainment of such status produces marked changes in a individual's personality and feeling of well being.

A school like any other social organization also involves a good deal of social interaction among its members. A school, in fact is a microcosm society. All the school processor of cooperation, conflict and accommodation which are at work in the society are also formed or found in a school. Social interaction in a school is cantered on giving and receiving instruction. The social relationship in a school may be analyzed in terms of interacting groups in the school. The most important is the pupil's group which has its own moral and ethical code and its customary attitudes towards the members of group (Stanley, 1967).Liking for others and their reciprocal feelings towards us are among the most important aspects of social life. Being liked by others can have significant effects upon a person's well being. Having friends is important to anyone. Feeling of liking leads to increased associations and they shape the behaviour of an individual in interaction. Groups are formed on the basis of attraction between persons (Secord and Backman, 1964 P. 238).

I.1.Justification of the study:

A child is a member of his class at school before he realizes himself as a member of the school and his life is lived mainly in his classroom with only brief excursion into the assembly of the whole school. Later on as adult, he may become an employee of a firm or organization; but he lives his working life in a workshop or

office group. In the leisure hour, he may be a member of a team or a social group; and if he belongs to a church, he actually lives a church life as a member of local congregation and is probably more aware of his membership than of the wider church of which it forms a part. If he falls sick, he may find himself among a group of people in a hospital ward or other kind of therapeutic group. In old age, he may return to the shelter of his family group or he may seek refuge in a home for old people. From the cradle to the grave, we are members of small groups.

Acceptability or unacceptability of a student in the class exercises and impact on his/ or her academic achievement. Acceptance in the class gives the students a sense of belongingness which develops positive traits in him/or her. The development of such traits is conducive for desirable academic achievement. Acceptance makes the student satisfied in social relation with other classmates and this satisfaction, to the great extent may help him/ her to raise the level of academic achievement. Academic Achievement has more or less positive relationship with the sociometric status of pupils. Moreover the academic achievements of pupils have great impact on their social acceptance in the classroom group which, in turn, develops positive or negative feelings towards the existing schools situations or conditions. Rejection by the group members may be sufficient to develop undesirable personality traits in students which have direct relation with their adjustments in the school. This maladjustment to some extent has direct bearing on the academic achievement of students. In the view of this, the present investigation was undertaken to study the academic achievement popular, neglected and rejected students studying in X class. The popular, neglected and rejected students of class X were compared and studied on academic achievement.

I.2. Definitions of the terms used:

- **Sociometric Groups:** These were revealed by the Sociometric test. Three groups will be selected.
- **Populars:** A popular or star is one who secures a large number of positive choices.
- **Neglectee:** A neglectee is one who receives relatively a few positive choices in a social situation.
- **Rejectee:** A rejectee is one who receives negative choices.
- **Sociometric Scores:** Number of choices- likes and dislikes obtained by an individual on a Sociometric test.
- **X Class Students:** In the present study, X Class adolescent students in the age group 15-16, studying in various government and private co-educational institutions of Kathua City of J&K, were considered for the study.
- **Academic Achievement:** In the present study, academic achievement means the percentage of total marks obtained by X Class students in their annual examinations of two previous classes (VIII &IX). The percentage of aggregate marks obtained was considered as an index of academic achievement.
- **Sex:** It included X class boys & girls studying in High or Higher Secondary Schools.

I.3. Objectives of the study

- To identify popular, neglected and rejected boys and girls on the basis of Sociometric status scores.
- To study and compare the significance of differences of mean scores on “**Academic Achievement**” between popular & neglected; popular & rejected; neglected & rejected Sociometric groups of students.
- To study and compare the significance of differences of mean scores on “**Academic Achievement**” among the different Sociometric groups of students in the boys & girls groups respectively.
- To study whether there are significant sex differences in “**Academic Achievement**” among the popular, neglected and rejected Sociometric groups of students.

I.4. Hypotheses

- There will be no significant mean differences on "**Academic Achievement**" between popular & neglected; popular & rejected; neglected & rejected Sociometric groups of students.
- There will be no significant mean differences on “**Academic Achievement**” among the different Sociometric groups of students in boys and girls groups respectively.
- There will be no significant sex differences in "**Academic Achievement**" among the popular, neglected and rejected Sociometric groups of students.

I.5. Delimitations of the study

- The present study was restricted to X class students studying in various Government and private High and Higher secondary schools of Kathua city of J&K State.
- The present study was confined to the co-educational schools only.
- The present study was confined to three sociometric groups only viz popular, neglected, & rejected.
- The students in different sociometric groups were identified on a three criteria -three choice sociometric questionnaire only.

- The annual examination marks of two previous classes (converted into %age) of X class students were taken as raw data or record of academic achievement of students.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH LITERATURE

In recent years, awareness has been growing of the influence exerted on behaviour and development of human beings by the group to which they belong. Research on children's peer relationship has accelerated rapidly within past several years and a dominant theme within the area has been the development of social competence and relevance of social competence in peer group.

The renewed interest in children's peer relations among developmental psychologists has been accompanied by a parallel interest among child-clinical psychologists to develop intervention programmes to promote peer relations. In large part, these empirical efforts are guided by view that childhood peer relationships serve a vital role in social development and later adult adjustment. The research literature indicates that peer adjustment problems in childhood are predictive of both concurrent and later maladjustment. The studies of disturbed adults and concurrent studies of psycho-social characteristics of disturbed children, demonstrate that children with peer adjustment problems are at risk for mental health problems. Various studies have looked problematic peer relations in childhood with military record of severe misconduct, history of adult Schizophrenia and manic-depressive disorder, mental health problems and Juvenile delinquency.

II.1. Studies done abroad:

Loeb (1941) investigated the factors, which might be related to degree of social acceptability. He reported that the children, whose rank of achievement in high school subjects was above their mental age, were found to have significantly higher acceptability scores. **Bonney (1941)** and **Bonney (1946)** reported that both elementary and secondary school pupils tend to choose associates who were similar to themselves in achievement. Thus when the relation between school achievement and sociometric position is being considered, the level of achievement seems to be linked with the acceptability of the pupils.

Grossman and Wrighter (1948) reported that the sixth grade pupils with high sociometric status had significantly higher scores on a standardized reading test than those with low sociometric test status. **Ohlsen and Dennis (1951)** reported that the most accepted students had higher scholastic averages than those in the least accepted group for college students. **Laughlin (1952)** found that the academic achievement and chronological age were of less importance in determining social acceptance or rejection.

Feinberg (1953) reported that the most acceptable students had higher scholastic averages than those in least accepted group for a study of 2000 adolescent boys and girls. **Buswell (1953)** in an extensive study of fifth and eighth grade pupils reported that those pupils who were highly chosen on a sociometric test had significantly higher achievement in basic subject skills than those pupils who were least accepted.

Laughlin (1954) again reported correlation co-efficients ranging from .14 to .36 between achievement in various school subjects and sociometric status for grades 2 to 7. **Lindzey and Urban (1954)** reported no relationship between sociometric status and achievement among college students. However they did not point out that there was limited range of achievement among college students or in a group. Difference in scholastic averages between pupils with high and low sociometric status, were also reported by **Brown (1954)** for the high school level. The most accepted students had higher scholastic averages than those in least group.

Bonny (1955) found that the students who ranked high sociometrically and were socially active tended to show higher level of achievement than those who ranked low. **Grondlund (1959)** studied relationship between sociometric status and achievement tests to follow the pattern of acceptance. It seems likely that achievement is related to social acceptance upto a point. Beyond that, other factors determine whether or not an individual is highly accepted by his peers.

Porterfield and Schlichting (1961) compared reading achievement scores with various pupils characteristics including sociometric scores. The sample was drawn from sixth grade pupils drawn about equally from schools of high, middle and low socio-economic status. As would be expected from studies of intelligence, they found a firm relationship between this achievement test and sociometric status. When results from socio-economic levels were examined, a significant relationship between achievement scores and social acceptability status in the high and middle group, was found, but the relation between the test scores and social acceptability status was not significant in **low-socio-economic status schools** although it was in the expected direction.

In **Bayti's study (1972)** scholastic achievement of correlation .43 with regard to relationship between social acceptance of students and their academic achievement was found. Thus it was concluded that there was positive correlation between social acceptance and achievement.

It has been noted that the academic achievement has more or less positive relationship with the sociometric status of pupils. These research studies have indicated that the students having high level of scholastic achievement are found to have higher acceptability in the classroom group. The academic conditions of pupils have great impact on their social acceptance in the classroom situations. Most of the researches

conducted earlier, indicated that populars had higher level of academic achievement followed by isolates, neglected and rejected group of students.

II.2. Studies done in India:

Balla (1954) conducted a study on sociometry in classroom. He studied pattern of grouping ranging from isolates, pairs, triangles to more intermingled ones. The study was conducted on 11 year old children. The study revealed that academic attainment has no relation with sociometric status. **Khanna (1956)** found that the intimate friendships were formed among the pupils who were similar in scholastic achievement.

Bhargava (1964) found the correlation between achievement and social status as positive. It was high i.e. 50 in case of populars. Therefore the results showed that the students who achieved high score academically were accepted mostly in the group. It was .24 in case of isolates which showed low positive relationship between achievement and social status which meant that those who achieved high score had a slight tendency to be popular among the group. Most of the stars tended to exceed the average by higher achievement. Isolates tended to be low in their achievement.

Gulati (1965) found out the impact of academic conditions on social acceptance in two schools. She investigated the fact that the highest percentage of choices were given to the academic field. The study revealed that social acceptability did not play so important role in Ladyirwin school as in Govt. School. It appeared from the conditions of the school that the students of Govt. School had no other criteria of value judgement, except the concrete examination results while Ladyirwin school children had plenty of activities to see and judge a person in the variety of situations. **Sharma (1970)** conducted a study on thirty two populars and twenty seven isolates on a three criteria-three choice sociometric questionnaire and found out that populars on the average accord higher in scholastic achievement than the isolates and rejected.

Badami and Tripathi (1973) studied group acceptance-rejection as function of intelligence and scholastic achievement. Bhatt Group Test of intelligence was administered. The information regarding scholastic achievement of each pupil was collected from school records. Group acceptance-rejection was found highly associated with the level of intelligence and scholastic achievement. Comparatively the achievement level of accepted was higher than that of neglected or of rejected pupils. It was quite low in case of neglected pupils. **Vasudev and Verma (1974)** found that the sociometric status was positively and significantly related with achievement.

Chatterjee (1979) studied some psychological correlates of social acceptance among primary school children. It was found that the high achievers in language and Mathematics were more socially accepted than their duller counter-parts. **Sudha (1982)** found significant difference among sociometric groups namely populars, isolates and rejected at .01 level of confidence on variable academic achievement and showed that the populars had higher academic achievement followed by isolates, neglected and rejected. **Pandey (1985)** found positive relationship between social acceptability and academic achievement. The students having higher social acceptability had higher academic achievement level.

Ram, Nek (2012) found that the popular students showed higher academic achievement of popular students followed by neglected, rejected and isolate. **Rashmi (2013)** conducted a study on the topic "Academic Achievement of VIII Class Students Belonging to Different Sociometric Groups". She found that the popular students depicted higher academic achievement level than the neglected, rejected and isolate students. In the boys group, the popular students depicted higher academic achievement level than isolate students. Moreover in the girls group, the popular students depicted higher academic achievement level than isolate students. Moreover in the girls group, the popular students depicted higher academic achievement than the neglected, rejected and isolate students.

Thus it becomes clear that there is positive relationship between sociometric status of pupils and their academic achievement. The level of scholastic achievement has great influence on the social acceptability of students in the classroom group. Most of the earlier researches clearly indicate that populars possess high level of academic achievement. These researches have clearly showed the significant difference in academic achievement and sociometric status of students. The unaccepted group of students-isolate, neglected and rejected seem to have low level of academic achievement.

III. METHODOLOGY

III.1. Population

The population of the present study comprised of all the X class students studying in various government and private co-educational schools located in Kathua city of J&K State.

III.2. Sampling

The overall initial sample consisted of 500 students from various schools selected at random, out of which 120 students picked on the basis of fixed criteria (popular:40, neglected:40, rejected:40,) comprising of

equal number of boys and girls from each sociometric category. Each section of the class was treated as one group for the study

Table.3.1.Detail of Sample taken from Government and private schools

S.No.	NAME OF THE SCHOOL	POPULAR		NEGLECTED		REJECTED	
		boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls
1.	GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL LAKHAN PUR, KATHUA	2	2	1	2	3	3
2.	GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL JANGLO TE, KATHUA	1	2	3	1	2	3
3.	ANAND MARG HIGH SCHOOL KATHUA	3	3	1	3	1	1
4.	GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL P/W KATHUA	1	2	2	1	2	0
5.	RAINBOW MODERN HR. SEC. SCHOOL KATHUA	3	1	3	3	1	2
6.	GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL KALIBARI, KATHUA	2	2	1	2	1	2
7.	M.H.S D.A.V HR. SEC. SCHOOL KATHUA	1	2	3	2	2	1
8.	BHARTIYA PUBLIC SCN. SCHOOL KATHUA	1	1	3	1	1	1
9.	RS JAGRITI NIKETAN HR. SEC. SCHOOL KATHUA	2	1	1	1	1	2
10.	DSHERITAGE HR. SEC. SCHOOL BARWAL MORH	1	1	2	1	1	2

11.	GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL KHAROTE, KATHUA	2	1	3	2	1	1
12.	LEARNING TEMPLE ENGLISH MEDIUM HIGH SCHOOL KATHUA	1	2	2	1	2	2
	TOTAL	20	20	20	20	20	20

III.3. Tools employed and their description

- **Sociometric Questionnaire:**

In the present study, Sociometric Questionnaire prepared by Dr. A. N. Sharma was used to identify three Sociometric groups of students viz. popular, neglected, and rejected. It simply asked the students to choose from amongst themselves companions or partners for activity or occasion that is dear to them and also to name those whom they would like least to have companions or partners for that activity or occasion. The method of classifying the students into three Sociometric categories was based on Bronfenbrenner's fixed frame of reference.

- **Academic Achievement:**

Regarding the academic achievement, the investigator consulted the examination In charge of each selected school and enquired about the marks obtained by students in previous two annual examinations (IX and VIII classes). The examination in charge teacher was kind enough to assist the investigator and in this way the researcher obtained annual examination marks of two classes of popular, neglected and rejected students already identified by the researcher. The marks were pooled together and added and then percentage found in order to obtain academic achievement index score of each selected student.

III.4. Statistical techniques employed

Mean, Standard Deviation and Critical Ratio

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Analysis of the data is the most important part in any research work. It means to study the tabulated material in order to determine inherent facts or meanings. One can draw proper inferences only after analyzing the data carefully. The data obtained is analyzed from different angles to find out new facts. The data was obtained by getting the percentage of marks obtained by the popular, neglected, rejected and isolate Sociometric groups of students in the previous two annual examinations viz. VIII & IX which were pooled together and added to obtain academic achievement index scores of each student. The data was then analyzed by using appropriate statistical techniques as mentioned earlier. The data collected has been analyzed under the following headings.

Table 1. Comparison of mean scores between popular & neglected, popular & rejected and neglected & rejected students on academic achievement

S.N	Sociometric group	N	M	S.D	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Popular	40	80	13.21	2.09	2.71	4.24*
	Neglected	40	68.5	10.91	1.73		
2	Popular	40	80	13.21	2.09	2.71	6.37*
	Rejected	40	62.75	10.93	1.73		
3	Neglected	40	68.5	10.91	1.73	2.45	2.35**
	Rejected	40	62.75	10.93	1.73		

* Significant at .01 level **Significant at .05 level

Table 2. Comparison of mean scores between popular & neglected, popular & rejected and neglected & rejected boys on academic achievement.

S.N	Sociometric group	N	M	S.D	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Popular	20	78	14.58	3.26	3.96	2.65*
	Neglected	20	67.5	10.05	2.25		
2	Popular	20	78	14.58	3.26	4.18	3.71*
	Rejected	20	62.5	11.66	2.61		
3	Neglected	20	67.5	10.05	2.25	3.45	1.45
	Rejected	20	62.5	11.66	2.61		

* Significant at .01 level

Table 3: Comparison of Mean scores between popular & neglected, popular & rejected and neglected & rejected girls on academic achievement.

SEX	Sociometric group	N	M	S.D	SEM	SEDM	CR
Girls	Popular	20	82	11.35	2.54	3.63	3.44*
	Neglected	20	69.5	11.62	2.60		
	Popular	20	82	11.35	2.54	3.41	5.57*
	Rejected	20	63	10.14	2.27		
	Neglected	20	69.5	11.62	2.60	3.45	1.88
	Rejected	20	63.0	10.14	2.27		

*Significant at .01 level

Table 4. Sex differences in academic achievement among popular , neglected and rejected students

S.NO	Sociometric group		N	M	S.D	SEM	SEDM	CR
1	Popular	Boys	20	78	14.58	3.26	4.13	0.97
		Girls	20	82	11.35	2.54		
2	Neglected	Boys	20	67.5	10.05	2.25	3.44	0.58
		Girls	20	69.5	11.62	2.60		
3	Rejected	Boys	20	62.5	11.66	2.61	3.46	0.14
		Girls	20	63	10.14	2.27		

V. MAIN FINDINGS

1. Inferences based on general view

- Significant difference is found between popular and neglected students on academic achievement. The popular students depict higher academic achievement than neglected counterparts.
- Significant difference is found between popular and rejected students on academic achievement. The popular students depict higher academic achievement than rejected counterparts.
- Significant difference is found between neglected and rejected students on academic achievement. The neglected students depict higher academic achievement than rejected counterparts.

2. Inferences based on Boys Group

- Significant difference is found between popular and neglected boys on academic achievement. The popular boys depict higher academic achievement than neglected counterparts.
- Significant difference is found between popular and rejected boys on academic achievement. The popular boys depict higher academic achievement than rejected counterparts.
- No significant difference is found between neglected and rejected students on academic achievement. The neglected and rejected students depict alike academic achievement level.

3. Inferences based on Girls Group.

- Significant difference is found between popular and rejected girls on academic achievement. The popular girls depict higher academic achievement than neglected counterparts.
- Significant difference is found between popular and rejected girls on academic achievement. The popular girls depict higher academic achievement than rejected counterparts.
- No significant difference is found between neglected and rejected girls on academic achievement. The neglected and rejected girls depict alike academic achievement.

4. Inferences based on sex differences

- No significant sex differences are found among popular, neglected and rejected students on academic achievement. The boys and girls in the popular, neglected and rejected groups depict alike academic achievement.

VI. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

In the present study, the popular students in general view depicted higher academic achievement than neglected and rejected counterparts and neglected students depicted higher academic achievement than rejected counterparts. However, in boys and girls groups, the popular students depicted higher academic achievement than neglected and rejected counterparts. In the light of these findings, the following steps can be taken:-

- The neglected and rejected students need to be identified as early as possible and special efforts shall be made to increase their level of academic achievement.
- Special attention should be paid to these unaccepted groups of students in the class room teaching learning process.
- Congenial, democratic and conducive environment should be created for such type of students in the class.
- Innovative and child friendly methods of teaching should be used for such type of children.
- Special tutorial class should be started for these children in order to remove their doubts and weaknesses.
- These students shall be encouraged towards curricular and co-curricular activities.
- Special tests series should be conducted for these students.
- Remedial teaching should be introduced for these children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. **Journal:** Badami, H.D and Tripathi, B (1973)– Group acceptance – rejection as a function of intelligence and scholastic achievement. *Indian Journal of Psy.*, 48(1) 69 – 74.
- [2]. **Dissertation:** Bhargava, Vidya (1964) – “ A study of relationship of academic achievement to classroom friendship Pattern (as determined by Sociometric tests) and Persnality traits”. M.ed, unpublished dissertation, Central Institute of Edu; Delhi University, Delhi.
- [3]. **Journal:** Bonney, M.E. and J. Powell (1953). “Differences in social behaviour between sociometrically high and Sociometrically low children”. *Jl. Educl. Research* 46: 481-495.
- [4]. **Review:** Brown, D. , (1954) Factors affecting Social acceptance of high School Students.” *School Review* 42 : 151-155.
- [5]. **Book:** Cattell, R.B. (1934). “Friendship and Enemies”. A Psychological study of character and temperament. Page 54-63.
- [6]. **Book:** Chapin, F.S. (1940). Trends in sociometrics and critique”. *Sociometry*, 3 : 245-262..
- [7]. **Journal:** Feinberg, M.R. (1953). “Relation of Back ground Experience to Social Acceptance”. *Jl. of Abnormal and Social Psy.*, 48 : 206-214.
- [8]. **Book:** Forlane, G. and J.W. Wrightstone (1951). “Sociometric self Descriptive techniques in Approval of pupil Adjustment”. *Sociometry*, 14 : 340-350.
- [9]. **Dissertation:** Gautam, P.N. (1974). “A Sociometric study of Patterns of social interactions among Principals, teachers and students in Higher Secondary Schools of H.P. Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- [10]. **Book:** Good, C.V, A.S. Barv and D.E. Scates (1941). “The Methodology of educational Research”. New York, Appleton Century Crofts Inc.
- [11]. **Journal:** Gronlund, N.E. and Holmlund, W.S. (1958) – The value of Elementary School Sociometric scores for Predicting pupils adjustment in High School Edul. *Adm. And Supervision*, 44, 255-60.
- [12]. **Book:** Grossman, B. and J. wrighter (1948). “The relationships between selection-Rejection and intelligence, Social status and Personality Amongst sixth grade children”. *Sociometry*, 11 : 346-355
- [13]. **Book:** Gulati, J.P. (1956). “Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education”. New York Mc Graw Bill Book. Co.
- [14]. **Thesis:** Kumari, Sudha (1982). “A study of Intelligence, Achievement, Adjustment, Socio-economic Pattern of Different Sociometric groups of Adolescents. A Ph. D thesis (unpublished)
- [15]. **Thesis:** Ram,Nek (2012): “Personality profile, reaction to frustration and problems of +2 students of different sociometric categories”. An unpublished Ph.D .thesis, University of Jammu, Jammu.
- [16]. **Dissertation:** Rashmi (2013): “Academic achievement of 8th class students belonging to different sociometric groups”. An unpublished dissertation at M.Ed. level at IGNOU RC Jammu.
- [17]. **Journal:** Pathak, R. D. (1974). “Level of Sociometrically selected groups of Peers. *Psychological studies*, 19(2).Sociometric groups of school children. *Indian Journal of social work*, 33, (3), 199-203.
- [18]. **Report:** Sharma, A.N. (1965). “Social Status of pupils and some factors related to it. Report No. 8. Department of Psychological Foundations N.C.E.R.T., New Delhi.
- [19]. **Book:** Sharma, Atmananda. (1970). “Handbook on Sociometry for teacher and counsellors”. Department of educational Psychology and Foundations of Education National Institute of education, NCERT, New Delhi.
- [20]. **Book:** Sharma, H. and Malik. S. (1984). “A Sociometric Study of Personality patterns of Adolescent girls as measured through Free expression drawings. *Trends in Education*, 9(3), 4-16.
- [21]. **Dissertation:** Sharma, Satya Parkash. (1968). “A Comparative Study of Personality traits of Populars and Rejectees. M.Ed dissertation (Unpublished). Rajasthan University.
- [22]. **Journal:** Sharma, V.M. (1965). “Some Determinants of Sociometric status. *Jl. of education and Psychology*, 23, 49-56.
- [23]. **Dissertation:** Shukla, J.K. (1951). “A Study of Friendship”. Unpublished M.Ed Dissertation, Rajasthan University, Rajasthan.
- [24]. **Journal:** Shukla, S.K. (1980). “Sociometric approach to Personality”. *Jl. of Educational Research and extension*. 17(1), 4-9.
- [25]. **Dissertation:** Singh, Rekha. (1975). “A study of effect of Intelligence, socio-economic status and Academic Achievement as social Acceptance. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation, Aligarh Muslim, University.
- [26]. **Dissertation:** Singh, Udey Partap. (1963). “An Investigation into the characteristics of socially accepted and socially rejected boys of age group 14”. Unpublished M.Ed Dissertation, B.R. College of Education, Agra University.
- [27]. **Dissertation:** Singhal, N. (1960). “Social Acceptance and Rejection as affected by Socio-economic status of girls Students of tenth Grade”. Unpublished M.Ed Dssertation, Central Insititute of Education, University of Delhi.
- [28]. **Book:** Smith, M. (1944). “Some factors in Friendship Slection of High school students”. *sociometry*, 7 : 303-310.
- [29]. **Thesis:** Stanley (1967), Tennings (1950), Bonner (1953), Herbert (1954). Studies quoted from the Ph. D. thesis of Sudha Kumari (1982) entitled “A study of Intelligence, Achievement, Adjustment, Socio-economic pattern of different sociometric groups of adolescents”, (Unpublished), Panjab Universities, Chandigarh.

- [30]. **Journal:** Vasu deva, P. and Verma, P. (1974). "Sociometric Status as related to achievement anxiety and intelligence. JI. of Psychological Researches 18, 93-95.
- [31]. **Book:** Verma L. K., and Sharma N. R. (1990). Statistics in Education and Psychology. Narinder Publishing House, Jalandhar.

Dr. Ram Singh "Academic Achievement of Adolescents Belonging to Different Sociometric Groups: A Comparative Analysis" International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI), vol.07, no. 12, 2018, pp.23-31