

PUPIL MOBILITY AND ADJUSTMENT*

Walter D. Smith
Winthrop College
South Carolina
and

John S. Demming**
Palm Beach County, Fla.

The great mobility of American families has produced a number of new legal, administrative, and curricular problems for public school children, teachers and administrators (Kopp, 12). Numerous problems of adjustment have also been reported (5, 20). In this study three aspects of the newcomer's adjustment to the already formed social structure of the schools' classrooms are explored: (1) the effects of late school entrance (December 1, 1957 through February 15, 1958) on the total social structure of the classroom, (2) the effects of late school entrance on the social status of the late school entrant, and (3) the emotional adjustment of the late school entrant. Statistical comparisons between early, or regularly entering children in September, 1957, and of late entering children are made in order to appraise the effects of late school entrance.

Developing The Problem

Only occasional studies of an experimental nature regarding the effects of introducing children into an already formed group have been made. Small group experimental studies as that of Phillips, Shenker, and Revitz (21) have shown that the newcomer to the group attempts to make behavioral adjustments fitting the common frame of reference of the group and the most active child in the group is most frequently the one imitated by the newcomer. Both the personality of the newcomer and the demands of the situation have been reported (17) to be significant determiners of spontaneous social pairings in newly formed three-person groups. Although small changes in group membership can be easily assimilated due to continuing reference points in the group (1), the equilibrium of the

*This study was supported by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Cooperative Research Division, Contract 457, under the provisions of Public Law 531, 83rd Congress. Other support for the project came from the Research Council, Florida State University, and from the General Extension Division of Florida. Research assistants on the project were Mr. Walter R. Duryea and Mr. Larry Thompson, Florida State University.

**Both formerly of Florida State University.

group has been reported to change with the introduction of each new member (4). When the size and general characteristics of the group remain unchanged, individual roles do not shift appreciably with the shifting of members from one group to another (3). The more stable social structures exert greater influence on new group members (13).

The distribution of sociometric choices from both newcomers and original group members may hinge on their positions in the social structure. A group member's leadership role in group decision making will be perceived (7) more often when his position in the communication network is more central. Jennings (9) found newcomers in a state training school for girls directing the majority of their sociometric choices to the well-chosen of the already formed group. Also, the well-chosen extended many of their choices to newcomers. However, considerable specificity in the well-chosen's choice of newcomers was reported as the newcomer was less frequently chosen for leisure activities than for work activities. A comparison (5) of children who had moved from school to school with those who had maintained a continuous residence showed that those children who had been in a single residence for two or three years after moving had higher social acceptance scores than those in continuous residence. However, recent stability of residence was required. The following hypotheses derived from recent research literature are tested in this study:

1. Shifts in social status of original group members will occur as a product of newcomers being added to the group.
2. The constancy of social status will be inversely related to the number of late entrants entering a classroom during the year.
3. Late school entrants will show greater choice for the already well-chosen members of the group.
4. Late school entrants will be chosen more often on a sociometric test on a "work" criterion (more formal activities of the group) than on a "play" criterion (a leisure and more intimate activity).
5. Late school entrants will tend to be below the original group members in social status throughout the year.

Little research relevant to the effect of late school entrance in terms of producing personal-social problems for children has been reported. Nash and Wolfe (19) point to the marginal role of the newcomer in the group and to the "uncertainty of the stranger's role" as constituting a threat to him which will be manifested by decreased inventiveness on his part. Sherif (24) found unfavorable attitudes and derogatory stereotypes being formed about the other group when two strange groups were brought into functional contact. Personal-social problems are reported to exist for children who are

moved from school to school as parents follow the crops as migrant workers (11). The development or restructuring of any group may well hold some threat for its members. The initial days of group life of a new group are filled with behavior aimed toward warding off anxiety (2). In part, this may be due to the fact that the newcomer's personal level of aspiration may be impossible of attainment as he wrestles with achieving group membership and a feeling of failure may be his lot (22).

These findings have lead to the formulation of the following hypotheses:

6. Late school entrants will present observable evidence of their struggle (to fit into the already formed structure) will be manifested in behavioral symptoms identifiable by their teachers. Late entrants will manifest more such symptoms than the September entrants both at the time of entering school and at the end of the school year.

7. Late school entrants will tend to present poorer self-perceptions of personal-social adjustment than the September entrants both on entering school and at the end of the school year.

Method

Subjects: A total of 25 white classrooms, 6 fourth, 6 fifth, and 13 sixth grade classrooms, located in two popular tourist counties in Florida were selected for the study, largely because of anticipated increases in classroom enrollments of 20% or more in each class after schools would open in January, 1958. Preceding year enrollments afforded the basis for this prediction. Maclachlan (16), reporting on the 1950-55 total population increases in these counties, noted that one county increased by 99% and the other by 43%. Due to winter weather conditions in 1957-58 the 20% increase prediction was occasionally in error. However, a total of 51 late school entrants in 21 classrooms (24 boys and 27 girls) coming between December 1, 1957 and February 15, 1958 were studied and provided the main data for the study. There were 11 fourth graders, 15 fifth graders, and 25 sixth graders constituting the total group of late entrants who were called the experimental group.

The control subjects of the study were the fourth, fifth, and sixth graders of the 25 classrooms who began school during the first week of September, 1957 and who remained in the same classroom during the school year. These children were well identified on background information as were each of the late entrants. Both a matched control group of September entrants and a stratified sample of control subjects served as controls for the late entrant group when

comparisons of scores were made. Due to difficulties in matching the entire 51 experimental subjects on the several criteria of age, sex, socio-economic status, and intelligence, the matched experimental and control groups were each reduced to 20 boys and 22 girls from 18 classrooms (9 fourth graders, 15 fifth graders, and 18 sixth graders). However, the total experimental group of 51 subjects was compared with a stratified control sample of 48 boys and 54 girls selected randomly (but proportionally) from each of the classrooms. The stratified group, stratified only on sex and classroom membership, consisted of two early school entrants selected randomly (for each experimental subject) from each of the 51 experimental subjects' classrooms.

Table 1 presents descriptive data covering age, sex, intelligence, and socio-economic status. It will be noted that the four

Table 1. Number, Means and Sd's on Age, Sex, Intelligence, and Socio-economic Status of the Control and Experimental Groups

Groups	Age (Months)			E-G-Y (IQ)			Socio-economic Status		
	x	SD	N	x	SD	N	x	SD	N
Control Stratified									
Male	125.42	10.78	48	117.75	19.41	44	10.96	2.95	48
Female	124.87	10.02	54	108.32	15.45	52	11.98	2.72	54
Total	125.13	10.34	102	112.65	17.91	96	11.50	2.86	102
Control Matched									
Male	126.20	10.60	20	114.00	12.07	20	10.85	1.95	20
Female	124.27	11.05	22	110.32	16.73	22	11.95	2.66	22
Total	125.19	10.75	42	112.07	14.64	42	11.43	2.39	42
Experimental Matched									
Male	126.10	11.29	20	114.55	13.44	20	11.70	3.13	20
Female	124.23	11.33	22	107.64	17.62	22	12.23	3.34	22
Total	125.12	11.22	42	110.93	15.97	42	11.93	3.21	42
Experimental Total									
Male	126.71	11.23	24	114.57	13.41	23	11.96	3.34	23
Female	125.59	11.06	27	107.08	17.89	25	11.74	4.11	27
Total	126.12	11.05	51	110.67	16.18	48	11.84	3.73	50

groups in Table 1 are much alike on the background descriptive factors. Means and standard deviations are so similar that both t-tests and F-tests failed to reach statistical significance. The stratified control group differs little from the matched control group; neither of the control groups differs significantly from the smaller matched experimental group or the larger total experimental group on these background factors. Therefore, it appeared practical in analyzing the data to compare the experimental group with both the matched and the stratified control groups only when the two control groups differed. It will be observed that the matched experimental group is always smaller than the total experimental group.

Testing procedure: The entire study was carried out as an extension course project in two classes for teachers titled Psychology of Child Development. The classes had one meeting in each of the two counties during the first week of each month from September, 1957 through May, 1958. At each meeting testing procedures were explained, test results were submitted by teachers, and the entire project was regularly evaluated. Teachers were encouraged to make use of all data in their daily classroom operations.

The data-gathering procedure consisted principally of group testing by the teachers who then scored all tests. Test administrations were scheduled throughout the school year in order to obtain initial measures of social-emotional adjustment of both early and late school entrants as well as changes in scores during the year. Tests were generally administered during the first week of each month. Late school entrants were administered the initial tests (listed below for September) after their first week in school and thereafter took their tests at the regularly scheduled times. The test schedule was as follows:

1. September, 1957 (to all the approximately 750 children in the 25 classrooms who were called early school entrants)

California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, Form AA, 1953
McGuire-White Socio-Economic Scale
General Information Form

2. October, 1957 (to all children)

Moreno-type Sociometric Test
Ohio Social Acceptance Scale

3. November, 1957 (to all children)

Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedules, Schedule B

4. December, 1957 (to all children)
Moreno-type Sociometric Test
Ohio Social Acceptance Scale
(Initial test battery to all late school entrants through February 15)
7. March, 1958 (to all children)
Kent E-G-Y. Scale D, Short Form Intelligence Test
8. April, 1958 (to all children in the 25 classrooms)
California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, Form AA, 1953
Moreno type Sociometric Test
Ohio Social Acceptance Scale
Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedules, Schedule B

The California Test of Personality, Elementary Series, Form AA (25) was administered to each early school entrant during the first week of September and in the second week of April. It was also administered to each late school entrant one week after his arrival at school and in the second week of April. The teachers read each item with the children in the group setting and the children marked their own answers.

The McGuire-White Index of Social Status (15) with minor adaptations was used with all children. Only three items, relating to (1) education of father, (2) source of family income, and (3) father's occupation were used. Low scores indicate higher socio-economic status. This instrument was administered to early school entrants during the first week of September and to late school entrants one week after entering school.

In addition to the above data-gathering procedures a General Information Form was completed by each child and kept current by his teacher throughout the year. On it was recorded information concerning birthdate, number, sex and ages of siblings, number of schools attended, number of absences during the year, occupation and educational level of both parents, and the child's intelligence test scores. Teachers began gathering these data in September and as soon as a new child entered the classroom. These tests and materials constituted the initial data-gathering procedures for both early and late school entrants and their continued use throughout the year provided re-test results designed to show change or progress by both early and late school entrants.

A Moreno-type sociometric test consisting of two criteria, work and play, with three unweighted choices on each was administered to all classrooms in the first weeks of October, December, February and the second week of April. Similarly, the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale (23), which will be referred to as the OSAS, on which the names of all children in the classroom were listed and on which each child could check one of five degrees of preference for each other child (1. not okay; 2. don't know; 3. not friends, but okay; 4. good friend; 5. very best friend) was administered at these four times. On the Moreno type sociometric test the child's total raw score was computed as well as scores for both work and play. In order to make scores from all groups comparable each child's score was computed as the proportion of all choices given in his group. The OSAS scores were computed as the average score (1-5) given to the child by all his classmates.

In order to obtain teacher's appraisals of children's adjustment the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedules, Schedule B (8) was completed by all teachers on all early school entrants in November and April and on all late school entrants one month after school entry and again in April. Scores for each child consisted of a summation of teacher's ratings on the thirty-five, 5 points, rating scales.

The final data-gathering instrument used was the Kent E-G-Y, Scale D, Short Form Intelligence Test (10) administered to all children in March, 1958. This test was used to define the general limits of intelligence in which both control and experimental groups fell. No need for more precise measures of intelligence was anticipated. IQ's were calculated from the results of these tests administered to all children in the first week of March, 1958.

It will be observed that test administrations were scheduled so that comparisons could be made between scores made by late and early school entrants on initial testing after each had been in the classrooms similar lengths of time. Also, continuous testing during the school year, particularly with the sociometric and the OSAS, allowed some conclusions to be drawn concerning change in social status and social acceptance. April testing permitted final, end-of-year comparisons.

Statistical analysis: The matched control group of 42 children entering school in the first week of September, 1957 was selected for comparison with the 42 experimental or late entering children, who entered school between December 1, 1957 and February 15, 1958 inclusively. A stratified sample of 102 controls, two selected randomly for each of the 51 experimental subjects for whom data were complete, was also selected inasmuch as the matched groups were somewhat small. Therefore, two statistical comparisons were generally made:

1. Matched control group (n=42) and experimental matched group (n=42).
2. Stratified controls (n=102) and total experimental group (n=51).

In addition to the statistical comparisons between groups, changes in certain scores presumably reflecting the effects of late school entrance are appraised. The .05 significance level was accepted for statistical significance. The null hypothesis is implied but not stated in each analysis.

Results

1. The first hypothesis to be investigated bears on the effect of new children coming into a classroom on the social status of early school entrants: shifts in social status of original group members will occur as a product of newcomers being added to the group. Correlational data were obtained on the 102 stratified controls who were selected as more representative of the entire group of early entrants than would be the smaller matched controls. The OSAS test scores obtained in October were correlated with test scores obtained in December, February and April; the obtained Pearson-r's were .65, .86, and .89 respectively. In each case the significance level of p was $\leq .01$. Similarly the correlation coefficients between October sociometric test scores and those obtained in December, February, and April were .53, .57, and .48 respectively with p reaching the .01 level in each case.

Any interpretation of the above results might provoke numerous questions. The sociometric research literature indicated that the normally expected shifts in sociometric and OSAS scores over these time periods are not exceeded by these data. The greater correlation coefficients between the OSAS October results and the February and April results than between October and December data are difficult to explain. However, no such unique relationships are evidenced by the sociometric data. Although shifts in status did occur, the uniformly high correlation coefficients offered little support for the first hypothesis. Reliability studies reviewed by Mouton, Blake and Fruchter (18) would indicate that the shifts in status in those groups where many children entered the classrooms late in the year do not appear disproportionately large.

2. The data concerning the second hypothesis, that the constancy of social status will be a function of (inversely related to) the number of late entrants entering a classroom during the year, are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. Means of Gains on Sociometric and OSAS Scores for the Three Groups of Classrooms Based on Number (Upper, Middle, and Lower Thirds) of Late School Entrants Between October and February 1, and October and April 1.

		Group 1 (2-4)		Group 11 (5-6)		Group 111 (7-13)	
		x	N	x	N	x	N
SOCIOMETRICS:	October - February	.0007	50	.0023	50	-.0076	50
	October - April	-.0055	50	-.0033	50	-.0047	100
OSAS:	October - February	.106	50	.168	50	.215	50
	October - April	.237	50	.341	50	.211	100

Inspection of the data of Table 2 shows the real similarities between means of gains in scores by early school entrants between October and the later three tests. Group 1 consists of children from classrooms with 2-4 late school entrants, Group 11 of 5-6, and Group 111 of 7-13 late school entrants. The range of late school entrants was then from 2 to 13; the n of early entering children, chosen randomly from the several classrooms may also be seen in Table 2. These randomly selected groups (approximately 20% samples) were sufficiently large to satisfy a rather stringent criterion of representativeness. When the early entrants were appraised for gains or shifts in sociometric and OSAS scores between the October and April testing by analysis of variance, no significant difference between the three treatment groups occurred (Table 3). As in Table 2 the conditions describing these groups related to numbers of new entrants coming to each child's classroom. The n of control subjects in each group was then 50 for the October-February analysis of gains and 50 in Group 1, 50 in Group 11, and 100 in Group 111 for the October-April analysis when many classes then fell into the 7-13 late entrant range. Shifts in status were then computed as the difference between scores obtained in October and February as well as in October and April with each of the two instruments. The F of 3.36 with $P < .05$ obtained between the October and February sociometric data suggests the possibility of a difference between groups related to the number of late entrants. Table 2 shows the major losses to have occurred among early school entrants in classrooms with the larger numbers of new entrants. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance (6) for the October-April data gave a chi-square of 14.44 with $p < .01$. However, the relatively large n in each group, in view of Norton's study (14), would make questionable the useful-

Table 3. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Early Entrants' Shifts in Social Status as Related to Number (Upper, Middle, and Lower Thirds) of Late School Entrants Between October and January and October and April

1. SOCIOMETRICS: October - February Shifts					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between Groups	3,683.21	2	1,841.61	3.36	.05
Within Groups	80,440.76	147	547.22		
Total	84,123.97	149			

2. OSAS: October - February Shifts					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between Groups	2,953.06	2	1,476.53	-	-
Within Groups	222,907.94	147	1,516.38		
Total	225,861.00	149			

3. SOCIOMETRICS: October - April Shifts					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between Groups	144.25	2	72.13	-	-
Within Groups	135,018.62	197	685.37		
Total	135,162.87	199			

4. OSAS: October - April Shifts					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between Groups	7,394.46	2	3,697.23	2.64	>.05
Within Groups	276,175.76	197	1,401.91		
Total	283,570.22	199			

ness of the Bartlett test. The significant F of 3.36 and the direction of difference between means of change scores in Table 2 indicate that the price of permitting larger numbers of late entrants to join the classroom during the year is a moderate loss in social status by the original group members. However, this appears to be a minor shift which has its impact on all three groups by April as all April sociometric shifts (Table 2) are downward. The OSAS, however, shows only moderate gains at all test periods.

It might be concluded from an examination of the data in Table 2 and 3 that the introduction of newcomers into these groups had no major effects on the social status or social acceptance of the early school entrants although some minor reordering of social relationships does occur. The evidence indicated that the number of late school entrants might be a contributing factor to the shifting of scores; its total effect did not appear appreciable when data from the longer time period analyses were examined.

3. Hypothesis 3, that late school entrants would show greater choice for the already well-chosen members of the groups, was tested by a chi-square analysis. All early school entrants in each of the 21 classrooms of the 49 late school entrants present for the April testing were divided into the upper, two middle, and lower fourths in social status in their classrooms on the basis of the first sociometric tests in October. Separate analyses were made for work and play choices. Frequencies under each of the four quarters, then, indicated the distribution of late school entrants' choices for early entering children already categorized by the October tests. The Chi-square values were February (work), 82.65; Feb-

bruary (play), 73.67; April (work) 69.89; and April (play) 93.68. When $df = 3$, each of the chi-square values reached the .01 significance level. The late school entrants continued the pattern of choice established in October by distributing the vast majority of their choices to those children already well-chosen in their group.

The uniformly high significant chi-square values for both work and play choices on both February and April testings offer clear support for the hypothesis and demonstrates the very positive tendency for the already well-chosen child to be chosen by newcomers to his group throughout the year.

4. The fourth hypothesis, that late school entrants will be chosen more often on a sociometric test on the "work" criterion than on a "play" criterion, was tested by using a t-test to test the significance of differences between play and work choice means in February and April of the early school entrants' choices for the late school entrants. In February complete data were available for 49 late school entrants and in April for 50 late school entrants. The mean for play choices in February (.0147) was compared with the mean for work choices (.0118). A t of 1.81, $p > .05$ was found. A similar comparison in April yielded a play mean of .0151 and a work mean of .0204 with a t of 3.14 and $p < .01$. The t-test of significance of the differences between the means of total scores in April reaches the .01 significance level suggesting that the late school entrant becomes more frequently chosen on the more formal criterion of work only after some months in the classroom. Crystallization of choice seems to have occurred by April; the hypothesis gains considerable support and may merit further testing.

5. The fifth hypothesis, that late school entrants will tend to be below the original group members in social status throughout the year, was tested by computing the significance of difference between means of the experimental and control groups on the several testings. Both the sociometric and OSAS data were used. Total sociometric scores were used and no separate sex analyses were made.

The first analysis was a comparison of scores made by the stratified controls and the matched control groups. Although the differences between means of the two control groups were generally small, differences reached the .05 significance level on three of eight comparisons (sociometrics in February and April and OSAS in April). Therefore, both control groups were treated in comparisons with means of the experimental subjects. These data are presented in Table 4.

Inspection of Table 4 shows that the early school entrants or the control groups consistently obtained higher scores on both the sociometric tests and the OSAS. The values of t reached the .01

Table 4. t-Tests of Differences Between Means of Sociometric and OSAS Scores of Late and Early School Entrants

Groups	Tests	x	N	<u>t</u>	df	P
<u>SOCIOMETRICS</u>						
1. Stratified Controls	February	.031	102	4.06	149	<.01
Total Experimentals	February	.013	49			
2. Matched Controls	February	.043	40	4.89	39	<.01
Matched Experimentals	February	.014	40			
3. Stratified Controls	April	.030	102	3.14	151	<.01
Total Experimentals	April	.017	51			
4. Matched Controls	April	.044	42	4.47	41	<.01
Matched Experimentals	April	.018	42			
<u>OSAS</u>						
5. Stratified Controls	February	3.39	102	3.42	149	<.01
Total Experimentals	February	3.10	49			
6. Matched Controls	February	3.54	40	4.95	39	<.01
Matched Experimentals	February	3.20	40			
7. Stratified Controls	April	3.47	102	1.97	151	>.05
Total Experimentals	April	3.31	51			
8. Matched Controls	April	3.69	42	3.97	41	<.01
Matched Experimentals	April	3.39	42			

significance level on all tests except that between the stratified controls and total experimentals on the OSAS in April when the .05 significance level was not reached. However, the .01 significance level was reached in April on the OSAS between the matched controls and matched experimental groups.

When means of February and April scores of late school entrants were compared, late school entrants were found to have made material progress in social status during their stay in the new classrooms. The April means on both sociometrics and OSAS were significantly higher ($t=2.39$, $P<.05$ for sociometrics and $t=4.35$, $P<.01$ for OSAS) than the February means. These data indicate the slow but steady progress in social status made by late school entrants.

The data rather conclusively support the hypothesis that the early school entrants maintain higher social status and social acceptance scores throughout the year. The handicap apparent for the late school entrant may be diminishing by April when no significant differences between OSAS scores for the stratified controls and the total experimental group were found. These data will bear close examination and must be considered as of central importance in this study.

6. Hypothesis 6, that late school entrants will receive higher behavior problem ratings (H-O-W- scores) by their teachers than will the early school entrants, was similarly tested by determining the significance of differences between means. Teachers rated all early entrants in their rooms in November and all late school entrants one month after they entered school. These ratings provided data for the first comparison. The second comparisons were between April scores for both groups. Again data only on the stratified control

group and total experimental groups were used in the analysis because of the marked similarity between the scores of the stratified and matched control groups. Differences between ratings (means for groups) were small.

None of the comparisons of means yielded large enough values of t to reach the .05 significance level (the greatest value of t was .69, P .05). The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. It must be concluded that these late school entrants manifested no greater behavior problems as rated by their teachers than did early school entrants, both soon after they entered school and at the end of the school year.

7. Hypothesis 7, that late school entrants will make lower scores on the California Test of Personality than will the early school entrants, was also tested by determining the significance of differences between means. Tests were administered to early school entrants in September and to late school entrants one week after school entry and again to all children in April. Differences between stratified and matched controls (Groups 1 and 2, Table 5) were not significant; therefore, only comparisons between stratified

Table 5. t -Tests of Differences Between Means of Total Scores on the California Test of Personality of Early and Late School Entrants

Groups	Tests	\bar{x}	N	t	df	P
1. Stratified Controls	September	108.90	102	0.62	142	>.05
Matched Controls	September	110.81	42			
2. Stratified Controls	April	113.67	102	0.61	142	>.05
Matched Controls	April	115.95	42			
3. Stratified Controls	September	108.90	102	2.32	151	<.05
Total Experimentals	(Initial Tests)	115.78	51			
4. Stratified Controls	April	113.67	102	0.56	150	>.05
Total Experimentals	April	115.62	50			

controls and the total experimental subjects were made on initial test scores and on final scores achieved in the April testing. These data are presented in Table 5. A t of 2.32 computed for the difference between means of initial test scores with $P < .05$ was found for the comparison of stratified controls and the total experimental group. April scores did not demonstrate differences which were statistically significant. The evidence not only failed to support the hypothesis but the differences appeared in the opposite direction with the late entrants achieving higher adjustment scores on initial tests with no differences being evidenced in the April tests between early and late school entrants.

Discussion

Late school entrance did not appear to be associated with poorer self-perceptions of personal-social adjustment and higher behavior problem ratings by teachers as hypothesized in this study. The related research literature generally falls into two categories: (1) experimental, small group research, or (2) studies correlating the number of schools children have attended with various measures of personal and social adjustment. The latter, while provocative and obviously important as sociological contributions exploring some general effects of population mobility, may not concentrate sufficiently on such issues as change over time, controls which minimize the effects of environmental forces, and an adequate description of the environmental situation being studied. Small group research, on the other hand, while most fruitful in its theoretical implications, appears to fall short in its interpretative contributions to the naturalistic setting of the classroom because of the great complexity of social forces in this less controlled setting.

Perhaps the negative results concerning the relationship of late school entrance and children's adjustment as measured by the several instruments were the most significant findings of the study. Early school entrants, children beginning school in September, 1957, did not appear to be particularly disturbed by the arrival of newcomers. In only one analysis (shifts in social status between October and February, Table 3) did change of the original social structure appear to be related to the numbers of children coming into the group. The marked constancy of social status of early school entrants, the fact that shifts appeared to be only slightly related to the numbers of children entering the group, and the consistently higher sociometric and OSAS scores of the early school entrants (Table 4) might serve to alleviate some of the concern teachers might have concerning the effects of newcomers on the original group members.

The sociometric and OSAS data, on the other hand, did picture the late school entrant as greatly penalized in social status (Table 4), but making significant gains between February and April.

However, the significance of the data of Table 4 must be looked for elsewhere. In particular, the comparative data between early and late school entrants on the H-O-W Behavior Rating Schedules and the California Test of Personality must be examined. It can be seen that the late school entrants seemed to show no ill effects on these tests of their poorer social adjustment. Although they did not differ significantly from the control groups, their behavior problem ratings were somewhat lower. The California Test of Personality scores of the total experimental group were higher ($t=2.32$, $P<.05$) in their first test (initial test, Table 5). Generally, the differences were small and the best conclusion to make is that these late school entrants did not appear to be more emotionally disturbed or present more behavior problems than did the early school entrants. On the other hand, any advantages in adjustment as measured by these tests belong to the late school entrants.

The sociometric tests and the OSAS measured acceptance by other children. Late school entrants, coming as strangers to new classrooms, must obviously change their role somewhat gradually from stranger to well-known friend. This did not appear to be a disturbing task for these children. Perhaps three explanations could be offered: (1) the two adjustment measures (H-O-W and California Test of Personality) are not valid measuring instruments, and/or (2) American children today as represented by this group can take entrance into new schools in stride, and/or (3) these teachers and schools employed great skill in bringing new children into the group. Perhaps other explanations are possible such as those bearing on the previous school history of the late school entrants.

The sociometric data revealed one finding of probable significance to teachers which small group research as well as other more naturalistic studies have anticipated. The late entering children showed a marked tendency to choose those children in the classroom who had already been frequently chosen by their peers before the arrival of the late entrants. The social structure of the group remained quite stable as the newcomer threw his support to the pre-existing structure. Early school entrants failed to discriminate between the "play" and "work" criteria in their choices of newcomers in February but gave significantly more work choices than play choices in April. However, these very general criteria, due to failure to specify activities, may still not have been the most adequate tests of the hypothesis that the late school entrants would be more frequently chosen on "formal" than on more "intimate" activities. By April early entrants did discriminate between the two criteria in their choices of late school entrants.

Finally, it was made clear to these teachers in September, 1957 what the purpose of the study was and they could, therefore, have been more conscious of the needs of these late school entrants.

The possibility of criterion contamination cannot be overlooked; however, because late school entrance is such a continuing matter in their communities and schools, these teachers soon appeared to lose sight of the fact that a particular child entered school late in the school year. Whether late school entrance and the poorer social adjustment demonstrated in this study were associated with other significant aspects of school such as school achievement remain as issues yet to be explored.

Summary

In order to study the relationship between late school entrance and children's adjustment, 51 children from fourth, fifth, and sixth grades in two counties in Florida who entered schools in these counties between December 1, 1957 and February 15, 1958, were compared with a matched as well as a stratified (randomly selected from each room) group of children starting school at the regular school opening in early September, 1957. Statistical comparisons were made between the late and early school entrants on their scores on: Sociometric Tests, Ohio Social Acceptance Scale, Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedules, Schedule B, and the California Test of Personality. Comparisons were made on initial (at school entry) scores, end-of-year scores, and change or progress scores. The results were generally negative in that the scores on personal-social adjustment of late school entrants differed little from those of early school entrants.

The results are:

1. Early school entrants tended to hold their social status positions (sociometric and OSAS scores) throughout the year. Considerable constancy in scores existed.

2. The shifts (gain or loss) in status of early school entrants which did occur showed a significant relationship to number of late school entrants coming into the group over the short period of time October-February, but the number of newcomers did not appear to be related to changes in the original group members over longer time periods. Greater losses in status occurred more frequently when many late entrants came in a short time period. These findings occurred with sociometric test data; however, the OSAS did not reveal a shifting in acceptance scores related to numbers of late school entrants.

3. Late school entrants tended to choose the already well-chosen members of the group on the sociometric test on both the work and play criteria.

4. There were no differences in early school entrants' choices for late school entrants on the two criteria, work and play in February; however, by April the early school entrants directed significantly more of their choices to late school entrants on the work criterion than on the play criterion.

5. Late school entrants were below the original group members in social status through the year. The difference on the OSAS was not significant in April and the late school entrants appeared to be making some progress in social status gains. Significant gains were evidenced between February and April on both sociometric and OSAS data.

6. Late school entrants did not differ significantly from early school entrants at any time in the year on their scores on the H-O-W or California Test of Personality.

The data on social status and social acceptance were most definitive in distinguishing between early and late school entrants. Other tests measuring adjustment revealed no differences between early and late school entrants. The relationship of late school entrance and measures of school achievement remains unexplored.

Bibliography

1. Bavelas, Alex. Some problems of organization change. J. soc. Issues, 1948, 4, 48-52.
2. Bennis, W. G. and Shepard, H. A. A theory of group development. Hum. Relat., 1956, 2, 415-437.
3. Bell, G. B. and French, R. L. Consistency of individual leadership position in small groups of varying membership. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1950, 45, 764-767.
4. Chapple, E. D. and Coon, C. S. The equilibrium of groups. Small Groups, 1955, 54-57.
5. Downie, N. M. A comparison between children who have moved from school to school with those who have been in continuous residence on various factors of adjustment. J. educ. Psychol., 1953, 44, 50-53.
6. Edwards, A. L. Experimental design in psychological research. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1950.
7. Goldberg, S. C. Influence and leadership as a function of group structure. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 51, 119-122.
8. Haggerty, M. E. Olson, W. C. and Wickman, M. E. Haggerty-Olson-Wickman behavior rating schedules. World Book Company, 1930.
9. Jennings, H. Leadership and isolation. New York: Longman, Green and Co., 1950.
10. Kent, Grace. E-G-Y, scale D, short form intelligence test. Psychological Corporation, 1946.
11. Koos, E. L. They follow the sun. Bureau Maternal and child Health, Florida State Board of Health, 1957.
12. Kopp, O. W. Elementary school transfer problems, principles, and recommended procedures. Bu. Publ., Teach. Coll., 1953.
13. Larsen, O. N. and Hill, R. J. Social structure and interpersonal communication. Am. J. Soc., 1958, 63, 497-505.
14. Lindquist, E. F. Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1953.
15. McGuire, C. and White, G. D. The measurement of social status. Research Paper No. 3, Revised. The Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Texas, March, 1955

16. Machlachlan, J. Recent population trends in the southeast. Soc. Forces, 1956-57, 35, 147-154.
17. Mills, T. M. Developmental processes in three-person groups. Hum. Relat., 1956, 2, 343-355.
18. Mouton, J. S., Blake, R., and Fruchter, B. The reliability of sociometric measures. Sociometry, 1955, 18, 7-46.
19. Nash, D. J. and Wolfe, A. W. The stranger in laboratory culture. Am. soc. Rev., 1957, 22, 400-405.
20. Patterson, C. H. The classroom teacher and the emotional problems of children. Understanding the child., 1952, 21, 67-72.
21. Phillips, E. L. Shenker, S. and Revitz, P. The assimilation of the new child into the group. Psychiatry, 1951, 14, 317-32.
22. Rasmussen, G. and Zander, A. Group membership and self-evaluation. Hum. Relat., 1954, 7, 239-251.
23. Rath, Louis. Evidence relating to the validity of the social acceptance test. Ed. Res. Bull., 1947, 26, 141.
24. Sherif, Musafer. Superordinate goals in the reduction of inter-group conflict. Am. J. Soc., 1958, 43, 349-356.
25. Thorpe, L. P., Clark, W. W., and Tiegs, E. W. California Test of Personality, 1953 Revision. California Test Bureau, Los Angeles 28, California.