Assessment of Personality Profile of Peer Rejected Children

Prof. Aparajita Chowdhury,

Department of Home Science, Berhampur University, Odisha, India

Ms. Kshamamayee Naik,

Department of Home Science,
Berhampur University, Odisha, India

Ms. Bilasini Mallick,

Department of Home Science,
Berhampur University, Odisha, India

ABSTRACT

The relationship with peers permits a new kind of interpersonal experimentation and exploration, which serve as one of the cornerstones for the development of personality. Present study aims at examining the personality profile of peer rejected school going children and compare them with the personality of peer accepted children. Peer rejected children were found to be shy in nature, disregarding social rules, involved more in anti-social activities, were emotionally less stable, depended, disobedient and have no originality of their own. Further, they were found to be socially immature and were having more negative and inadequate self-concept that made them more anxious, less adjusted and less effective in the tasks required at school and in their real life. Whereas, the peer accepted children were found to be obedient, emotionally stable, and were more creative in nature. They were also found to be less anxious and well adjusted both at school and home. Present findings indicated that the peer-rejected children are 'at risk' and intervention is required to develop positive personality traits so as to be accepted by their peers. An implication of this study has been discussed in the context of providing social skills training to the peer rejected children through 'peer-mediated intervention' in the Indian classroom situation.

Keywords: Peer accepted, Peer Rejected, At-Risk children, Social Skills, Peer mediated Interventions.

INTRODUCTION:

The study of peer socialization and sociometric status in childhood and adolescent years has expanded over the past three decades in the western literature. However, such types of studies are rear in Indian socio-cultural context to provide general understanding of peer socialization and its consequences. Although, Indian society is in transition from every aspect of life and there are many more social problems arising out of it, not much thought has been given to understand the children and adolescents, those are rejected by their peers in some point or other. The interest on peer socialization has been propelled by a number of longitudinal studies demonstrating a clear link between low peer social status in childhood and a variety of detrimental outcomes in adolescence and adulthood including poor school adjustment, school dropout, smoking, drug abuse, delinquency and psychopathology (Dodge, 1983).

Children's social contracts extend beyond the family to include a world of peers. The contacts with peers, serve many significant functions in children's lives and development. The quality of relationship with peers permits a new kind of interpersonal experimentation and exploration, and most particularly a new kind of sensitivity, which will serve as one of the cornerstones for the development of personality, social justice and the capacity to love (Patnaik, 1997). Accordingly, interaction with peers begins to shape children's behaviour and personality at a much earlier stage. Hence, the development of competent relation with peers has long been viewed as one of the most important developmental tasks of childhood.

During childhood years the child's interaction with his /her peers becomes an important part of their life. Peer group has greater impact on children than on adults. The child who spends and lives in an isolated area is found

to be less competent socially and personally than the child who spends most of his time with other children (Chowdhury & Pati, 1997). School age children become aware of one another's mental, physical and personality characteristics, when the peer group is quick to identify its members according to their prominent traits / behaviors. As a result of these interactions they form new perceptions of themselves and become concerned about their popularity among their peer group. Further, they develop flexibility, confirming or other ways of dealing with people. They experience a sense of social belonging or alienation and get caught up in rapidly changing patterns of peer group organization. These inter-personal characteristics of children carry them into their adolescents and adult years. Thus, research has found that unpopular / peer rejected children show a wider discrepancy between their self-ratings and the ratings given to them by others in the group.

Both longitudinal and cross-sectional data suggests that low acceptance among peers is associated with negative outcomes. In particular children who are rejected by their peers seem to be at 'heightened risk' or a wide range of 'mental health' difficulties and are found to be lacking in their competence (Patnaik, 1997). Thus, the failure to establish adequately a place in this world is both a rejection and a precursor of individual maladjustment and rejection. Peer rejection covers a large time frame of development. Consistently across studies, aggressive, withdrawn and inattentive-hyperactive behaviors have predicted peer rejection, whereas prosocial behaviors have been linked with peer acceptance (Newcomb, Bukowski, & Pattee, 1993). The reasonably high level of stability in peer rejection across changing peer contexts (Coie, 1990) has led to the assumption that peer rejection often results from deficits in child social skills (Ladd & Maize, 1983). The consequences of poor peer relationship are isolation or rejection may lead to poor school adjustment, negative traits of personality, juvenile delinquency and mental health problems in later life. Children who are poorly accepted by their peers find social world to be lonely and dissatisfying, and become more isolated and less interactive over time, even though they were highly interactive early in the life of the group. The peer-rejected children would have reason to be unhappy about their social life at school and would feel lonely. Thus they perceive themselves to be less socially competent have less positive expectations for social success and feel more depressed.

The most significant people in child's life is his/her family members and then comes the role of peers and teachers. With their help and guidance certain personality patterns get modified and developed in children (Kuppuswamy). Since, personality development can be controlled by the personality pattern that can also be changed and modified in ways that lead to improve personal and social adjustment (Hurlock, 1989). The early years of life are the critical years in personality development and with each passing years changes are more difficult to accomplish. Each child comes into the school with his/her unique personality and goes out of it as a unique personality. Moreover, concepts of the self come from the contacts children have with people, how they treat children, what they say about children, what status children have in their peer group.

Children's personalities influence their popularity, their social status among their age mates, in turn affects how friendly relaxed, considerate and active they are in social situations. The ways in which children learn to deal with others in seeking peer acceptance often remains an integral part of their personality (Ellis et al., 1981). Personality thus is significantly influenced by the fact that children enter school and become increasingly involved in peer group and community activities. The degree of stability of the self-concept plays an important role in the degree of organization of the personality pattern. Instability comes from conflicting self-concept for the children who are treated by significant people in their lives (such as parents, teachers and peers etc.) When self-concept is positive, children develop strong self-confidence, better self-esteem and the ability to see themselves realistically, which leads to better social adjustment. Children having negative self-concept, lack in self-confidence, develop feelings of inadequacy and inferiority complex, which lead to poor inter-personal as well as social adjustment (Kuppuswamy, 1984). According to Patnaik (1997) peer rejected children mostly behave unsociably, were rebellious and usually aggressive towards others. This ultimately makes them unpopular among their peers, which again reinforces unfavorable behavior among peer-rejected children.

A number of personality characteristics are correlated with peer acceptance and peer rejection. In general, characteristics that are highly valued in the culture such as physical attractiveness are associated with popularity. While physical unattractiveness related to rejection (Larner & Larner, 1977) it even influence an individual's social experience and even potential challenging effects upon social and personality development (Adams, 1977); (Adams & Grossman, 1978). Peer acceptance in the middle-class school related with positive verbal interaction. While in working class school, peer acceptance was related to engagement in positive non-verbal interaction. Middle class children who engaged in positive non-verbal behaviour tended to be more disliked. Disruptiveness and uncooperativeness among children also may lead to peer rejection. Children select friends on the basis of desirable personal attributes such as altruism, honesty and sensitivity. (Hartup, 1989) viewed that individual differences in behaviour are responsible or children's social acceptance and rejection in

peer group. Some behavioral orientations are more predictive of children's peer status than others. Peer rejection and social rejection is related to descriptiveness and aggression at all stages, but the forms of aggression becomes more differentiated and subtle as children get older with increasing age rejection becomes associated with more indirect forms of aggression, self-isolating behaviors and hypersensitivity.

(Coie, 1990) describes several routs by which children in an emergent phase of rejection may become caught in a negative cycle of peer difficulties that maintains itself over time. One route involves the social characteristics of initially rejected children; some children may maintain their rejected status because they continue to exhibit characteristics (either behavioural or non-behavioural) that the peer group holds in low regard. Coie further emphasizes the role of aggression as the largest single behavioral predictor of poor peer status in concurrent as well as predictive studies. He notes, that a variety of other behavioural (e.g., social withdrawal, annoying behaviour, bossiness) as well as non-behavioral (e.g., physical appearance, academic standing) characteristics that persist over time and are poorly tolerated by the larger group which may lead to an ongoing pattern of problematic peer relationships.

According to (Coie, 1990), rejected children were described as aggressive, disruptive, easily angered, often express in angry outbursts, unhappy, more likely to violate social rules and more likely to be inconsiderate of other children. Rejected children were different in more subtle aspects of social behaviors such as not giving and receiving help easily, not sharing or waiting their turn, not knowing how to join a group and being dishonest. Aggression is the primary correlates of rejection, but the form of his behaviors changes with increasing age the behaviors and personality associated with rejected status, shift from over aggression toward more indirect forms of aggression and toward hypersensitivity and being a target of peer ridicule and exclusion. Teachers also report that rejected children are highly aggressive, hyperactive, disruptive and insensitive (Patnaik, 1997). Solitary behaviors such as being off task dawdling, daydreaming or engaging in fantasy behaviour seem to be most closely related to a lack of acceptance and rejected status.

Further, rejected children are dissatisfied with their peer relationships and were actually disliked by the majority of children in their class. The result of observational studies suggested that the daily social climate of rejected children is negative. Rejected children receive fewer positive interactions and more negative treatment from others (Dodge, 1983); (Gottman, Ganso, & Rasnussen, 1975); (Asher & Hymel, 1981). The children without social support from peers would over the long term, are at risk for feelings or extreme loneliness or even depression. Peer relationship especially friendships, provide valuable support during times of life stress. Hence, peer relationship problems would be at risk for stress related difficulties, such as psychosomatic disturbances and personality disorders.

Social behaviour and personality of children are primarily responsible for rejection by peers. Children dislike individual peers not simply because they are deficient in these areas but because of the way they handle themselves with the peer group over issues related to these and other aspects of social interaction. If a child is disliked by a significant number of peers become less socially secure and confident (Asher & Coie, 1990). Children who are accepted in the social group or who from time to time, fill positions of leadership develop self-confidence, pose and poses positive personality traits, in turn with more friends as their popularity increase their poise, self assurance also grow stronger. By contrast, unpopular children feel inferior and being left out of the play activities their age-mates enjoy and they are sullen, irritable. These reactions do not help them to develop the personality traits which will improve their social or group acceptance (Mathews, 1975). Moreover, (Chowdhury, 1990) in her study reflected that, harmonious social interaction is essential for an individual's adjustment in the society. Those who fail to make such adjustments have less chance of growing to their utmost (Chowdhury & Pati, 1997). In addition, children, who are accepted by their peers, got the opportunity from their peers who facilitate development through interaction discussion, intellectual and moral understanding, role taking etc. Thus, this type of peer context may well be a typical medium through which many skills necessary to adjust at adulthood are acquired (Horney, 1937) and further develop the personality of the children.

Hence, the present study aims at studying the general personality profile of the peer-rejected school children as compared to their peer-accepted counterparts in Indian socio-cultural context for understanding them better. Through which to make necessary attempts to bring the rejected children back into the mainstream, to avoid any social problems in future.

METHODOLOGY:

Present study on 'personality profile of the peer rejected children' has following objectives:
(1) To identify the peer rejected children in the classroom situation
(2) To find out the family background of peer rejected children.

(3) To study the personality profile of peer rejected children, as compared to their peer accepted counterparts.

Sample: Out of 600 children between the age group of 10 and 13 years belonging to grade 5th, 6th and 7th. Only one hundred children (50=peer accepted, 50 = peer rejected) were selected as the final sample for the study. These children belonged to both urban and semi-urban areas of Ganjam district of Orissa state of India. Peer nomination and teacher assessment techniques were used to select the extreme cases of peer accepted and peer rejected children from the classroom situation. Utmost care was taken to validate it with the teacher's approval and investigator's own observation, while identifying the peer accepted and peer rejected children.

Tools and Techniques:

1. Identification of the peer-rejected children:

 To select the target children from total sample (600) the peer sociometric scale was administered to all children in their respective classroom in group settings. Researchers had adopted variety of procedures to identify the peer rejected children from the classroom. For present study the standardized tool 'peer nomination scale' was used adopting the procedures of (Coie, 1990) with little modification (suitable for the Indian classroom setting) to select the extreme cases of peer rejected and peer accepted children, after proper validation by the teacher's assessment.

After an introductory explanation by the investigator each student of particular class was provided with the whole list of names of their classmates. Children were asked to nominate their classmates based on their own personal experience (liked most and disliked most). Separate lists were prepared for students belonging to different classrooms. The students were asked to put a tick mark (✓) against the names that they **like most** and put a cross mark (X) whom they don't like. Each child had to give his / her opinion (positive / negative) against their classmates name and was instructed strictly not to consult with each other while expressing his / her opinion. An individual child who fills the form was advised to strike out his or her name from the list. The investigator gave assurance of the secrecy about the choices and thereby gained the confidence of the children and got unbiased response.

After counting the number of tick mark (✓)liked most and liked least (X) scores of each children, the social preference scores were calculated- like most scores (LM) regressed from liked least (LL) scores. In this procedure children were classified according to their social preference scores. Children whose social preference scores were less than 0 and got above 70 percent negative scores were considered as rejected children and children whose social preference scores were more than 0 and got above 70 percent positive scores were considered as popular children (Figure 1) Further, their respective class teacher assessed each child in both the groups (rejected or accepted) to validate their peer assessment of children. On the basis of the teacher's assessment each individual child was placed in respective group. Thus, multi-method (peer and teacher) approach was adopted to identify the peer accepted and peer rejected children from the classroom situation that seems to be biased free.

2. Family background inventory:

In India social and cultural setup family background plays a very important role in reflecting the child's development. The main purpose of this inventory was to find out the family's background and socio-economic status of the sample. The questionnaire consists of various questions regarding their home background (date of birth, ordinal position, total monthly income of the family). For parental education, a five point rating scale was used from low to high education level (below high school, junior college, graduation, post-graduation and Ph.D.). Five point occupational rating scale was used for grading the occupation of the parents. Family monthly income was scored with the help of three point rating scale for low, middle and high-income group families.

3. High School Personality Questionnaire:

To study the personality factors of the peer rejected children, Cattelle and Cattelle's High School Personality Questionnaire (1975) was used, which is good, reliable and valid test of personality. The purpose of the scale was to acquire maximum information in the shortest time about a number of dimensions (14 traits) of personality. The High School Personality Questionnaire scale consisted of 142 questions of multiple choice type. This scale was administered in-group setting in the classroom situations. A hand score able answer the questions by choosing the correct alternative given under each questions as a, b, c. The subjects were instructed to answer by putting cross mark (X) in the square given in the answer sheet for each item a, b, c.

The HSPQ was scored according to the manual (Cattelle and Cattelle, 1975). The completed answer sheet was primary record from which the personality factor scores were obtained. The answer sheet was scored by using two cardboard stencil key, developed in the Institute of Personality and Ability Testing (IPAT) within a very short time. Then the cross mark (X) for each personality factor or traits were added to get a total score. Similarly same process was adopted to get 14 raw scores such as A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, O, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4, mentioned in the answer sheet by using these two cardboard stencil keys children who scored highest score or more than cut off points (see Table-1) considered as warm-hearted (A+), bright (B+), emotionally stable, mature (C+), conscientious (G+), Adventures, socially bold (H+), Sensitive (I+), reflective, internally restrained (J+), self-reproaching, insecure (O+), self-sufficient, resourceful (Q_2+) Controlled, Socially precise (Q_3+), tense (Q_4+). Children who scored lowest score or less than cut-off points considered as reserved a aloof (A-), dull (B-), emotionally less stable (C-), undemonstrative (D-), obedient mild (E-), sober, serious (F-), disregards rule (G-), shy (H-1), tough minded, rejects illusions (I-1), liking group action (J-) self-assured secure (O-) sociably group dependent (Q_2-1), unctrolled careless of social rules (Q_{3-}), not frustrated (Q_{4-}).

Table 1: Interpretation and classification of the raw scores for Personality Questionnaire

Competent	Highest score	Lowest score	Cut-off point
A	13	6	9.5
B	13	5	9.0
C	14	6	10.0
D	13	7	10.0
E	13	8	10.15
F	16	4	10.0
G	12	6	9.0
H	16	6	11.5
I	12	7	9.5
J	14	7	10.5
O	13	7	10.0
Q_2	14	7	10.5
Q_3	13	7	10.0
Q_4	16	7	11.5

Note: More than cut-off points = Positive personality
Less than cut-off points = Negative personality

Data Analysis:
Mean, standard deviation and dependent 't' test were calculated for personality scores and family background scores of peer rejected and peer accepted children to find out the personality profile and family background of the children of both groups.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The results and discussions for the present investigation have two main aspects – family background and personality profile of the peer accepted and peer rejected groups. In order to obtain better understanding regarding the peer rejected and peer accepted children were also taken into consideration. In India, studying family background is essential as it plays a very important role in shaping the personality of the child. Moreover, the parents and other family members shape much of the child's behaviour and attitude, than the peers in general.

Family background of the sample:
A total of eight scores were obtained to find out the family background of peer rejected children as compared to their peer accepted counterparts.

**Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) scores on Family Background
information of Peer Accepted and Peer Rejected Children**

Sl. No.	Variables	Peer accepted Children (N=50)		Peer rejected Children (N=50)	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1.	Ordinal position	1.50	0.64	3.12	0.05
2.	Number of siblings	2.12	0.76	4.00	1.14
3.	Number of family members	4.44	0.75	6.62	1.29
4.	Maternal Education	4.08	0.56	1.81	1.04
5.	Paternal Education	4.68	0.46	3.62	0.85
6.	Maternal Occupation	1.92	1.99	0.31	0.91
7.	Paternal occupation	4.68	0.46	3.21	1.57
8.	Total family Income*	2.68	0.47	1.68	0.68

Note: *Total family income: 3- High Income, 2 – Middle Income, 1 – Low Income

The results of the present study revealed that the peer rejected children were usually third or later born which Freud's disciple Alfred Adler supports (1930) and predicted that different types personalities evolve depending upon one's ordinal position in the family. More middle born children are regarded as extremely unpopular by their peers than of the children in any other birth orders. Present study also found that the peer-rejected children came from large and uneducated family, having large number of brothers and sisters. Rejected children's parents were found to be lacking love and affection toward their children. This may be due to the reason that, because of so many children parents were unable to provide necessary guidance and attention to all the children. May be only the eldest and youngest get the care and attention more than the middle born. This view is well supported by the studies done by Dunn and McGuire (1990); (Hartup, 1989) and (Maccoby, 1980) with large number of children particularly in families with over six children, family roles tend to become precisely defined, chores are assigned and disciple is more authoritarian and severe (Bossard & Boll, 1960), There is little time for reasoning and extended explanations. In India majority of parents are struggling to get the means for their family and lack of proper awareness regarding childcare and providing necessary guidance to their children. Especially among low social class families, where large number of family members live together, caring the children properly is a rear expectation one can have.

As family size increases, the mother exhibits not only less attention but also less warmth towards the individual children. The parents in the large family cannot interact as closely with their children as that of small family. The results of this relationship are reflected in greater independence but lower academic achievement of children from larger families. Many studies suggested that the family environment provided by parents and parental behaviors with the child might be major factor in early and continuing education of child. According to (Gupta & Gupta, 1978) mother's education, occupational status influences the personality development of the children to a greater extent. Since, in the present study the mothers of the peer-rejected children were not educated; their interaction with their children might be poor and inadequate as well.

It has been found out that children with low acceptance and disapproved by their peers are said to have come from the families with low social status. In Rochester longitudinal study it was indicated that, family social status had a major impact on the cognitive competence and personality development of children. Many other studies indicate that socio-economic status (SES) has an impact on the development of personality and intellectual growth. Tajfel and Turner (1979) have also suggested that there are differences in status between groups; the higher status groups may behave differently from the lower status group in order to enhance social identity. The low-grade occupations of the parents of peer rejected children might be an indirect reason for their children's peer social status and a sense of inferiority complex among these children. Hence, in the present study family variables might have affected the personality development of peer rejected children to some extent. Moreover, it is very much clear from this study that, the peer accepted children came from the families with better socio-economic status, educated parents and less number of family members. It is quite evident that the mothers of peer accepted children were more educated, which might have some strong impact on their children's pro-social behaviour. In India society, more than the fathers, mothers play significant role in shaping the child's body and mind.

Personality Profile of the sample:

A total of 14 scores were calculated for each child to study the personality profile of both peer rejected and peer accepted children. The children having negative personality traits were mostly found to be rejected by their peers. They rated themselves as reserved, aloof, dull, emotionally less stable, mild, sober, disregards social rules, very much relaxed, self-assured tough minded and shy in nature. It was also observed that the children who were having positive personality traits belonged to peer accepted group who rated themselves as warm hearted, emotionally more stable / mature, excitable, moralistic, tender minded and self-sufficient.

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) and 't' value of personality factors of Peer Accepted and Peer Rejected Children

Sl. No.	Personality factors	Peer accepted Children (N=50)		Peer Rejected Children (N=50)		't' value
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1	A	9.60	1.82	8.52	1.14	3.41***
	B	9.10	1.83	8.04	2.65	3.27
	C	9.66	1.86	8.56	1.14	2.81***
	D	10.58	1.66	9.24	1.28	4.50***
	E	10.20	1.17	10.04	1.81	1.08
	F	10.48	2.77	8.04	1.86	5.17***
	G	9.28	1.52	8.92	1.14	1.41
	H	10.58	1.96	8.52	1.21	6.77**
	I	9.56	2.22	9.12	1.11	1.15
	J	11.06	2.15	9.28	1.05	5.42***
	O	9.78	1.21	8.52	1.21	4.63***
	Q_2	10.52	1.77	9.12	1.08	4.38***
	Q_3	10.00	1.81	9.40	1.94	2.03***
	Q_4	14.64	2.36	9.08	0.98	4.11***

Sears (1957) a behaviorist and a learning theorist deal with social aspects of children said that during late childhood years, children's dependency on the teachers and peer increases. It may be the negative and positive pattern of attention seeking which increase with cooperative efforts with their peers. The findings of the present study reflects that peer rejected children showed more negative personality traits such as they were more-depended, disorganized and showed anti-social behaviour. A healthy and stable mind enabled peer accepted children to be engaged more in favorable activities among their peer group. This might have a positive effect on their personality. Moreover, the attitudes of their peers towards this acceptable group were positive and thus showed more acceptable behaviour. (Horney, 1937) in his social theory reflects that the insecure and anxious child (reflected) develops various strategies with his feelings of isolation and helplessness. While (Erikson, 1968) in his theory shows that during school age a sense of duty and accomplishment develops the scholastic and social competencies among children. On the other hand, some children due to poor work habits avoid strong competition and feel doomed, lead a life with sense of futility in them. Changes in personality during childhood do not occur spontaneously but are the results of maturity, experience, pressure from the social and cultural environment and of course the child's temperament. It also appears from the present study that peer accepted children rated themselves doing well in scholastic and social competency with a sense of industry and superior. While peer rejected children on the other hand developed a feeling of inferiority complex within them. On the basis of (Eysenck, 1950) Factor theory, the trait of sociability, impulsiveness, activity, liveliness and excitability grouped under extroversion. In contrast to these characteristics the introverted person tends to be passive, controlled, calm and reliable. Likewise, it is reflected in the present study that the peer rejected children tend to be pessimistic, depended, felt unwanted, uncontrolled, disorganized, disregards rules and very calm. Supporting these findings Hurlock (1989) stated that during childhood social attitudes and peer group are more favorable towards peer accepted children. These children have more desirable personality characteristics. This reinforces favorable social attitudes towards them and thus influences positively on their self-concept. As a result they are more confident, more relaxed and friendlier. On the other hand in case of peer rejected children

unfavorable social treatment on the part of the peer rejected children leads to negative personality traits and thus rejection by their peers.

Peer accepted children in the present study rated themselves as more sociable, excitable, emotionally more stable prevailing group standard very sensitivity to their needs. Whereas peer rejected children found to be dull, reserved, emotionally less stable, were inactive and often disregards social rules (Hethrington & Parke, 1986). Moreover, rejected children were found to possess inadequate personality traits. These types of children feel insecure and are observed to have feelings of inferiority complex, tend to think themselves incompetent, unsuccessful in their relations to others. They were very much irresponsible towards their work and shy in nature. Very often they loose their self-confident (Combs & Snygg, 1959). It was also reflected from the works of Ellis *et al.*, (1981) and (Paplia, 1989) that positive personality among children makes them proud, satisfied, consisted, arrogant, overconfident, motivated, willing to help others and build up self-confidence. Whereas children having negative personality characteristics tend to develop failure complex, seek more advice and help, always unsure of their abilities and were gloomy and unhappy.

CONCLUSION:

It can be broadly assumed that there seems to exist a relationship between family background, children's peer social status and personality development. Low level of family resources was found to have certain links with negative personality traits, leading to rejection among peers. The poor-rejected children were usually third born or more, have large number of family members and came from low-income families. Their parents were less educated and have low occupational level. On the basis of findings of present study it can also be concluded that due to the poor family background, poor parent child interaction and lack of positive behavioral and personality traits, the children were found to be rejected by their peers. Whereas, peer accepted children were found to have a healthy and enriching family environment as compared to their counterparts. Their parents were better educated and had better family income to maintain their families successfully.

The poor-rejected children were found to posses more negative personality traits. They were very shy in nature, disregard social rules, emotionally less stable, disobedient and have no originality of their own. On the other hand poor-accepted children may be better accepted in the classroom.

Rejection is a social process, yet the focus of most of the research both in terms of courses, consequences and intervention paradigms have been on the individual rejected child. Children's successful adjustment to family life affects their ability to adjust to the outside world. As the structure of family changes, there is greater need for positive communication about issues that affect children's self-respect and self-regard. One context for this communication is the family meeting, which provides opportunities for parents and children to talk about concerns, make decisions and suggest ways to solve problems. Since, in India the extended family structure still exists and parents have to struggle for the basic livelihood, and may not have the scope for having good interaction and communication with their children. However, they may be encouraged to have closer interaction during the family eating time with all the family members.

Other ways of helping these rejected children can be by establishing balance curricula that meet children's needs: Teachers, Administrators and parents must be informed about what children are expected to learn and how they learn best. We need to employ sensitive teachers to promote children's abilities and who recognize the power of their pedagogic task. School age children need safe and super visual care in which they are involved in activities appropriate their stage of development. They also need teachers who understand them, their families and their needs.

Moreover, social skills training through the peers may have positive impact on personality development of children belonging to poor-rejected group, which may further help them in developing their inner-feeling, abilities competent and foster positive behaviour. It can be well being given in the classroom situation involving teachers as well. Further, parent's awareness regarding the importance of developing positive peer relationship is required. The significance of 'peer culture' is gaining momentum; hence, ignorance in this regard may bring devastating effect on children's normal growth and development. In the world of competition, materialism, it is the human nature and personality that can have edge over everything. Thus, developing positive, healthy and strong personality among children is the call of the day and need for the parents to help and assist their children for their optimal growth and development.

REFERENCES:

Adams, G. (1977). Physical Attractiveness: Toward a developmental social psychology of beauty. *Human Development, 20*, 217-239.

Adams, G., & Grossman, S. (1978). *Physical Attractiveness: A cultural imperative.* Rosying Heights, N.Y.: Libra Publishing.

Asher, S., & Coie, J. (1990). *Peer rejection in childhood.* N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.

Asher, S., & Hymel, S. (1981). Children's social competence in peer relations: sociometric and behavioural assessment. In J. W. (eds.), *Social Competence* (pp. 125-157). N.Y.: Guilford.

Bossard, J., & Boll, E. (1960). *The sociology of the child development.* N.Y.

Chowdhury, A. (1990). Development of social competence in Children. *International Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 10*(1-2), 55-69.

Chowdhury, A., & Pati, C. (1997). Effect of selected family variables on social preference, academic achievement and self-concept of elementary school children. *Early Child Development and Care, 137*, 133-143.

Coie, J. D. (1990). Towards a theory of peer rejection. In S. A. (eds.), *Peer rejection in childhood* (pp. 365-401). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Combs, A., & Snygg, D. (1959). Social influence, socialization and the development of social cognition: The heart of the matters. In N. E. (Ed.), *Advances in developmental psychology* (pp. 190-215). New York: Wiley.

Dodge, K. A. (1983). Behavioural antecendnts of peer social status. *Child Development, 7*, 1386-1389.

Ellis, S., Rogff, B., & Gomer, C. (1981). Age segregation is children's social itesactious. *Developmental psychology, 17*, 399-407.

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity growth and crisis.* New York: Norton.

Eysenck, H. (1950). *The structure of human Personality.* New York: Wiley.

Gottman, J., Ganso, J., & Rasnussen, B. (1975). Social interaction, social competence and friendship in children. *Child Development, 46*, 709-718.

Gupta, M., & Gupta, P. (1978). Areas of adolescent problems and the relationship between them. *Indian Psychological Review, 6*(3-4), 1-4.

Hartup, W. (1989). Social relationships and their developmental significance. *American Psychologist, 44*, 120-126.

Hethrington, E., & Parke, D. (1986). *Child psychology: A contemporary viewpoint* (3rd ed.). New Delhi: McGrawHill Inc.

Horney, K. (1937). *Neurotic personality of our times.* New York: Norton.

Hurlock, E. (1989). *Developmental psychology: A life span approach.* New Delhi: Tata McGrawHill Inc.

Kuppuswamy, B. (1984). *A textbook of child behaviours* (4th ed.). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

Ladd, G., & Maize, J. (1983). A Cognitive-social learning model of social skill training. *Psychological review, 90*, 127-167.

Larner, R., & Larner, J. (1977). Effects of age, sex and physical attractiveness on child peer relations, academic performance, an elementary school adjustment. *Development Psychology, 13*, 585-590.

Maccoby, E. (1980). *Social development, psychological growth and the parent –child relationship.* New York: Has Caurth, Brace, Jovanovich.

Mathews, L. (1975). Improving the self image of the socially disabled. *Journal of Home Economics, 67*(3), 9-11.

Newcomb, A., Bukowski, W., & Pattee, L. (1993). Children's peer relations: A meta-analysis review of popular, neglected, controversial and average sociometric status. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 99-128.

Paplia, D. (1989). *Human Development.* New York: McGrawHill Inc.

Patnaik, S. (1997). Assessing social competence in peer rejected children. *Unpublished Ph.D. thesis*. Orissa, India: Berhampur University.