A STUDY OF THE PEER ACCEPTANCE OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN WITHIN THE INTEGRATED CLASS IN NAIROBI

BY

MUGAMBI DOYNE KAGENI

A PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION, KENYATTA UNIVERSITY.
DECLARATION

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university Supervisor.

DR. SAMMY TUMUTI

This thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other University.

MUGAMBI DOYNE KAGENI

(Candidate)
DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to all the members of Mugambi Kamunde’s family for their support and understanding.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all those people who, in one way or another, assisted me during the course of this study. In particular I would like to thank my supervisor Doctor Sammy Tumuti. His constructive criticisms and encouragement saw me through the different stages of this study. I am also grateful to other members of the Department of Psychology and the Institute of Continuing Education not forgetting Professor M. M. Patel and Prof. H. O. Ayot.

Special thanks go to my husband Eliphas Mugambi and my children Annette Kawira and Brenda Kathoni who were very understanding during this trying period.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends and particularly the members of Masters of Educational Psychology (M. Ed.) class. The going was sometimes rough and it was refreshing to have such interesting and interested colleagues around.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of Thesis</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Tables</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION........................................... 1
1.1 Background........................................... 1
1.2 Statement of the problem................. 7
1.3 Research questions............................ 8
1.4 Purpose of the study......................... 9
1.5 Significance of the study.................. 9
1.6 Scope of the study............................ 10
1.7 Limitations of the study.................... 10
1.8 Assumptions........................................ 11
1.9 Definitions of terms......................... 11
3.7 Scoring of the attitude test................................................ 29

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 Results................................................................................. 30
4.1 Introduction........................................................................... 30
4.2 Data for research question one............................................. 30
4.3 Data for research question two............................................. 31
4.4 Data for research question three........................................... 33
4.5 Data for research question four............................................ 34
4.6 Summary results.................................................................... 36

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 Discussion and conclusions................................................ 37
5.1 Introduction........................................................................... 37
5.2 Interpretations of findings related to research questions........... 37
5.3 Considerations of peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped children................................................ 37
5.4 Comparisons of age and peer acceptance............................ 38
5.5 Considerations of response to gender................................... 39
5.6 Considerations of findings related to integration................... 39
5.7 Conclusions.......................................................................... 40
5.8 Recommendations.............................................................. 41
5.9 Recommendations for further Research.............................. 43
REFERENCES ........................................................................................................... 44

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Likert scale Questionnaire .............................................................. 51
Appendix B: Sociometric Questionnaire .............................................................. 55
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total pupil sample per school and gender distribution per school</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Class distribution in total pupil sample</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age distribution in the total sample</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chi-square comparison of peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children by the non-handicapped children</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chi-square comparison of age difference in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gender difference in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children by the non-handicapped children</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pupils attitude towards integration of the physically handicapped children with the non-handicapped children</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

This study focused on the physically handicapped children within the integrated class in Nairobi. It aimed at determining whether or not the physically handicapped children were accepted by the non-handicapped. It also sought to establish if there were any gender and age differences in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children and if attitudes towards integration were related to peer acceptance.

The sample of this study was drawn from three schools situated in Nairobi. These were two primary schools and one secondary school. Purposive sampling was used to select a sample of eleven (11) children who were physically handicapped. Eighty nine (89) non-handicapped children were included to make a total sample of one hundred pupils' (100).

Two instruments were used. A Sociometric test and a Likert type questionnaire to measure pupils' attitudes towards the physically handicapped children by the non-handicapped.

The results of the study revealed that:

i) There was no significant difference in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children by the non-handicapped.

ii) Peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children by the non-handicapped children become greater progressively as children grow up.
iii) There was no significant difference between girls and boys in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children.

iv) There was a positive relationship between integration of the physically handicapped and non-handicapped and peer acceptance.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

A study carried out by Rocher (1961) suggests that societal perception and treatment of the physically handicapped children are neither homogeneous nor static. This statement infers that the attitudes toward the physically handicapped children differ across cultures and change from time to time.

Variations in the treatment of the physically handicapped children are manifest in all parts of the world including Africa (Walker, 1978). Some treated them positively whereas others were negative. Plato (1974) for example, was of the opinion that the physically handicapped children should be put away in some “mysterious unknown place” p.75.

The African traditional societies had a variety of views and responses towards the physically handicapped children. The Meru people in Kenya for example, viewed the physically handicapped children as an embarrassment to the community. Consequently, they were taken to the forest and left there to await their death (Mbiti, 1973). The Chagga of Tanzania perceived the physically handicapped children as possessed by the evil spirits. Care was thus taken not to harm them.
since they believed that they were protecting their society. They offered communal attention to such children. The community contributed foodstuff to the families where these children were found and they would visit them regularly.

The Wanga of the Luhya community in Kenya consider the physically handicapped children as a blessing. According to this community, a rich man cannot be able to sustain his wealth unless he has a physically handicapped child. This community therefore ensured that such children were protected and well fed. It was also their responsibility to make them happy so that through their happiness the riches of the community could be increased (Mbiti, 1973).

Others like the Nuer of Nigeria viewed the physically handicapped children as undergoing punishment by gods due to disobedience of the individual or on the part of the parents. Due to their fear of the unknown, the society either abandoned or killed the physically handicapped children (Field, 1956).

Among the Ashanti of Ghana, children with obvious physical handicaps were anticipated as bringing bad omen to the community and were killed upon birth (Rottary, 1952).

In Benin, children born with physical handicaps were taken to be under the guardianship of special supernatural agents. They were received well since they were believed to bring good luck. (Wright, 1960). Children who became
physically handicapped later in life were ridiculed by their peers as observed by Abila and Kang’ethe (1991).

Questions by the society regarding physical handicaps in Africa often found answers in superstition (Mbiti, 1973). While globalization has brought about many changes, the residue of traditional beliefs influence present day practices and attitudes towards the physically handicapped children (Wright, 1960). With the advent of modern science and technology, information regarding causes of physical handicaps have been provided. As a result views based on unnatural causes have weakened. Hobbs (1975) for example, is of the opinion that medical causes of physical handicaps range from pre-natal, peri-natal to post-natal. Pre-natal causes are generally attributed to injuries, accidents or illness that occur before birth. Peri-natal factors include complications that a child may suffer from in the process of delivery. These complications are such as lack of oxygen, which causes brain damage resulting in cerebral palsy. Children with cerebral palsy have disturbances in their motor functions and end up being physically handicapped. Post-natal causes range from malnutrition to bacterial or viral infections, which result in poliomyelitis. Other causes include burns and accidents.

Auka and Afedo (1985) conducted a study of the causes of physical handicaps at Port Reitz special school in Mombasa and Dagoretti children’s centre in Nairobi. From the results, poliomyelitis was found to be the leading cause of physical handicaps in Kenya with 51.95%. This shows the importance of hygiene and
immunization. Cerebral palsy conditions ranked second with 13%. Muscular
dystrophy 2.6%, spina bifida 2.16%. This is in contrast to the causes of physical
disabilities in England where in 1914 cerebral palsy ranked first with 2,451 cases.
Authorities in the field of education in Kenya no wonder indicate that attitudes
towards the physically handicapped children are a major hindrance to their
acceptance by their peers (Njoroge, 1991). An important factor to note is that peer
acceptance of any child is an important factor in determining later social
adjustments. It’s even more important if the child is physically handicapped. The
responsibility to ensure that peer acceptance is attained is left to the society.
Therefore, the society has been discouraging segregated education whereby
physically handicapped children are educated on their own. There has been a lot of
emphasis on integrated learning where children who are physically handicapped
can learn side by side with those who are not handicapped (Kibis, 1974).
Providing special education was pin-pointed as a way through which the
physically handicapped children could be accepted by their peers. It is for this
reason that programmes for the physically handicapped children were started. For
example, Dagoretti School for the Physically handicapped was started in the early
1940s whereas Joyland School in Kisumu and Mombasa Secondary School were
started in 1960s. Before Kenya became independent, Dagoretti Children’s Centre
was the only one catering for the physically handicapped children: primary for
example, was providing custodial care. Most of the children in this school were
physically handicapped. Their physical welfare rather than their academic welfare
was considered the priority. The number of programmes and schools that are providing education and other services to the physically handicapped has grown steadily since then throughout the country. This has been possible partly with the assistance of church bodies and Red Cross (Ministry of Education Report, 1976).

Upon attainment of independence in 1963, the Government of Kenya resolved that it should continue to promote the education of the physically handicapped children just like it was doing for the normal children (Ndururumo, 1985). Therefore, in 1964, the Kenya Education Commission was set up under the chairmanship of Prof. Ominde to investigate among other things the formulation and implementation of educational policies considering the available resources. The commission was also to address the needs of the physically handicapped children. They were to examine and report on the existing machinery for co-ordinating services for the physically handicapped children. Among other findings, the commission noted that people are now accepting that a physically handicapped child is in majority of cases, a normal child faced with some disadvantages.

The Kenya Government’s concern for the physically handicapped children was further realized in the establishment of the Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE) which opened its doors in 1986. This institution was established to meet the need for trained manpower to handle the rapidly expanding special education programmes (Kristensen, 1989). In addition, the government has set up a number of educational assessment and resource centres in the country. However, these
facilities are not enough for the high population of the physically handicapped children in Kenya. Writing in the Kenya Times, Abilla (1985) had the following to say about this population.

The population of the physically handicapped children is estimated to be two million. Out of this number, there are about six thousand physically handicapped children being served in forty two schools and units in Kenya (p.11).

Initially, the physically handicapped children were conceptualized as a minority group and were granted a separate place in the society (Mbiti, 1973). With time, special institutions were set up with an assumption that they would cater for the needs of the physically handicapped. This trend has been progressively changing slowly. Currently physically handicapped children are being integrated into the regular schools. This is due to the fact that special institutions were isolating the physically handicapped children from the rest of the non-handicapped children (Beatrice, 1986). The new approach gives an opportunity to the physically handicapped children to interact with their non-handicapped peers.

To pursue on the issue of integration for peer acceptance, Kenya Institute of Education (1987) noted that the physically handicapped children will get encouragement from the non-handicapped. This creates a non-restrictive environment that is necessary for the growth and development of the physically handicapped child.
Gachathi Report (1976), proposed integration of the physically handicapped children with the non—handicapped and recommended;

Firstly to follow a policy of integration of the physically handicapped children. Secondly, to expand the existing amenities and establish more services to the physically handicapped children. (p.48).

Education of the physically handicapped has been going on alongside the non-handicapped children. This study attempts therefore to find out whether the physically handicapped children are accepted by their non-handicapped peers within the integrated class.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The issue of education in Kenya occupies a vital part of the government policy. The government is committed to enhancing education in general and the education of the physically handicapped children in particular. The purpose of this study will be to investigate peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children in the integrated class. Integrating physically handicapped and non-handicapped children according to Dahl, Tangerud and Vistie (1982) expresses a wish to break down divisions of non acceptance of the handicapped by the non-handicapped at classroom level. Through integration, children whether handicapped or not learn to accept one another. Failure to realize co-existence between the physically handicapped and the non-handicapped may lead to non-acceptance of the physically handicapped children (Amoako, 1977).
Generally, children who are not accepted by their peers have a development risk in matters concerning language behaviour, ability to concentrate and understand. They also develop a sense of inferiority. The case is even worse if the child is physically handicapped (Gadow, 1982).

It is widely acknowledged that non-restrictive environments such as the integrated classes are socially stimulating to the physically handicapped children. Such an environment encourages positive peer relations.

This study therefore intends to investigate peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children within their integrated class in Nairobi.

1.3 Research Questions

1. To what extent are the physically handicapped children accepted by their non-handicapped peers in school in an integrated class?

2. Does peer acceptance become greater or lessens as the child grows up?

3. Do non-handicapped boys and girls accept their physically handicapped peers in the same way?

4. Is there any relationship between integration and peer acceptance?
1.4 **Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study is to:

1. Establish whether the physically handicapped children are accepted by their non-handicapped peers within the social environment of their class.

2. Determine how other variables like gender, age difference and integration are related to peer acceptance.

1.5 **Significance of the study**

It is anticipated that the results of this study will be of great use to:

1. The understanding of peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children by the non-handicapped within Nairobi.

2. Influencing greater peer acceptance through investigating variables like gender, age difference and integration in relation to peer acceptance. It is hoped that the study will provide evaluation results of how the social distance between the physically handicapped and the non-handicapped can be strengthened.

3. Formulation of future education policies on integration of the physically handicapped and non-handicapped. The study will determine whether integration is positive to peer acceptance. If it is, integration will be seen as
successful in enhancing peer acceptance of the physically handicapped. If not, policy makers could find out why hence be able to come up with policies that will correct the situation.

4. Educational planners in the designing of the most appropriate games and activities suited to the needs of the physically handicapped children. Specifically, this study could be beneficial to the Kenya Institute of Education. This study will address gender in relation to peer acceptance. It will be an eye opener to educational planners to strengthen diverse activities in the curriculum that will incorporate both male and females that are physically handicapped and non-handicapped. This in turn will enhance peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped.

1.6 Scope of the study

This study was focused on the physically handicapped children both in primary and secondary schools. All the schools were located within Nairobi. The variables that were studied in relation to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children were age difference, gender and integration.

1.7 Limitations of the study

1. This study was limited only to regular schools that have physically handicapped pupils in Nairobi.
2. The presence of a stranger in class seeking information about a physically handicapped child is something which can result in some strong negative emotional feelings from a pupil. Some of them were not at ease to answer certain questions.

1.8 Assumptions

The researcher made the following assumptions while carrying out this study:

1. All the respondents would be sincere in responding to the questionnaire.

2. The nomination of a particular child by another in the sociometric items reflect peer acceptance of the chosen by the one who chose.

1.9 Definition of terms

**Attitude** - An internal state which affects an individual's choice of action towards another person or the way in which classmates react to an individual who has a physical handicap.

**Acceptance** - Receiving interest from non-handicapped children due to ability to perform an activity in a manner considered normal within the range of non-handicapped children.
Handicap- A disadvantage for a given individual resulting from an impairment that prevents the fulfilment of a role that is considered normal (WHO, 1980).

Integration- The inclusion of handicapped children in as many educational activities as possible which the non-handicapped children participate in while being educated in regular schools.

Physical handicap- A disability which retards, distorts and adversely affects normal growth, development and adjustment to life for a substantial period or permanently.

Special Education- Individually designed institutional services to meet the unique educational needs of handicapped children.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 Review of literature

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses literature related to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children. It also presents studies pertinent to variables that influence peer acceptance such as age difference, gender and integration.

2.2 Theoretical Rationale

Loring (1975) observes that peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children influences their development. Further, Crow and Crow (1956) were of the opinion that peer acceptance is one of the basic needs for the physically handicapped.

Whereas we know that social relationships are important sources of peer acceptance, research has shown that physically handicapped children are segregated and not accepted by other children due to lack of awareness (Kazungu, 1987).

An important fact to note is that the acceptance of physically handicapped children influences self-confidence and worth of such a child. He/she finds it easy to adjust and shape his relationship with the rest of the children in the class. Non-acceptance
damages the physically handicapped child and finally the child becomes withdrawn.

2.3 Variables

2.4 Peer Acceptance

Every child whether physically handicapped or not needs a balance of affection and peer acceptance. He/she needs to form friendships that lead him/her to gain self-confidence. Physically handicapped children also need to be understood so that they can be able to share roles with their peers (Groenewegen, 1984).

Previous studies on social acceptability of the physically handicapped children indicate that physical contact is not adequate to improve non-handicapped acceptance of the physically handicapped children within their class. The acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped were measured using a sociometric questionnaire. The results showed that younger physically handicapped children were less accepted by the non-handicapped peers (Strain, 1981).

Njoroge (1991) in his study on factors influencing initiation of successful mainstreaming of the handicapped students in Kenya, found that students who were handicapped were not accepted by their peers and that their peers were rejecting them in class. In response, the handicapped preferred a segregated setting. He observed that the handicapped usually carry some implements to assist
them in their movements. These implements make the other children to stay away from them. This is as opposed to the non-handicapped students who may be able to run fast and occupy the front chairs in class. From these studies we can therefore expect that the physically handicapped children will be treated differently in terms of peer acceptance.

Other researchers such as Alport (1954) suggest that peer acceptance is acquired through exposure. He further explains that there is a small proportion of peer acceptance that is acquired through first hand experience.

It is worth noting that unless peer acceptance is encouraged through interaction, frustration is likely to be experienced by the physically handicapped children. We should not assume that if physically handicapped children attend integrated schools they will be accepted by other non-handicapped peers. Awareness should be created to make them understand the physically handicapped as suggested (Asher, 1975).

In a case study by UNESCO (1974) on effective methods of integration, it was found that non-handicapped children who have gone to the same schools with the physically handicapped accept them more and are more positive to their plight. They recognize their abilities and limitations.

In support of peer acceptance of the physically handicapped, Mr. Mwai Kibaki who was Vice President of the Republic of Kenya in 1984 urged that giving was
not the ideal solution to the problem facing the physically handicapped children. He further asserted that giving discourages creativity and quest. Hence, what the physically handicapped children desired most was unprejudiced acceptance and opportunity (Nation, August 6, 1984, p.3).

In view of the literature reviewed, we can say that a non-handicapped child is more acceptable than a physically handicapped child by their peers. It can therefore be hypothesized in this study that non-handicapped peers will accept children with no physical handicap more than children who are physically handicapped.

2.5 Age

Studies done by MCLean and Handline (1990) to establish when non-handicapped children first become aware of physical handicaps indicate that at the age of four years this awareness is built but less obvious handicaps were noted at a later age. They found that at this age, children with physical handicaps would become socially accepted by their non-handicapped peers. The reason they gave for that situation was that young children were not keen on their physical handicaps. Therefore, it was easy for them to interact and as far as they were concerned the physical handicap was only a functional limitation.

In another study by Kazungu (1987), it was observed that as physically handicapped children progress in age, unfavourable attitude towards them by the
non-handicapped were exhibited. Mbindyo and Nkinyangi (1981) studied the conditions of the disabled in Kenya and found that three to four year old children were less aware of developmental expectations than were those of school age. They were more helpful to the physically handicapped children than the other children who openly rejected them. From the above studies we can hypothesize that younger physically handicapped children are likely to be subjected to less rejection by their peers than the older children.

2.6 Gender

Review of literature in this area indicated that females were more likely to have positive attitude toward their physically handicapped peers than males. Females were also not likely to make harsh judgements of the handicapped children like the males (Mwaipopo, 1983).

Groenewegen (1984) in his study of the integration of the physically handicapped in Kenya noted that though recreation is important for both sexes, boys attach more importance to plays and games. A boy who can not participate in such games especially due to his physical handicap is likely to face rejection from his non-handicapped peers.

The hypothesis that can be drawn from the above studies is that girls accept their physically handicapped peers more than boys.
2.7 Integration

There is currently an increasing trend toward integrating physically handicapped children into regular programmes. For many years, it was felt that regular schools were simply not an appropriate environment for children with physical limitations.

Evans (1995) studied how peer integration was related to formation of peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children in America. His findings were that peer integration was initiated to provide the physically handicapped children with the greatest opportunity to achieve personal fulfillment. But that did not achieve peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children.

Groenewegen (1984) in his study of integration of the handicapped in Kenya found that people had various reasons for not being in favour of integration of the physically handicapped into the regular schools. These were such as:

2.7:1 Regular schools did not cater for skills required for physically handicapped children.

2.7:2 Special attention to physically handicapped children would be at the cost of attention to the non-handicapped.

2.7:3 Special provisions were too costly for regular schools to provide just for the sake of a few physically handicapped children.

2.7:4 The physically handicapped children got on well with fellow handicapped.
2.7:5 They could compete, encourage each other and learn special skills together.

2.7:6 Parents of the non-handicapped would not be happy to find their children being educated with the physically handicapped children. To the parents, this would be detrimental to the progress of their non-handicapped children.

Munyi (1983) also holds that integration cannot lead to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children if it just starts in the class without having prepared the family environment. Karugu (1983) contends that it is extremely important for the developing countries not only to practice physical integration but also maximise sharing of activities and have a positive attitude towards the physically handicapped children in the society, particularly in the class.

To expand the concept of integration, Solder (1980) states that there are three main forms of integration. A brief description of each is as follows:

2.7:7 Physical Integration

This is when a special class or unit is attached to an ordinary school but without much relationship. Karugu (1983) emphasizes that physical integration should not be the only one to be encouraged. Other types of integration that encourage peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children should be introduced.
2.7:8 Social integration

Social integration is a situation whereby both physically handicapped and non-handicapped pupils come into regular contact to the extent that the pupils feel and behave like the non-handicapped children. Regular contact would be in form of class activities such as discussions and playing games. This influences peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children.

Addressing a national conference for the disabled in Nairobi, former President of Kenya, Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi was of the opinion that the physically handicapped children have the same natural urge to achieve their objectives and to be integrated with their peers to enhance peer acceptance of the physically handicapped. He was quoted as saying:

...they (physically handicapped) desire to be integrated with the others for nation building...no man can feel accepted and respected if his self-actualization is denied him/her first by his/her handicap and secondly by the peers she/he lives with (Kenya Times, August 6, 1984, p.3).

The review of literature on this part reaches a conclusion that integration can lead to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped if the attitude of the non-handicapped children is changed. Through integration, physically handicapped children are likely to be accepted by their non-handicapped peers.

2.8 Research hypothesis

1. The physically handicapped children are accepted less than the non-handicapped.
2. Peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children lessens progressively as the children grow older.

3. Non-handicapped girls accept their physically handicapped girls peers more than boys do to their physically handicapped boys.

4. There is a positive relationship between integration of the physically handicapped and the non-handicapped, and peer acceptance.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 Research Methodology and the Design of the study

3.1 Introduction

This chapter consists of methods and procedures used in obtaining data pertaining to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children within the integrated class.

The sample will be described, subjects identified, and sampling procedures, research instruments and data collecting procedure will also be described. Relevant methods of data analysis will be proposed.

3.2 Research Design

This was a descriptive study since it intended to find out peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children by the non-handicapped children

3.2.1 Pre-test

Before the actual study, a preliminary study was carried out with a sample of two physically handicapped pupils and three non-handicapped students all drawn from Nairobi. These subjects were excluded from the sampling of the subjects for the actual study. The tool that was used in the pilot study had twenty (20) attitude items on Likert type scale and five (5) items on the sociometric test. After the pilot
study, the responses were studied and then a change was made in terms of reframing and modifying certain statements if necessary, for example, some of the items had to be removed to ensure that the most favourable items remain.

3.2.2 Sample

The study sample consisted of one hundred subjects. Eleven of them were physically handicapped children and eighty-nine were non-handicapped. The sample was obtained from three schools; two primary schools and one secondary school. Their ages were between eleven (11) to seventeen (17) years. A preliminary survey was done to establish the schools where the physically handicapped pupils could be found. All the subjects were from Nairobi since the researcher works within this area and so it was the most convenient place for her to carry out the study.

Due to limitation of time, it was not possible to take a big sample. Therefore, the findings are not generalisable. Consequently, it was not possible to compare the degree of physical disability, academic achievement and teachers’ attitudes in relation to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children.

3.2.3 Sampling Procedure

Purposive sampling was used to select the classes that were suitable to answer the questionnaire in respect to the objective of the study. The classes also had the required characteristics necessary for the study; that is physically handicapped
pupils. The subjects were drawn from standard six and seven classes, and form two and three. Their age was ranging from eleven to fourteen years in primary school and fifteen to seventeen years in secondary school. These classes were chosen since they were not examination classes and therefore they were easily available for the research. Standard six and seven pupils were particularly chosen for the study because they have enough knowledge and understanding to freely express meaningful opinion of their experiences with the physically handicapped.

Accidental sampling was used to administer the sociometric test. This is because the classes where the physically handicapped children were had been identified in the preliminary survey. Only one class took the sociometric test and this was sampled randomly.

3.2.4 Description of the sample

The sample selected comprised of eleven (11) physically handicapped children. The non-handicapped children were eighty-nine (89). From the total number of subjects, thirty-nine (39) were males whereas sixty-one (61) were females. This figure was arrived at after summing up the number of pupils in the schools that were visited during the preliminary survey. The researcher’s target population was found in these classes and so the classes were taken in full. There were seven (7) physically handicapped females and four (4) physically handicapped males. Table 1 below shows the schools and distribution of male physically handicapped and non-handicapped as well as female handicapped and non-handicapped.
Table 1. Total pupils sample per school and gender distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physically handicapped</td>
<td>Non-handicapped</td>
<td>Physically handicapped</td>
<td>Non-handicapped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midas Primary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucies Primary School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arya Secondary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class distribution of the pupil sample

Table 2 below shows the distribution of pupils per class. The subjects were ranging from standard six and seven and form two and three.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Female Handicapped</th>
<th>Non-handicapped</th>
<th>Male Handicapped</th>
<th>Non-handicapped</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midas Primary</td>
<td>Std 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Std 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucies</td>
<td>Std 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arya Secondary</td>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age distribution

Table 3 below shows the distribution of the sample with regard to age.

Table 3. Age distribution in the total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

The following instruments were used in the study:

3.3:1 A *Likert* type scale to measure pupils' attitude. This consisted of declarative statements which were used to rate the subjects in terms of acceptance or non-acceptance. The pupils' attitude towards integration was measured using this scale. Some of the items were derived from the review of literature and the others were formulated. The respondents were asked to
indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement to each of the statements. Each degree of agreement or disagreement was given a numerical score.

3.4 Enhancing Validity

To ensure that the test measured what it intended to, the researcher ensured that the variables under study were reflected in the items that were constructed. A critical examination of the test items was done by the researcher. Each item was judged in terms of its relevance to the variable under investigation. Subject experts were also consulted to rate the test items and give their opinions.

3.5 A sociometric test was used to obtain data directly from the pupils. This involved asking the pupils who took the test to select three (3) pupils that they would like to associate with in various class activities. The total items were five (5). This was as shown in Appendix A.

3.6 Enhancing reliability of the sociometric data

The intention here was to ensure that the results obtained from administering the test were essentially the same results that would be obtained if the research was to be repeated. A pre-test was done which involved administering the same instruments twice to five (5) pupils. The pupils that were used in the pre-test were not included in the final research.
3.7 Scoring of attitude scale

All items in the attitude scale had responses such as Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (UD), Disagree (DA) and Strongly Disagree (SD) as shown in Appendix B. Each item was scored from 1-5. If it fell under favourable items the score was five and if it was unfavourable the score of one was given. Eventually the respondents score were computed by summing up the scores from all the statements. Chi-square statistics was used to measure the student's attitude on Likert scale. This is what would show the attitude scores.

The sociometric data was tabulated into a matrix table. In this study, three (3) choices were used with five (5) sociometric items. The number of choices that was expected was fifteen (15) for each subject. The lower limit in the matrix table had the pupils that were rejected by their peers. The upper limit had those pupils who were chosen by their peers twelve (12) or more times. Chi-square statistics was also used to analyze sociometric data that was collected.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study on ‘Peer Acceptance of the physically handicapped Children’ within the integrated class in Nairobi.

The following research questions were explored within peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children.

1. To what extent are the physically handicapped children accepted by their non-handicapped peers in class?

2. Does peer acceptance become greater or lessens as the child grows up?

3. Do non-handicapped boys and girls accept their physically handicapped peers in the same way?

4. Is there any relationship between integration and peer acceptance?

4.2 Data for Research Question one

Examination of data collected in order to explore the first research question as shown in table 4 below reveals that there was no significant difference in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped at 0.05 level.
Table 4
Chi-square comparison of peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of pupils in high acceptance</th>
<th>No. of pupils in low acceptance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-handicapped</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically handicapped</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 0.015$  
Degree of freedom = 1

Critical $X^2$ at 0.05 = 2.641

Since the obtained $X^2$ is less than the critical $X^2$ at $P = 0.05$, hypothesis one is rejected.

The results indicate that the attitudes of the non-handicapped towards the physically handicapped had no significant difference at $P = 0.05$ level. Therefore, hypothesis one which states the physically handicapped children are accepted less than the non-handicapped is rejected.

4.3 Data for the research Question two

Question two asked whether peer acceptance becomes greater or lessens as the child grows up. The sample size of the physically handicapped children was very small and so the total sample of 100 pupils was divided into two groups (primary and secondary). Primary school had 52 pupils whereas secondary school had 48
pupils. The average ages in primary school was twelve years and three months (12.3) whereas in secondary the average age was sixteen years, four months (16.4).

The sociometric data that was collected was analysed using chi-square statistics to find out if there was any age difference in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped as shown in table 5 below.

Table 5. Chi-square comparison of age difference in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Std 6 and 7</th>
<th>Form 2 and 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age average</td>
<td>12.3 years</td>
<td>16.4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of pupils in high acceptance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of pupils in low acceptance</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obtained $X^2 = 4.29$

Critical $X^2$ range at $P = 0.05$ level of significance is 2.84

Since obtained $X^2$ is greater than the critical $X^2$, hypothesis 2 is rejected.

From the results, there was a significant difference between younger children in the peer acceptance of the physically handicapped at $P = 0.05$.

Hence the hypothesis which states that peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children lessens progressively as children become older is rejected.
because 40% of the older children were rejected in high acceptance group as compared to 30% of the younger children being in high acceptance group.

4.4 Data for research question three

Question three asked whether non-handicapped boys and girls accept their handicapped peers in the same way. The analysis of data on gender differences as relates to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped, indicated a trend whereby was no significant difference as shown in table 6 below.

**Table 6. Gender difference in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children by the non handicapped.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys (fo)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls (fe)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fo-fe)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fo-fe)²</td>
<td>207.4</td>
<td>-289</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fo-fe)²/fe</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>= 2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 2.26\]
Degree of freedom (C-1) (R-1)

\[(5-1) (2-1)\]

\[4 \times 1 = 4\]

\[X^2 = \frac{(fo-fe)^2}{fe}\]

\[fo - Observation\]

\[fe - Expected\]

From the analysis, there was no significant difference in peer acceptance between boys and girls towards the physically handicapped children. The results (2.26) show that there is no significant difference at 0.05 level. Therefore the third hypothesis which says that girls accept their physically handicapped peers more than boys was rejected since it did not find enough evidence to be retained.

4.5 Data for research question Four

Data collected to explore question 4 is as shown in table 7. Hypothesis four predicted that there is a positive relationship between integration of the physically handicapped and the non-handicapped and peer acceptance.

The likert scale test scores were summed up and an average was taken. The results indicated that there was a significant relationship between peer acceptance of the physically handicapped and integration. Therefore hypothesis 4 which states that there is a relationship between peer acceptance and integration is retained.
Table 7

Pupils attitude towards integration of the physically handicapped children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fo-fe)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fo-fe)²</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fo-fe)²</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.09 =2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of freedom (C-1) (R-1)

(5-1) (2-1)

4 X 1 = 4

X² = 2.1

From the analysis, the magnitude of the error is high and so the prediction is insignificant. The hypothesis number 4 was retained. That is there is a positive relationship between integration and peer acceptance.
4.6 Summary Results

From the analysis of data collected, there was clear indications that there were significant results for the following hypothesis at $P = 0.05$ level of significance.

Hypothesis 1: There was no significant difference in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by non-handicapped. Hypothesis one was thus rejected.

Hypothesis 2: Peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children lessens progressively as the children grow older. Hypothesis two was rejected.

Hypothesis 3: Non handicapped girls accept their peers more than boys. Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Hypothesis 4: There is a positive relationship between integration of the physically handicapped and the non-handicapped and peer acceptance. Hypothesis 4 was retained.
CHAPTER 5

5.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This discussion section will include implementation of findings related to each of the 20 research questions in the questionnaire and five sociometric questions, implications of the study and recommendations for further research.

5.2 Interpretations of findings related to research questions.

This study was undertaken in an effort to explore concepts of variables related to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children in the integrated classes within Nairobi.

5.3 Considerations of peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped children

Considerations of peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped children through chi-square analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped. This means that the physically handicapped children fit well in the regular classes. This is because the peers accept one another socially and are able to enhance growth of each other. Analysis of this study thus found evidence to reject the first hypothesis.
Several factors seem to be causing greater peer acceptance of children with physical handicaps. Professionals for instance encourage support and reduce fear of the handicapped through information. The government’s insistence on the elimination of barriers that prevent physically handicapped children from being discriminated. Bringing children together through integrated learning. All these encourage positive attitudes toward the physically handicapped children.

5.4 Comparisons of age and peer acceptance

This was done in Question 1,2,3,9,10,11,12,14,17,18,19 and 20. There were significant differences. Findings clearly indicated that peer acceptance of the physically handicapped become greater progressively as children grew up.

From the chi-square analysis, results showed that older children accepted their physically handicapped peers more than the younger children. About 40% of the older children were in high acceptance group while 8% were in low acceptance group. In contrast, 30% of the younger children were in high acceptance group whereby 22% were in low acceptance group.

It can therefore be deduced that younger children in standard 6 and 7 were still learning to relate with physically handicapped children. Data analysed thus found enough evidence to reject hypothesis two.
5.5 Considerations of response to gender.

Research questions 6, 7, 15 and 16 were concerned with an analysis of subjects' response to gender in relation to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children. Question 6 and 15 were negative whereas question 7 and 16 were positive statements. Review of literature indicated that non-handicapped girls were likely to accept their peers more than boys. However, from the data analysis a different trend was observed in that there was no significant difference. From the analysis it is evident that $-2.9$ results of the chi-square statistics has no significant relationship at 0.05 level.

5.6 Considerations of findings related to integration

Analysis of data related to the question - if there was any relationship between integration and peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children in question 4, 5, 8 and 13 revealed that there was a positive relationship between integration of the physically handicapped and non-handicapped. These findings are similar to Kazungu (1987), who in her study involving the physically handicapped children in Wundanyi – Kenya reported that integration of the physically handicapped children with the non-handicapped contributed change of attitude towards the physically handicapped in the division. The present study found enough evidence therefore to reject hypothesis four.

As non-handicapped children understanding and acceptance of physically handicapped children has increased, so has the support for integration. Placement
in integrated environments better prepares students to be well-adjusted contributing members of the society.

This is due to the fact that the physically handicapped children share the same learning opportunities and expectations of their non-handicapped peers.

5.7 CONCLUSIONS

The present study has revealed that the integration of the physically handicapped pupils into regular classes makes the physically handicapped to be accepted by their non-handicapped peers.

It was noted that younger children did not accept their physically handicapped peers like those that were older. Probably this was because the younger children did not understand the physically handicapped but once they were exposed in class together with the handicapped for a longer period in school they change their attitude towards them and accept them.

Males were observed to accept their physically handicapped peers in the same way as the females. The results were in agreement with the findings of an earlier study by Mwaipopo (1983).
5.8 Recommendations

The following recommendations were based on the findings that were made.

5.8.1 This study revealed that there was a significant difference in age in relation to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped. This suggested that older children understood the physically handicapped children and were able to get along with them.

Therefore awareness should be created to the young children on what it means to be physically handicapped right from home throughout school life. It is the recommendation of this study that awareness should be created right from home at an early age by parents about the physically handicapped and should be carried on in class.

In addition, correct physical management procedures, adaptations and devices, if implemented by families and others in class, can help the child participate in daily activities at home, in class and in the community, and acquire independence thus ensuring peer acceptance.

The teacher of a student with a physical disability should learn as much as possible about the handicap of his/her pupil. He/she should be in a position to explain to the child and others in the class about the handicap. The teacher should be able to help other students in class understand that a physical handicap is not something to fear, ridicule or cause shame.
The teacher can emphasize to the students on the quality of life by carefully avoiding over-protection and favouring the children who are physically handicapped in his/her class.

5.8.2 It was also noted that girls accepted the physically handicapped the same way as boys. This study recommends that policy makers should strengthen a school curriculum that accommodates both boys and girls physically handicapped in various class activities especially in games.

A teacher with physically handicapped pupils in his/her class should be able to vary or adapt the exercise for each category of children. For instance, some may perform the exercise while sitting; some while lying; and others while kneeling or standing up depending on the area that is affected.

5.8.3 It was noted that there was peer acceptance of the physically handicapped by the non-handicapped. This study recommends that more doors should be opened to accommodate the enormous number of the physically handicapped children who are not in school for fear of being rejected by the non-handicapped. The study recommends that Kenya Institute of Education should look for ways of strengthening peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children by the non-handicapped through having a syllabus that is friendly to both groups. In particular special adaptations may be needed in physical education programmes or for playground activities to accommodate children with physical handicaps. Classroom
teachers should work closely with physical education teachers to help them design programmes for children with physical handicaps. Special equipments should be made available in schools. For example, a lowered basketball hoop can be used to allow the physically handicapped students to participate with the non-handicapped peers fully.

It is proposed that further research should be conducted in the following areas:

1. Academic achievement in relation to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children.

2. Degree of disability in relation to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped.

3. Teachers’ attitudes in relation to peer acceptance of the physically handicapped children.
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APPENDIX A

Likert Scale for Pupils

Please answer the questions on the following pages simply by circling the answer, which mostly applies, to your level of agreement or disagreement. Please respond to all the statements. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

SA is used for Strongly Agree
A is used for Agree
UD is used for Undecided
DA is used for Disagree
SD is used for Strongly Disagree

Please indicate your age and sex

Sex: Male: ____________________________
Female: ____________________________
Age: ______________________________

1. I would like to sit next to a physically handicapped child

   SA  A  UD  DA  SD

2. I would like to play with the physically handicapped children

   SA  A  UD  DA  SD
3. Education should not be offered to the physically handicapped children

4. I prefer working independently than with a physically handicapped child.

5. Other pupils refuse to have discussions with the physically handicapped children.

6. Am not satisfied with the way physically handicapped boys work.

7. I feel warm when I am with the physically handicapped girls.

8. I have been finding it easy to get along with the physically handicapped children.

9. Physically handicapped children should not expect to live normal lives.

10. Physically handicapped children should be given the same opportunities like other children in the school.
11. It is a waste of money educating the physically handicapped children.

12. There is nothing worse than being physically handicapped.

13. Children who are physically handicapped are able to get along with only those who are also physically handicapped.

14. Young children accept the physically handicapped children more than those who are above thirteen years of age.

15. Boys do not accept the physically handicapped boys of their age than girls.

16. The physically handicapped girls should be in a class/school of their own.

17. Physically handicapped children should be educated in a class of their own.

18. I always sympathize with the physically handicapped when I meet them along the corridors.
19. Most physically handicapped seek sympathy from normal children.

20. I do not mind the appearance of the physically handicapped children.
APPENDIX B

Sociometric Questionnaire for the Pupils

Instructions

The following questions ask you to write down the names of pupils in this class you would like to associate with. You may choose anyone in your class. Your choice will not be seen by anyone else. You are to make up the three choices for each question. Indicate your age and sex in the spaces provided.

Age                                      
Sex: Male                                  
Female                                    

1. I would like to be friendly to the following pupils

                       
                       

2. I would be happy if the following were my deskmates.

                       
                       

                       
3. I would like to be in the same class with the following pupils.

                        
                        
                        
4. The following are my best friends in the class

                        
                        
                        
5. If I were to choose the prefects of my class I would choose the following

                        
                        
                        