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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The Problem

It is common belief that institutions of reform and imprisonment foster relationships that aid the individuals in becoming more firmly entrenched in delinquency and crime. It is surprising how many people, who are supposedly well informed, are convinced that such institutions are closely knit organizations which, in many instances, are organized against society rather than being rehabilitated to it. An objective for study would be to determine the amount of, or relative degree of, socialization existing in such institutions. One measure of the degree of socialization is the sociometric technique.

The problem of this study is to (1) determine the amount of peer acceptance existing among a group of delinquent girls committed to the Texas State Training School for Girls and (2) to determine the relationships between peer acceptance and some other variables.

The Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are threefold:

1. To apply the sociometric technique as a measurement of peer acceptance accorded to the girls in each cottage by each other girl in that cottage.
2. To show how this acceptance is related to such other variables as nationality, age, mutuality of friendships, present leadership positions, cliques, and emotional expansiveness.

3. To recommend some techniques that may be applicable to raise the level of acceptance of those individuals who are among the lowest in peer acceptance.

Importance of the Study

It is difficult to conceive of individuals adjusting to groups outside of their own social contact range if they fall among the lowest in peer acceptance among those with whom their associations are most frequent. Those who are already branded with a social stigma, such as these girls confined at the Gainesville school, find it difficult to accept the customs and standards of society without some antagonism and rebellion, even after rehabilitation. Without some element of success in being accepted into groups, an individual may tend to behave in such a manner as to force society to recognize her, even if it is through a negative approach. If we can devise methods which will aid these "social outcasts" to find acceptance among their peers, we will be laying a foundation upon which to build a further adjustment to society as a whole.

Definition of Terms

Throughout this study, "peer acceptance" will be defined as the degree of acceptance of the individual by the other
girls in the cottage to which she has been assigned, as calculated from a weighted score for the individual, taken from a summation of the ratings given her by the other girls in her cottage.

The term "emotional expansiveness" used in this study will be defined as the total vote or weighted score which the individual of a cottage gives to the other girls in her cottage.

"Rank in group" is the rank of the individual among the entire cottage population, which is determined by calculating the algebraic sum of the positive and negative scores, and ranking the group by giving the highest positive sum a rank of 1, the next highest a rank of 2, etc., until the lowest individual in rank will have either the lowest amount of positive over negative choices, or the highest amount of negative choices over positive choices.

The term "high" used in this report will refer to an individual who is among the top five students in her cottage in peer acceptance; whereas, the term "low" refers to the individual who falls among the lowest five in her cottage.

The "group acceptance index" is the ratio of the weighted scores of the group to the maximum score possible for that group.

The ratio of the weighted scores to the maximum score possible for a student is referred to as the "individual acceptance index".
Related Studies

Sociometry is a rather contemporary technique, and studies of the degree of socialization of institutionalized girls are limited. One of the most intensive and closely related studies is that of Jennings, conducted at the New York State Training School for Girls.¹

The technique used by Jennings was one of local criteria, as devised by Moreno, for the measurement of interpersonal relations. Jennings asked the students at the school to list the names of students they "would prefer to live with at the school", "would like to work with", "would like in their recreation or leisure group", and also to list the names of the students they "would not like in any of these groups". This provided both positive and negative choices, as well as showing the isolates of the group (those who received neither positive nor negative choices). She gave a retest after an eight month period to determine the reliability of her measurements, and she found a high correlation between the tests.

Jennings also made a rather intensive study of the highs and lows of her group as a result of the sociometric test. She had a greater opportunity to become acquainted with the students as she lived with them throughout the study period. This enabled her to establish a high degree of rapport with the subjects and obtain some reliable data. She includes

¹Helen M. Jennings, Leadership and Isolation, 240 pp.
the results of interviews held with the leaders and isolates in her study.

In her conclusion, Jennings states:

....the phenomena of leadership and isolation appear as side by side phenomena that are born of the press exerted by field forces which are specific other persons acting upon the individual; in the one instance, individuals are propelled into positions of leadership through the response which greets their extraordinary capacity for interpersonal contribution in specific situations and, in the other instance, individuals are propelled into isolation through lack of positive response to their interpersonal contribution in specific situations.2

and further on she writes:

Leadership appears as a process in which not one individual has a major role but in which relatively many share... The severalness of leadership appears related not alone to different capacities on the part of the leader-individuals but to the personality differences within the population....3

Moreno has included a study he conducted in the same school as Jennings, but at an earlier date than hers, in his Who Shall Survive?4 This was a closed community of approximately 500 girls who are a cross-section of nationality and of social groups found in New York State. Like Jennings, his study used the sociometric technique that employs a local criterion for expressing likes and dislikes of each girl toward the other girls in the community.

---

2 Ibid., p. 217.
3 Ibid.
Moreno found that there was little discrimination among nationality groups, religious groups and intelligence lines. He reports:

At the same time the choices "broke" all the racial and religious and I. Q. lines, colored choosing white, white choosing colored, Catholics choosing Protestants, high I. Q. choosing low I. Q., and vice versa.5

He brings up the question of why it is better to use the sociometric technique in preference to careful observation of each member, as a means of finding the attractions and repulsions existing in the group. The unsurmountable labor involved, and the confused picture of the situation which would be subjectively determined, make the sociometric technique a highly valuable and financially reasonable instrument, he asserts.

Moreno's sociograms give a picture of the mutualities and unreciprocations among the subjects he studied. From these, he can show the networks, chains, and cliques. Several networks may be connected through a strong mutual relationship between a member of one clique and the member of another clique. Proof of the existence of networks in interpersonal relations is given by Moreno. He describes the running away of fourteen girls, many of whom had never attempted to run away before. Tracing interrelationships on sociograms, he found mutualities existing between these fourteen girls

---

5 Ibid., p. 91.
regardless of whether or not they were assigned to the same cottage. When one escaped, it started a chain reaction; each girl followed in the footsteps of her mutual friend.

Selection of personnel for residence in the various cottages should be conducted scientifically so that each cottage will contain as much mutuality as possible, is the theory of Moreno. He writes:

The problem is to select a population for any given community in a manner that is not arbitrary but an outgrowth of the spontaneous forces operating within this population. In order that each settlement can be expected to develop into a community it is necessary that the selected population shall be a harmoniously interrelated whole. Any selection which neglects to take into account the spontaneous attractions and repulsions existing within the population may lead to the including of families which, however worthy they may be as individual units, together make up group formations which may later have a disrupting effect upon the progressive development of the whole population.6

Another study involving leadership among delinquent girls was conducted by Van Waters; however, this study was made on girls outside an institution, and is more of the descriptive type rather than a measurement of leadership. Her conclusions closely allied those of Jennings, as she writes that families must deal with individuals in relation to forces in personality which attract or antagonize rather than in isolation. She states that delinquent leaders not only lack normal parental relationships, but adequate understanding by the

---

6Ibid., p. 354.
community. They are a result of numerous rejections by various organizations, isolated by distorted gossip, and seek recognition through the negative approach.7

In the vein of the purposes of this study, Dale Harris prepared an article discussing socialization. He has defined socialization as:

Socialization is the learning process whereby the child prepares himself acceptably into the manners and institutions of the family, neighborhood, community, and society. It is the learning of the conventional patterns of behavior.

He found that play activities showed an appreciable difference between the delinquent and non-delinquent, in his study of boys. He states that these play activities permit certain substitute satisfactions, and certain aggression activities in playing "house" or "school" or "doll play" may reveal reactions to adult aggression. The play activities of delinquents permit them to gratify certain personal aims for thrills and adventure, and a dramatization of certain roles.

In Harris' eyes, the delinquent is not socially maladjusted in his own social group. His maladjustment occurs because his behavior patterns are too deviant to be accepted by the larger social groups. He is frequently quite well socialized in his own group.9

---

9Ibid., p. 153.
CHAPTER II

THE INVESTIGATION

The Group

This study was conducted among the students of the Gainesville State Training School for Girls, Gainesville, Texas, which has a population of approximately 125 students, with fluctuations from time to time depending upon commitments and releases. The Girls' School was selected in preference to the Boys' Training School because of its accessibility to the investigator; however, the sex difference places a limitation upon the investigator in his range of study and investigation. Girls from all over the State of Texas are committed to this institution by the courts for rehabilitation, and many have been returned because of violation of parole.

It was necessary to limit this study to 110 girls living in the various cottages; some of the students were confined to the hospital, while one or two others were employed in the town of Gainesville, Texas, as part of their rehabilitation. It was necessary to eliminate these students from the study.

Each cottage was administered the sociometric scale separately, as the individual cottages were used as a unit for study rather than the entire school population. As may be seen from Table 1, each of the five cottages had a similar number of students assigned to it; this aided the investigation.
in that the results of the study would not be swayed by a few cottages housing most of the students, while the remaining cottages housed only a few students.

Table 1
ACTUAL NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN EACH COTTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age range of the group studied is from 12 years 6 months to 20 years, with an average age of 16 years 7 months. Among these 110 students, 23 were of Latin American descent. The population of the cottages according to nationality may be determined from Table 2.

Table 2
POPULATION OF EACH COTTAGE ACCORDING TO NATIONALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that the breakdown is between Latin-American and North Americans only, as it is believed there may be some discrimination between the two nationalities. The
school is inhabited solely by white girls; the colored girls are committed to a separate school.

Revising the Instrument

Due to the nature of the residence of the students at this school, it was deemed necessary to revise the original scale for measuring interpersonal relationships. Such questions as "You go to their homes and they come to your home quite often" and "You never go places with them and you never talk with them unless you have to" were not applicable to the State Training School.

A questionnaire devised to obtain data to change the substantive statements under the four categories to be altered, i.e. Best Friends, Other Friends, Students Who Are Not My Friends, and Students I Do Not Want As Friends As Long As They Are Like They Are Now, was administered to a random sampling of approximately 80 of the 125 girls making up the total student body. Each student sampled named one or two of their "best friends," "other friends," "people I do not wish as friends," and "people I do not want as friends as long as they are like they are now," and then were instructed to list as many reasons as they could think of that would describe the person they listed in the particular category.

1Merl L. Bonney, "How I Feel Toward Others" Scale, Unpublished.

2A sample copy of this questionnaire and the revised scale may be found in the appendix.
These responses were listed and tallied according to the number of times each girl stated a particular reason in a particular category. Statement 3 of Bonney's How I Feel Toward Others scale was not altered as it was suitable for the purpose as written. Those responses having the highest tally scores were included in the scale, and the statements of the original scale deemed not applicable were eliminated. In some instances, only part of the statement was deleted, as it was noted that some statements receiving a high tally score were similar to part of the original substatement in the scale.

Bonney has listed, from his study of elementary school children over a 5 year period, such traits as "thoughtful," "sweet," "kind" and "generous" as criteria of personality patterns. These criteria were found to be the same among this study group, which would lend itself to apparent normal determinants of peer acceptance among these girls.

Administration of the Instrument

Each student residing in a particular cottage was listed along with the names of the other students in that cottage. Forms were mimeographed so that each student had both a scale and a sheet containing all the names of the students in her cottage. The scale was administered in the individual cottages; no briefing occurred prior to the arrival of the examiners. All five cottages were tested at the same time so that the

---

students would not have an opportunity to inform the students of the other cottages what had taken place during the testing period. Three proctors, each familiar with the sociometric scale, were used to administer the scale to each cottage.

The detailed instructions given with the test requested each student to employ the figures 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 to indicate their "best friend," "other friend," "people I don't know," "people I do not want as friends" and "people I do not want as friends as long as they are like they are now," respectively. Each figure could be employed as many times as the student saw fit; it was not necessary that the student employ every figure if she felt it did not apply. A figure 6 was placed opposite the student's own name to indicate the student making the choices.

Scoring

After the test was administered, the scores were charted on a sociometric matrix chart. A weighted score was given to each figure used, as follows: a weighted score of 2 was given for figure 1; a weighted score of 1 was given for figure 2; no score was recorded for figure 3; figure 4 received a weighted score of -1, and figure 5 was given a weighted score -2. These scores were added algebraically, with the sum of the "received" score divided by the total possible score if every girl had voted for every other girl as "best friend"
indicating the group index. The individual "received" and "given" totals indicate the acceptance and expansiveness scores, respectively.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Comparison With Previous Study at This School

In the Spring of 1948, Bonney took his students, who were enrolled in a sociometry class at North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, to the Gainesville school to administer a similar sociometric scale.¹ The scale was administered to the entire school population of 145 girls, regardless of their dormitory assignment. Although the data were compiled, the material has not been published. The raw data were compared with the results of this study to determine the similarities between the two.

It is interesting to note that the students who were among the five highest in their cottage in this study, and were in the institution in 1948, were scattered throughout the rankings of the earlier study. However, the students who ranked among the lowest five in their respective cottages were also among the lowest 20 per cent in the 1948 study.

Among the high-ranking students of this study, five were at the Training School in 1948. Three are now living in cottage 2, and two are in cottage 5. Their rankings in peer acceptance in their cottages as compared to the 1948 study are as follows: In cottage 2, the three students rank 2.5, 4, and 5.

¹ Merl E. Bonney, Unpublished Data, 1948.
with a 1948 ranking of 32, 66, and 114 respectively; in cottage 5, the two students rank 2 and 4, with a 1948 ranking of 42 and 38 respectively. Among the low-ranking students of this study, only three were at the Training School in 1948. One lives in cottage 1, one in cottage 2, and one in cottage 5. Their rankings in this study as compared to the 1948 study are as follows: In cottage 1, the student ranks lowest (21) and is 119 in the 1948 study. In cottage 2, the student is tied for the next to last place (20.5) and is 124 (next to last) in the 1948 study. In cottage 5, the student is in next to last place (25) and is 122 in the 1948 study. It should be remembered that the 1948 study was conducted on the entire population as one group rather than the individual cottages. Many of the girls included in this study were not students at the school in the 1948 study; likewise, many of the girls in the 1948 study are no longer students at the school in this study.

Group Indices

The group indices for the five cottages, found by dividing the algebraic sum of the votes received into the total possible had every student voted "best friend" for every other girl in her cottage, range from a low of .166 to a high of .429, with a mean group index of .279. It will be noted from Table 3 that only cottage 2 approaches the average index for
elementary schools found by Bonney to be .40. Two possibilities for the deviation of .15 from the mean may be indicated. One possibility is that the results of this cottage were not reliable. This could be due to a misunderstanding of the instructions or a lack of confidence on the part of the students that these results would not be used against them. The other possibility is that there is a much higher degree of socialization promoted in this cottage. It seems that the latter possibility is the most likely since the superintendent of the school reports that the matron in charge of this cottage has been fully accepted by the girls and is quite successful in promoting friendliness and harmonious relationships among the girls assigned to her cottage.

The group indices indicate that there is a paucity of mutual friendships among the girls in the various cottages, and may suggest that assignments are made on a basis that would exclude mutual acceptances or rejections among the girls.

Table 3

GROUP INDICES BY COTTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Index</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High and Low Voting

An analysis of the voting between the highs and the lows in each cottage reveals critical ratios ranging from a low of 0 to a high of 8.0, when computing the critical ratio on the difference between the two means, using the formula $C. R. = \frac{D}{\sigma_d}$. The 0 was found to exist between the highs $\rightarrow$ highs and lows $\rightarrow$ highs, with "$\rightarrow$" indicating "voting for," in cottage 2; the 8.0 exists in cottage 1 between the highs $\rightarrow$ lows and lows $\rightarrow$ highs. Table 4 shows the means of the highs and lows in each cottage, as well as the critical ratios for the differences between the means, and a mean critical ratio on all five cottages.

The mean critical ratio for the five cottages shows statistical reliability (as near as can be determined from using five cases in each category of high and low) on the difference of the means of the high $\rightarrow$ high and high $\rightarrow$ low; high $\rightarrow$ low and low $\rightarrow$ high; and high $\rightarrow$ high and low $\rightarrow$ low, and unreliability for the remaining comparisons. Those critical ratios reliable for the five cottages are found to be reliable at the 1% level of significance.

Although the critical ratio is not completely reliable, we find that the votings of the low $\rightarrow$ high and low $\rightarrow$ low is at the 2% level of significance. There is no reliability found between high $\rightarrow$ high and low $\rightarrow$ high, and low $\rightarrow$ low and high $\rightarrow$ low.
TABLE 4
MEANS AND CRITICAL RATIOS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEANS
OF THE VOTING BETWEEN THE HIGHS AND LOWS IN EACH COTTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>C. R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting Process</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>C. R.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>C. R.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>C. R.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High → High</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High → Low</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low → High</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low → Low</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High → Low</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low → High</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low → Low</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High → Low</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>C. R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting Process</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>C. R.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>C. R.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>C. R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High → High</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High → Low</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low → High</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low → Low</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High → High</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low → Low</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that one cottage (4) reveals a reliability at the 5% level of significance in the voting high → high and low → high; not one of the cottages has
reliability in the voting of low→low and high→low.

From these data, one can see that there is a more persistent trend for the low groups to vote for the high groups more than they vote for themselves, and more than the high group will vote for them. What is more, we can expect to find these conditions to exist among similar groups tested under similar conditions. This may be an expression on the part of the lows of a wish to be like the highs and be better accepted among their peers. The high group rejects the lows or refuses to give them recognition through positive selections because they have attained their "place in the sun" and are not in need of the acceptance of the lows. Jennings makes note of this trend by including in her footnotes the following statement:

Monema E. Kenyon suggests a further explanation: that the leader may hold greater appeal to the isolate (or near isolate) because the former may represent "what he would like to be," a sort of "wish fulfillment" (conscious or otherwise); on the other hand, the citizen who is nearer to average in his psychological position in the group may have adequate satisfactions coming to him in his immediate setting....

We find, too, from a review of Table 4, that the highs give a greater portion of their positive votes to other girls who are high in peer acceptance. This tends to develop cliques and networks among the high groups, and, unless there is some mutuality between the highs and lows, the lows will not always be "in on the know" of the affairs of the girls. The identification of the groups seems to be always upward, and never

---

downward. That is to say, the highs identify with other highs, and the lows identify with the highs; no one identifies himself with students who can be found to be among the lows in peer acceptance.

From an observation of the raw data, one is aware of several instances of strongly mutual attachments between students classified among the highs in their cottage and students classified as among the lows in the same cottage. It would be simple enough to speculate as to the reasons for this; probably the best approach would be to make a longer and more detailed study of the individual relationships and how and why they occur.

Positive and Negative Choices

The number of positive choices over negative choices was computed by dividing the sum of the negative column into the sum of the positive column for each cottage. In every case, the positive choices exceeded the negative choices, although cottage 4 had only a small excess, as may be seen from Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>2.6:1</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>2.5:1</td>
<td>1.8:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreno found that the positive ratings at the New York Training School exceeded the negative ratings, and reported,
"...the cohesive forces at work in Hudson were stronger than the forces drawing the girls away from their groupings."4 Bonney, in his 1943 study of the Gainesville school, found a ratio of 1.8:1 of positive over negative choices.5 These data are further corroborated by Jennings' study in which she found that positive choices outweigh negative choices. She writes, "By and large, it is seen that the positive attractions of individuals to one another far outweigh the rejecting or repelling feelings active between them."6

**Mutual Attractions and Rejections**

The mutualities revealed by the sociometric scale are the vetings between two people for "best friend" or for "people I do not want as friends as long as they are like they are now," for which weighted scores of 2 or -2 are recorded, respectively.

It is possible to compute percentages of mutual attractions and mutual rejections by dividing the total possible of mutual attachments if every girl was a best friend to every other girl in her cottage, and the total possible mutual rejections if every girl rejected every other girl in her cottage, into the total number found.

---

4 Moreno, op. cit., p. 103.
5 W. B. Bonney, Unpublished Data, 1948.
6 Jennings, op. cit., p. 216.
Again we find that mutual attachments exceed mutual rejections as revealed in Table 6. It can be seen that there is only a very small percentage (.01) of rejections existing in cottage 2. This would be expected since this cottage has the highest group index. We note, too, that the mutual attractions are more than half again exceeding mutual rejections for the five cottages as a group, as revealed by the mean. Cottage 4 is the only cottage exhibiting a higher percentage of rejections than attractions. One would also expect to find this since this cottage has a very low group index.

Table 6

PERCENTAGES OF STRONGLY MUTUAL FRIENDS AND MUTUAL REJECTIONS FOR EACH COTTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Attachments</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Rejections</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For individuals, it is noticed that only one student who is rated as number 1 in rank in her cottage has the highest number of strongly mutual friends; however, the highest number of strongly mutual friends can be found to be held by one of the students in the high grouping of each cottage. The individual having the highest number of mutual rejections is not always the individual ranked as last for her cottage; such an occurrence is found in only one cottage; the remaining cottages
have the highest number of mutual rejections distributed among
the lower half in their cottages. As an example, cottage 1
has the highest number of mutual rejections listed to the
student ranking 15th in peer acceptance; cottage 2 lists no
more than one mutual rejection for any one girl, and these
girls rank from 2.5 to 20.5; cottage 3 lists the student ranked
as 14th with the highest number of rejections; cottage 4 lists
the student ranked as 18th; cottage 5 gives the most mutual
rejections to the student at the bottom of the rankings, or
in 26th position.

From this, we see that the student who receives mutual
rejections is not necessarily poorly accepted by the other
girls in her cottage. The student who is very high in peer
acceptance does seem to possess the greatest number of mutual
attachments, although it does not mean that she does not pos-
sess some mutual rejections, as is evident in cottage 2 where
the student ranks 2.5 in peer acceptance, but also has a mutual
rejection.

Nationality Differences

The ranking of Latin-American students does not vary to
any large degree from that of the North American students.
The range of the Latin-Americans is from first place in cottage
1 to last place in cottage 5. The mean rank for all the Latin-
American students in all five cottages was found to be in 14th
place. The mean rank for each cottage will be found in Table 7.
From these results, it would seem that there is little or no discrimination against Latin-American students by the North-American students. It would seem that other factors are involved in peer acceptance than just an individual’s nationality.

**Table 7**

Mean Rank of Latin-American Students in Each Cottage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Ranks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age and Peer Acceptance Rank**

The ages of the students were computed at the time of taking the scale to determine if there was any relationship between the ranking of the student in peer acceptance and her ranking by age in her cottage. The correlation was found by using the formula \( r = \frac{6 \sum d^2}{n(n^2-1)} \). The results for each cottage may be found in Table 8. A mean correlation for the

**Table 8**

Correlation Between Peer Acceptance Rank and Age Rank by Cottages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.93±.15</td>
<td>-.24±.13</td>
<td>.13±.14</td>
<td>.19±.15</td>
<td>.49±.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for the five cottages was found to be .12±.13. Only one of these correlations has any significance and statistical reliability as revealed by the probable error, cottage 5. Cottage 2 shows an inverse relationship between peer acceptance rank and age rank. The mean correlation is of little statistical validity, nor is the correlation significant. It would seem that there is little or no relationship existing at the Gainesville school between the age of the students and their acceptance by their peers in their cottages. Jennings also found a zero relationship between chronological age and peer acceptance. 7

Emotional Expansiveness

Peer acceptance means the acceptance of an individual by those who are in an equal situation and have similar group affiliations. But, it also implies how well the individual accepts his peers. That is to say, through measurement of peer acceptance, it is also possible to get a measurement of emotional expansiveness; the degree to which one student is in need of the other students as friends. This is determined by the number of positive choices she gives to the other girls in her cottage in excess of the negative choices given.

The high and low groups (five cases in each group) for the five cottages were compared as to their emotional expansiveness indices for their respective groups. The indices

7Ibid., p. 132.
were computed by dividing the emotional expansiveness scores of the five cottages for the five students by the total possible had every girl in the high or low groups voted for every other girl in her cottage as "best friend". Table 9 shows the indices for the emotional expansiveness of the high and low groups, and the mean for all five cottages.

**TABLE 9**

**EMOTIONAL EXPANSIVENESS INDICES FOR THE HIGH AND LOWS IN EACH COTTAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Groups</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Groups</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note from Table 9 that in all but one cottage, the emotional index of the highs exceeds that of the lows by at least .15. In the cottage where the low group exceeds the high group, it does so by only .01. The mean index for the high groups is twice the size of the low groups' mean index. This is rather an unusual situation, and it would not be expected to occur in a normal population, nor on the group as a whole. This data would tend to indicate that there is a close relationship between the emotional expansiveness and peer acceptance of the students, but, as will be shown later, we may expect to find little or no relationship existing.
A correlation was computed after ranking the girls on peer acceptance and emotional expansiveness. On the basis of the results of the high and low groups' indices, it was supposed that the correlations would be fairly significant between peer acceptance and emotional expansiveness. The results, as shown in Table 10, indicate that there is no relationship existing between the acceptance by the girls' peers, and their expression of emotional need of friends.

**TABLE 10**

**RANK CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PEER ACCEPTANCE AND EMOTIONAL EXPANSIVENESS IN EACH COTTAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.10 ± .15</td>
<td>-.04 ± .15</td>
<td>.07 ± .14</td>
<td>.06 ± .14</td>
<td>.10 ± .15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range is from a high of .12 to an inverse correlation of -.04, and all having high probable errors. The individual's emotional expansiveness may be greater than is indicated in this study. Each student was limited in her expression of choices to the students within her own cottage. It is quite probable that some of her positive choices would extend beyond this limited group, and even beyond the community.

The emotional expansiveness indices of the extremes, the highest and lowest girl in each cottage, were compared to determine the differences,
In reviewing the raw data of the highest student in each cottage, it is apparent that their emotional expansiveness indices are below .50, with only one exception. One reason for such a low index is that these individuals may have most of their emotional needs met through their acceptance by their peers, and they do not need to make a bid for other friends, nor do they feel it is necessary to reject them. Only one student among the highs was found to give an equal amount of positive and negative choices, giving her an emotional expansiveness index of .5.

In reviewing the lows, it seems evident that the students are expressing a wish for more friends and an acceptance by the high, as revealed by their high emotional expansiveness indices. They are attempting to identify with the high group, and seem to express the feeling "See, I like you, why don't you like me?" Not all the lows have high indices; some express a low emotional need which may be an indication of recognition of their low peer status, and they have used the negative choices as a means of retaliation. It would be as though they are expressing the feeling "You're not hurting me by disliking me, because I dislike you!"

Leadership Roles

In a community such as found at the Gainesville school, it is not always possible to assign leadership roles to those...
students who are the highest in peer acceptance and exhibit leadership ability. Certain other factors must be considered in addition. It is on these bases that assignments are made at Gainesville.

There are two leaders in each cottage; one holds the rank of "mayor," and the other is "judge." They handle the minor disciplinary cases, and make a report to the superintendent each month. The report is countersigned by the matron in charge of the cottage. While the officers are elected, only those meeting the qualifications are eligible to be selected. Each girl is given a certain number of credits for good behavior, and for certain other deeds that warrant commendation. On the basis of these credits, the student becomes eligible to hold office, and final selection is left to the voting of the cottage inhabitants.

Cottage 4 is, at present, without an elected mayor or judge, as the former officers have been released from the school. However, two officers were appointed as "acting mayor" and "acting judge"; the mayor has not been included in this study, but it is noted that the judge ranks in the bottom half in her cottage, holding 14th place among her peers. An election will be held shortly to determine who will fill these positions.

In two of the five cottages, the leadership positions are held by students who are among the highs in this study.
The judge in cottage 2 holds the top position in her cottage, while the mayor is tied for second place with a ranking of 2.5. The other cottage (3) has the judge ranking 2.5 and the mayor with a rank of 5.5. A fourth cottage (1) ranks the judge among the highs, but the mayor is just outside the high category; the judge ranks 4.5, and the mayor is 6th in peer acceptance.

Only one of the cottages (5) has officers who fall below the majority of students in their peer acceptance ranks. It is also interesting to note that the mayor in each of the previously mentioned cottages has always ranked lower than the judge; in this cottage the mayor ranks higher than the judge, although she is still not in the upper brackets of peer acceptance. The mayor ranks in 10th place and the judge holds the 21st rank, which is just one rank short of being among the lows for her cottage.

These data would seem to indicate that the girls at the Gainesville school do not react contrary to the wishes of the administration. Those who the administration feel are worthy of leadership roles because of adherence to rules and regulations of the school, appear to be the same girls who are well accepted by their peers, with only one or two exceptions.

Leaders, to be followed, should rank high in peer acceptance, otherwise the followers would refuse to cooperate, since they neither like nor have respect for the person in charge.
The ideal situation would be to have girls elected to office who can influence the other girls in her cottage, and with whom those of lower peer acceptance may identify themselves, and thus select them as their "ideal." Since these leaders must maintain a certain behavior pattern, it would seem logical that their example will encourage the other girls to have similar behavior patterns and thus be like their "idol." It would seem that the leaders in cottage 5 may have a difficult time in promoting any "changes" or set any examples for the remainder of the girls in their cottage. In fact, the other girls may do exactly opposite of the leaders' wishes as an expression of their dislike for them.

Cliquas and Networks

Almost every group has some sort of line of communication whereby "news" and other information is passed along from one person to the next. We would expect to find the best line of communication to exist among the "best friends" of the group. Not everyone in the network is necessarily the best friend of every other person in that network. The only requirements are that a mutuality exist between two of the people. As an example, a network would exist between Charlie, Harry, Frank and John, if Charlie and Harry were best friends, Harry and Frank were best friends, and Frank and John were best friends. It is not necessary that John even know Harry or Charlie; he will receive the "news" because he is a best
friend with someone who knows the other two, and has a mutual
attachment with one of them.

Moreno has shown how certain cottage networks and cliques
have functioned at the Hudson school. One strong member of
the clique ran away from the school, and this started a chain
reaction until all the girls within that network had also run
away. This illustrates, too, the strong identification that
exists within such groups. Each one follows after her own
"leader."

A clique differs from a network in that mutuality exists
between all the members of that clique. Some cliques are
closely knit groups that shun outsiders, while others will
admit newcomers into their group. Cliques may have as few
members as two or as many as ten or twelve; however, the more
members within a clique, the weaker the clique will be. To
extend the example cited above to involve a clique, we only
have to have a mutuality existing between John and the other
members, as well as between Frank and the others, Harry and
others, and Charlie and the others.

No matter how disorganized a group is, there are certain
to be a few cliques in it. Our emotions demand that we de-
velop some attachment with someone in our environment. On
this assumption, it was decided to chart the various cliques

---

8 Moreno, op. cit., pp. 256-258.
and networks found at the Gainesville school, using as a basis the choices of "best friends" of a mutual attachment. These sociograms will be found in figure 1.

From a first analysis, we find that each cottage, regardless of its index of voting, has at least one student who is not involved in a clique of "best friends." They are virtually isolated from such a clique, although in no wise are they without some other attachment. In cottage 1 we find four such isolates; there is no mutuality expressed. We find too, what might be termed "near isolate" in that there is no direct involvement in either a strong or weak clique, but they have some mutual attachment with an individual who is in one of these cliques. In addition, it is noted that one student is not only involved in a strong clique, but has some attachment to a weak clique as well. It appears that the cottage is composed of two weak cliques and one strong clique.

The strong clique of cottage 1 is mainly composed of highs, although one of these girls ranks 14th in peer acceptance in this cottage. Of the isolates, only two of the four girls are in the lows; the remaining two rank 15th and 12th in peer acceptance.

The first isolated clique appears in cottage 2. We find a strong mutual attachment existing between two students, but neither one has any strong attachment with any other girl in her cottage. Another feature in cottage 2 that did
Legend:
- Strong Clique
- Weak Clique
- Isolated from Cliques
- Near Isolate
- In both Strong and Weak Cliques

Figure 1  Cliques and Networks of the Five Cottages
not exist in cottage 1 is the star effect of the network.

B. G. appears to be the core of the other groups, and most of the other cliques are allied with her either through a strong clique or a weak clique. This cottage also contains the least number of isolates and near isolates, with only one isolate and two near isolates. It should also be noticed that the highest number of students who are involved in both strong and weak cliques exists in cottage 2. A closely knit pattern was expected when the group index was found to be the highest of the five groups.

Cottage 3 has two isolated cliques, and, although it is not as closely united as cottage 2, we do find a similar star effect exists in this group.

We might pause here to illustrate how some "news" might travel in cottage 3, thereby demonstrating the network effect.

Let us assume that NLP overhears some "news." She may divulge this to MT who, in turn, tells it to WE, and she, in turn, to SH. Now SH may tell it just to JK or to MMV or both. JK probably would tell only KSH, whereas, MMV could tell both GW and BAL. CB and FL may both receive their knowledge of the "news" directly from its source, NLP. MLC and GE, and NN and IK would be without this "news" unless one happens to overhear it and relate it to the other. RH, AM, and LG would also be without the information; each must overhear it alone, as they have no mutual friend who will tell them of it.
Of course, any other source such as "other friends," has not been taken into consideration in this example, as the problem would become too complex for simplified comprehension.

Of all five cottages, only cottage 4 shows a high degree of disintegration and disorganization in the group. More than half the cottage may be classed as isolates or near isolates. Only four students are involved in a clique that exceeds what might be termed "isolated cliques." Again, this type pattern would be expected when the group index is low.

Cottage 5 is unique in that it possesses four comparatively strong cliques, two of which involve four or more persons. It is also differentiated in that two distinct networks can be seen, and only one student available for contact between them. It is interesting to note that in this cottage, the three girls in a strong clique isolated from the main group, and the near isolate of this clique are all in the lows for that cottage. The highs, on the other hand, can be located in either of the two remaining cliques.

To aid the reader in determining the various cliques, cottage 1 has been blocked off to illustrate the three cliques existing in that cottage. Two of them are weak cliques, and one is a strong clique.
CHAPTER IV

SUGGESTED METHODS OF SOCIALIZATION

This chapter is primarily devoted to a summarization and description of a few of the techniques for the development of group socialization.

Present Status of the School

At present, the State Training School for Girls is in a period of transition, and many of the suggestions that would have been made have been already incorporated into the rehabilitation program being promoted by the present superintendent. This transition period began in the Spring of 1949, when the program of the school was changed from one of punishment to a program of rehabilitation and reeducation; in many instances it is merely a program of education rather than reeducation, where schooling has been seriously lacking in the environment of the student.

The regimentation and institutionalized appearance of the girls has been eliminated. Punishments for escapes, such as head shavings, etc., have also been discarded. Overt appearances of the school would impress the average visitor with the feeling of visiting a private boarding school. This does
not mean, of course, that punishment has been entirely eliminated; the stigmatizing forms of punishment, and the ego-reducing punishments have been eliminated. However, some girls behave in such a manner as to make some form of punishment a necessity to maintain discipline and control.

Some of the methods of rehabilitation being developed in the school are:

1. The restoration of "smoking periods" whereby the girl has an opportunity to smoke if she so desires and has the approval of her parent or guardian. This provides for periods of relaxation, and an opportunity to "discuss things" with the other girls.

2. A beauty shop which gives the girls beauty treatments, and aids in restoring their self-esteem and self-regard. People hastily judge others from their outward appearances; through this beauty clinic, the girls have an opportunity to improve their appearances. Another important feature of this beauty shop is the training given to the girls who are being schooled as cosmetologists. A trained and fully certified cosmetologist is in charge of the shop; it is her task to see that the girls being schooled here have an opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills that would enable them to pass the state examinations for cosmetologists.

3. The florist shop in which girls are trained in the art of creating corsages, center pieces, boutonnieres, and
other floral designs and arrangements. These articles are made from colored ribbons in preference to the flowers. Colored ribbons will not deteriorate, and they are more readily available than the flowers. This is another opportunity to learn a useful occupation for return to a more normal life when the students are released from the school.

4. A nurses' training school has been very recently added and approved. This school will provide practical nurses training, and upon release of the highly selected candidates in the school, the girls will be given more advanced training at some hospital.

These are the larger undertakings of the present rehabilitation program; there are several other such programs in effect that will aid the girls in reestablishing themselves as useful citizens when they are paroled from the school. These include such training as elementary school education, leathercrafts, kitchen work, vocational agriculture training during the spring, summer and fall seasons, vocal training in a glee club, and homemaking courses.

All of these projects are primarily designed to train the student for some acceptable position, as a means of rehabilitation. These various facilities increase the social contact range of the girls, but do not necessarily increase the interpersonal relationships. Probably the more influential
contacts are made in the students' cottages. This same thesis is expressed by Jennings:

In the test population the results indicate that living together in the same housing unit is provocative of more positive reactions and of a greater likelihood of the individual being reciprocated by those whom he is attracted than does participating together in work.1

Suggested Therapeutical Devices

Important to the rehabilitation of these girls is, of course, the means by which they will earn their livelihood when they are released from the school. This factor is being quite satisfactorily met by the previously stated techniques; other "trades" may be added as the school progresses in its program. However, one factor that seems to be neglected is that of the development of social skills and insight, so that the student will be able to analyze objectively those patterns of behavior that tend to bring discredit and objections from society. If, from such analysis, the student can gain insight into the "wrongness" of her own behavior, and is sufficiently motivated to become better adjusted to our society at large, then we may suppose that the combination of this training with the vocational training will restore to society a useful and better adjusted citizen.

Not only will they recognize the "wrongness," but the insight

---

1Jennings, op. cit., p. 229.
into their behavior will enable them to see the factors that caused or provoked them to such acts, and thereby have something more "tangible" to attack.

Socialization techniques require the employment of a well-trained therapist who is conscious of the needs of her subjects, and is aware of the "right method for the right individual." The range of maladjustment is great in such an institution, and many techniques that are primarily designed for "treatment" would prove fruitless in situations requiring mere activity as a means of building self-confidence in the subject. An important feature in the success of any remedial technique is the homogeneous grouping of the individuals. It would hardly seem wise to include a seriously maladjusted individual in a group that is undergoing an activity program; likewise, it would be unjust to both the maladjusted individuals and the minor problem group to mix them in one group for a "treatment group" primarily designed to release strongly repressed resentments and aggressions.

Role playing is one technique that would apply to the less seriously maladjusted individuals who merely lack the ability and "know how" of group participation. This would fit well into the program of rehabilitation for work situations, as it may help develop insight into the behavior patterns expected of people who are employed in positions that require a person to come in contact with the general
public, such as cosmetology, nursing, and floristry. In role playing, short "plays" of work situations may be dramatized, and the subjects are given the opportunity to express themselves regarding the approach, behavior, or attitude of the "actors." For this situation, spontaneity acting would probably inspire deeper and longer lasting insight than the memorization of a script. The work situation could be proposed by the therapist, with a few lead lines provided, and then the actors would develop the remainder of the situation.

Another suggested form of socialization, although for reasons that may be unknown to the author, it may be impractical, is the formation of some hobby groups or clubs. One thing lacking in the personality development of these girls is, in many instances, a feeling of belonging. A hobby club will enable them to capitalize upon their own abilities at levels at which they can succeed. Success in some undertaking is as important to better attitudes, personality and group adjustments as is any one therapeutic device. Through a hobby club, the student will have some group to which she feels she belongs, not because she is committed to the association by "orders from the front office" but because she has a definite contribution to make to the club. As a side issue, yet an important therapy device, various group therapies can be instituted as part of the club programs.
Self adjustment is needed, although not mandatory, for good group adjustment. Although there are some methods for better self adjustment, such as interviews and counseling, these recommendations are being limited to group adjustment because it is believed that an individual who possesses self maladjustments (provided they are not too deep seated) is still capable of making a good adjustment to the group without bringing discredit or negative responses to herself. It is also believed that the primary objective of rehabilitation of these girls is the adjustment to the group with which she comes in contact upon her release. Ackerman has called group therapy a "laboratory in social living." He states further, "It is a special kind of social experience and may bring about effective reduction of certain socially deviant behavior patterns."²

Two other therapeutical methods that would apply to the less seriously maladjusted individuals are the "service therapy" and the supportive therapy. Service therapy is of value to the student who has high social service interests. Here the therapist attempts to train the student to aid other students who are in need of help, and who will respond to the remedy used; whereas, the supportive therapy will require the attention of the therapist who will act as the "crutch" until such time as the student has gained sufficient ego strength to "stand alone."

²Nathan W. Ackerman, "Group Psychotherapy With Veterans," Mental Hygiene, XXX (October, 1946), 559-570.
An appropriate group technique for this school is described by Gabriel as being efficient for unresolved oedipus complexes and sexual disturbances. A free range of discussion is provided at regular meeting periods during which the girls are permitted an opportunity to release their pent-up emotions. The "worker" uses a minimum of interference, except when supervision is required, and no comment is made on any emotional release. It is important for the individual to rid herself of these repressions to gain more confidence and better insight into her behavior. The group should consist of no more than five or six girls, each having similar problems.

There are few, if any, group therapies designed to aid the psychoneurotic; they must be screened out of any program involving the development of group skills, socialization, and group insight through group therapy. However, for the more seriously maladjusted students who would not fare well in some of the aforementioned therapies, such devices as psychodrama and sociodrama may prove to be more effective. The psychodrama technique is similar to the role playing technique, except that it is designed for the treatment of the individuals involved. It is dramatization of individual problems of home life, social life, or behavioral maladjustments so that they may be viewed objectively and criticized.

constructively by a small group of the student's peers. In sociodrama, we find a broader approach; the individual confesses and dramatizes her maladjustment before the larger group, seeking comment, criticisms, suggestions and insight.

There are numerous ways of promoting better group adjustments which, in turn, may promote better interpersonal relationships, and some may be more appropriate for certain type situations. An attempt has been made to present a few methods that would seem adequate for the situation found at this school. Needless to say, any undertaking as described above will require the full time duty of a skillfully trained therapist; for this school, a woman therapist is mandatory. While a few of the teachers presently employed at the school may be able to fulfill a few of the minor requirements, it is important that the person responsible for such a program be relieved of supervisory and punishment practices. To do the work adequately, the therapist must be "one of the girls," yet maintain enough dignity to win the confidence and support of the groups with which she is working. This type worker would, in many cases, play an important part in the life of the girls, and she would be instrumental in reducing the amount of returnees for violation of parole. Combined with the present program in progress, it would be a highly effective instrument for rehabilitation.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The problem of this study was to determine the relationship between certain variables and peer acceptance. It was conducted on 110 white girls under 21 years of age, and who are confined to the State Training School for Girls, Gainesville, Texas, by the courts of the State of Texas. It was deemed essential for the girls to make a satisfactory adjustment to their present environment, and to have success in being accepted by their peers, before they could adjust to society at large.

Two closely related studies, published in the form of books, were referred to as background data. Both of these studies were conducted at the New York State Training School for Girls; one was made by J. L. Moreno, and the other by Helen H. Jennings. Moreno's study was conducted in the early 1930's, while Jennings conducted her study during 1937-1938. Both studies were intensive and exhaustive investigations of the factors related to peer acceptance, and the relationship between these factors.

The students of this study were administered a socio-metric scale which had been revised to suit their particular situation. The tests were scored by the use of weighted
scores, and a matrix chart was prepared for each cottage. Each girl was given an opportunity to respond positively or negatively to each other girl in her cottage. The results of these choices and rejections were used as a basis for comparison with other variables.

A comparison with a similar study was made to determine the similarities existing if any. Group indices for the five cottages were computed to determine the amount of peer acceptance and interpersonal relationships existing in the cottages as compared to what it could have been if strong mutualities existed among all the girls.

The five top girls in peer acceptance, and the five low girls, were selected; special study was made of these two groups to see if there were any significant factors evident. The relationships between the voting of the highs and lows for each other were computed by means of the critical ratio.

Positive and negative choices were studied to see if there was a greater feeling of hostility or friendliness existing among the girls. Mutual attractions and rejections among the girls were also studied to find out whether or not the students were accepting other girls in their cottage as friends, or rejecting them from their social life. It was also deemed advisable to determine to what degree the Latin-American students were accepted by the North-American students in the school. Age was related to peer acceptance in hopes
of uncovering some data which would lend itself to prove or disprove the hypothesis that the older the student the better she is accepted by her "friends."

Statistics which would show the amount of emotional expansiveness existing in the various cottages were computed. It was believed that the girls were in need of friends and some emotional expressions. A correlation was computed to determine if there was any relationship existing between the amount of friends needed, or emotional expansiveness, and the amount of friends possessed, or peer acceptance.

It was felt that certain leaders who were already serving the part of leader were not necessarily those who were highest in peer acceptance in their respective cottages. This variable was investigated to determine to what extent the present leaders in each cottage were also among the highs in peer acceptance in their cottage.

A final factor studied was the structure of the cottages in respect to mutuality in "best friend" choices. Sociograms were drawn to show the various cliques and networks that are presently existing, and to what extent certain individuals are not included in these cliques or networks. One cottage was selected in which the network was verbally described to better enable the reader to follow the chains in the chart.

In concluding the study, various methods successfully employed by other groups were suggested as a means of
building more successful and stronger relationships among the girls in the cottage to which each was assigned. A description of some of the procedures presently employed by the school was included. Such therapies as psychodrama, role-playing, spontaneity groups, and discussion groups were suggested methods for the rehabilitation program.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data contained in this report, certain conclusions may be drawn:

1. From the statistics computed on the group indices, we find that there is less feeling of mutuality existing in the Gainesville school than exists in the average elementary schools.

2. There is a more persistent trend for those students who are not very well accepted by their peers to vote more often for those students who rank among the highest in peer acceptance.

3. Individuals who rank high in peer acceptance tend to vote more for other students who rank high than they do for those students who are low in peer acceptance.

4. In spite of the type institution involved in this study, the subjects give more positive than negative votes when choosing each other.
5. The higher the student ranks in peer acceptance in her cottage, the greater the possibility of her possessing a larger number of mutual friends.

6. There is little distinction made among the students when choosing friends, on the basis of nationality differences. The North-American girls have similar rankings with those of Latin-American origin.

7. There is a very low relationship between peer accept ance rank and the age of the students involved in the ratings.

8. There is an almost zero relationship existing between the ranking of a student in peer acceptance and her emotional expansiveness rank.

9. The high students tend to make more positive choices than the low students.

10. Strong friendship cliques exist in almost every group.

11. There is at least one student who does not give nor receive a "best friend" choice from her cottage mates in each cottage.

12. Certain network chains exist in each cottage. This enables the students to "pass along" information.

Certain of these conclusions are drawn on only a small number of subjects in the study. Such studies that involve high and low groups are based on five students in each category, and this would necessarily place a limitation on the validity of any generalizations.
It seems evident that there is a greater need for socialization and peer acceptance among the girls at this school. In spite of the present rehabilitation methods now in use, certain of these girls are seriously lacking in acceptance. Suitable means of emotional expression and insight are in dire need by these girls. It is on these assumptions that the following is recommended:

1. Suitable means of expression be permitted, such as psychodrama, sociodrama, role playing, and group affiliations.

2. Classification for dormitory assignments be made on the basis of a sociometric scale administered to the entire school population. (This recommendation is new in the process of being acted upon. By request of the superintendent, a sociometric scale is being administered for the purpose of classifying students according to the results of the scale.)

3. This study should be followed, as soon as possible, by a study of the entire school population, and their feelings toward each other, as well as their feelings toward the teachers and housemothers employed at the school.

4. After a suitable period has elapsed and the end of the transition period, another study should be conducted to determine the differences, if any, in peer acceptance that have occurred during the interval between the two studies.
APPENDIX

TO THE TEACHER:

Please read this entire sheet to the girls, and then list the questions on the board so that the girls can read them as they are ready to answer each one. Be sure to have each girl put her name and the date on her paper when she turns it in.

TO ALL STUDENTS:

These data are needed to edit a measurement scale called "How I Feel Toward Others" so that the language of the scale will be similar to that used by you girls here at the State School. There are only four questions involved in this questionnaire.

1. List the name of one or two of your BEST FRIENDS here at the school, and then *tell all the reasons you can think of as to why they are your BEST FRIENDS*. For instance, some people choose Best Friends because they are people who help them when in trouble. Why did you name the person you did as BEST FRIEND?

2. Now list the name of one or two OTHER FRIENDS. These are people who are your friends, but not your BEST FRIEND. Then *tell all the reasons you can think of as to why they are your OTHER FRIENDS*. 
3. Now please list the names of one or two people you know but are not your friends. Then tell all the reasons you can think of as to why they are not your friends.

4. For this last question, please list the names of one or two people you do not want as friends as long as they are like they are now. Again, tell all the reasons you can think of as to why you do not want them as a friend as long as they are like they are now.

Your answers to these questions will be held in strict confidence, and they will be used to prepare a device to be used by Louis Weber, North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, in obtaining data for a study he will make here at the State School this spring. Please be as sincere as you can.
HOW I FEEL TOWARD OTHERS SCALE

The administrator and students should read this entire scale together.

TO THE PUPILS:

You have all taken a lot of tests in arithmetic, reading, and other subjects. You have been asked to take these tests so your teacher would know better how to help you in your studies. Now you are asked to tell how you feel toward other students in your cottage. This is not a test like the others you have taken. There are no right or wrong answers. All you need to do is to tell how you feel toward the other students in your cottage. By doing this, you will help the administrators to know which others you get along with best.

No student will be permitted to see another student's paper.

DIRECTIONS: Immediately after the reading of these directions, you will be given a sheet of paper containing the names of all the students in your cottage. You will be asked to place a number to the left of these names, including your own. The numbers which you will use are the numbers of the paragraphs listed below. Be sure you know how to mark your list of names before going ahead with your numbering.

Number 1 is for: My Best Friends. How can we tell our best friends from just ordinary friends? Below you will find listed some things which are generally true of your best friends here at the Training School.

A. They are very sweet to you, and help to keep you out of trouble, and you have fun with them.
B. They treat you nice and kindly, and they share things with you.
C. You talk with them a lot, and they can be depended upon.
D. You have common interests, and they help you when you don't understand something.

Number 2 is for: My Other Friends. Besides our best friends, all of us have other friends whom we like fairly well.

A. You talk with them sometimes, but do not always have fun with them.
B. You are nice to them most of the time, but you seldom share your things with them.
C. Sometimes you do things together, but not very often.
D. They are generally neat and clean, and they try to do what is right.
Number 3 is for: Students I Don't Know. All of us can not
know everyone on our list, and we cannot tell whether we
like them or not. It may be that you have not been with
them enough to tell much about them. You don't know how
you really feel toward these students. Put a 3 to the left
of those students you don't know well enough to rate.

Number 4 is for: Students I know but who are not my friends.
All of us know some persons quite well, but we do not con-
sider them to be our friends.

A. They think they’re better than others.
B. You do not get along very well with them when you are
around them,
C. You do not talk to them or associate with them unless it
is necessary to be polite.
D. You do not like some of the things they do, and the way
they act at times.

Number 5 is for: Students I do not want as friends as long as
they are like they are now. Nearly all of us find there are
a few persons we cannot get along with. These people may be
all right in some ways, and may be regarded as good friends
by others, but not by us.

A. They think they’re smart, and you never choose them as
partners for a game.
B. Sometimes you fuss, quarrel, and fight with them when you
are around them.
C. They are too bossy and two-faced.
D. You dislike very much some of the things they do, and the
way they act at times.

Now let us go over the main headings.
What is number 1 for? (Students respond)
What is number 2 for? (Students respond)
What is number 3 for? (Students respond)
What is number 4 for? (Students respond)
What is number 5 for? (Students respond)

You do not have to use all these numbers. You may use any one
as many times as you wish. All you need to do is show how you
feel about each person on your list by putting one of the
above numbers to the left of her name.
You will now be given the sheets containing the names of all
the students in your cottage.
Look for your own name and place a 6 to the left of it. If
your name is not on the list, inform the instructor so that
your name can be added to everybody's list. After you have
finished, place your paper face down on the table until the
examiner takes it up. Go ahead and place your numbers to
the left of every name on your list.
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