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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the social interaction and the social dynamics which existed in one section of the Men's Quadrangle at North Texas State College, giving particular attention to the attraction and repulsion between roommates. The second purpose of this study was the application of the above investigation to the management of the dormitory in general, and the assignment of roommates in particular.

Definition of Terms

The definition of general terms in the area of sociometry is probably not necessary; however, where definitions may be doubtful, terms will be defined as they are introduced into the study.

Social status score was specifically defined for this study to mean the algebraic sum of the number of positive and negative votes received.

Reject or group reject was defined as a person who received more negative choices than positive choices.
Isolate was defined as a person who received neither positive nor negative choices.

Rejection was defined as any negative choice given or received.

Significance of the Problem

The significance of this study lay in its kinship to the area of human relations, for the problems which arise out of a dormitory situation are imbedded in the relationships among the individuals of the group. The college dormitory offers a great many possibilities for human relations training, and higher education has come to realize its responsibility for training students in this area as well as along conventional academic lines.

The importance of the present problem and the need for studying the contributions which dormitories can make in social relations training is given impetus in a study reported by Thompson. Thompson, gathering information through group interviews with students, investigated the possible contributions of residence halls to the entire educational program. 1 "If it is true that individual problems are essentially social, is not training in social education a suitable objective for higher education?" asks Thompson. 2 She classified her findings into four


2 Ibid., p. 649.
major areas: Personal Living, Personal-Social Relationships, Social-Civic Relationships, and Economic Relationships. The following are the results of the responses which Thompson received when asking the students what it was that they learned from their college experiences:

In the area of Personal Living some of the learnings students believed they experienced were: (1) the building of a satisfactory personal philosophy, (2) the formation of individuality through self-expression and in turn the integration of personality, (3) emotional maturation including emancipation from the family, (4) the acquisition of knowledge, (5) the development of interests, appreciations, and attitudes, and (6) the development of skills and techniques.

The area of Personal-Social Relationships includes the immediate face-to-face situations, and learnings in this area were said to include: (1) social customs and techniques, (2) the formation and evaluation of friendships, and (3) the ability to get along with all kinds of people.

Social-Civic Relationships are considered to be those out of face-to-face contact. In this area they learned: (1) techniques of working with groups, (2) how to be leaders and how to select leaders, (3) the meaning of being responsible to the group or for the group, (4) consideration for individuals and groups, (5) the necessity for appropriate regulations for group living, (6) the importance of co-operation to a smooth-running enterprise, (7) loyalty to the group, (8) tolerance, and (9) freedom.

The area of Economic Relations was seldom mentioned.

From these data it is clear that students place much emphasis on their relations with the group and on their relations with other individuals. In conclusion, Thompson states: "Just as the end product of learning experiences was found to be largely in the area of human

\[3\text{Ibid., pp. 649-650.}\]
relationships, so was it also evident that the process of learning was rooted in dynamic social forces. It is some of these social dynamics which have been studied in the present investigation.

Physical Setting of the Study

The Men's Quadrangle consists of four separate units with a central dining hall. Each unit is divided into two ramps, with Ramps 1 and 2 constituting a section which is separated by a solid wall from the section formed by Ramps 3 and 4. It is not possible to get from one section to another within the building. Each unit contains fifty three-boy rooms, giving every unit a capacity of 150 boys with a total dormitory capacity of 600 residents. This study was conducted among the seventy-five residents of Unit III, Ramps 3 and 4. These two ramps are separated by a stair well, as is the case in every section, with Ramp 3 on one side of the stairs and Ramp 4 on the other. There are two floors in the Ramp 4 division and three floors in the Ramp 3 division, with fifteen boys to each ramp-floor.

Administrative Organization of the Dormitory

The Men's Quadrangle is administered by a residence director and eight counselors. One of these counselors, the writer, is designated

4 Ibid., p. 651.
as Head Counselor to act in the absence of the residence director. Counselors are responsible for two ramps or one section as described above. The management of each section of the dormitory is left very largely to the discretion of the counselor in charge, with the exception of certain administrative functions such as the collection of room and board payments and the enforcement of college regulations governing drinking, gambling, and firearms. Prior to the fall of 1952 only two of the four units were open, since the other two units were not completed until the summer of that year. Consequently, the present study took place in a setting which had no established traditions and no strict disciplinary policies. The Quadrangle is characterized by the amount of freedom given its residents. This point is of considerable importance to the study.

Description of the Sample

The sample used in this study consisted of the seventy-five male residents of the Men's Quadrangle, Unit III, Ramps 3 and 4. Of this group, approximately seventy-one per cent were freshmen, fifteen per cent were sophomores, eight per cent were juniors, three per cent were seniors, and three per cent were graduate students. Eighty per cent of the residents were new to the dormitory system, while twenty per cent had been in the dormitory system earlier in their college experience, either in the 1951-52 school year or in the summer sessions.
of 1952. Most of this group had been with the counselor of this section on one or both of these occasions. The mean age of the group was 18.0 years, with a range of from seventeen to twenty-three years of age. All residents came from the state of Texas with the exception of one from Arkansas and one from Mississippi. The major courses of study being pursued by the residents ran the gamut of majors offered by the college. Table 1 gives the distribution of majors as shown on the residence cards filled out by the boys in September of 1952, although this distribution underwent considerable change during the semester.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTS ACCORDING TO MAJORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Medical and Pre-Dental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Registrar’s Office, the relative sizes of each of the five major academic divisions of the college were as follows, ranking from largest to smallest: the School of Education, the School of Business Administration, the School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Music, and the School of Home Economics.

The counselor for this section, the writer, was included as part of the group throughout the study.

Procedure

The procedure employed in gathering the data for this study was primarily sociometric. A sociometric test or choice form was constructed to include a roommate criterion and a leisure-time criterion. The roommate criterion consisted of both positive and negative choices. The form was prefaced with a paragraph designed primarily to motivate choosing. The following page is an example of the form used.
Name

In an effort to make your college residence a better place in which to live the management of your dormitory is studying the policy of assigning roommates. We want you to be as happy and comfortable as possible. Obviously everyone cannot get along with everyone else; we all have our likes and dislikes. It is important that you have an agreeable roommate—it's not a matter of good or bad, right or wrong, but a matter of the type of people which you like.

Below are three areas in which we would like to have you make some choices. We cannot promise that you will be able to get the roommates that you want next semester (as time passes you may change your mind), but wherever it is possible we want you to feel free to make the change at the end of the semester.

PLEASE MAKE THESE CHOICES IN THE ORDER OF YOUR PREFERENCE AT THIS TIME.

THIS FORM IS STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

1. List the boys that you would most like to have as your roommates in order of your preference (first choice first). You may make as many choices as you like.

2. List the boys you would least like to have as your roommates in order. You may list as many as you wish.

3. List the boys that you would most like to have with you in an activity such as planning a dance, playing a game, double-dating, studying together, working on a class project, etc., in order of preference. You may list as many as you like.
It will be noted from the form on the preceding page that the residents could make an unlimited number of choices out of the total dormitory population of 600 residents. The second question was designed to enable the writer to gather negative sociometric data.

During the third week of the fall semester, the counselor personally went to each resident and had him fill out the test. All seventy-five residents returned the choice forms at that time. Again at the end of the semester, the sixteenth week of the fall term, the counselor had the residents fill out the choice forms; only sixty-nine forms were returned on the second choosing since six boys had left school during the semester. The procedures for the analysis of these data will be presented later in this presentation.

Another technique employed in gathering the data herein reported was by the participant observer method. The counselor played the role of participant observer. This concept needs some clarification, and its implications to the present study should be considered.

This term is explained or defined by Moreno as follows:

In order to overcome the grave errors which may arise in and from the investigator himself, we resort to a sociometric approach which is especially adapted to the microscopic study of social phenomena. The participant observer—in one particular form of this work—does not remain "objective" or at a distance from the persons being studied: he becomes their friend. He identifies himself with their own situation; he becomes an extension of their own egos. In other words, the "objective" participant becomes a "subjective" one. As a subjective participant he can enter successively or simultaneously into the
lives of several individuals, and then function as a medium between them. 5

The counselor endeavored to be "one of the boys" as much as possible; yet his position as an administrator made this impractical on certain occasions when it was necessary for him to take disciplinary action. This method made it possible for the counselor to observe the actions and discussions of the residents without being looked upon as an intruder or as an outsider. Some method needed to be employed to check the counselor's position in the group. Accordingly, a Counselor Rating Form was developed with items designed to give particular attention to the counselor's relationships with the boys in the dormitory unit. The following discussion is concerned with this check on the methodology being used for gathering part of the data which will be presented in this study. An example of this Counselor Rating Form appears on the following page.

Sixty-five of the seventy-five residents returned this scale during the fourteenth week of the term. The scale was circulated by one of the residents at a time when the counselor was known to be out of town. Eighty-four per cent of these residents felt that their counselor was doing a good job in keeping the dormitory a desirable place in which to live. In response to the second item, seventy-five per cent

---

PLEASE FILL OUT AND RETURN TO YOUR COUNSELOR.

COUNSELOR RATING

Please rate your counselor on the following points. DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME. Please be honest about this so that we can find out what we're doing that's not right or that you don't like.

1. Do you feel that your counselor is doing a good job of keeping your section a desirable place in which to live?
   Yes _____ No _____

2. Do you feel that your counselor enforces the rules and regulations too strictly _____ about right _____ not strictly enough _____

3. Is your counselor always willing to help you with school or personal problems?
   Yes _____ No _____

4. Would you go to your counselor with a personal problem?
   Yes _____ No _____

5. Do you like your counselor as a person?
   Yes _____ No _____
   Is he one of the boys?
   Yes _____ No _____

6. Please make any comments that you wish concerning the management of your section of this dorm.
Limitations of the Study

The present study was limited to the Men's Quadrangle at North Texas State College. The findings cannot be assumed to apply to other dormitory situations, although some of the data, particularly the sociometric data gathered, are in line with the findings of other investigators.
CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES

Several investigations have been conducted in recent years which have a direct bearing on the present study.

Since the placing of individuals together in a dormitory at the beginning of the school year creates a new group from which a social configuration will spring, consideration should be given to the development of new social structures. Powell and his associates have studied this structural process in the Women's Quadrangle at the University of Oklahoma. ¹ After thirty-five girls had lived together for thirty-seven days, these investigators found that a group structure developed with four major cliques centering around the academic classifications of the residents, and that this structure was fairly constant on five criteria (choices of girls to chat with, choices of girls to eat with, choices of a committee for action, choices for roommates, and choices of people to tell problems to). The authors pointed out that there was surface stability in the structure, as seen

in the emergence of cliques, but that the group hierarchy in the cliques was not well defined in this period of time.

Another factor involved in the study of groups and group structures centers around cleavages. Smucker investigated this and other related points in an undergraduate women's dormitory at Michigan State College. He gathered his data by means of a questionnaire consisting of items concerning best friend choices, rejections, campus prestige, personality, and background factors. Placing emphasis on negative data, he found that the range of rejections was from zero for thirty-six girls to twelve rejections for one individual. Mutual rejections were found to be almost non-existent; there were six pairs out of a total of 159 negative choices. The author, in accounting for this phenomenon, states: "This might imply that people are simply unaware of the degree of repulsion directed toward them." A comparison of the number of rejections received by an individual to the number in a group is referred to by the author in terms of the "tension factor."

Smucker, who was also interested in the relationship between these types of data and guidance, makes the following statement:

Much guidance, especially that related to effective personal and social adjustment, neglects one of the most fundamental factors in inter-personal relationships.

---


3 Ibid., p. 329.
namely, the spontaneity with which individuals accept each other as friends in a specific milieu. A considerable amount of maladjustment relates to the inability of individuals to gain social acceptance and their efficiency in finding their most effective locus of group activity.

This author also made a careful analysis of the cliques in his study and placed them into the following seven categories: (1) bridge players, (2) academic majors, (3) the "de-bunkers," (4) the noisy jitter-bug gang, (5) the joiners, (6) the literary crowd, and (7) the regional associates coming from a common geographic location.

Smucker found that there was no relationship between friendship and prestige status and the educational or occupational background of the parents.

In discussing his findings on behavior characteristics, Smucker states:

In general, highly chosen individuals engage in behavior which represents the highest values of the group. In addition there is a definite sensitivity to individual needs and the ability to provide some degree of emotional satisfaction in the fulfillment of those needs. It was also observed that individuals much sought after as friends had the ability to control their moods to the extent of not inflicting negative feelings on their peers. They all had a peculiar ability in establishing rapport with other individuals through a combination of characteristics which appeal to a higher than average number of individuals.

In the case of rejects, the opposite of the above description was found to be true. The isolate was a neutral individual in respect to

---

5 Ibid., pp. 335-337.
the above description, and the average chosen individual was difficult
to describe—they were good citizens, but they lacked leadership.

The likelihood of friendships being established was found by
Smucker to be in inverse proportion to the distance between individual
prestige and status scores. The correlation between prestige status
scores and friendship choices was reported as being a Pearsonian
$r$ of 0.64.

Negative sociometric data as related to group tension was studied
earlier by Smucker in an investigation of friendship patterns at Stevens
College. 6 A questionnaire, in which students were asked to name their
best friends, as well as those persons with whom they did not care to
associate, was employed in gathering the data. The investigation
was carried out in five dormitories with ninety per cent of the 745
girls living there responding to the measurement.

The author points out that the primary difference between the
positive and negative sociogram "is the lack of articulation in the
sub-group structure." 7 There were several other factors which are
characteristic of rejection patterns, according to Smucker. These
factors are: the single rejection, mutual rejections, negative pairs,
lone rejects, negative chains, negative mutual triangles and quad-
rangles, and rejection clusters. The author discovered an interesting

---

6 Orden Smucker, "Measurement of Group Tension Through the
Use of Sociometric Data," Sociometry, X (November, 1947), 376-383.
7 Ibid., p. 377.
point concerning the concentration of rejections in relation to the concentration of positive choices. He states:

A rather curious phenomenon existed in this study as seen in the fact that the out-going negative arrows were considerably smaller in number than the positive and at the same time the concentration of rejections on certain individuals was much higher than the concentration of positive choices on the popular individuals in the positive sociogram.  

Group tension was found to be measured in terms of the ratio of rejections to the total number of individuals in the group, and Smucker points out that enlarging the size of the group will increase the number of rejections, thereby increasing group tension.

Reilly and Robinson conducted two investigations which considered factors related to social acceptance. These authors pointed out that there is a great desire for friendship on the part of students starting to college and "keen observers have judged that this desire for acceptance and its corollary, the sex drive, are the primary motivating forces of the adolescent age." This point is particularly applicable to the present investigation.

In their first study, these authors presented evidence concerning the ability to predict the popularity of freshmen on the basis of

8Ibid., p. 379.

college entrance records.\textsuperscript{10} Their sample consisted of 163 girls, mostly freshmen, in a dormitory at Ohio State University. The authors found that the predictive efficiency of such data was very low. By comparing sociometric status with items on the entrance records, it was found that significant differences between groups, composed of the upper, middle, and lower thirds on the sociometric data, and records existed on only two items. These two items were chronological age and the existence of a broken home situation. No significant differences were found between sociometric status or popularity and such factors as the number of children in the family, high school activities participated in, high school honors held, parents' education, father's occupation, religious preference, and home town size.

In their second study, Reilly and Robinson endeavored to determine what effect room assignments as to location in the dormitory had on popularity.\textsuperscript{11} The same sample of students was employed as that for their first study. Using eight criteria as the basis for determining popularity, the authors found that there was no significant relationship between popularity and the location of the room that the girl occupied in the dormitory. Furthermore, these authors found that

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., pp. 67-72.

girls who lived near popular girls were not guaranteed any degree of popularity.

French and Mensh studied the relationships between sociometric data and inter-personal judgments among thirty-four girls in a sorority house at Northwestern University. The purpose of their investigation was to determine the extent of the relationships between sociometric status and (1) group's ratings of individuals on several personality characteristics, (2) ratings on individuals by persons of varying sociometric status, and (3) self ratings. These authors found, first, that students who were rated high on the more valid social traits also had high sociometric status. Second, the ratings which a student made were in some cases significantly influenced by his own status in the group; and, finally, sociometric status was not found to be directly related to self ratings.

Investigating the in-group cohesion and the relative amount of social distance between in-groups and out-groups, Lundberg and Beazley discovered several interesting factors. The determination of out-groups was made on the basis of certain information found on college records. The investigation, involving 253 students, showed


that there was a very strong tendency to select persons from one's own in-group in regard to the following four factors: (1) academic classification, (2) major scholastic interest, (3) common domicile and geographic proximity between living quarters, and (4) socio-economic status.

Frequency of association was also found to be important among the various years and majors. In addition, these authors reported that in-group preference was due partly to students being in the same classes. Finally, the authors feel that propinquity is the prior or dominant factor which determines in-group indices. Concerning the latter finding, the authors pose the following question:

The question will arise as to whether the observed in-group preferences result from the choice of association or whether friendships already formed on other bases cause students to choose a house, major, classes, etc., in order to associate more closely with the previously preferred members of the group. 14

Bonney studied friendship choices at the college level in relation to church affiliation, in-church preferences, family size, and length of time in college. 15 Six church groups and one non-church group were involved in his study. Twelve hundred students at North Texas

14 Ibid., p. 71.

State College rated themselves and a friend on a personality inventory and then chose a second friend who was not rated. About forty-five per cent of the college population (2,546 students) were used in the investigation.

The author reported the following results:

1. Of the six churches studied none showed a reliable advantage over another in developing the kind of individuals who win friends in college.

2. Those students (chiefly men) who did not align themselves with any church received friendship choices beyond chance expectancy, and this difference in their favor is statistically reliable.

3. All churches except the Christian showed in-group preferences which are statistically reliable, but the Baptist church showed this tendency to the greatest extent. Also the Baptists showed the least amount of preference for all out-group individuals.

4. Those students who did not belong to any church also showed a very high degree of in-group preference. Since the great majority of them were men, the conclusion seems warranted that the non-church-goers constituted primarily a male clique.

5. No family size showed a reliable advantage over another in friendship choices received, with the exception of the largest family size, which fell below expectancy, and this difference is highly reliable statistically.

6. Length of time in school did not bear a consistent relationship to number of choices received, with exception of extreme groups. Those who had been in school less than one full semester fell far below expectancy, while those who had been in school six or more semesters obtained a reliably greater number of votes than chance alone would allow. 16

16 Ibid., p. 165.
The nature of rejection was studied by Kidd at Michigan State College, using 639 male residents in a dormitory situation. A sociometric type questionnaire was employed by the author to gather his data and the nature of rejection was found to be involved in two factors. The first was the background factor. Kidd found that rejection significantly was related to an individual's being a foreigner in a national or ethnic sense and to an individual's being from a city whose population was over 100,000. In addition, it was found that lower classmen are more rejected by upper classmen than upper classmen are rejected by lower classmen.

Under the area of behavior characteristics, Kidd's investigation showed that egocentric, inconsiderate, aggressive, withdrawn, odd, and juvenile behavior are significantly related to rejection. According to the author, the type of aggression referred to above is the type which arises out of insecurity.

Vreeland studied social relations in eleven male and female fraternity groups and this study bore out other findings in the area of sociometry in that there was a persistence for highly chosen individuals to remain high over a period of time, while the low remained low.


18 Francis M. Vreeland, "Social Relations in the College Fraternity," Sociometry, V (May, 1942), 151-162.
Concerning the influence of academic classification in these groups, the author points out:

In conclusion, then, it may be said that in the college fraternity membership in one's college class introduces a skew which interferes with the choices which might otherwise be made if personality traits alone were involved. \(^{19}\)

\(^{19}\)Ibid., p. 162.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURE, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Procedure

The choices which were obtained on the sociometric tests were analyzed by means of matrix charts. Figure 1 is an example of one of these charts and is an actual segment of the chart which was constructed from the first set of choices. Two of these charts were constructed—one for the first test and one for the second.

Under the names listed across the top of the chart are recorded the votes which the individual gave. Reading across from the vertical list of names, the votes which the individual received are shown. The black numbers indicate positive choices on the roommate criterion and the size of the number indicates the order of preference (1—first choice, 2—second choice, etc.). The negative numbers indicate rejections and their order; and the red numbers indicate leisure-time choices and again the size of the number indicates the order of preference. For example, Carl gave a first choice to Emil, a second choice to Hugh, a second order rejection to George, and a leisure-time choice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>NCR</th>
<th>PCR</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Given</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>George</th>
<th>Henry</th>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Emil</th>
<th>Hugh</th>
<th>Ivan</th>
<th>Karl</th>
<th>Keith</th>
<th>Phillip</th>
<th>David</th>
<th>Joel</th>
<th>Hal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emil</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mickie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.—Example of the matrix chart used in analyzing the sociometric data.
to Henry. Carl's first order rejection was given to a person on another floor and was recorded under Carl's name but further down on the chart. Carl received a fourth place choice from Henry, a seventh place choice from Ben, a fourth place choice from Emil, and a third place choice from another floor. He also received a first order leisure-time choice from another floor.

On the left-hand side of the vertical list of names are recorded the number of choices each resident received under each of the three choice categories. The first column (labeled PCR in Figure 1) indicates the number of positive choices for roommate received by the resident, irrespective of the order of preference. In the case of Carl, this number was four. The second column (labeled NCR in Figure 1) shows the number of negative choices received by an individual for not being wanted as a roommate; the order of preference was not considered. In the column labeled SSS in Figure 1 is recorded the social status score of the resident. Carl had a social status score of four, since he received four positive roommate choices and no negative choices. George, on the other hand, had a status score of zero, since he received three positive choices and three negative choices. Phillip, receiving two positive choices and thirteen negative choices, had a score of minus 11. Finally, the red numbers in the first column (PCR, Figure 1) indicate the number of leisure-time choices which an individual received.
Columns for the number of positive, negative, and leisure-time choices given were also included in the matrix charts but are not shown in Figure 1.

Several variations of the standard sociometric matrix chart were employed to make these charts particularly applicable to the data being analyzed. First, the names of the residents were arranged according to rooms with the black inked lines indicating the room divisions. Second, the names were also arranged according to a plan based upon ramp-floor units, with each large red square representing one floor. To the right of the floor division shown in Figure 1 would be four more such divisions in which were recorded the choices which residents on other floors gave boys on this floor. Under the large red divisions shown in Figure 1 were recorded the choices which the boys on this floor gave to residents on other floors.

The blue line running diagonally across the chart served as a base line. The spread or concentration of choosing within rooms or floor units was readily observable by noting whether or not the choices clustered along this line. This clustering is not particularly apparent in Figure 1; however, it will be noticed that the room cell colored red is an example of a room cluster, while less concentration and more spread can be observed in the room cell which is colored green.
The room divisions of the chart through which the blue line passes have been referred to as room cells because they show the degree of choosing which took place within the room itself. For example, in the room cell shaded red in Figure 1, all three of the boys in the room chose one another, while in the room cell shaded green only one mutual choosing occurred.

Similar nomenclature has been used in the case of floors. The large red division seen in Figure 1 is a floor cell, since the choosings within the floor unit are shown there. The divisions of the chart to the right and under this cell show only the choices given and received between this floor and the other four floors.

At the bottom of the charts was recorded the number of votes which the residents of this section gave to residents in other sections of the dormitory system. This feature of the matrix charts is not shown in Figure 1.

Besides the matrix charts described above, sociograms were constructed for some of the floors. Modified examples of these sociograms will be presented later in this chapter.

The Choice Process

The primary focus of this presentation is on the functional relationships which existed in this particular section of the Quadrangle. Statistics are inadequate to describe or explain these one-to-one,
face-to-face relationships. Some of the findings of the investigation, however, are important in that they support the growing body of information dealing with inter-personal relations.

Table 2 presents the means, medians, and ranges for the distribution of choices given on the roommate and leisure-time criteria and the means, medians, and ranges of the beginning and end distributions of social status scores.

### TABLE 2

**MEANS, MEDIANS, AND RANGES FOR THE FIRST AND SECOND SOCIOMETRIC TESTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Medians</th>
<th>Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Test</td>
<td>Second Test</td>
<td>First Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roommate . .</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure time . .</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status score. .</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An extreme score of -23 was not included in this distribution.

Using the Pearson-Moment method of correlation, the relations between the roommate and leisure-time criteria were 0.731 and 0.900
of these residents thought that he enforced the regulations "about right"; eleven per cent considered him "too strict"; and fourteen per cent believed him to be "not strict enough." Seventy-seven per cent felt that their counselor was willing to help them with school and personal problems, and fifty-four per cent indicated that they would go to him with personal problems. Finally, ninety per cent of this group liked the counselor as a person; and sixty-two per cent considered him to be "one of the boys."

Apparently, the counselor had achieved reasonably good status in the group, although there could have easily been a certain amount of "halo" effect involved in the ratings. In a group of this size, however, anyone would have difficulty in becoming an integrated part of every group or the intimate confidant of every individual in the group. Then, too, the counselor was a graduate student enrolled for a full-time course of study and had only a limited amount of time to devote to establishing rapport with his boys. Nevertheless, the counselor was fairly well accepted in the group, though not necessarily as a peer.

Other data for the study were gathered through conferences with the residents individually and in groups, from dormitory records, and from records in the office of Counseling and Guidance Services of the college.
for the beginning and end tests, respectively. This would indicate that there was a fairly strong and constant relationship between these two criteria.

Using the social status scores derived from the two tests, the difference between the means of the beginning and end tests was found to be significant at the 0.654 per cent level of confidence. The correlation between the two tests was 0.67 and the critical ratio between the means was 2.72. The above correlation was statistically significant, since the critical ratio between this number and zero was 5.5.

Some Factors Involved in the Choice Process

In discussing the relationships which existed in this section of the dormitory, there were certain factors which may have had considerable influence on the choice process.

The first of these was the management of the group by the counselor. There were only two activities in which the entire group was involved. One was a series of group meetings which were held for the purpose of establishing a system of self-government for the section. After several meetings, the residents organized a Disciplinary Council composed of two boys from each floor. The counselor acted as a kind of "prosecuting attorney" for the group, and the boys decided that he would be responsible for the enforcement of the rules which
the group had drawn up. Residents were brought before the council by the counselor and the council determined the punishment which was to be meted out to the offenders. This council was not a "kangaroo court"; its actions took the form of recommendations for disciplinary action made to the residence director. This program met with only moderate success, but the council did function frequently throughout the semester.

The second program in which the entire section was involved was the opportunity to participate in an intermural sports program. When the counselor began talking about the program, there was, or seemed to be, considerable enthusiasm over it. Only one football team, however, emerged from the group with about seventeen residents participating. The counselor assumed that other boys might have participated if they had not had late afternoon classes.

Emphasis should be placed on the fact that these two activities were given only a minimum amount of impetus by the counselor. He did not attempt to sell either program to the residents nor did he encourage participation in them. Furthermore, no effort was made by the counselor to get socialization in the group to take place. The emphasis was on spontaneous association based on the personal preferences of one individual for another.
The point being established is that the relationships which existed in this group were primarily of a psychegroup nature rather than of a sociogroup nature. With the exception of the two activities described above, the residents of this section had no objectives or goals. It is assumed that the only reason for associations of the type being reported here were involved in the attractions and repulsions between the individuals of the group.

A second factor which influenced the choice process was nearness or propinquity. This point comes up throughout the study and will be discussed in those sections in which its influence can be seen to be the strongest.

A third factor, pertaining particularly to the second set of choices which the residents made, concerned those boys who moved from the dormitory during the semester as well as those boys who anticipated moving at the end of the term. College regulations provide that single male undergraduate students must live in the dormitory during their first year on the campus. This rule applies to transfer students as well as to freshmen. Since there was not enough dormitory space to accommodate all of these students, exceptions to this rule were frequently made. The counselor felt that this point would have a marked effect upon the second sociometric test because the residents were anticipating that room assignments for the spring semester would be made on the basis of their choices.
In an effort to counteract any effect that these boys leaving might have on the choosings, the counselor requested that the residents choose as if all the boys were going to be in the dormitory for another term. The choosings indicated that the residents did in most cases choose with this point in mind, because those boys who were known to be moving maintained their status on the second test. This is not to say, however, that this point did not affect the choosing process at all.

The influence of this factor was observed during the week which followed the second sociometric test. Association patterns in the section began to change markedly at that time with those boys who were to move out definitely excluded from group activities. This exclusion was not so much a repulsion on the part of the remaining residents as it was a withdrawal on the part of the moving ones; their leisure time became occupied with activities related to their moving. A realignment of cliques also took place so that by the time room assignments were made for the new semester, a new social structure was partially established.

Two other factors influencing the choice process and associations were "bull sessions" and mischief. The "bull session" is no doubt traditional wherever boys get together, and it was certainly very popular in this section of the dormitory. An indescribable amount of the leisure time of these boys was spent in this type of
activity. The counselor observed sessions composed of as many as twenty-five boys, all in the same room, on more than one occasion. In the majority of the cases, however, the number of participants in "bull sessions" ranged from five to ten boys. Most of the "bull sessions" took place before and after meals and at night after the residents had returned from their evening's activities. These sessions contributed greatly to the amount of noise and general disturbance which was caused after eleven o'clock at night; nevertheless, the important factor was that these situations—the "bull sessions"—provided opportunities for socialization and association to take place. In these situations the residents formed their original opinion of one another. Mischief such as "horse play," water fights, and other practical jokes also provided situations in which the residents were in contact with one another. These situations helped the boys get acquainted with each other's attitudes. In both of these activities, the residents exchanged their experiences, both past and present; and no doubt they were quick to ascertain the persons with whom they had things in common and with whom they would like to have additional association.

Cliqu es

Cliqu es were determined on the basis of the choices received and given on both the roommate and the leisure-time criteria and on the basis of the observations of the counselor. The cliques consisted
of three or more boys who, in most cases, mutually chose one another; but in no case did the clique exceed six persons. Membership in the cliques which are about to be discussed was by no means constant and their determination of membership was somewhat arbitrary, since they were in a process of continual change. Leisure-time associations as observed by the counselor were used to supplement the sociometric data in determining which boys should be included in these groups.

The cliques which developed were not clearly defined at the time of the first sociometric test. By the end of the term, the second sociometric measurement indicated more articulation of these groups; however, some of the cliques lacked cohesiveness while others were difficult to differentiate from the choice clusters found on the matrix chart. The sociometric test used seemed weak in its ability to differentiate small groups out of larger ones. Because of the closeness of the situation in which these boys lived, the counselor felt that a certain amount of "fraternal spirit" had developed by the end of the term so that instead of measuring psyche-group attractions, the test measured acquaintance volume.

Since the cliques emerged from the respective floor units, their existence and development will be discussed floor by floor. The floors were arbitrarily numbered from one to five, and each room was identified by letters A through E. A modified sociogram showing the mutual
relationships on the first and second sociometric tests will be presented in conjunction with the discussion of each floor unit.

On Floor 1 the original matrix chart indicated that there were four potential cliques. Three of these—Room A, Room C, and Room D—were roommate situations in which there were three mutual choices. If three boys in a room mutually chose one another, as was the case in these three room situations, this would generally constitute a clique; however, such situations existed in only twelve of the twenty-five rooms on the first test and in only three of the twenty-five rooms on the second test. The fourth group on this floor consisted of two boys from Room B and two boys from Room D.

By the end of the term, the cliques in Room C and Room D had dissolved, and Room A had lost some of its cohesiveness in that there were only two mutual choices indicated on the second matrix chart. A rather strong clique did develop between the four boys in Room B and Room D (Clique I), although the third roommate in each of these rooms was excluded. Clique I was characterized by the amount of "out-of-dorm" activities in which it participated, by not being very prone to study, and by the large amount of noise for which it was responsible.

Clique II developed out of Room C, Room D, and Room E and consisted of five boys. From the standpoint of association, this group was
weaker than Clique I. At the end of the semester, Room E contained only two boys, as the other resident had left school early in the term. Room C, in which there was originally a group of three mutual choices, was split by a "personality clash," and two of these boys joined Clique II. The fifth member of this group was the excluded roommate in Room D. Lack of participation in "out-of-dorm" activities characterized this group, though some of its members did date frequently. As a group, these boys could easily have been called "the show-goers."

Figure 2 shows the arrangement of cliques on Floor 1. The mutual choice lines shown here included either roommate or leisure-time choices or both. Black lines indicate mutual choices on the first sociometric test, and the red lines indicate mutual choices on the second sociometric test. A line drawn away from the name indicates a mutual choice between this boy and a person on another floor. A single asterisk (*) indicates that this boy moved out during the semester, and a double asterisk (**) indicates that the boy moved out of the dormitory at the end of the semester after the second test. The parallel lines down the center of these figures represents the hallways on each floor. The colored squares show the cliques to which the residents belonged.

There were two cliques on Floor 2 at the beginning of the semester. These groups contained three boys each, with a fourth boy fitting
equally well into either group. The clique in Room A (Clique III) lost two of its members by the end of the semester, and Clique IV in Room B lost one member. The counselor was not in close enough contact with these groups to be able to characterize them by any particular type of activity, although they were generally noisy and frequently absent from the dormitory at night.

As the socializing process continued to develop, a rearrangement of these two groups took place so that by the end of the term there were no cliques on the floor. The remaining members of the two groups became attached to Clique I on Floor 1. Figure 3 shows these two groups on Floor 2 as they existed during most of the term.
A very strong clique (Clique V) appeared on Floor 3 at the time of the first sociometric test. An exception occurred here in that this group appeared to be composed of seven persons; actually there were so many mutual choices between the members of the group that no one could be excluded and no further differentiation could be made. As time passed, however, observations indicated that the group was made up of two closely knit, well-integrated cliques. This group was characterized as being a home-town clique, since all except two of its members were from the same home-town area. These boys could not be characterized by any particular type of group activity. The
final choosings indicated that the structure of the group was considerably weaker than it had formerly been and actually became two cliques, indicated as Cliqués Va and Vb in Figure 4.

Fig. 4. —Cliqués on Floor 3.

To Clique VI on Floor 4 were added three other boys by the end of the term. This group's existence was observed shortly after the first choosing and remained constant throughout the term, although one member was lost at the end of the semester. These boys were very active in both dating and sports. Figure 5 shows this clique.
Finally, there were three cliques on Floor 5, two of which were well integrated. Cliques VII and VIII remained fairly constant throughout the semester, although each group lost one member. Clique IX dissolved at the end of the term, and one of its members joined Clique VII. This group was characterized by the dating behavior of its members and by its participation in sports. There was a mild degree of integration between these three cliques, based on observed associations. Figure 6 shows the clique arrangements on this floor.

There are several other factors to be considered concerning the cliques which developed in this section of the dormitory. Because
of the physical layout of the dormitory, the floor formed natural units in which the residents associated. Any boy would have had difficulty in living on a floor for a semester and not be affected by the activities taking place around him, though in the case of certain isolates and rejects this was true. The majority of the fifteen boys on each floor, however, were involved in the "bull sessions" and mischief which took place.

The boys who were in cliques were leaders in these types of activities with the other residents being either observers or passive participants. The many types of activities which took place within the
dormitory itself were difficult to describe. The "bull session," however, was basic among these activities. After classes, before and after each meal, and before and after evening activities, these groups were in session. Each person joined his clique or the clique with which he identified himself, and "dorm life" with all of its classical aspects was in full swing.

The resident, if a reject, could be observed going from group to group until the groups broke up to go their separate ways. Isolates kept pretty much to themselves during these periods, neither contributing to nor being affected by the activities which were taking place around them.

Without exception, if the members of a particular clique were in the dormitory, they were in a room together and remained together in many cases, not separating until forced to retire by the necessity of having to arise the next morning to go to class. On each floor the clique was in complete control of its members. To a great extent, it governed sleeping schedules, times for study, nights for dating, etc. Any resident who did not conform to the pattern could not be considered a member of the group. In cases in which there was more than one clique on the floor, friction quickly developed unless there was a fair degree of integration between them. It must be remembered that the clique's influence was an informal arrangement of which the residents were not cognizant.
The influence of these groups upon the lives and living schedules of the boys was tremendous and at times almost humorous. For example, a boy would return from a date and report to the members of his clique concerning his evening's activities. He would decide that there was nothing of particular importance taking place on the floor, tell the gang that he must study, and retire to do so. In a matter of a very few minutes, however, he would return to join the group. Again, after a period of time, he would decide that he must study and once more return to his books. This cycle would continue indefinitely as long as the group or any of its members were around. When this process was multiplied by four or five boys, each of whom was very anxious not to miss anything and therefore would stay up until they were certain nothing was going to happen, the primary problem with which the management of the dormitory was faced is obvious.

Watching this process rather closely, the counselor observed that it was universal in his section and he realized that he had faced this same type of situation every semester. Boys seemed to be drawn, as if by a compulsive force, into contact with what the group was doing. Bearing in mind that dormitory life was a new experience for most of these boys and realizing the strong motivation involved in the desire for acceptance, the fact that every boy wanted above all else to be as much as possible a part of what the group was doing is
not at all surprising. Residents who were considered by the counselor to be conscientious students arranged their personal living habits so as to be able to participate in group activities which generally took place after ten in the evening. Boys slept and studied in the afternoon in anticipation of the night's activities. There was, of course, a great deal of individual, independent behavior. The pressure of the clique was certainly no respector of academic classification, though upper-classmen as a group could control and schedule their living habits so as not to let the activities in the dormitory interfere with their academic pursuits. Nevertheless, the influence of the cliques in this section of the dormitory should not be underestimated.

Besides those activities in the dormitory in which the clique held a leadership position, there were also "out-of-dorm" activities which it influenced, such as dating, attending sports events, etc. In dating, for example, if the members of the clique had decided to have dates, every member of the group could be expected to have a date. Even though they did not all go together, the group generally went to the same place. If the group was one that did not date, then they might go to a motion picture or to some sports event such as football and basketball games. To be sure, there was a great deal of individual dating, but the influence of the group was nearly always observable.
The counselor of this section learned early that to control his boys he had to have an effective working relationship with the outstanding members of each clique. It was also found that the counselor's judgment as to whom these persons were was not always accurate. The effective management of the group was greatly enhanced when the counselor was armed with the results of the sociometric tests, since it contributed greatly to his insight into the social structure and social processes which existed in his section.

Inter-floor Choosing and Association

It has been seen how the cliques developed on the respective floor units; the question now is to what extent did the residents choose persons living on floors other than their own.

The interaction between the members of the respective floors can best be seen in an analysis of inter-floor choices. The first matrix chart indicated that out of a total of 572 choices given on all three choice categories, only 117 of them, 20.4 per cent, were given between floors. Slightly more than twenty-five per cent of the ninety-nine rejections given went between floors; about nineteen per cent of the total number of roommate choices went between floors; and about nineteen per cent of the leisure-time choices went between floors. It is interesting to note that proportionately the highest percentage
of inter-floor choices constituted rejections, although rejections accounted for only about twenty-two per cent of the total number of these choices.

At the end of the term, the matrix chart constructed from the second sociometric test indicated considerably more inter-floor choosing. There were 242 choices given between floors at that time out of a total of 679 choices given on all three choice categories. This was roughly thirty-five per cent and represented an approximate fifteen per cent increase over the first choosing. Thirty-nine per cent of the total number of leisure-time choices, thirty-five per cent of the total number of roommate choices, and about thirty per cent of the total number of rejections went between floors. Rejections did not constitute the highest proportion of inter-floor choices at the end of the term.

On a percentage basis, the increase of inter-floor choosing, from about twenty to thirty-five per cent, is not very significant, particularly when it is considered that there was an 18.7 per cent increase in the total number of choices given between the first and second choosings. The matrix chart for the second sociometric test did, however, indicate a considerably different pattern of choices. There was a greater spread of choices away from the base line on the matrix chart, although most of this spread was observed to be within the floor cells themselves.
To make the present discussion more meaningful, Figure 7 has been constructed to show the position of the respective floor units. This is a side view of the dormitory section involved in this study.

![Diagram of dormitory section]

Fig. 7. — Side view of the back half of Unit 3 of the Men's Quadrangle at North Texas State College.

Particular attention must be given to the interaction between Floor 1 and the other four floors, especially Floor 2. The highest degree of inter-floor choosing at both the beginning and end of the term took place here. Furthermore, the largest amount of inter-floor association was observed to be between Floor 1 and the other floors. One reason which partially accounts for this phenomenon was that forty-seven per cent of the rejections given between floors on the first
sociometric test were received by Floor 1. Most of the choices received by Floor 1 came from Floor 2; however, Floor 1 did not give as many choices to Floor 2 as it received from that floor. Table 3 gives the extent of inter-floor choosing in this section of the dormitory.

**TABLE 3**

INTER-FLOOR CHOOSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Choices Received on All Three Choice Categories*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Sociometric Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages are based on the total number of inter-floor choices.

The increase in choices received by Floor 2 can be explained on the basis of the integration which took place between certain members of this floor and those of Floor 1. The rather large decrease in the number of choices received by Floor 5 could not be explained. The
change may have been the result of the top floors being somewhat set apart from the other floors; however, this point was not certain.

If the room was considered "home base" for the resident, then apparently as time passed, he ventured further and further away from the ties between him and his roommates; or if his room situation was an unhappy one, he sought new associates in a very short period of time. The amount of change between the beginning and the end tests might have been greater with respect to inter-floor choices had it not been for the fact that some thirty-one per cent of these choices went between boys who already knew one another before the beginning of the term. These were boys who had lived together in the dormitory before the time of this study. In most cases, however, associations took place on the floor units. The floors were the locus in which inter-personal relationships developed and the location where the highest frequency of inter-personal contacts took place.

Propinquity was definitely an important factor in the development of ties between the individuals in this section of the dormitory. This study would certainly support the views of Lundberg and Beazley, who feel that nearness is the prior or dominant factor which determines in-group indices. ¹

¹ Lundberg and Beazley, op. cit., pp. 59-73.
Group Tension

Smucker defined group tension in terms of the ratio between the number of rejections received and the number of individuals in the group. The friction which was observed between certain individuals and the number of rejections given within the section served as an index of group tension in this study.

As previously pointed out, there were ninety-nine rejections given between seventy-five residents and 125 rejections given between sixty-nine residents on the first and second sociometric tests, respectively. The ranges on the two tests were from zero to thirteen and from zero to twenty-four rejections received. Both of the distributions of negative choices were markedly skewed toward the high number of rejections received, since forty-eight boys on the first choosing and forty boys on the second choosing received no negative choices. There were several extreme scores which influenced these distributions. Although rejections contributed only an average of 17.85 per cent (17.3 per cent on the first and 18.4 per cent on the second) of the total number of choices received on all three choice categories, their influence was considerably more important than these figures indicate.

Positive choices are indicative of cohesion and strength within a group. This is particularly true when such choices are reciprocated or are mutual choices. Such attractions tend to draw people together into more intimate associations. Sociometric studies have repeatedly shown that in any group there will be a preponderance of positive choices. Nevertheless, there is also within every group a certain amount of negative tele; in this study, rejections indicated this factor. Negative choices, as opposed to positive choices, indicate a directly opposite effect on group structure. They indicate that the group is weak and disorganized; they indicate friction between group members; and they indicate repulsion or the desire on the part of one person to get away from or avoid contact with the person to whom the repulsion is directed. This point was found to be particularly significant to the problems which confronted the administration of this dormitory.

Bearing in mind that the residents of this dormitory lived in very close quarters, it was not possible for a person to simply avoid people whom he did not like. In some cases he was living with just such a person. Naturally a certain amount of hostility would be expected in such cases; yet, as every student of human behavior knows, hostility is not necessarily directed toward its true object. In the dormitory, fist fights were infrequent, but the hostilities were still
exhibited in much more subtle ways. For example, the counselor observed the highest incidence of "horse play," practical jokes, damages to furniture, and infringement on rules and regulations in situations in which negative choices had been received. Of course, these types of activities occurred universally throughout the dormitory, but their frequency was noticeably higher in cases in which there was negative sociometric choosing. Noise, which generally resulted from mischief, was also proportionately related to the amount of negative choosing on a floor unit. Members of cliques were observed to reject the same individuals and to follow their expressed dislikes with actions which in some cases were cruel enough and persistent enough to border on persecution. Rejects found little sympathy or understanding in this dormitory situation. In some cases, the hostility of a resident toward his roommate was transferred to the administrators of the dormitory.

Assuming that hostility and rejection partially accounted for some of the problems which arose in specific situations and were present to some extent every time a rejection was given, the magnitude of the problem can easily be seen by multiplying such actions by the number of rejections given within the group. This was group tension as it existed in this section of the dormitory and could easily be considered a primary point of concern for the dormitory managers,
since it resulted in a type of unpleasantness which would make any living situation undesirable.

**Rejects and Isolates**

The effect of rejections has been discussed in terms of the total group. A consideration of the persons who received the majority of these rejections follows.

There were thirteen residents who received more negative than positive choices on the first sociometric test, and there were twelve boys in this category on the second test. These boys were called rejects. Four per cent of the residents on the first test and slightly less than 3 per cent of the residents on the second test received social status scores of zero and were classified as isolates. Another classification, "fringers," was composed of boys who had social status scores of one; there were 9 and 9.3 per cent fringers on the two sociometric tests, respectively. The total percentage of rejects, isolates, and fringers was 30.6 per cent (twenty-three boys) on the first choosing and 29.2 per cent (twenty boys) on the second choosing.

Other sociometric investigations have indicated that from about 25 to 30 per cent of the individuals in groups would be expected to fall into these categories.

Concerning the reject, some specific cases which were encountered in this section of the dormitory should be considered.
Phillip, who received thirteen rejections on the first test and twenty-four rejections on the second test, was an extreme case, since he received more rejections on each testing than the highest chosen boy received positive choices. Phillip's debut as a reject was made early in the term, according to the counselor. At the end of the fourth day after the opening of the semester, he had to be restrained from moving from the dormitory in the middle of the night. As best the counselor could determine, this situation was the result of four days of bullying which Phillip had received from boys on his floor. From that time to the end of the term, and on into the spring semester, he was subjected to merciless treatment by the residents of this section. By the third week of the term, Phillip had developed such an unfavorable reputation that he received more negative choices from other floors than any other resident received positive choices from other floors. Phillip's reputation made him a curiosity which other boys in the section came to view as children view animals in a zoo. It may be safely assumed that no one in this section desired Phillip for either a roommate or for a leisure-time associate, although he did receive some positive roommate choices.

The question arises as to what types of behavior this boy exhibited to justify the amount of repulsion which was directed toward him. His physical appearance was most unattractive; he had very
poor personal health habits; and he was ill-mannered and selfish.

Actually, from an academic point of view, Phillip was considerably above average, standing above the ninetieth percentile on the A. C. E. test. All of his ability and knowledge, however, worked against him socially. As a journalism major he was very well read on current and past affairs in all fields. Though he was not a science major, Phillip had acquired an exceptional mathematical ability and could work almost any problem involving mathematics. He was in constant demand for these abilities, but they won for him no social favor with the residents.

He sought arguments on questions about which he was well informed and consistently made other boys look "stupid" by their lack of information. In "bull sessions" he inflicted his knowledge on the group, regardless of whether or not it was pertinent to the discussion which was in progress. Conferences with the counselor had led him to understand that he should not intrude upon the privacy of others; still, he " barged in" again and again where he was not invited.

Phillip was an excellent example of a person who was socially maladjusted. On Rorschach's Test, the counselor found that Phillip was basically a normal individual. This is not to say, however, that he did not possess some basic personality problem; nevertheless, his social problem was pre-eminent in the dormitory. Every attempt at friendship ended in disaster. At the beginning of the spring semester,
Phillip was placed with one of the residents, also a reject, who had chosen him and who had been chosen by Phillip. This situation lasted three weeks, at which time the other boy moved to another room. This break-up was anticipated by the counselor, for experience had shown that rejects ordinarily are most incompatible. At the time of this writing, Phillip lives alone, having effected no satisfactory adjustment in his social life at college.

Cyrus was another type of reject who contributed a unique, if not dangerous, problem to the residents of this section of the dormitory as well as to the administrators of the dormitory. He had high acceptability among the "rough" boys who admired persons who drank hard, fought hard, and were Don Juans with the women. Cyrus's nine rejections came from residents with whom he was seldom observed to have any contact whatsoever.

Cyrus had a never-ending chain of wild stories about his escapades to recount to his audiences and the counselor reported that while many of these stories were exaggerated, many of them were quite true. This boy left school before the end of the term, but had been with the counselor for two semesters prior to the time of this study. He exhibited every type of behavior which characterizes a psychopathic personality. On three occasions during his year and a half in the dormitory, he attacked boys with such brutality that he
became a constant source of fear to the counselor, who believed him capable of doing serious bodily harm to the residents.

The question arises as to how Cyrus managed to stay in school or "get away with" such activities, which also included excessive noise, gambling, and possession and use of firearms in the dormitory.

Cyrus was smart; he was never caught at one of these acts by the counselor. On the contrary, he always reported such actions himself. If Cyrus had done anything which he thought that the counselor would discover, he was the first to tell the counselor about it, accepting full responsibility for what he had done—generally reporting accurately the facts involved in these situations. The counselor reported, "There was simply nothing which I could do, except be constantly on the alert—again and again I reported the boy to the residence director, but Cyrus was always one jump ahead of him, too." It would certainly appear that this type of person constitutes a great threat to any group. Cyrus's ability to "work" persons in authority, to avoid the consequences of anti-social behavior, his guiltlessness, his total lack of conscience, and his total lack of moral and ethical values defied description.

There was a third type of reject in this dormitory section. These were boys who were characterized as being very immature: boys who lacked experiences equivalent to their peers and who compensated
for these inferiorities by engaging in very childish, attention-getting types of behavior. They "over-did" everything; they never knew when to stop and were a constant source of irritation to everyone around them. Their degree of rejection depended upon their associates, and if they were in a "good" crowd, they eventually learned socially acceptable modes of behavior. For these boys who were immature there was some hope of achieving some degree of social adjustment without the help of a counselor. The chronological ages of these boys was one year below the average for the group as a whole.

The isolates who were found in this section of the dormitory simply had no personal acceptability and in most cases they spent very little time in the unit. When they were in the dormitory, they were in their respective rooms and sought no associations with the other residents.

All of the rejects or isolates were not personally or socially maladjusted, of course; the two cases reviewed above represent extremes. Nevertheless, every reject and most of the isolates exhibited behavior which was truly anti-social in nature.

Leaders and Leadership

One of the uses of sociometric techniques has been the identification of leaders. The type of leaders implied here is those who received the highest number of choices from their peers. They are
informal leaders and are not necessarily aware of their status in the group. Through their personal acceptability, however, they are in a position to influence persons of lesser status.

In the present study there were nine residents indicated by the first test and five residents indicated by the second test who fell into the above category. In all instances, however, this did not indicate the true group leader. The counselor had difficulty in determining on several floors just which one of two boys was the actual leader for his group. The total absence of hazing and organized activities made this section a spontaneously democratic group but provided no particularly good indications of leadership.

It was interesting to note that the counselor maintained a high position in the group on both tests. His social status scores were seven and ten, respectively, for the roommate criterion, and three and nine, respectively, for leisure-time associate. The change in the latter was probably because the residents were getting to know him better and were considering him more like one of them instead of as a disciplinarian.

Another point which concerned the management of the dormitory was the loss of developing and established leaders at the end of the semester. These boys did not leave school; they simply moved out of the dormitory and into private homes. Even though a boy received
sufficient choices to be classified as an informal leader, there was no assurance that he would accept any responsibility for helping to direct the actions and activities of the group. Some examples of this were observed by the counselor in working with the Disciplinary Council.

Some of the boys who were informal leaders did not assert themselves and did not contribute anything to this committee; on the other hand, true leadership was exhibited by three boys of the council, all of whom had the acceptability of informal leaders. Unfortunately, two of these boys moved from the dormitory at the end of the semester.

Actually, there was no one in this group who had attained high enough status or who had developed sufficient interest to lead even an entire floor unit. The counselor, however, was of the opinion that over a period of time some of the informal leaders would have achieved such a position. In addition, he felt that the residents leaned too heavily upon him and expected him to make decisions for them. At nearly every meeting of the Disciplinary Council, the counselor’s attitude and advice determined the course of action which was followed by the residents. Gradually, the residents did show more and more initiative to do things on their own so that by the time of this writing, some positive steps have been taken by the boys in an effort to discipline their own floor units.

For example, on one floor, the residents had drawn up a set of house rules and were fining the members of the floor twenty-five cents
for infringements. This money went into a "kitty" and was to be used for a "beer bust" at the end of the term. Since there was one vacancy on this floor, these boys had managed to move six beds into one room, calling this their "sleeping room"; another room was designated as a study room; and a third room was designated as a play room. Regardless of some of the apparent disadvantages of this situation to the management of the dormitory, the counselor allowed the boys to continue their project, which had been in effect for about four weeks at the time of this writing and was working very effectively.

Only three rooms (eight boys) were participating in this project, but they included the central and dominating clique on this floor and were the boys who had caused considerable trouble in the section on previous occasions.

There were some very capable leaders in this section of the dormitory, but they had nothing tangible toward which to work. What was needed was some type of sociogroup activities in which the tremendous energies of the residents could be used to some advantage. Instead, such energies went toward making the dormitory an undesirable place in which to live.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF ROOMMATE RELATIONSHIPS

Types of Roommate Relationships

Obviously, all roommate relationships could be classified as either compatible or incompatible. There were several degrees of compatibility and varying types of incompatibility under these classifications.

The first degree of compatibility consisted of roommates who were strong, intimate friends. These boys had been good friends before they moved into the dormitory and living together did not seem to affect their relationship. Six such pairs were found in this section of the dormitory. Since these were relationships between two boys in a three-boy room, the third boy could easily have been responsible for an element of incompatibility. In four of the six cases mentioned above, this was true.

A second and lesser degree of compatibility was observed in the case of boys who were well acquainted with one another and who were friendly to some degree, as in the case of boys who came from the same home town, high school, or neighborhood. The distinction between home towns, high schools, and neighborhoods has been made to
describe more appropriately the geographic proximities of the relationships which formerly existed among the residents. For example, home town relationships were considered to be composed of boys who came from a small town which had only one high school. If from a large city or from a town having more than one high school, a high school of neighborhood situation would be a more appropriate classification.

About 50 per cent of the original roommate situations were considered to fall into this second degree of compatibility. This figure was determined on the basis of the number of boys who had requested rooms together at the beginning of the semester but who did not want to live together during the second term. Like the first degree of compatibility, the second degree was composed primarily of two-boy relationships. This 50 per cent formed the largest portion of the roommate relationships within the section.

Time had a greater effect on second degree relationships than it did on first degree relationships. The counselor had observed that boys from the same home town, high school, or neighborhood who wanted to live together seldom stayed together longer than one semester. On the other hand, some remained together for two or three semesters. Inquiries by the counselor led to the conclusion that these situations were the result of the intensity and degree of intimacy of the original friendships between the two boys involved.
Herein lies a basic and significant point which must be considered in interpreting the relationships and changes which occurred in this dormitory section. When two boys from the same home town, high school, or neighborhood found that they were going to the same college, they decided to be roommates. Such a decision, however, was not necessarily based on friendship. In all probability, the decision was the result of a certain amount of insecurity concerning the new environment into which the boy was going to find himself propelled. The prospective college freshman is uncertain as to what will be expected of him in his new living quarters as well as in the college as a whole. These fears, therefore, are partially overcome and one of the variables of the new situation is somewhat stabilized by the selection of a home town, high school, or neighborhood acquaintance for a roommate. After the boy has been in college for a semester, he naturally develops confidence, makes new acquaintances, and establishes new friendships. Gradually, he breaks away from his old home town or high school ties and contacts, choosing his friends more for qualities within the individuals rather than because they represent a type of security which was needed in a particular situation. In other words, the student no longer has a need for his old home town associates. The student can stand on his own two feet now without the assistance of old ties.
This process is, of course, much to be desired, since it is maturity itself. Realizing the desire which normal adolescents have to break away from their home ties, to assert themselves in an adult world as mature individuals, and to be recognized as independent adults, the changes in the attitudes of the residents toward their original home town, high school, or neighborhood roommates were not particularly surprising. College freshmen are, indeed, excellent examples of maturity in action, especially when they are observed in a living situation. The counselor for this section of the dormitory stated that early in his work with freshman residents, he came to realize that no miracle of maturity had taken place in moving the student from a high school environment into a college environment.

There was a third degree of compatibility which was observed by the counselor, although only one situation of this type existed in the present study. This degree was composed of boys who were compatible roommates but who were not friends; they did not associate with one another outside of the room situation. Generally, they had dissimilar interests and liked different types of people for leisure-time associates. This type of situation had been observed frequently by the counselor in summer sessions when most of the residents were graduate students. Generally, roommate relationships of this type were found between residents who were older and more mature.
The incompatible roommate relationships varied from situations which were simply unpleasant to all the boys involved to situations in which there were frequent manifestations of animosity. All of these situations were undesirable and the residents would have had a much happier living experience had they been with persons whom they liked.

Significance of Roommate Relationships to Dormitory Management

The first problem with which the administrators of the dormitory are faced at the beginning of the fall term is the assignment of roommates. Forty-five, or sixty per cent, of the original seventy-five boys who were placed in this section requested to room together. In seven of these cases there were three boys involved so that five of the twenty-five rooms in the section began the semester with supposedly totally compatible roommate relationships. Twelve other rooms had compatible relationships to the extent that two of the boys in the room wanted to live together. This meant that thirty boys had to be placed in the section with the hope that they would simply "get along" or "fit in."

By the end of the third week of the term the first sociometric test indicated that not only were most of these thirty boys not "getting along," but that some of the originally compatible situations had become undesirable. On the other hand, the number of totally compatible
room situations had increased from seven to twelve. This meant that 48 per cent of the boys were living with persons whom they desired as roommates; furthermore, all of the choices given in these situations were first, second, third, and fourth order choices. There were six rooms in which at least one of the boys was rejected by one of his roommates, and in one room all three boys rejected one another with first-order rejections. The significance of this point can be taken two ways: either that 24 per cent of the residents rejected at least one of their roommates or that 24 per cent of the residents were rejected by at least one of their roommates.

Thus far, 72 per cent of the boys have been accounted for as either being chosen by or rejected by their roommates. This meant, as borne out in an analysis of the choosings, that 28 per cent of the residents were not chosen by their roommates. Consequently, 52 per cent of the boys living in this section of the dormitory system wanted to live with someone else at the end of the third week of school.

Time did not improve this situation, for by the end of the term, the number of totally compatible room situations had decreased from 48 per cent (twelve rooms or thirty-six boys) to 12 per cent (three rooms or nine boys). The number of boys rejected by at least one of their roommates had increased from 24 per cent to 35 per cent, and
53 per cent of the residents were not chosen by their roommates as opposed to the original 28 per cent. Therefore, by the end of the term, 88 per cent of the boys in this section wanted to live with someone other than the roommates they had at that time.

The question arises as to why 52 per cent of the residents in this section continued to live in situations which were unpleasant. First, the administrators of the dormitory discouraged room changes during the semester. Second, if the dormitory staff had encouraged such changes, more than one person would have had to be moved, since there were very few vacancies in the whole dormitory system. The administration of the college endeavored to keep the dormitory filled at all times. In the case where two boys wanted to swap rooms, changes were easily effected; however, this was seldom the case. Generally, any changes would involve four or five residents. A third reason for the boys not changing rooms was observed by the counselor, who reported that many boys were reluctant to express their feelings for roommate preferences. At the time of the second choosing, several residents came to the counselor and stated that they did not want to live with the persons whom they had listed as roommate choices. In such cases, their sociometric tests were changed to give a more nearly accurate picture of their preferences. This reluctance to give direct
expression to dissatisfaction with existing room relationships was frequently seen in the discrepancies between the sociometric choices and the observed relationships between the boys.

By way of contrasting the situations which existed during the fall semester with the ones which existed during the spring semester, one specific incident was interesting to note. The dormitory was not full during the spring semester, and there were some seventeen vacancies in this section. Through a rearrangement of roommates at the beginning of the spring semester, conditions within the section had been greatly improved. Nearly every boy was living with the persons whom he chose, although there were one or two exceptions. Ten new boys had been introduced into the section and had been allowed to change rooms as soon as they became well enough acquainted to know whom they wanted as roommates. This policy worked very well. In one room, however, the counselor noted all of the symptoms of dissension. The entire floor was being affected by the noise and "horse play" emanating from this particular room. The counselor noticed that at least one of the three boys in the room in question was involved in everything that happened on this floor. One of the boys was a reject of the immature type; and another, a new resident, exhibited behavior of this type, also. After talking with these boys individually, the counselor found that none of them were happy with their present room
situation, hence he requested that they change rooms immediately. After these boys were separated, the change in the conditions on the floor was amazing. One of the boys stayed in the original room; another one was moved into a vacancy on the floor; and the third was moved to another ramp. There were, of course, some aspects of this situation which were possibly questionable, such as whether or not the rejected individuals were any happier in their new situations; but the fact remains that the entire floor was benefitted by the rearrangement.

The roommate relationship was, and is, basic to the effective management of the dormitory, for it represents the private life of the individual and that portion of his existence about which he is the most sensitive. This matter of privacy will be developed more fully in the next section of this chapter. While ideal roommate relationships would not have been a panacea for the problems which arose in this section of the dormitory, observations indicated that they would eliminate a great many of the causes for these problems and would make the dormitory a much more pleasant place in which to live.

Two additional points need to be considered regarding roommate relationships and the problems involved in dormitory management. If boys were unhappy in their room situations, they would associate with boys whom they liked in other rooms. In most cases, the boys
from the unhappy room situations spent most of their leisure time in rooms other than their own. Such situations had two undesirable effects or aspects. First, there was a constant intrusion into the privacy of the boys whose rooms were being visited. In some cases, the residents referred to these boys as their fourth roommate, although they did not necessarily resent the presence of the boys from the unhappy room situations. Secondly, in the actual physical movement of these boys from one room to another, there was a certain amount of disturbance; furthermore, a fourth boy in the room contributed an additional amount of noise to the situation. Loud talking, laughing, and yelling were always a source of disturbance in the section; therefore, the addition of a fourth person to a room was simply one additional boy to help make these noises. Emphasis should be placed on the fact that these boys were not isolates or rejects; they were the friends of the boys whom they visited, a fact which was supported by the sociometric choosings.

Finally, the three-boy room situation appeared to be very undesirable in itself, since boys tended to "pair up" in leisure-time activities and in the selection of roommates. This point was supported by the fact that there were more compatible two-boy situations both at the beginning and at the end of the term than there were three-boy situations. The majority of the boys who requested rooms together were
pairs; consequently, the management of the dormitory had to place a third boy with these pairs; and so far as could be determined, there was and is no sure method of matching these individuals. This study indicated that the probability of chance matching being successful was very poor. The old axiom, "Three's a crowd," would seem to be very applicable to this living situation.

Some Factors Involved in Roommate Relationships

The counselor talked with some of the residents in his section concerning the types of things which they considered undesirable in roommate relations. Consideration for others and respect for the privacy of the individual were the outstanding points in these discussions. Because of the close quarters in which these boys lived, they had very little privacy. Privacy here did not yield well to definition; however, it seemed to involve things which were associated with the necessary functions of daily living. For example, the residents resented being awakened from a nap or a night's sleep by some prankster. They resented having boys pry into their personal affairs, which included, among other things, the reading of personal mail. The use of another's clothes, toilet articles, shoe polish, etc., was also considered undesirable by most residents. Another example of the infringement of privacy consisted of the types of intrusions which
occurred when boys " barged in" on one another during periods of study, reading, or relaxation. Finally, reference was occasionally made by the residents to "horse play" and particularly to actions which involved physical contact which could best be described as simply indiscreet.

Privacy would seem to have some significant psychological overtones. Apparently, the individual, in the giving up of his privacy, felt that he gave up or did give up some of his individuality. Too, privacy seems to be one of the advantages which adults enjoy; thus, the resident who was striving to achieve adult status wanted the privacy which was assumed to go along with adulthood. No doubt, many of the types of behavior which came under the private life of the individual were not particularly desirable; nevertheless, the important point was that the residents of this section resented intrusions into what they considered their private affairs.

Obviously, certain anti-social and abnormal types of behavior were undesirable factors in the roommate relationship. The descriptions of Phillip and of Cyrus given in Chapter III are examples of this point. The residents also made reference to certain types of egocentric behavior which were considered to be something more than simple inconsiderateness. Most of these types of behavior have been responsible for what has been traditionally called "personality clashes," but this classification is not necessarily limited to anti-social, abnormal, or egocentric behavior.
In an effort to determine whether there were any measurable types of personality traits which might account for this so-called "personality clash," a standardized personality test was given to sixty-six of the residents in this section. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (The 16 P. F. Test, Form A), published by the Institute of Personality and Ability Testing, Champaign, Illinois, was used. The Pearson-Moment correlations between these sixteen factors and the social status scores of the residents obtained from the first sociometric test are presented in Table 4. The average correlation was -0.060. Obviously, none of the factors included in this test were related to the social status scores of the residents. This is not to say, however, that this particular test was invalid, for the counselor stated that in many cases the test brought out very accurate descriptions of the observable behavior of the residents.

Profiles were also constructed for each of the sixty-six residents on the basis of their sixteen test scores. These profiles were compared with one another in cases in which "personality clashes" were known to exist. No relationships could be found between them.

Actually, this entire area of relationships needs additional investigation. Certainly, many of the conflicts which arose between the residents of this section were the result of differences in the family backgrounds, attitudes, and values of the individuals. In the present study,
TABLE 4
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL STATUS SCORES AND SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Cyclothymia Versus Schizothymia</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. General Intelligence Versus Mental Defect</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Emotional Stability or Ego Strength Versus General Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Dominance or Ascendance Versus Submission</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Surgency Versus Desurgency</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Positive Character Versus Immature Dependent Character</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Adventurous Cyclothymia Versus Inherent Withdrawn Schizothymia</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Emotional Sensitivity Versus Tough Maturity</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Paranoid Schizothymia Versus Trustful Accessibility</td>
<td>-0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Bohemianism Versus Practical Concernedness</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Sophisticated Versus Rough Simplicity</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Worrying Suspiciousness Versus Calm Trustfulness</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁. Radicalism Versus Conservatism</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₂. Independent Self-Sufficiency Versus Lack of Resolution</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₃. Will Control Versus Character Stability</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₄. Nervous Tension</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
however, four factors appeared to be important in fostering desirable roommate relationships. These four factors were: (1) respect for the privacy of other individuals; (2) consideration for the rights of others; (3) the absence of egocentric types of behavior; and (4) the absence of anti-social and abnormal types of behavior.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the social interaction and social dynamics which existed in one section of the Men's Quadrangle at North Texas State College, giving particular attention to roommate relationships. The findings were related to the problems of dormitory management.

Sociometric type tests were given to the seventy-five residents of this section at the beginning and at the end of the semester, and these tests were analyzed by means of modified matrix charts. The participant observer method was also used in gathering the data, with the counselor of the section acting as the participant observer. The study was conducted in the Men's Quadrangle, Unit III, Ramps 3 and 4.

The sociometric data were analyzed as to social structure and the choice process which was involved in the choosings. Factors affecting this process were also discussed. Cliques, their structure, development, and change, were analyzed with emphasis given to the
effect which these cliques had on the conditions which existed in this
dormitory section and the influence which they had on the living habits
of the residents. Inter-floor choosing was analyzed, showing its ef-
fect on the social structure of the section.

Group tension as a factor in social structure was presented in
terms of its relation to negative choosing, and this factor was further
related to some of the undesirable conditions which existed within the
section. Rejects, as recipients of the majority of negative choices,
were discussed in terms of the problems which they presented to the
harmony within the dormitory. Attention has also been given to lead-
ers and the importance of leadership in the effective management of
the dormitory.

Roommate relationships were considered, giving special atten-
tion to the significance of these relationships to dormitory management.
Some of the factors which the residents and the counselor of this sec-
tion considered important in roommate relationships were presented.
Data on the correlation between social status scores and scores on a
standard personality measurement were presented in an effort to more
adequately determine the factors which are involved in "personality
clashes."
Conclusions

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following conclusions have been formulated. The conclusions apply specifically to the Men's Quadrangle at North Texas State College and may or may not be applicable to other dormitory situations:

1. The social structure of this group began to form in a short period of time (three to four weeks after the beginning of the school term and the organization of the personnel of the dormitory group); however, this structure was subject to continual changes during the semester.

2. The changes which occurred in the sociometric choosings were statistically significant, although the status of the individuals within the group remained statistically constant.

3. Spontaneous socialization and expansiveness in choosing did take place over a period of fifteen weeks without any efforts being made to encourage this process.

4. One of the most important factors in the social relationships of this section was the influence of cliques.

5. Group tension was proportionately related to the problems of noise, damages, and infringements on rules and regulations in the dormitory.

6. There were not sufficient types of organized activities to constructively use the energies and leisure time of the residents or to enable leaders to develop.
7. The three-boy room situation was found to be far less desirable than the two-boy room situation.

8. The vast majority of the human relationship problems as well as the disciplinary problems in the dormitory were the result of too many people living in too small a space.

Recommendations

As outgrowths of this study, the following recommendations are made concerning the situation revealed in this study of the Men's Quadrangle at North Texas State College:

1. As many vacancies as possible should be left in each section of the dormitory to facilitate roommate rearrangements during the semester.

2. Organized activities and programs should be encouraged, using cliques and the natural physical division of the dormitory as competitive groups or units.

3. Incompatible roommate relationships should be changed immediately, and changes of this type should be encouraged by the counselors in each section of the dormitory.
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