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CHAPTER ONE

THE ACTION RESEARCH PROJECT

What is attempted herein is the outlining and description of an action research project in a church group, using the following techniques which have been evolved in research on group dynamics: discusional, sociometric, dramatic and observational. The aim is to examine more precisely the educational or training-retraining process of a church group.

I. Foci of Attention in Group Study

Bradford and French\(^1\) state that three levels of conceptualization may be distinguished in studying the complex process of group change: (a) the cultural environment of the group, both as to broad and immediate institutional forces influencing the group; (b) the group members as individuals, as personal dynamics affect their participation; (c) the group itself, its structure and pattern of operative forces. These three levels are used in this beginning chapter as a frame for considering certain theoretical aspects of the study.

A. The Relation of the Church to the Group

The cultural environment of the youth group chosen is the church which may be looked at in two ways. First, there is the local institution; its structure, its function in the community and the pressures it exerts on the youth group. Although very important, the local church will

not be considered in the project; any adequate treatment would entail a
research project in itself. It might also be mentioned here that other
institutions directly influence the group: the school, community and
so forth. These too will not be considered directly.

Second, there is the church in its broad cultural function: what it
is concerned with as a general institution of the culture. This general-
ity is achieved via several different means, such as the Bible, denomina-
tional affiliation (a Protestant background is presumed in this project),
an educated clergy, theological schools, to mention a few. As an
institution, the church differs from other institutions. Its religious
function is probably its most distinguishing feature. But psychologically,
it differs from other institutions for its educational objectives have to
do with large molar areas within the individual: fundamental attitudes
and sets, ideals, values and often large changes therein.

In a very real way, this general educational function of the church
defines the frame and instruments of any action research project aimed at
understanding its group processes. If its educational objectives were
more verbal and less attitudinal (such as learning history), then the
psychological frame and instruments would differ radically. Since they
are not, processes of education and change in the church would be better
understood in a dynamic rather than behavioral scheme. Religiously put,
"God looketh on the heart". Psychologically described, the chief concern
is with the internal determinants of behavior.

The attempted focus at this point is not on specific individuals per
se (within the group) but rather on how the individual in general learns,
takes on or internalizes attitudes, ideals and values. This cannot be understood properly outside a dynamic approach. But dynamic schools vary as to theory and techniques of educating or training individuals. Thus psychoanalysis in its retraining process leans heavily both in theory and techniques on an individual emphasis: the disease syndrome, although socially determined in part, is totally within the individual and is largely the resultant of that individual's anti-social drives and traumata. Therapy consists in changing the individual's personality structure by a limited social situation: a one-to-one (doctor to patient) relationship. Not only is such a process costly and time consuming, it has also not been conspicuously successful. Recent research emphasizes a field as the conceptual framework: the individual emerges, grows or regresses within a social matrix.

It would be impossible to mention here all the implications of such a concept. Relative to the project undertaken, there are certain ideas which may have far-reaching consequences. One of these is the concept of the role. Quite a theory has been developed concerning the importance of roles in the emergence of the individual self or ego systems. It has also been useful in understanding how the individual internalizes and becomes immersed in the culture. Such has put meat on the bony structure of a field concept: for empirical observation and experimental research. Another concept is that of interpersonal relations. This has been emphasized in perception by the Gestaltists, in empathy and therapy by
Harry Stack Sullivan\textsuperscript{2} and in therapy and drama by Moreno\textsuperscript{3}. Still another concept is the dynamic view of group relationship. This is not a new emphasis but there is more realistic understanding of its functions as an agent of change. Although the concepts of role, interpersonal relations and group are not separate and distinct, those who have stressed these concepts separately differ somewhat in their assumptions and emphases. These concepts contribute to and are unified by the field concept.

In summary, recent research in dynamic psychology of an interpersonal sort may contribute much in theory and techniques toward the understanding of the educational objectives of the church in its broad cultural functioning. Such may be profitably applied in an action research project where a better understanding of group functioning and individual change is a desired goal.

B. Group Members as Individuals

The group is not an entity unrelated to the members who compose it. An understanding of the individual's personality structure and motivational forces affecting his behavior is necessary for a better understanding of the group process. Here again dynamic psychologies have been


most useful. Nor are insights into the dynamics of behavior limited to those schools which stress social process. Psychoanalysis has contributed perhaps the most basic insights in this area.

A concept increasingly used of late for understanding personality dynamics is projection. It encompasses more than Freud meant by it, now including the field concept. No matter what the individual does, whether it is structuring his perceptual field or his overt behavior, the structure of his personality and the dynamic forces operative are to a measure revealed therein. This is particularly so in an amorphous, relatively unstructured situation. Such is the rationale basic to all projective techniques.

In a little different sense, J. L. Moreno uses a similar test situation although he doesn't term it projective; though it may be structured, the situation allows for spontaneity; the test may be limited, as in personal choice of an associate, or broad, as in a dramatic situation. Actually, almost any situation may be used as a projective test. The question seems to be how valid, reliable and insightful such tests are.

Since personality structure and dynamic forces affect individual behavior which in turn influences group process, an action research project should include tests of personality, preferably of a well established variety, such as the Rorschach Technique, the Thematic Apperception Test, the Sentence Completion Test and others. Tests requiring group participation are sociometric choice and psychodrama. The Rorschach Test and Sociometric Test have been used, both for inter-test verification and for seeing how greatly individual dynamics affect group interaction.
C. The Group Level of Analysis

Although the group cannot be well understood apart from an understanding of the individuals who compose it, it also is not adequately comprehended solely by an individual approach. A group is not a simple sum of the members. Rather it is the interaction of those individuals and the results therefrom. Perhaps a formulation of the process involved would be as follows: group interaction leads to individual perception of that interaction with a resultant difference in behavior leading to changed group interaction. Thus what is demanded is not only techniques for study of individuals but techniques for studying group interaction in process.

Several different investigators are interested in group dynamics. Lewin and his group have studied the interaction process; Ba
des has developed a notational system for categorizing verbal interaction.

Slavson, in setting up his cells for therapeutic purposes, assigns a boy to a cell according to a few salient features of his personality. Slavson's idea is that such assignment will make for a more balanced group, minimize the possibility of conflict, and strengthen the needed development of each member. Empirically, this procedure may be very helpful in therapy. Yet it should be pointed out that this is looking at group function from the view of the individuals who compose it. Although not so obvious,

---

4. R. F. Ba

Moreno leans toward the same bias in his sociometric measurement of a group⁶ (to be discussed in detail later). Thus he concludes that a group with too many leaders (or frustrated aspirants) will demonstrate disintegrative trends. Although the label "leader" is obtained from a test of the group, it is still descriptive of the individual. And this is all the more apparent in Moreno's assignment therapy; he is looking at the group primarily as a congeries of individuals, who mesh or do not mesh together according to their individual characteristics. This interpretation of Moreno's approach is not to deny its value. It is quite valuable. But it is not sufficient. Group interaction must be assessed for any adequate study of group process. Many more factors must be considered to understand disruption of a group than the number or leader. What is crucial is the group situation and the kind of interaction: a group with too many leaders may or may not show disintegrative trends, according to the conditions of interaction which pertain.

This is a necessary level for study of a group. However such emphasis is quite new and at present the crucial techniques are observational: not enough observations of group interaction in process have been made, especially where individual and cultural variables were known; the techniques of observation may be very primitive. Another emphasis with high potentialities as a frame of reference is productivity. The litera-

ture will be discussed in some detail later; suffice it to say here that the group chosen for this action research project should be studied at its action level. In so doing, a frame (inadequate though it may be) must be sketched as an integral part of the project.

In summary, the project requires cognizance of no less than the three levels of conceptualization mentioned above. The group is embedded in the church, the local and the generalized institution. No study of the local church and its pressures (expectations and so forth) on the group will be attempted. The generalized institution sets a frame of certain educational expectancies: the acquisition of certain attitudes, ideals and values which are characteristic of the motivational and behavioral systems of the individual. The only adequate psychological frame for the study of such an educational process is the dynamic one, with special emphasis on interpersonal relations. Study of the specific group also necessitates adequate study of the individual members. Projective techniques seem to offer better assessment than others, although test situations of any sort may indicate projection to a degree and intelligence tests may differentiate grossly as to ability. Yet another level of attention is the interaction within the group itself. Here observation is the prime necessity; the concept of group productivity seems to offer large possibilities for assessing and categorizing types of group interaction and thus may set the frame of observation.
II. Techniques Used in Group Analysis

A project such as herein attempted would be impossible without techniques: tools of observation and assessment, tools for introducing change indigenous to the situation. Recent studies in group dynamics indicate a variety of techniques. The question arises, what to use? Some of these studies are concerned with group therapy: treating the mal-adjusted individual via a special group situation and process. Such studies will not be considered in this thesis. Although the techniques employed are suggestive and possibly translatable for use in the group under study, this would present too many theoretical problems, too wide a literature to cover adequately. Another reason is that studies of more "normal" groups have been made; these are closer akin to the study of a group in a church or community.

The clearest and most extensive study of normal groups has been made by the Research Center for Group Dynamics, currently at the University of Michigan. Other suggestive studies have been made in industry but they are largely oriented toward problems in industrial relations and their best features have been largely incorporated in the afore-mentioned group studies. In these studies, the four types of techniques already mentioned are used:

a) **Discusssional.** This method is probably the most commonly used one to obtain group participation. Bradford says it "is the basic method of adult education". 7 Discussional method takes on added importance where

---

the aim is the making of decisions. Not only may groups change and grow
by means of effective methods of discussion; individual change is also
possible, of a rather enduring and fundamental kind.

b) Sociometric. This will be discussed in detail (as well as the
others here mentioned) later. It is a method for obtaining group
structure and the position of the individual in that structure. As
already mentioned, assignment therapy may be undertaken after a sociometric
test. There are, however, other uses to which the results can be put.

c) Dramatic. Drama has been particularly useful for two purposes:
therapy of the individual and group; as a method for role-training in
specific jobs or in hypothetical situations closely allied to the problems
of the group or to anticipated future situations.

d) Observational. There are several different methods under this
heading. Some have to do with the content of the discussion or drama,
others are directed at how and in what manner members of the group interact.

III. Practical Considerations - Criteria of Fittingness

Stressed over and over in research in this area is the fact that there
is no royal road which leads directly to better group participation, no
"bag of tricks" that will magically give desired improvement in group
productivity and individual change. The reasons for this are numerous.
One is that any such action research must be "tailor-made" for the situa-
tion; from beginning to end, the methods should fit the group, the results
should be an achievement of the group.

For any action research in a church group, it would seem that
techniques should meet at least the four following criteria:

a) They should be adaptable to the situation pertaining in the group. This is not an unreasonable expectation. Experimentation in industry, education and other areas of social life is meeting this requirement. The techniques mentioned above have been used in different situations and proved highly adaptable.

b) They should be simple, requiring little rationale. The leaders and interested members of the group should be able to use them and interpret the results. The basis for this requirement is the apparent necessity that participation must precede or at least go hand-in-hand with learning. A complicated procedure requiring much rationale may be doomed in advance.

c) Although simple, any techniques should be reasonably valid for diagnosis, for obtaining insight into the forces at work in the area studied. The aim is not just the application of so-called "successful" techniques. Those employed should also be directed toward insight into why productivity or participation increases or decreases, not just toward the objective measurement of that increase or decrease.

d) Those techniques which enable the user to increase his skill and knowledge, which help him change and grow, should be preferred. Such techniques are less directive, more democratic.

One of the major concerns of this project was to note the acceptance of or resistance to any techniques used. The plan of the project was not forced upon the group but was always subject to reformulation.
If particular parts of it were not properly understood by the leaders or members (whichever were concerned) or met with resistance and re-formulation failed, those parts were omitted; for the purpose of the project was to see whether or not and why certain techniques of a group character succeed or fail in a specific church group.

**IV. Plan of the Dissertation**

As already indicated, the aim of the action research project was to study a specific church group where group participation was a recognized part of its educational process, to introduce changes therein and to note results. The introduced techniques were of four general types: discusional, sociometric, dramatic and observational.

The plan of the thesis is to begin with a review of the literature on research in group dynamics, covering the areas just mentioned. Then follows the description of the group studied: its place in the community and church, the adult leaders and the members, its aims and its felt difficulties. The same chapter contains a description of the techniques used in the light of those available as covered in the review of literature. The Rorschach Test was used to check sociometric and observational data. Certain considerations on procedure - the pacing of introduced changes, rapport with leaders and members - will be treated as well as the actual reception accorded the introduced changes by the group.

The results will be presented in three chapters. The first covers sociometric data: what the data shows concerning the group, leadership, and isolation. The second presents results from discusional techniques
in the order in which they were employed. The third chapter contains Rorschach summaries, with a brief sketch of each member tested. The results are then pooled and discussed at the group level and individual level. Finally, there are the conclusions about the usefulness of the techniques: whether or not they yield significant data; whether or not they may be employed by relatively unskilled, church personnel.
CHAPTER II

ACTION METHODS: REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Moreno states: "Operational methods in the social sciences are closely linked with the development of action methods." Lewin and others would agree with this. In social experimentation and research, observational methods and test procedures are not enough; neither are survey methods. Action methods are the procedures to use. Various reasons are given, such as "learning by doing"; others will be discussed in the following. A very simple explanation is that non-action methods have not achieved the desired results. One may, for example, use a test. Presumably such a diagnosis should lead to action: therapeutic or remedial measures. But, unlike medical diagnosis, the kind of therapy may not be indicated. Time and again a diagnosis in social areas has not led to remedy. The fault lies in not using action methods in the beginning phase.

I. Discussion

Group discussion is the basic method of adult education and decision making. It is not the only method but it is the most widely used in our democratic society. On a theoretical level, there are sound reasons for this. Methods of individual change, reeducation and therapy are not too numerous or widely effective; all depend on interpersonal relations.

Recent trends show the importance of the group as a matrix for such change: individuals isolated from others tend toward increased maladjustment; even in the counseling situation, amelioration of socially ineffective behavior has been difficult to achieve while character reformation has come more easily in therapeutic groups. There is also the growing recognition of the importance of the group in personality formation: it is the "ground" (as contrasted to "figure") of the person's perceptual systems, his feelings and his actions.

As can already be surmised, education is used herein in a very broad sense. This is a more accurate definition and delineation of the concrete conditions pertaining in human learning. Education is by no means limited to more formal procedures such as are found in schools. Important dynamic forces of personality are largely shaped outside formal institutions. This shaping continues throughout life wherever and whenever the individual interacts with others on more than a superficial level. It is the recognition of this as the basic educative process which has helped frame the experimental designs of recent experiments in social psychology and which has made possible a more realistic study of concrete situations and individuals.

Group discussion, though enjoying wide use, has frequently failed as an educational method, has thwarted participant satisfactions, production and growth. This and its commonness probably explain why it has been so long overlooked as an incisive action method, why its potentialities have not been more thoroughly explored. A basic distinction is necessary. If individuals are dynamically shaped in interpersonal relations, then
attention must be directed toward what kinds of interaction bring this about. In group discussions, this means that study of how members interact is fully as important (if not more so) as what is achieved (decisions, verbal learning, etc.) in that interaction.

A. Dynamic Discussion

The Research Center for Group Dynamics, headed formerly by Kurt Lewin and now by Dorwin Cartwright, has carried on extensive research of this method. In the summer of 1947, after several pilot studies had been made, the First National Training Laboratory on Group Development was held at Bethel, Maine. The Laboratory was conducted again last year and is offered this summer. Results of the First Laboratory are becoming available; these will form much of the basis of the discussion that follows.

The purpose of the Laboratory is stated by Bradford and Cartwright:

This Laboratory was initiated (1) to provide research scientists with an opportunity to communicate scientific knowledge of group dynamics to key education and action leaders, (2) to provide an opportunity for observing, experiencing, and practicing basic elements of the democratic group process which are relevant to educational and action leadership, and (3) to provide an experimental laboratory for further research explorations of basic problems of assessment and improvement of efficiency of group growth, group thinking, and group action.

The design of the Laboratory was extensive. The primary concern was the study of individual and group change in relation to the productivity of both. This necessitated a variety of tests, techniques and observa-

tional procedures. To assess properly individual change, the clinical-individual approach had to be used. Delegates were screened in advance on the basis of their possible contributions. They were thoroughly tested in the first two or three days: Picture Arrangement Test, Sentence Completion Test, Vigotsky Test, Group Rorschach and the Runner-Seaver Test. A small group of six, selected at random for closer clinical study, also took an intelligence test, the TAT, the Vigotsky Block Test and a long developmental history interview. From the test results and interview, a prediction of individual behavior in a group was attempted. All delegates were also given an ideological questionnaire and interview at the beginning and end; a Post-meeting Reaction Questionnaire was also used.

Tests were necessary for the group as a whole. Those used were: Planning and Skills Test, Group TAT, Group Productivity Test, Sociometric Tests and Leader-Out Test. Still another important area was observation of the delegates in action; this will be treated in the next chapter of the thesis.

As important as the tests and measures of change and production, were the techniques and procedures for participant interaction, the group dynamic approach. Since all of the delegates were "trainers" (key education and action leaders), small groups were formed to work intensively on certain basic skills: conference planning, leadership training, staff relations, etc. Techniques emphasized were discussion method, group decision and role playing. It was assumed that skills in and understanding of human relations were basic to all of the delegates' back-home work;
this afforded the common ground for their participation together, irrespective of their special problems.

To sum up, the design of the Laboratory was to study: the personality of the members, the functioning of the sub-groups and the organization and operation of the total Laboratory with a view to improving later ones. In a more practical sense, the aim of the Laboratory was to provide training for the delegates as well. Since the delegates were "trainers" of others, the faculty had certain practical goals for the delegates: 1) increased understanding of dealing with people, 2) increased sensitivity to dynamic interrelations between people in groups, 3) skills in using this understanding and 4) increased understanding of one's own motivations. These goals of training for the delegates were invested in two areas: Change-Agent Skills and Group Growth Dimensions.

1. Democratic Leadership

Change-Agent Skills (skills required of the agent who effects change in a group) are the tools of the group consultant. The Research Center presumes democratic leadership throughout. To understand better this bias, an earlier paper by Lewin and Lippitt\(^3\) should be considered. In it they discuss an experiment in setting up democratic and autocratic leadership. Two groups of fifth and sixth grade pupils (five in each group) were picked. Care was taken to equate the children in each group.

---

on sociometric attraction and rejection status and to choose children
who expressed little relation to each other. The project for both groups
was the making of masks; twelve meetings were held with these differences
in leadership:

Policy
Autocratic - Determined by leader.
Democratic - Determined by group with help of leader.

Steps to Goal
Autocratic - Dictated one at a time.
Democratic - Perspective outlined at beginning with two or three
alternate possibilities.

Associates
Autocratic - Structured by leader.
Democratic - Partner left to individual.

Task
Autocratic - Structured by leader.
Democratic - Division of task by group.

Attitudes
Autocratic - Impersonal; leader remained outside group in criticising or
praising.
Democratic - Leader a group member in spirit though not in work; praise
or criticism given to group as a whole.

Each group was observed in action. A quantitative, running account was
kept of social interactions: whether approaches were ascendant, sub-
missive or objective; whether or not response to social approach was
purposeful refusal. A running account was also kept of group structur-
ing: activity sub-groupings, goal of each sub-group, sources of initia-
tive and degree and variety of interest shown. A quantitative and
qualitative analysis was then made of these accounts for eight different
categories; each pupil was rated on in-group, out-group behavior. The
results showed striking differences between the two groups. In the
democratic group, there was more cooperative behavior, more expression
of an objective attitude, higher constructiveness, a greater feeling of "we-ness", more stable and unified group structure. The autocratic group showed a higher state of tension with more ascendant behavior, the developing of two scape goats and about thirty times more hostility expressed than in the democratic group. Midway, two children switched groups; the one joining the democratic group showed a decrease in dominant behavior and the other vice versa.

Change-Agent Skills presuppose a democratic attitude in leadership. Barron and Krulce\textsuperscript{4} list the following:

1. Understanding one's own motivation for desiring a given change.
2. Assessing the initial situation: the resources available, people affected by a change, potential sources of resistance.
3. Helping the group to recognize the need for a change; increasing the motivation and involvement of the members.
4. Working with the group on a diagnosis of the problem and on a realistic plan for action.
5. Carrying a plan into action and subsequently evaluating and assessing the results.
6. Replanning so as to continue the process of change and to maintain the change.

Deutsch, Pepitone and Zander\textsuperscript{5} discuss the concrete effects on the group of a leader's personal characteristics and his perception of the environment in which he is functioning (the wider referents of skills one and two above). The subject is Ray Andrews, one of the faculty members. From personality tests, they graphically show the linkage between his behavior as a discussion leader and his personal needs and emotional tensions. His needs and tensions are further linked to his perception of


the objectives of the Laboratory: he felt that fulfilling these objectives demanded unassertive, socially sensitive and supportive behavior. Personality dynamics and perceptual systems are not separable, for the person's sentiments and values function as channels for the satisfaction of needs and tensions. This was so in the case of Ray Andrews. Thus one of the beginning assumptions of the Laboratory was amply justified, that the individual-clinical approach is a vital approach in the study of group dynamics. Leadership, and for that matter any other group participation, is not described or attained by a set of rules; enduring dynamic forces and sentiments vitally affect functioning.

2. Group Dimensions

Not only is it necessary to explore the proper and concrete function of leadership in a group, it is also necessary to do the same for group function. How can group maturity, efficiency and productivity be measured? What signs indicate this? The following are dimensions evolved in the Laboratory for such an evaluation:

1. Problems of intercommunication between members.
2. The ability of a group to study its own functioning objectively and to attempt to improve its functioning.
3. The need for sharing the responsibilities and leadership functions among the members.
4. The ability of the group to inform itself, to utilize fully the contributions of all members, and to secure additional resources from outside the group.
5. The ability to integrate into the group persons having different ideologies, needs, and goals.

Such must and can be implemented by concrete techniques. How can the group, for example, study its own functioning? It seems that the Laboratory here

made one of its most significant contributions to the theory and practice of group dynamics: the feedback of observed functioning of the group. One member has the role of observer (it may be rotated) and that is his only function; he does not otherwise participate. At a designated time, the group has a self-evaluative session in which the observer reports his data. The group then studies specifically the "how" of its interaction. Many difficult problems have been successfully handled via this method: splitting of the group into factions, non-participation of some members, "pressurizing" by other members, lack of productivity, and so forth. Potentially, this is an explosive as well as a curative method; care must be taken to avoid "shaming" and too critical self-analysis. The fact that the member plays the "role" of observer helps to depersonalize his comments; the leader may also be very helpful by showing the way, pointing out his own inadequacies.

Role playing is another technique for studying the "how" of interaction, the concrete behavioral aspects of participation. It will be discussed later in this chapter. It is not a separate method; best results are obtained when it is used as an adjunct of discussion.

Another important factor is the recognition that group productivity requires member roles as well as leader roles and that in a democratic group where members assume responsibility there is no sharp distinction between these types. Benne and Sheets distinguish two general types of

member roles: (1) group task roles, (2) group building and maintenance roles. Assuming that the task of the discussion group is to select, define and solve common problems, the following task roles are necessary: initiator-contributor (new ideas), information seeker (clarification), opinion seeker (expression of values of the group), information giver, opinion giver, elaborator, coordinator, orienter (toward goals), evaluator-critic, energizer, procedural technician and recorder. For group building and maintenance, the following roles are necessary: encourager, harmonizer, compromiser, gatekeeper and expeditor (increasing communication and participation), standard setter or ego ideal, group-observer or commentator and follower. Yet in actual group interaction, these roles do not often appear as clearly delineated as this. Member behavior is often self-centered, not oriented toward the task or group building and maintenance. This may be in part due to authoritarian or laissez faire leadership, inadequately defined goals or low group morale. Roles under these conditions may be: aggressor, blocker, recognition-seeker, self-confessor, playboy, dominator, help-seeker or special interest pleader. For a group to function properly, it must give attention to the mechanics of its interaction. Here again the complex nature of participation is met: member personality dynamics, sentiments and perceptions of the total situation; the group task, structure and maturity level.

B. Discussion of Dynamics

A recent interesting development is the discussion of personality
dynamics in the public schools. Bullis and O'Malley\(^8\) and Bullis\(^9\) present course outlines and teaching aids for seventh and eighth grade classes in human relations. Preliminary reports are very favorable. Each session is organized around some illustrative material (story or play). The intent is to introduce material as close to life situations as possible. The pupils discuss freely the emotional problems involved, give their appraisals, speculate on motivations and give parallel examples from their own experience. The teacher concludes the discussion, summarizing or emphasizing important points. The pupils then write down what they have learned, what was important to them. Topics cover: favorable and unfavorable personality traits and their development, drives, emotions (how aroused, pleasant and unpleasant, conflicts), home problems, personal handicaps, shyness, cooperation, day dreams, habits, goals, etc.

The purpose of the discussions is to bring out into the open personal problems and to arrive at possible solutions. O'Malley stresses the importance of discussion technique. The leader should be democratic, sympathetic, encouraging. His function is to guide the discussion, bringing about as full and free participation as possible, not to act as an authority. Thus he should be skilled in observing - who takes part and who doesn't - and have means available for increasing participation. He should see that the problem is clearly defined, that every effort is made to bring out relevant facts and ideas, that some conclusion is reached.


Actually the success of these discussions depends less on "how" they are conducted, more on what is discussed. It is still a study course in a classroom, not an autonomous group. Consequently the suggestions coming from the Laboratory at Bethel do not seem applicable except in the broad and general definition of democratic leadership. Yet it is interesting to note that somewhat the same effects are achieved. Here, instead of personality dynamics being drawn to group attention via a feedback mechanism, they are the basis for the group discussion. As O’Malley says, "Where, for any reason, there is strong stirring of the emotions, some awakening of personal reactions, surprisingly good results ensue." This is further confirmatory evidence that the needs, drives and sentiments of people should be a fundamental concern of education. These are "educated" from day to day, whether or not any formal attempts are made to guide their growth; they are fundamental for on their development depends later health or disease.

A closer inspection reveals the therapeutic effect of discussion in this area. One of the chief difficulties is that a person’s private world remains all too private. When he sees others express themselves in those private areas and can do so himself, therapy results. Further, such classes in human relations offer genuine participation to the pupil: he already knows something about the topic under discussion for it has to do with his and the other pupils' experience. Nor are the answers given in advance. A pupil may create a solution for another (as in the case of a twin girl who didn’t want to look like her sister - a boy suggested

wearing different clothes). Skills in problem solving and problem sharing, in insight and understanding of others, in seeing their relatedness to each other are learned; this is positive therapy.

Certain other techniques are used by the teacher in conjunction. A "near" sociometric test is given at the fourth session and is used as basis for that hour's discussion. Ten questions are asked concerning class officers, associates in class work or a difficult job, outstanding ability and popularity. It is called the Class Acceptability Record and aids the teacher in problems to be outlined in the next chapter under sociometry. As to counseling techniques, Rogers' principles are largely followed and applied in non-directive group leadership. The authors draw the teacher's attention to shyness, behavior problems, psychological mechanisms and conflicts between the community and school. The aim of all these teaching aids is to enable the teacher to better the mental hygiene of the pupil, adding the pupil to develop an emotional maturity involving: adaptability, responsibility, frustration tolerance and solution, ability at making attachments, freer expression of inner fears and self-discipline.

II. Dramatic Techniques

Drama is an excellent action method which combines in one procedure the old duality of diagnosis and indicated change.

A. Psychodrama - Moreno

Moreno is probably the first to consistently emphasize its importance. As a psychiatrist, he has used it for its diagnostic and therapeutic
values in treating mental disease (although he does not view mental
disease as narrowly as most psychiatrists). It is hard to tell, as with
the chicken and the egg, which came first: his theory or his practice.
Moreno considers both to be important so some of the rationale is
included here with a description of methods employed.

1. Spontaneity, A Fundamental Concept

Spontaneity is his basic concept. He posits it as a separate,
though not independent, factor which is a function of the brain field;
it presupposes memory and intelligence. Spontaneity may be expressed
in four relatively independent ways: 11

a) Dramatic activation of cultural stereotypes. Here it is important
for energizing and unifying the self.

b) Creation of new organisms (life) or of new arts and patterns of
culture. The emphasis here is on the creation of the self and an
adequate environment for the self; it may or may not include dramatic
prowess.

c) Originality. Spontaneity functions in this area in the adding
of new forms (without changing essences), the free expression of the
personality.

d) Adequacy of response to novel situations. Emphasized is the
mobility and flexibility of the self.

Moreno does not always sharply distinguish these areas and, as will be
seen, psychodrama may be applied to all four.

11. J. L. Moreno, Psychodrama, First Volume, (New York: Beacon
House, 1946), pp. 89-93.
Spontaneity thus has an important role in the functioning of the psyche. Moreno traces this from the beginning, how it plays an important part in the development of the child. Since it is a natural component of the psyche, that which inhibits its function is a source of personality disorder. The machine, the robot, the cultural conserve are all examples of such inhibition and indicate how broadly Moreno views the causality of mental disorders, the culture itself. Spontaneity produces both order and creativity as well as reproducing itself; it is a very necessary function which must be trained.

No act or thing occurs without the following: the locus or place of birth; the status nascendi or moment of experience; the matrix which is the organism or seed. Spontaneity is primarily related to the status nascendi; thus the emphasis is on the beginning, though imperfect, phase and not on the end phase, the created product or conserve. The locus and matrix are also important, especially in drama and are to be compared to the setting (stage, characters, plot, etc.) and the primary actor (the psyche out of which the status nascendi will emerge). Moreno gives these careful and practical attention in actual dramatizations.

2. Psychodrama, A Therapeutic Process

Psychodrama is an action method of diagnosis and treatment, evolved by Moreno and based on the above theory. Treatment starts at the psychological level where the individual can be truly spontaneous; it is spontaneous drama. It is the psyche in action in a group and it brings about participation with action catharsis. Moreno distinguishes four
levels of catharsis: somatic, mental, individual and group. "One of the problems of psychodramatic treatment is to arouse the subject to an adequate re-enactment of the lived out or un-lived out dimensions of his private world." Traumatic experiences would be one area of treatment: "Every true second time is a liberation of the first." But not traumas alone. The subject has tainted and changed attitudes toward all persons and objects in his environment. Usually this "tainting" is very obscure to him; he cannot see it for it is not only traceable to mental but also to bodily functioning. Psychodrama may give a portrayal to the subject in an objective fashion - the actual actions or performances entailed in the "tainting". Not only action habits toward people but also toward objects, such as eating food, may be modified and amenable to reeducation via psychodrama. There is still another area of treatment. Daily living is of a restricted sort: only a very narrow range of roles are used, so the vast potential of personality is not utilized. Psychodrama is a method of expanding these areas, making them explicit and skill-training the person in them. Psychodrama, then, is training in spontaneity: greater utilization and expression of the self, especially in areas of conflict. A very practical problem of such training (and of any other action method) is the warming up process, getting into the role, drama or situation. Moreno stresses "starters" - bodily, mental and chemical (drugs such as alcohol). Without starters, one never gets "warmed up" and thus cannot attain spontaneity. Training begins in this area:

12. Ibid, p. 16.
body-to-mind training, muscular motions inducing moods and states; mind-to-body training, mental states leading into bodily behavior (as in story telling). Besides starters, training in the warming up process is oriented toward liberation from cliches (rigidity) and toward increased susceptibility and readiness. Psychodramatic training itself is aimed toward more efficient and sensitive bodily behavior and toward getting "abstract learning and contents of the mind into active creative states." 14

Psychodrama may be open (whole community present) or closed. There are several different techniques:

a) Auxiliary ego. This is a "closed" session where supporting players - auxiliary egos - portray roles required by the subject's inner world and help guide him in spontaneity to a better solution.

b) Self-presentation. The subject acts or lives through his daily life with special attention to his conflicts. The past, present and future are presented as well as the people in his world: how they act toward him, he toward them, how they interact among themselves.

c) Soliloquy. The subject soliloquizes while acting, revealing hidden thoughts and meanings which present themselves in the situation.

d) Spontaneous presentation. The subject acts in fictitious, imagined roles; the emphasis is on preventing his private character coming through, portraying the role given realistically.

Moreno feels that psychodrama is more than a mere learning by doing. When one is "in" the drama, there is almost total amnesia; when one is not "in" it very well, he watches his own performance. Learning by doing is

of a similar nature for when one is "in" his doing there is relative amnesia and little awareness of what one is doing. Thus there is the large risk that errors will be trained in. Psychodrama avoids this by its recording of the drama (as to instructions, starting interval, the drama itself and concluding action) and by use of auxiliary egos; both are available for use by the subject. The goal of training is both to think and to act spontaneously.

3. Role Playing, A Special Use of Psychodrama

Although recognizing the hazards in learning by doing, Moreno also realizes that the use of auxiliary egos in everyday situations is both impractical and undesirable (too shaming). Role playing, the technique of spontaneous presentation mentioned above, is the answer. In effect, this is an acting through of a future situation (such as a new job or an interpersonal relation) when mistakes may be made without real consequences and may be corrected. This particular contribution of Moreno's is highly flexible and adaptable to many and varied situations and uses. Its use by other investigators will be presented in a section below, Moreno's contribution being mentioned here.

Moreno has used role playing for a variety of purposes. With children, it has been useful for minimizing anti-social attitudes and increasing social responsiveness. Also, it has helped to indicate cultural age (a children's jury picks the fifteen most chosen roles; each child is then gotten to act each role, observation of each role enactment and perception being made.) Role playing has also been adapted to the four
areas mentioned above where the spontaneity factor is operative: dramatic, creative, original and adaptive. Measures have been made on individual differences in adaptability to novel situations: appropriateness of response, temporal duration, shortest route, endurance, etc.

B. Sociodrama - Moreno

While considering Moreno's contribution, sociodrama should be mentioned. It is a drama of the socius - the other fellow - rather than the psyche. The matrix is not the individual but the group or community. To quote Moreno, "In a particular group, a subject may be used as an instrument to diagnose and as a therapeutic agent to treat other subjects." The individual is seen as a product of the group. Thus there are three elements in a sociodrama: the agent of healing, the patient (the group) and the medium of therapy (the production on the stage). Sociodramas have been produced with rather effective results in neighborhoods and in small towns as a whole.

C. Role Playing As Developed By Other Researchers

Since role playing has been so widely used in so many areas, it is treated separately, although it is only a part of what Moreno includes in psychodrama. As an action method, its wide currency is due to its adaptiveness to particular situations, its minimal requirement of skilled personnel (no trained auxiliary egos are necessary). Admittedly it does not deal with deep personal dynamics on a conscious

15. Ibid, p. 316.
level but this is a point in its favor: it would be hard to duplicate the stage and organization Moreno has at Beacon, N. Y. Not going deeply, it does not require the rationale and skills of psychodrama, nor does it run the risks of the latter. It would seem to be an action method adaptable to the parish for use by clergy and church personnel.

Yet it is by no means a superficial instrument. Role, as a psychological concept, seems to be an incisive instrument not only for study of the individual but also of the group and culture. As already mentioned, Moreno uses the concept to trace the psychic development of the infant; the mother plays the role of auxiliary ego, not only as supporter and provider but also as interpreter and clarifier. By "warmed up" to his needs and interpreting them to him, the child's perception of her, of her "different than" and finally of himself emerges. According to Lawlor, 16 G. H. Mead conceives the structure of personality as divided into ego ("I") which is the central core and roles ("Me's") which are more peripheral and are integrated patterns. The roles are portrayed when the person is playing in a social situation; they are productions of the culture and are acquired from it in order to function according to the expectations of the group. From principles discovered and emphasized by the Gestaltists, such should be expected for perception is holistic and only after educational sophistication is acquired does perception become analytic (and then only partially so). Group and cultural expectations are perceived and internalized as wholes, as

roles; such are very important in the development of the person. As Lawlor says further, adjustment depends on the ego (strength of motivation, perception of the self and world, character structure), upon role playing, upon interpsychic relationships between ego and roles and between the roles themselves. Moreno emphasizes the latter by pointing out that roles never occur in isolation but in patterns; on an interpersonal level, there may be tele (attraction or repulsion) between individuals playing certain roles and no tele otherwise (i.e. when they are "themselves"). With the growing emphasis on individual perception, the concept of role seems to be one of the coming instruments for personality, group and cultural studies.

1. Personality Diagnosis

This theoretical importance is grounded in the other aspect of role as a concept: it can be easily translated into an action method, role playing, and then the theory can be tested. If people perceive different roles and internalize them, these can be dramatized, thus revealing both individual perceptual systems and personality structure. Role playing has been used for this purpose. Lawlor, in the same article just mentioned, describes a questionnaire which he has developed. It is aimed at finding the roles played by the subject and covers five areas (family, vocational, group and organizational, person to person and world at large), including 150 separate roles. The subject is asked to check those roles he plays and others not listed (if any), to give an estimate of how well he plays those roles, how much he likes to play them, how
much he would like to play them if he could very well and to list those he would like best if he could play them well. This gives information as to amount of ego satisfaction gotten from each role and from the present roles played. If ineffectiveness or lack of confidence is the cause of dissatisfaction, stage presentation helps to clear up both areas. When enactment brings no satisfaction in any role, then ego conflicts are involved.

Bronfenbrenner and Newcombe\(^\text{17}\) have attempted to set up a standard dramatic test procedure for diagnosing personality. Six standard situations are used, two for each of three conflictual areas: parent-child, authority relationships, relationships with the opposite sex. The plots and roles are rather freely structured and are a departure from real-life roles, thus following the rationale of the Thematic Apperception Test (especially for the last ten cards). Analysis, though tentative now, would take into account how the subject structures and fills in the situation, consistency and variation of behavior, ability to stay in the role, how emotional elements are handled, adaptiveness to the partner and how the drama ends. Areas of observation are verbal content, voice characteristics, bodily movements and postural adjustments. Especially provocative is the authors' treatment of the latter: opened or closed manner of bodily movements and the locus (regions) or movements. It is turning the attention to the projective nature of

expressive movements, hinted at in Allport and Vernon's study. 18

Role playing was used by the OSS staff as a diagnostic procedure for the selection of leaders. Symonds 19 describes six types of improvisation situations: personal criticism, interpersonal conflict of aims, or ideals, moral issues, interview (as applying for a job), rejection, interpersonal conflict and decision, authority-subordination. Criteria noted varied for the six situations. In general, the following were noted in the leader-role: tact, tolerance, ability to discipline, forcefulness, resourcefulness, severity, sympathy, etc. In the subordinate-role such things as these were noted: reaction to failure and attack, resourcefulness, excuse giving, persuasiveness, diplomacy, ability to counter-attack, etc.

Kerstetter 20 reports the application of role playing to marriage prediction. From group discussion, eleven general roles were found to be important in marriage. Each partner then portrayed (or attempted to) his or her conception of each role. Each could see the other's expectancies and thus gain insight into future probabilities. Where blocks developed on understanding the meaning of the partner's enactment, attempts were then made to interpret. The person also obtained insight into his or her own expectancies, not realized completely until then.


To a certain extent, all role playing has a diagnostic function, both for the player and the observer; so the general divisions are arbitrary. To sum up this section, dramatization may be an excellent projective technique for diagnosis of personality and expectancies in interpersonal situations. It opens up areas for study, such as bodily movement, which have received scant attention so far. It offers reasonable validity for prediction of job performance where the job specifications are known.

2. Group Production

Role playing may be used where concrete presentation of job skills or group problems helps to clarify the group's aims and goals. Industrial researchers in human relations have found it particularly useful. Bavelas\(^{21}\) describes in detail one method used in training management personnel. The group's problems and aims are discussed. Two or more of the group are chosen to play the primary role in a situation somewhat akin to the problems outlined. They are given only limited information and are allowed to develop the role as they choose. The group and the member playing the subordinate role are given full information on the situation to be dramatized. The group can then see concretely how different members approach problems in human relations common to their jobs. Care must be taken to avoid "shaming" and to provide the proper atmosphere of encouragement; success also depends on the relevance of the dramatized situation to the actual work conditions of the manage-

\(^{21}\) A. Bavelas, "Role Playing and Management Training", Sociometry, 1 (June, 1947), pp. 183-191.
ment personnel and on the possible extent to which the work situation will permit the group members to put into practice what they have learned. The latter is particularly difficult where top management does not understand this sort of training or is indifferent to the actual work conditions. Bradford and Lippitt\(^\text{22}\) feels that training of any special group (top management, intermediary supervisors, line supervisors, etc.) in isolation is impractical, partly because other special groups would be unsympathetic and partly because each group is relatively ignorant of the problems of the other. They describe in the cited article the meeting of four training groups simultaneously (an employee group being one) with intercommunication between the groups - to see the "other fellow's" problems through his eyes. Each group having delineated its own aims and problems as well as having seen how the other groups react to such delineation can then deal realistically with those aims and problems via a role playing procedure. The results of such training are much more easily employed in the plant situation. Role playing may also be used as a solution-making technique - acting out how to deal with a future situation - and thus forms a focus for group discussion, group change and increasing member skills.

Apathy on the part of management and administrators is a more difficult problem. Lippitt\(^\text{23}\) uses a sociodrama in which administrators,


after proper preparation, are shown a "training session" in process with a clarifier to interpret what is going on. Such is supposed to "sell" the idea of need for training. Sometimes this is not enough. Bradford and Sheets\textsuperscript{24} give the following reasons for resistance to change:

vested interests, no experience of what could be, inadequate perception of the total problem, status quo smugness and individual or group insecurity. A situation must be created in which the inadequacy of the present situation is seen without guilt - to shock complacency. Here too, role playing is vital by virtue of its concreteness.

From the above, it can be seen that role playing is highly adaptable and is a useful adjunct in almost any training program, for it gets beyond the verbal-instructional level and brings into play action skills which can be viewed by the group. It enables learning by doing in the presence of an auxiliary ego (the trainer) who paces the drama so that it will not progress too fast for absorption or too far into a "hot" area where guilt and shame would result. The Research Center for Group Dynamics, realizing this, made role playing an integral part of its research project at Bethel, Maine, where increasing group and member productivity via a discusssional approach was its major project. It was used to increase insight of the members into group problems and to give practice in skills. Role playing has also been used in interview training\textsuperscript{25} to short-cut the tedious process involved; it is also used in


\textsuperscript{25} M. E. Barron, "Role Practice in Interview Training", Sociology, 1 (June, 1947), p. 195-208.
3. Areas of Disturbance

Acting out conflicts and areas of disturbance has long been recognized as beneficial; role playing is helpful here, particularly with children. Lippitt lists the following situations where role playing may be used in the home: overcoming deep seated fears or emotional blockings of long duration, improving social behavior (the ability to meet daily frustrations), sibling rivalry, behavior toward pets, preparing for new experiences and interpreting the news, as well as stimulating spontaneity and creativity. This borders on play therapy but with this difference: interaction is always and primarily with an auxiliary ego(s), not objects. Moreno feels that dolls and toys do not provide an adequate interpersonal relation; children easily over-express with objects where such is impossible with real, live persons. This is more realistic training for living; over-emotionalism and expression are pathological spontaneity.

Hass introduces a dramatic approach in the counseling process, largely for diagnostic purposes. This is needed if it be true that the client "taints" his world, not only perceptually but behaviorally. This is


close to psychodramatic therapy yet it is also within the range of role playing: the individual seeing his behavior as he plays a role. It has the obvious advantage of removing the area of disturbance by a degree and enabling the client to view his behavior more objectively.

In conclusion, dramatic techniques have been employed in many and varied areas of human relations and learning situations; attempted use of them in a church program would seem advisable. Drama appears to be a very flexible instrument, adaptable to the purpose at hand, whether such a purpose is therapy, diagnosis or training the person in dealing with present or future situations. Further, there is a close linkage between psychodrama and sociometry, the latter to be described in the following chapter. Moreno "invented" both, he uses both to check the results of each, and both are action methods.
CHAPTER III

SOCIOMETRIC AND OBSERVATIONAL TECHNIQUES:

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Strictly speaking, certain sociometric and observational procedures are action methods. However, they are less so than those mentioned in the previous chapter. There is less participation on the part of the subjects, the researcher being mainly interested in interpreting the data.

In another sense they are, however, necessary tools for this type of research. In the broader view that people are not closed psychic systems but are foci in a social force field, the structure of that field and behavior exhibited within it are necessary areas for study. Without knowledge of these areas, the previous methods do not get far. Sociometry is largely concerned with group structure, observation with the group activity in process. The effectiveness of both is shown by their wider and wider employment. Sociometry is becoming more and more standard procedure in schools. Observation is less widely used, partly because its effectiveness has only recently been realized, partly because defining of significant categories is still in the experimental stage, and partly because it is more difficult to employ where total coverage is desired. Yet it is fast coming into its own.

I. Sociometric Techniques

Sociometry is a term used by Moreno to indicate an area within a larger field, that of sociometry: "A science which is concerned with
the psychological properties of populations and with the communal
problems which these properties produce

(1) (By psychological, he means
the relations between individuals and the cumulative effect of these
relations.) Sociometry includes mathematical measures, the experi-
mental techniques and results obtained in studying these psychological
properties.

A. Moreno - Sociometric Theory and Test

This is better understood by considering some of Moreno's pre-
suppositions and interests. As a psychiatrist, he is interested in
therapy but in somewhat different form from that of other psychiatrists.
He is particularly interested in human creativity and feels that this
is the fundamental function of the healthy human being. Therapy con-
sists of helping people become creative again. Fundamental to bringing
about such a state is the enabling of the individual to attain spontaneity.
Strong pressure against this arises from the culture which tends to con-
serve and preserve human creativity of the past. Moreno feels that other
therapeutic attempts to resolve this have over stressed sublimation:
Christianity used an active form; Nietzsche, Freud and others pro-
mulgated a negative variety. Therapy should attempt to reinstate a
natural spontaneity, free of indoctrination and suggestion. However, the
obvious drawbacks of free, spontaneous interaction by all human beings


are readily apparent. There must be some individual sublimation in order that others may enjoy a measure of spontaneity too; this should be in accord with the natural laws which apparently control the interpersonal interaction of the population. So a study of the psychological properties of the population is necessary. A technique for such a study must be one "of freedom, . . . balancing the spontaneous social forces to the greatest possible harmony and unity of all".³

Such a technique is the sociometric test which "requires an individual to choose his associates for any group of which he is or might become a member";⁴ it is not given in isolation but to all others in the group. This can be contrasted to two other methods: objective observation of group formation and interpretation therefrom; participant observation, noting the intimate developments of the group. Moreno feels that the sociometric test has definite advantages. It assumes spontaneity; observational and participant methods do not assure it for pressures may be existent in the group thus precluding it. It enables the individual to take part in the manipulation of his own environment, it is no academic test. It also makes possible a study of group structure and formation. Two points should be stressed in the giving of any "true" sociometric test. The expression of choice required must be in respect to a definite criterion: with whom would you like to work, play, study or live? The participants must be assured the results of their choosing

---

4. Ibid, p. 11.
shall be put into effect. The number of choices varies from 3 to 5 although there are some adaptations which ask for complete expression.

Study of the results of sociometric testing forms the bulk of sociometry in print. Fundamental to an understanding of such study is Moreno's original means of graphic representation, the sociogram. Each person is represented on a chart by a numbered symbol (circles, or triangles of different kinds). Each expression of choice (and rejection, if asked for in the test) is then drawn on the chart from the chooser to the chosen (and rejector to rejected). Certain features are then readily apparent. Some individuals are chosen frequently, they are the leaders (or stars). Others are not chosen at all; these are termed isolates. Still others may be frequently rejected. The pattern for each is called the social atom of that individual, the social atom being defined as the psychological relations (within a group) of an individual to others and of others to him. There may be individuals who mutually choose or reject each other (mutual pairs of attraction or repulsion); attractions or repulsions may also form into chains, triangles, squares and so on. In a community, a chain may be so extensive that it links individuals who do not know each other. Such is called a network.

1. Sociometric Research

Moreno lists four levels on which study of sociometric findings may be carried on: research, diagnosis, therapy and complete integration. Research deals with the theoretical implications of socio-
metric data. In a study of school children (grades 1 to 8), the configurations of personal choice differed in important respects according to the grade (age) of the children tested; moreover, these differences were relatively stable. Kindergarten groups showed a high number of isolates, few mutual pairs and no triangles or chains; intersex choice was comparatively high. By the eighth grade the percentages of isolated were lower while mutual pairs, chains and triangles had risen markedly. Intersex choice was much lower although the lowest point occurred in the fourth and fifth grades. All this suggests that there is a temporal aspect of group organization. From organic isolation in infancy, increase in age brings complexity in social organization. An early social skill may be the child's development of the ability to choose those who will choose him. Moreno calls this temporary aspect the sociogenetic law: the highest forms of organization evolve from lower forms.

The sociometric results may also be studied spatially, i.e., the patterns shown. This has largely to do with features mentioned above: the social atom which is the smallest unit, mutual pair, chain, triangle and so forth. In general there are two processes at work: toward greater differentiation (group drawing apart) and toward greater transmission (group drawing together). Moreno calls the interplay of these two processes the law of social gravitation. He also speaks of sociodynamic effect: the more choices to leaders, the less to others. Increasing the number of choices only tends to increase this effect.
In comparing the obtained spatial aspects of in-group attractions and repulsions with chance expectancy, marked differences are observed. With chance choosing, isolation is lower; so also is the frequency of mutual pairs, chains and so forth. Some factor must be operative to cause this difference. Moreno calls it tele (positive or negative): in an attraction or repulsion a feeling is directed from one to another at a distance. The following kinds of tele are differentiated: 1) simple (mutual first, second or third choice), 2) incongruous (first to third choice and so forth), 3) symbolic (choice is for the role alone), 4) unreciprocated, 5) directed toward objects. Moreno speculates on a "social" physiology for tele involving a duplicity of organs as in bisexuality and speech function. However tele is recognized as an abstraction. On a practical level, everyone functioning in a social system is restricted by two factors: his own emotional expansiveness and the psychological pressure exerted by the population. Moreno is largely interested in the former in four ways: the intensity of the emotion projected (tele), how many persons are interested thereby, to how many people the individual may transfer emotion and from how many he can absorb emotion.

These points have large theoretical consequences in treating the social atom. Although motivation and causation of choices are studied, the idea of emotional expansiveness implies a certain consistency in the individual's social atom (the Acquaintance Test, whom the individual lists as being acquainted with, is used to discover this expansiveness). Most people do not function near the
limit of their capacity; this is partially affected by the emotional and social differentiation of the group and the person's position in it. Moreno feels this is amenable to training and manipulation but that the natural expansiveness sets the final limit.

Helen Jennings has studied the social atom intensively and her work will be mentioned later. Mutual pairs, another spatial aspect, may be viewed in a variety of contexts. Developmentally, mutual reciprocation represents a necessary social skill for the young child. At a higher level, lack of it indicates that the individual is operating at a level of unreal choice; this is particularly so where an isolate chooses a leader. Mutual pairs are significant in the group context in which they occur; this is also true of triangles, squares and so forth. Thus reciprocation may appear in the group as isolation. This kind of isolation is not as severe for the individual but it may indicate strong disintegrative trends within the group.

Chains come with the developing of a society and the maturing of individuals. Thus networks are very important and increasingly so the larger the group is. Large groups cannot function without networks; the older and wider networks are, the less important individual contributions toward it seem to be. Mutual choice is more significant when related to a network. Thus an individual who is not the center of many choices (not a leader) but who chooses first and is chosen first by a leader may wield large influence in the group. Moreno terms such interchange aristocracies. All the spatial aspects sociogrammatically exhibited take on added significance as they are or are not related to networks.
Within the larger context of a society or culture, spontaneous choice of individuals is less significant than choice of roles. With increasing complexity of interaction in a society, roles are extremely important functionally. Sociometric tests may be applied at this level, the role taking the place of the individual.

2. Diagnostic Usages

Research in group structure and comparative differences due to age, size and so forth is important; it provides a mass of data with which comparison and study of specific groups may be made. But it is a serious question whether this is sufficient. There may be personal or situational factors present which exert strong pressure. No group may be "typical" for its size and the age of its members. For diagnostic purposes, other factors must be considered.

Moreno recognizes this; he studies the individual intensively. The formulas of the social atoms are obtained. The individual is also asked for the motives in his choosing. But this is insufficient for the subject may not know or be able to state clearly his reasons. He is then studied in spontaneous relations with all the individuals in his social atom. This is called the Spontaneity Test. The subject is asked to throw himself into an emotional state (anger, fear, sympathy, dominance) toward each individual in his social atom. This borders on psychodrama for each individual is present in turn opposite the subject. The value of this test is that a more precise measure and determination of the nature of the tele forces operative in the subject's social interaction may be obtained. These also are plotted on the sociogram
or social atom. Sociometric data must be supplemented by other means of diagnosis of personality dynamics.

Implicit in diagnosis is prediction. Can the data obtained give a reasonable picture of expectancies? This has been tried at a reform school in Hudson, N. Y. The girls are housed in cottages; incoming girls were assigned to cottages where vacancies existed. An attempt was made to improve the chances of successful assignment via a sociometric approach. Two tests were used: the Parent Test and the Family Test. In the first, the girl interviewed each prospective housemother; then both the girl and housemother were asked to rate each other sociometrically. Success was found least often where there was mutual rejection and proceeded up the scale as follows: housemother rejecting and girl choosing, girl rejecting and housemother choosing, and finally mutual choice. The Family Test is similar, each cottage furnishing a representative girl to interview the newcomer. After both test results were studied as well as the structure in each cottage, assignment was made.

As with individual members, motivational and situational factors are operative in groups, making for differences in group structure. Yet these factors may not be directly deducible from sociometric results. The criterion for choosing - work, play, living together, etc. - makes for differences in groupings of the same individuals. At the reform school already mentioned, negro girls were extremely popular; inquiry revealed that they functioned as male substitutes. The confirming situation pertaining in the school, with its restriction of
normal, human relations, affected the choice patterns and organization within the whole school. The condition of living in cottages brought about in-group and out-group patterns which would not occur in other situations. Sociometric data must be supplemented by a description and diagnosis of conditions impinging on the group.

Sociometric results may have predictive value for groups. In the reform school mentioned, incipient disintegration or revolt of a group (cottage, work unit, etc.) was often spotted. Recognition of these symptoms in milder forms is useful in the assignment of a new girl; if the group is so cohesive that she stand little chance of "breaking in" or if disintegrative trends indicate she will have trouble in making normal attachments, the prognosis is not good.

3. Assignment Therapy

Closely allied to the above is the use Moreno makes of sociometric data for therapeutic purposes: assignment therapy. An individual may be doing poorly; and placement in a more congenial environment may be beneficial. This is based on the assumption that positive tele is therapeutic. Therapy is implied in the test itself; by spontaneously choosing and manipulating his environment thereby, the individual is benefited. An example is the seating arrangement for girls in the above reform school. When left to choose their own seats, efficiency was 25% to 30% (an isolate might sit at a table, seating four, with others avoiding that table thereafter; while a table chosen by a leader might be mobbed thereafter - frustration develops in both
situations). Efficiency after sociometric placement ran from 80% to 100%. Assignment therapy may run the gamut: from individual assignment to clarifying and forming a beneficial group structure to manipulating and changing a pathological group structure. Manipulation of a group is by no means easy. Removal of undesirable leaders or members (as with the removal of any leader or member) may seriously disrupt the structure; subordinate leaders may lose rather than gain eminence. This illustrates the value of a therapeutic level of inquiry; such may pose problems that do not arise in either pure research or diagnosis. And it is important to keep Moreno’s emphasis in view: “Group therapy treats not only the individual who is the focus of attention because of maladjustment but the whole group of individuals who are interrelated to him in the community.”  

4. Complete Integration

All the various levels may be combined, not carried out in isolation but together. Moreno prefers this; it would appear to be the best. Not only would each area of interest fertilize and make more productive the other; it also represents a holistic approach which avoids obvious errors and may more adequately deal with the problems confronting action research. The Church may be an example: its concrete organizations and functions (the local church) are determined in many ways by its members and their interpersonal relations on the one hand and its embeddedness in the community and wider human organizations on the other. Nor can the minister harp on any one string, be it therapy or research or

5. Ibid, p. 301.
diagnosis. He must work within the global situation. He sees people alone with their troubles and also in active participation in groups. An action research method must take in as complete an area as possible if it is to be employed with success in concrete situations.

B. Other Contributions

Many other researchers have furthered the study of sociometrics. Some of these are close to Moreno; some are not fully approved by him. Sociometric tests have been applied in many different social situations; they have enjoyed widest acceptance in the schools. The following attempts to cover in part these other contributions.

1. Jennings - Leadership Function

Helen Jennings has been one of Moreno’s intimate collaborators. She has been largely interested in the study of three areas: leadership, the difference between psychogroups and sociogroups, and the social atom. Leadership was her first interest. She defines it as a large concentration of tele forces. Two factors determine the extent of concentration: a) the leader’s own emotional expansiveness and the capacity of members to respond; b) temporal and special aspects of the group structure. Variation in leadership may be great or little: stable, erratic and unstable. It may be bound up with only a narrow segment of the group, large and momentary, wide and enduring or aristotele. To find some indication of emotional expansiveness, the Acquaintance Test was used; a high correlation (.94) was found between
the number of times an individual was a leader (on sociometric tests) and his acquaintance volume. Leaders have greater capacity to warm up to and initiate acquaintances. Leadership position depends also on accuracy of choice: mutual relations are very important.

Her later study of leadership points away from emphasis on the capacity of the leader. Leadership is a product of many interacting together; those who concentrate their tele upon the leader are not so much followers as supporters. Even isolates probably exert some influence by their (looking up to and) expectations of the leader. The function of leadership is to bring the group more satisfying and rewarding experiences. Thus a democratic process is indicated; leadership is produced by the group rather than individually achieved. Further, such group expectancies and formative influences have an enduring effect upon the leader; when transferred to another group, patterns of action previously developed are to a large measure retained.

These later findings also hold in sociogroups. The large difference between these groups lies in the tele forces exerted. In psyche-groups, tele is on a private, personal basis. In a sociogroup, tele is collectively determined; it is directed, not to the private individual, but to the role in which he is cast. Such is characteristic of almost any society but more particularly of large and complex ones. Both groups are necessary in any community; they tend to fertilize

each other. In general, emergence of leaders depends on factors already mentioned. However, there is no right or wrong pattern; leadership positions differ markedly according to the group in which they are embedded.

Jennings views the social atom as the smallest unit in social configurations. She is particularly interested in whether various expressions are significantly correlated. This necessitated two tests separated by at least eight months and in which full, spontaneous expression of the population, both positive and negative choice, was obtained. She was interested in three performances for both positive and negative expression: a) the individual's emotional expansiveness toward (or rejection of) others, b) that received from others and c) positive reciprocation. Her two general conclusions are: 1) the character of choice processes in a population is reflected in social atoms, 2) the social atom, as it undergoes change and as sociometrically measured at different times, retains some internal consistency. She concludes that the social atom is a structural unit.

2. Northway — Isolation and Personality Structure

Mary L. Northway is another contributor; she has used sociometric techniques in the Toronto schools. She modified Moreno's graphic representation to include quartile ratings (her "Target" sociogram).7

It consists of four concentric circles of equal area, the inner one representing the upper quartile, the outer one the lower quartile and so on. Not only does it show at a glance the leaders and isolates; the target may be split in half to show division in sex and each half further subdivided to show special racial, religious or other groupings under study.

She also made a test, widely used and called "The Social Acceptability Test" (she now feels that "acceptance" is a more accurate term). This is a "near" sociometric technique, no objective change in the social environment being promised. Three choices are invited for association in work and play, inside and outside the school (four questions in all). She gives an arbitrary weighting of five points for a first choice, three points for a second choice and two points for a third.

From her testing, she became interested in the children with the least or no acceptance scores. She studied their personality patterns to find possible correlations. Areas studied were: 1) basic data of age, health, family, etc., 2) intelligence tests, 3) psychologist's interview, 4) time samples of class participation, 5) time samples of participation in play and special groups, 6) club participation, 7) participation in specially selected discussion groups and 8) literary compositions. From this she found three patterns among the isolated and


rejected: recessive, socially uninterested and socially ineffective. Many of the objective measures (intelligence, scholastic achievement, family position, etc.) had very low correlations. Thus she became interested in the location, description and development of these patterns and in a plan for group therapy using sociometric procedures and psychiatric interviews. She has found that recessivism is least amenable to therapy. She also became interested in the cultural cleavages present; intercultural education has become another project in the Toronto schools.

Northway feels that only a beginning has been made, that important questions and hypotheses, having been isolated by the above, should be intensively studied. Some of the questions are: whether or not acceptance scores measure a psychological characteristic called acceptability; whether or not, in a static group, fluctuation occurs only in the middle range and the extremes of choice remain unchanged. One hypothesis is quite interesting:

"Anything which served to unite the members of a group to the achievement of a common cause and provided opportunity for co-operative participation would increase the measurable cohesiveness of that group. That, in addition, if the attainment of that common cause provides a degree of adversity, that cohesiveness would increase. I would further hypothesize that as competition and individual success were emphasized within the group cohesiveness would measurably decrease."

3. Zeleny and Others - Social Status

Zeleny\(^\text{11}\) uses a modified sociometric approach in the classroom. All the members of the group are listed, the criterion is working in a certain committee or smaller group. Expression asked for is:  
(a) first choice (b) acceptance (c) indifference (d) unacceptance (e) last choice. Each is asked to check the appropriate expression for every other member. Weighting for each of the five categories runs:  
\(+1, \,+0.5, 0, -0.5, -1\). A social status index is then computed which is the average intensity (\(+\) or \(-\)) of the group toward that individual. Zeleny uses it as a diagnostic instrument; where there are negative scores, remedial measures are indicated. He gives three suggestions for improving the individual's social status index: 1) continued practice in interpersonal relations with common goals to be obtained, 2) group reassignment, 3) personal guidance interviews.

Howell\(^\text{12}\) modified Zeleny's procedure by simplifying it: asking only for like, indifference and dislike. He used it for different levels of association: work, play, eating and so forth. He also added another category for free choice: who would be chosen if choice were not limited to the group. Jacobs\(^\text{13}\) used a somewhat similar procedure in an office and combined it with personal choice. He called the


latter spontaneous choice; the subject could choose five and was asked for his reasons. The former he called spontaneous feeling; each in the office was asked for his reaction to each of all the others.

Shoobs has used the sociometric test as a jumping off point for classroom discussion. The pupils were asked to pick one with whom they could do their best work. A discussion followed on the meaning of friendship. The pupils thought that such a test should incorporate two features: the pupil, not only with whom you have the most fun, but also upon whom you can depend (the latter was voted as most important). Putting into effect the sociometric results brought less tension, better scholastic behavior and a gain in self confidence.

The teacher could select more dependable pupils for student organizations; the test also helped to discover attitudes and actions in their nascent stage (pathological leadership) and reorganize groupings for better pupil growth. Sociometric techniques were not employed in the next grade and the pupils gradually regressed to the previous struggle for leadership among themselves. However some kept their gains and were more amenable to improvement.

4. F. E. Moreno and Frankel - Sociometry and Children

Where sociometric tests have been used with preschool children, results have not been very satisfactory. It is hard for them to make more than one verbal choice and, if some do, their choosing does not

---

seen reliable. F. B. Moreno\textsuperscript{15} decided to check on the validity of their choices. Her procedure included: 1) observation of spontaneous interaction, 2) verbal choice (sociometric test) and 3) experimental manipulation (removing a mate to see if isolation was preferable to a second choice). Each child was charted according to: total number of children contacted, total number of contacts, total number and time of positive contacts and percentages for both, percentage of concentration (number and time) on one child. Comparisons were then made with sociometric expression. Moreno concludes that sociometry is not reliable at this age level.

Frankel\textsuperscript{16} did a similar study and in addition tried to discover related factors in children's social relationships. She found that shyness, lack of energy and enthusiasm of the directing of these toward non-social interests were the main factors related to low contact and acceptance scores. The sociability of the child (number of individuals contacted and chosen) was not related to his acceptance score. However the social acceptance and play contact scores were related to contacts with play friends. She also checked the emotional and disciplinary records of the children and found a very interesting phenomenon: although there was no clear relation between adjustment and social scores, children with high scores had more emotional episodes and exhibited more non-conforming behavior than those with low scores.


Sociometric tests have been used in smaller communities. Lundberg\textsuperscript{17} in a house to house canvas used a modified test ("who are your best friends?") together with the Chapin Scale of socio-economic status, supplemented by information about the families. He found seven well marked groups with leaders and some isolates. He also found that socio-economic status correlated highly with choices received. In a later paper,\textsuperscript{18} he lists these additional factors influencing choice patterns: cultural homogeneity, family relations, club and church membership.

Cologne\textsuperscript{19} describes a very interesting employment of sociometry in a self-help center in a very poor community. The community was split into two groups headed by aggressive, hostile (to each other) leaders. The first test was used on a Mother's Day Program where six leadership positions needed to be filled. The two leaders first declined to serve and then consented. A second test was used to pick personnel for six different types of work carried on in the self-help center. Greater discrimination in choice was shown; some amelioration of the community conflict resulted.

The above summary of sociometry does not cover all the contributions made but does offer a representative sample.

\textsuperscript{17} G. A. Lundberg, "Social Attraction Patterns in a Rural Village: A Preliminary Report", Sociometry, 1 (July-Oct, 1937), pp. 77-89.

\textsuperscript{18} G. A. Lundberg, "Social Attraction Patterns in a Village", Sociometry, 1 (Jan-Apr, 1938), pp. 375-419.

II. Observational Techniques

It is generally agreed that no method precludes observation as a procedure in the study of group interaction. Perhaps the largest attempt at complete coverage was made at the Bethel Laboratory. Three areas were covered. First, the group observer recorded all content, divided it into units and classified it according to the following categories: source of content, channel of communication, activity or method of communication, unit of locomotion, interest and nature of content. Second, the interaction observer classified the interaction in small units (sentences, phrases or words) for the following information: who speaks to whom and the kind of interaction. The latter might be scored in one of twenty categories, each of one of these general types: impersonal and objective, positive, friendly emotion; negative, hostile emotion. Third, the anecdotal observer concentrated on the group process and reported back to the group when asked to do so; his function has already been discussed under feedback technique. He worked in close collaboration with the faculty leader, writing up in addition his plans, his behavior and his feelings of success or failure.

The scoring categories of the first observer may be described in more detail. Sources of content were subdivided: personal experience prior to the workshop, primary or secondary (reading, etc.); personal experience at the workshop, primary or secondary (read or heard from others); current experience at the workshop (such as role playing, episode going on, etc.); and other (not classifiable in any of the preceding). Channel of communication referred to whether the
originator was: faculty leader, expert, member of research team, member, group or group leader. Activity or method of communication referred to the means used, whether recording, movie, blackboard, printing, practice (role playing) and so forth. Content was also scored as to unit of locomotion: creating, recognizing or accepting a problem; defining the problem and goals; diagnosis of the position of the group in relation to the problem; positive suggesting and evaluating; arriving at a consensus; plan for action; tryout; evaluating and modifying. Rating scales were also made for: interest (keen, mild, bored or out of field), acceptance-rejection, and nature of content (intimate, peripheral and non-personal).

Back reports some very interesting conclusions reached from data gathered by the second observer. The relative amount contributed by each member is important in group functioning; where only a few are relied upon the complexion of the group is quite different from that where participation is more even. High contributors establish rather permanent positions early in group life. Interesting differences appeared between the work groups at the Laboratory on this point. The kind of participation also was significant; percentages were worked out for the three categories of work centered, positive emotional and negative emotional participation. If the emotionally toned percentages were high, then personality factors were entering largely. These percentages afforded inter-group and inter-leader comparisons

as well as temporal comparisons for a single group. Direction of participation (who talked to whom) indicated whether the discussion was directed toward the leader, impersonally toward the group or whether it was a series of inter-changes among members. On these three levels, Back shows how two groups exhibit internally consistent patterns. The influence of the leader and status struggles of the members are important factors in group dynamics. Back concludes his article: "Interpersonal relations in a discussion group are not only attributes of clashing or harmonious personalities. They can change substantially, and the discussion leader can influence the relations among members by his own behavior."

Observational methods need not be (and often cannot be) as complex as those used at the Bethel Laboratory. Of course, the more complete the coverage, the more inclusive and refined the results. Hyde and York describe a simpler method of observing the spontaneous behavior of mental patients on a disturbed ward. All verbal (from whom to whom), attentive (to whom) and motor (direction and frequency in and out of the room) activity is noted during a fifteen minute period; it is then charted on a sociogram. Hostility is shown by a staggered line. The value of this method lies in its simplicity; it requires only one person, no elaborate equipment and it may be easily learned by the novice. Yet it offers richness of observation: for evaluation of the

21. Ibid, p. 65

behavior of hospital personnel; social concomitants of medical procedures (social behavior of the pre- and post-lobotomized patient) and the closer scrutiny of group life among mental patients for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes.

Another method used at the Boston Psychopathic Hospital is observation of patient groupings throughout the whole ward at specific intervals over an extended period of time. Simple recording of who speaks to whom in a discussion group (patients or personnel) has been also employed with effectiveness, in showing non-participation and the direction of discussion. In several instances, an analysis of participation has yielded valuable data. Almost any simplified form of observation is useful provided the purpose of the study is clearly defined and the nature of the interaction is taken into account.

The techniques reviewed in this chapter appear to be of value in studying a church group where discussion is the main tool of the education process. Sociometry has been widely used in the study of primary (face-to-face) groups. Yet although sociometry has proven a significant, almost indispensable, instrument it by no means is sufficient. Observational techniques which focus on the group process of interaction are also necessary. In fact, each may supplement the other, a better picture being obtained.
CHAPTER IV

THE GROUP AND METHODS USED

The object of this study is a youth group of a Congregational church in an average rural town of Massachusetts. Several features recommend it for such a study: discussion is the prime method for achieving its objectives; the group has considerable freedom in organizing and running its own program; the members are well acquainted with each other because of the intimacy and frequency of personal contacts in a rural situation.

I. Description of the Group

In presenting a description of this group, the plan is to delineate certain molar features of its larger cultural background, the community and Church. This is followed by a formal treatment of the group: stated aims, responsibilities of members, and organization as contained in its constitution. A more concrete picture of how the group functions will then be added, leading into felt problems of leaders and members.

A. Background: Community and Church

The community, called Westdale in this study, is a rural town of around 3200 population. Settled before the middle of the 17th century, it has a long and interesting history. Originally much larger in extent, other communities have split off from it. One such to the south became an industrial center. Although the original woolen industries
moved south twenty years ago, other industries have moved in. Many of the people of Westdale work in the factories there. A larger industrial town lies to the north and west. Westdale has thus remained a rural community. Decrease in size, lack of business establishments and other factors have contributed to high taxes and financial stricture.

Westdale is one of the more beautiful towns in the state. Besides the developments mentioned, a very important factor was a prominent and wealthy family. Before the turn of the century, this family made extensive purchases of land. These were made not only for their large estates but also to preserve the beauty of the town and to keep out undesirables. Public buildings (town house, museum, library and so forth) were donated, town deficits were made up so that taxes were nominal and recreation was provided for residents at a nominal fee.

The effect upon the social structure was very marked. Many of the families in the community were servants on their estates. A very elite social grouping developed and included other prominent citizens. In later years, members of this family, mill owners and other estate-holders moved away; the social distinctions still persist.

The estates, formed by combining several farms, did not revert to their former usage. Two large ones became schools. Several of the large mansions were purchased by the Adventist-Christian Church, the New England headquarters of which is in the south village of Westdale. Thus extensive areas became tax free, increasing the tax rate to five times its former size.
The social groupings are reflected in the religious groupings. The upper social stratum is affiliated with the Unitarian Church. The Congregational Church was established over a hundred years ago during the schism out of which Unitarianism developed. Its constituency is of the middle and lower classes and to a certain extent embodies still the differences engendered by that schism. There is also a strong Catholic Church. The Adventist-Christian Church almost comprises a community by itself and is largely centered in the south village. It has its own parochial school system and college.

The combined effect of these factors give the youth group a distinctive place in the community. There is no commercial entertainment. The only places for the youth to gather are a small, general drug store which closes early and an eating establishment in the south village. A new and bigger high school, badly needed, has been voted down repeatedly over fifteen years. There is no gymnasium and the old recreation hall was torn down after it was donated to the town. Social activities such as dances and parties are almost non-existent; athletic activities are at a minimum. Nor is there popular support forthcoming when attempts are made to institute such. Programs like scouting, cubbing and so forth are poorly supported. School is the big exception. Thus this youth group fills a needed social function for its members. None of the other religious faiths have such an organization. The Unitarian Church is decreasing in activity; no provision is made for its youth, educationally or socially. The Catholic Church provides only religious instruction.
These social and religious factors strongly influence the membership. In theory, anyone may attend. In practice, members are largely from the families closely affiliated with the Congregational Church. Some few Unitarians have attended, one is now a member, but this is exceptional because the social gap is large. Catholics may not attend per order of the priests; neither do the Adventists for similar reasons. Yet heterosexual attractions exert a strong influence and there are occasional exceptions. Several members of churches in the industrial center, mostly Episcopalians, were and are enthusiastic participants.

Many other factors of a more personal nature affect the membership. Children of parents who are on the fringe ("out" as over against "in" group) remain apart; the social structure of the local Church has direct bearing. Others were not happily impressed with early contacts in the Church, i.e., the Sunday School. Interpersonal contacts at school and elsewhere with resultant perceptions determine participation. The rural situation seems to intensify and magnify these patternings.

This leads into the existing relation between the Church and group. On the whole, it is rather free. Older members are proud of the group; it is large, its members comprise the choir, teach in the Sunday School and actively help in other ways. Practices, such as occasional dancing, though not approved by some are not pried into either. The group is not closely supervised by the Church. The adult leaders have been given free rein and are credited with doing an excellent job. Opinions of the youth are sought and definitely influential in many areas.

Besides the local relation, denominational ties are influential. The constitution copies that of the denominational form in other
churches. The association to which the Westdale Church belongs has a youth organization. Rallies are held four times a year and one of the members was its president. These rallies tend to increase denominational ties and also afford wider heterosexual contacts. Denominational literature is used, though not exclusively, and camps are attended every summer.

In summary, the group has a unique function in the community. Outside of the school, it is the only organization at its age level for the youth. It is comprised of youth from the middle and lower classes. Usual commercial recreational facilities are lacking; although these are used in other towns, they are not as easily accessible, while indigenous groupings and participation in other social activities are at a minimum. Religious barriers largely limit the membership to those affiliated with the local church though the need for heterosexual contacts is sometimes stronger. The social structure of the church and personal perceptions also determine participation.

B. Formal Structure

The group studied consists of young people, thirteen years of age and older, organized as an adjunct of the Church for the achieving of certain objectives of a Christian nature. These are stated in the constitution of the group as:

To achieve Christian personality after the pattern of Jesus,
To seek a fuller understanding, one of another, in the interest of happy relations in home and community,
To work for a united church, practicing Christian freedom and definitely promoting the program of Jesus,
To secure equal rights and opportunities for all classes and races as equally the children of God,
To practice a Christian patriotism which recognizes the authority of God in conscience as supreme,
To strive for justice in the social order which will afford an abundant life for all,
To work for such international organization of the nations as will preserve peace and security.

Anyone who is willing to join in the work of achieving the above objectives is considered a member; anyone desiring to participate but unwilling to accept full responsibilities is considered an associate member. On joining, the new member is required to sign and read before the group the following pledge:

Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength, I promise Him that I will strive to do whatever He would have me do. I will make it the rule of my life to pray and read the Bible, to support the work and worship of my church, and to take my part in the meetings, and other activities of this society. I will seek to bring others to Christ, to give as I can for the spread of the Kingdom, to advance my country's welfare, and promote the Christian brotherhood of man. These things I will do unless hindered by conscientious reasons, and in them all I will seek the Saviour's guidance.

The associate member's pledge is shorter, requiring faithful attendance at the discussion meetings and a willingness to help in any way possible.

The society has five officers. Four of these (president, vice president, secretary and treasurer) are held by members of the group; the duties entailed are those customary for such offices. The fifth is the adult counselor. He is the liaison between society and church. He is a member ex officio of all committees. Although it is specifically stated that he shall not dominate the group, his view is to be asked on all matters. Another function is to be acquainted with available literature and denominational programs, to see that appropriate officers
and committees receive the same. The adult counselor is elected by the group from a list of names submitted by the Church Committee. All the other officers are elected in the regular fashion.

In addition, there are eight committees. The executive committee is composed of the aforementioned officers plus chairmen of all committees and the pastor. The president is chairman and its function twofold:

To prevent waste of time in the regular meetings of the society by useless debate and unnecessary parliamentary practice, which are always harmful to the spirit of the prayer meeting, and also to counsel together concerning the society work.

This committee should meet monthly. Other committees are: membership, missionary, music, program, publicity, sick and social. These are appointed by a joint meeting of the old and new officers just previous to the installation of the latter. These committees are expected to submit reports of their activities at every regular meeting of the society.

The most frequent meeting is the prayer service, held every Sunday evening; the program includes discussion and worship. The society shall hold a regular business meeting every fourth Friday of the month; a social shall be held immediately following it. In addition, two other business meetings are to be held in January (annual) and June (semi-annual). There is a service of installation for new officers on the last Sunday night of December.

Being a part of the Church, the constitution states that the society shall bear its share of the church's program. The society is
also joined with others of a similar nature in the associational, state and national organizations and is committed to support summer conferences of the denomination.

C. Functional Description

The youth group meets at the Church every Sunday afternoon at 5:30 during the fall, winter and spring months. The first part is devoted to a discussion of the topic for the evening, being introduced by hymns, scriptural and topical readings, and a brief prayer. One of the members, chosen by the program committee, leads and this job is usually rotated among the others; his name is posted in advance and he may choose a topic from the material available. Most of the leaders merely read the prepared material and offer questions for discussion. This period is ended when the questions are completed; length of discussion varies with interest in the topic and the skill of the leader.

There follows immediately a worship service in another room which is lit only by candles; another member presides at the back. Bible readings, hymns, prayers, a vocal solo and an inspirational story or essay comprise the content. After the benediction, all file out and go home. The young people pride themselves on keeping this meeting free of the usual entertainment.

A business meeting and social are held every fourth Friday. Games are of the active type and refreshments large in quantity. Four associational rallies are attended every year; attendance is always
large. Special social gatherings are the Christmas party, Easter breakfast and picnic outing in the summer. Money, for sending members to summer conferences, is raised by food sales and parties.

The summer conferences are an important function. At least two and sometimes four are sent to various conferences every summer: for officers of the society to have education in the interests and program of the church. All are run on the familiar camp style: boating, swimming, outdoor games and the like. The adult counselor is certain that those who go become more enthusiastic workers in the society. In addition, the Church sends two young people to an educational institute in New Hampshire during the latter part of August.

Perhaps the most important activity, with the exception of the Sunday service, is an informal gathering of the girls at the adult counselor's home every other Thursday evening. It is called the Girl's Club and it's ostensible purpose is to undertake various projects: sewing for charitable institutions, preparing showers or layettes for others in the group. Actually, the core is the informal conversation; it may be on any topic (home difficulties, horror stories, sex and so forth) and apparently catharsis is its main function. The adult counselor's wife is as much a leader in the group as he - there are really two counselors. Their two eldest children (girls) are members of the society. The Girl's Club apparently evolved spontaneously. The mother plays a wholly permissive role, the girls themselves determining what to talk about and when to drop it. She provides large quantities of food because she is so inclined; for some of the girls the
refreshments are a major attraction, either an adequate diet or sufficient affection being lacking in their own homes. The Club is very popular, some continuing to come after dropping out of the society. Boys drive them over and pick them up afterwards.

The above has been a little more concrete description of the society's activities than that contained in the constitution. A few remarks about temporal and compositional aspects are added. When the writer first became acquainted with the group in the winter of 1947-48, the membership was fifty-five. Never more than forty-five were present at any one meeting, the average being around forty. The age range was large, thirteen to twenty-seven. As would be expected, this also meant large differences in interests, particularly heterosexual relations. There were three married couples in the society and two more couples were married before the end of the season. Several couples were going "steady" and other girls wanted beaus; the ratio of girls to boys was two to one. With a few exceptions, the high school adolescents were not interested in boy-girl relations or were extremely shy about them. It is rather unusual to find such a wide age and interest spread in one group; the war was a large contributing factor. Some of the older boys had been in the service. The society was the only local organization where heterosexual contacts could be made. Some had married and were continuing out of habit; others were to marry later. These differences in interest were reflected in the topics chosen for discussion: older ones chose marriage, unattached girls chose courtship, younger members evaded these.
D. Felt Problems

During the spring of 1948, attendance fell off markedly, to twenty and less. The quality of the discussions dropped also: a few monopolized the time, interest wasn’t as keen, meetings became shorter. This caused concern among the older members and the wife of the counselor. The older members felt they were the cause of the difficulty: younger members didn’t enter into discussions because they felt inferior to the older ones; younger members had complained that discussions were all on marriage and heterosexual relations; older members occupied the important positions in the society. Thus the older members felt they should get out for the good of the society.

The female adult counselor thought the fault lay with her husband and herself. He wasn’t as interested as he had been, he was prone to be more easily irritated, consequently the young people weren’t as responsive. Anyway, they were getting stale, they had had the group long enough and it was time for a change. It was during this period that the first interaction records were begun.

In the fall, the pastor talked with both counselors, finding that the husband did not share his wife’s view: he would like to continue with the job. The pastor urged that they both serve, expressing the feeling that they played the roles of substitute parents for several in the group. He also suggested that dwindling attendance and interest might be due to other factors: the wide range of interests among the members, poor preparation of the discussion material and lack of good techniques. Relative to the suggestion of the older members, the pastor
felt that their immediate exit might make for a rapid disintegration of the society if they were the natural leaders. Several projects were to be undertaken: meeting with the program committee to see if better preparation could be made, trying various techniques for increasing participation, the use of drama in presenting the topic, and sociometric tests. The counselors agreed to serve for another year.

During this same period a Young Couple's Club was formed. The Church Committee felt that no activities were oriented toward this group, there being fifty to sixty couples which might participate in such a program. The adult counselors of the society and another older couple helped to organize the first meeting. The couples present liked the idea but desired no supervision, wanted no formal organization and wished to limit the age limit of members to thirty-five. All these points were at variance with those of the adult counselors, particularly the male one who desired to retain the old relations he had with the young people and wished to be included in their activities. By December of 1948, membership in the society had dropped to twenty-one, all the older members having dropped out. Some joined the Couples Club, others married and found other interests, some went away to school or found jobs elsewhere than in the vicinity. The formation of the Couples Club was not the prime factor; it only accelerated the strong trend already apparent, for the program of the Club did not conflict with the society's nor did all the members who left join the Club.

Besides this decrease in members, frictions developed within the society during the same period. The male counselor felt the officers
were doing a poor job; he became increasingly apathetic and irritated yet desired to keep his position. The program chairman (an older, unattached girl) left the society on short notice. Election of officers was held a month late and was hastily done; the counselor felt his previous assessment of the president had been correct. Three regular business and social meetings were missed in succession. The new officers, although meeting with the counselor's approval, were not entirely to his liking; they were not the natural leaders of the group (by sociometric test). These and other features will be discussed later in conjunction with techniques and results. Leading of the discussions was no longer rotated, a few of the more experienced members (frequently the program chairman) conducting Sunday after Sunday. The counselor and pastor were each asked to take a meeting, something not done before. The worship service was dropped. A conflict came to a head in the counselor's family, involving the daughter (irritation expressed from her towards him, not vice versa) who was program chairman. This was apparent in discussions, particularly when she was the leader. At a spring executive meeting, which he was unable to attend, she stated that the society needed a change in counselors; all the other officers approved and he acceded to their request at a later meeting. The program of the society was concluded a month earlier than usual; some of the members were not notified.

In summary, the society has gone and is going through a transition from a large to a smaller group. The older members have left because their interests were different nor were these compatible with the way
the group was formally constituted. Since they were accustomed to carrying out the necessary functions, the society has not run as efficiently as before. This together with the counselor's perceptions of the group and vice versa, colored by personal conflict and idio-syncratic characteristics, intensified the dissatisfaction with group process. The young people have ousted the counselor.

II. Techniques Used

The techniques are presented in the order in which they were employed. Since one of the primary aims of this project is to find their usefulness and limits of usage for those unschooled in psychologic theory, the purpose here is to link them with the temporal process already briefly described, i.e., each technique and its results are not discrete areas but related to the temporal course of events and the individuals participating.

A. Interaction Records

These were first made during the late winter and spring of 1948. The method was simple: the recording of who spoke to whom (or the group) in sequence. This was simplified by numbering each member; when one spoke, his number was written followed by an arrow and then the number of the person addressed (or G for group). An attempt was made to separate the interaction into the following classes:

a) discussion proper, more or less spontaneous; b) asides such as whispering, comments not made for the group and so forth; c) spontaneous
laughter or other expressions; d) verbalizations concerned with the presentation of the topic, i.e., reading and questions addressed to the group by the leader and responses by members concerned with clarification.

In the beginning, several were inquisitive about what the writer was "doing". Later only occasional notice was made. Attempts at getting others to make similar records were not successful. Charts were made and shown to the counselor as well as the program committee (two girls) at the start of the fall. The counselor saw the need of more participation as well as the girls although they were more interested in finding out who did all the talking and who did none. The consensus was that "better programs" were the solution and "seeing to it" that non-participants were made to join in the discussions.

B. Drama

When the question of how to have better programs was raised, drama was suggested. The counselor was enthusiastic but the program committee was not, one of whom was his daughter. They consented to a trial run, however, the writer conducting it. Two situations were used for warming up the group: sitting in a room with a bat flying around and climbing a steep cliff. The members were asked to close their eyes, to imagine that they were in such a situation and to produce in themselves the emotion of fear (bat) and strenuous effort (cliff) with appropriate muscular tensions. All were intensely interested. Then it was explained that a dramatic situation (a teacher-pupil scene) was plan-
ned to illustrate the topic for the evening (human relations). Volunteers were gotten and the drama was conducted according to the steps outlined by Bavelis (page 37).

Since the writer could not record, one of the older members was drafted previous to the meeting. He was training to be a stenographer and could take a hundred words a minute. The shorthand record was made but never transcribed. He was unwilling to finish the job or do any further recording. Though not the only reason, he no longer wished to attend society meetings.

The necessity of a recorder was apparent and one was obtained in 1949, a Webster-Chicago. Drama was used in only one other meeting, when the writer was leading. Although the young people thought drama was interesting, none felt able to use it; they could not think of appropriate plots nor could they see its purpose. They were also unaccustomed to the spontaneity involved, thinking of drama as a prepared plot with lines to be recited.

C. Sociometric Tests

At first, this technique was suggested only to the adult counselor. A "real" sociometric test was described, i.e., one in which personal choices would be put into effect. He saw the relevance of placing members on committees they liked; it took him a little longer to comprehend the significance of choice of co-workers. He thought it would be worth trying. Accordingly the president of the society was approached; it was suggested that an additional social could be planned,
using the whole group. Committees for the social would be made up
from the results of the test. A sociometric test was given toward the
end of October, 1948. Each was asked to give his first, second and
third choices of others whom he would like on a committee with him, to
rank in order of preference the five committees for the social, and to
check the other members as to whether he would like to work with them,
was indifferent toward them or disliked working with them. As can be
seen, this combined Moreno's test with Howell's modification of
Zeleny's social status index test (pages 58-59).

Originally the plan was to repeat this sort of test every three
months or so; it would provide an additional social, give the members
opportunity to develop finer discrimination in their choosing of co-
workers and committees, afford a picture of the attraction patterns in
the group and changes therein. An expansion of the test was planned
test asking for the expression of friendships outside the group, in-
viting these friends to a social. After the first test was run and
committees were drawn up, circumstances intervened and the party was
never put on. The social committee, largely composed of older members
who were leaving, ceased to function at this time.

In consequence, only one other sociometric test was given. Each
year, the new and old officers met together to appoint the committees
for the next year; this provided an accustomed opportunity. In order
to avoid any hint of taking over prerogatives of the officers, it was
suggested that the test could be given, the results being compared with
those appointed by the officers. The test was given late in December;
it was a duplicate of the previous test, different committees (seven in all) being substituted. The old and new presidents used the results in toto.

D. Group Study

The exodus of older members placed greater responsibilities on those who were left. Young members were without the experience necessary to give them confidence. The social committee may serve as an illustration: although younger ones served on it, older ones ran the social singlehanded. The lack of confidence and skill was glaringly apparent at the Sunday evening discussions. Some were entirely bound to the topical material; they appeared scared stiff, having no animation or personal contributions to make. The writer thought that the role of discussion leader might be split: the role of presenting the topic and the role of moderator, focusing on the increase of participation and interest. One with more skill might function as moderator, enabling an inexperienced member to lead more comfortably. There was the further thought that some might be interested in the study of the society's process at these discussions. Accordingly, two questions were appended to the second sociometric test: Would you be interested in studying the job of moderator? Would you be interested in group study?

Several indicated an interest in one or both. Of these, four met together weekly through the winter months and into April. A summary of these meetings will be discussed later.
The wire recorder was at first secured to obtain content in a
dramatic situation; being more spontaneous, such might furnish material
more expressive of individual characteristics than that in a discussion.
Since drama was not used by the young people, discussions were recorded.
They were very much interested in the recorder although some cut down
their participation. Playbacks were interesting for only the first
two evenings. The recordings were used in the study group at the
beginning; study of them required too much time.

Recordings made available another variable which could not be used
for interaction records: the temporal length of a member's participa-
tion. Theoretically, the recordings could be studied for other
variables such as Bales' categories of interaction (Page 6). Un-
fortunately, the writer was unskilled in that system; further, such
categorizing should be made on "the spot", on "live" interaction.
Recordings are not a substitute for other forms of observation although
they do preserve the content.

F. Other Techniques

One of the purposes of group study was to give those interested
some training in conducting a discussion as a moderator. Another was
introduced, that of feedback observer; one of the four would play the
role of observer and give his impressions as to how well he thought the
discussion went. Out of this there developed an interest in what the
group thought about the discussions. This was started near the end of
the season. Five questions were given to the group: 1) How do you feel tonight's meeting was? 2) How much did you expect before you came to this meeting? 3) How much did this meeting contribute to the goals of the society? 4) Were there times, during this meeting, when the way things were going bored, upset or irritated you? 5) If you were irritated or bored, how often were you able to express your irritation or change the way things were going to your greater satisfaction? Each was asked to give his ratings on a five point scale: the words poor (1), nothing (2 and 3) and never (4 and 5) representing the low end of the scale and excellent (1), a great deal (2 and 3) and very frequently (4 and 5) indicating the high end of the scale.

An abortive attempt to introduce different content into the discussions should be mentioned. Complaints had been voiced about the topics: some were so complex and far removed from their experience, they could not talk about them intelligently; some such as courtship and marriage were not interesting. The writer also noticed that religiously oriented material often left little to the imagination. Expected answers were implied in the way the topic was written up and in the "leading" questions that followed. Occasionally some one would take the opposite side just to be different and to make the discussion more lively. The content thus excluded individual expression, minimized original thinking, allowed little freedom. The material by Bullis and O'Malley was shown to the program committee; it was not used. Another series in human relations (four meetings) was used, primarily because the counselor and pastor pushed it. Leaders of those meetings disliked
the series because it required more work in preparation and
necessitated more skill in drawing out group participation, for there
were no rote answers. Since the choosing of material by the adult
advisers meant the prohibition of a discussion leader's choice and
led to feelings of inadequacy and insecurity, the project was dropped.

G. The Rorschach Test

The work of Northway suggested that sociometric tests could be
linked with other testing devices yielding information about personal-
ity structure. The Rorschach Test was used for this purpose, to see
if any idiosyncratic features coincided with such status phenomena as
leadership and isolation. Fifteen members were tested and fourteen
protocols were obtained, one girl going through four cards without a
response. This left six members untested. One has not attended in
months. Another is in training to be a nurse and is no longer an active
member. Two belong to other churches and are not well known to the
writer. Another has married and will, in all probability, drop out of
the society. The sixth is a very shy boy and should have been tested.
However, the writer has had to rely on friendliness with the youth;
all have taken the test on the basis of helping the writer to obtain
wider experience in its use. Attention has not been called to the fact
that members of the society have been tested. Since this boy is so shy,
it was thought better to wait until good rapport had been established.

Mr. Atwell, clinical psychologist and chief psychometrist at the
Boston Psychopathic Hospital, has checked the scoring on all responses.
He also gave his interpretation of each protocol. This was thought advisable since proficiency was lacking in interpreting the test. Also the interpretations were done "blind" and thus afforded a more objective check. This was all the more necessary as the test administrator was the minister of the church. The effect of this situation is noted and due allowance made by Mr. Atwell in his interpretations. The complete individual protocols may be found in the appendix; Rorschach summaries together with Mr. Atwell's comments are contained in Chapter VII.

In the presentation of results which follows, certain abbreviations are used for ease in reporting. Each member has been assigned a number; thus when any specific member is mentioned, his or her number is used preceded by the letter S (which merely stands for subject). The abbreviation used for the adult advisor is AA and that for the observer is Obs.
As mentioned in the previous chapter, only two sociometric tests were given. More were planned but not given for the following reasons: 1) only one indigenous situation, the choice of group committees, could be used for a "real" test; 2) the attempt to set up another situation, calling for choice that would be carried into effect, failed; 3) some of the members reacted unfavorably, were hesitant to carry out the task honestly. Regarding this latter point, it was thought better to give no test except a "real" one. Thus only two tests were given.

Before proceeding to the results, some of the reactions should be briefly mentioned. A few individuals were contacted before the test, to see what their reactions would be and to obtain permission to give the test. The AA, at first cool because he thought it would reveal only personal preferences and antipathies, gave consent when he understood the intent of the test to be the giving of members the chance to assess their own abilities and feelings as to committees and working companions. The program committee was divided: S18 didn't think much of the test; S23 became highly enthusiastic. S8 (president at the time) was somewhat suspicious of the intent but consented to its being given. When the test was given, several filled the blanks quickly and easily, others were hesitant and doubtful. S14 checked all in the "indifference" column of preference, erased
and placed several checks in the "like" column. S20 started to check discriminately, erased and placed all checks in the "like" column. S26 signed his sheet by a nickname in quotes. S21 remarked in a later conversation that both he and his wife (S19) were hesitant; he told her to go ahead because, as he put it to the OBS, "I knew you had something good in mind and it was alright". S16 also expressed a similar feeling. In summary, there was some resistance to the test: in a church group, it was not nice to make personal choice public, particularly expression of indifference and dislike. That all did not feel this way suggests that individual dynamics are involved.

I. Test One

The first sociometric test was given in October of 1948. As previously described, the individual task was to list various committees for a group-planned social in order of preference and to list a first, second and third choice among the members. Since conceivably committees so drawn up might include other members undesirable to the chooser, each was asked to indicate his or her feeling of preference toward every other member, whether that feeling was liking, indifference or Disliking. Illustration I is a reproduction of the test sheet used, with the names omitted.

Chart I is a sociogram of the results, a la Moreno. Besides first, second and third choices, feelings of Disliking were also graphed; liking and indifference were omitted because of the complications in-
Illustration I

Sociometric Test Sheet Used

Personal Choice for Party Committees

The plan for the next Party of the youth group is to have everyone take part in its preparation by serving on a committee according to your personal choice (as far as possible): 1) as to the others on the committee with you and 2) as to the committee of your desire. The questionnaire below has been prepared for this purpose; committees will be appointed from the pooled choices of everyone in the youth group.

I. Who would be your first, second and third choice to serve on a committee with you? 1.  2.  3.

II. Which of the following committees would you like to serve on best, next best and least?
   Refreshments   Decoration   Publicity
   Arrangements   Entertainment (games)

III. Since there will probably be other members on the committee with you whom you have not chosen, the names of the members of the youth group are listed below so that you may indicate how well you would like to work with each. You can put a check mark opposite each name in the appropriate column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Would like to work with</th>
<th>Makes no difference</th>
<th>Would rather not work with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cetera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed ____________________________
Symbols:
- Red lines (numbered) - choice
- Blue lines - rejection
- Circle - female
- Triangle - male
volved. Table IA presents these results in tabular form. Choices have been weighted according to Northway's method: first - five points, second - 3 points and third - 2 points. If all the members had completed the test and each received as many choices as he gave, his weighted score would have been ten. However, four could not be persuaded to fill out the test; three of these (S3, S5 and S10) had already left the group and S27, a younger member, did not feel competent to fill it out. Thus, if all the weighted scores are averaged, it is 8.44. It will be noted that the following are the leaders of the group:

- S14 = 36 weighted score
- S8 = 35 weighted score
- S20 = 35 weighted score
- S16 = 24 weighted score

Of these, S14 and S16 are older members who are leaving the group, S20 is an older member who is staying in the group and S8 is a newer leader. Others who might be listed on the border-line of leadership are:

- S17 = 19 weighted score
- S23 = 17 weighted score
- S7 = 14 weighted score

These are all younger and active members. Rejections are largely directed at those receiving few or no choices; only three (S7, S9 and S29) whose scores are above the average of 8.44 are rejected by other members. Table IBa contains the raw data of individual preference and Table IB summarizes the results of individual preference. The different preferences are weighted as follows: each liking, given
## TABLE IA

Summary of Sociometric Choice and Rejection: Test #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>W S Sociogram</th>
<th>Rejections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Given</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II

Summary of Sociometric Preference: Test #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Preference Given</th>
<th>Preference Received</th>
<th>Weighted Score Given</th>
<th>Weighted Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE Ia

**Summary of Sociometric Preference, Raw Data: Test #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symbols:**
- \( x \) indicates liking or preference
- \( o \) indicates indifference
- \( \_ \) indicates disliking or rejection

**Note:**
For the subject's preferential expression, read across.
For the preferential expression of others toward the subject, read down.
or received, one point; each indifference, given or received, zero; each disliking, given or received, minus one point. The weighted decimals for giving and receiving are given. It will be noted that in some cases the correspondence is close (S1, S8, S11, S16, S20, S21, S24, S31 and S32). This would seem to indicate that the subject's attitude toward the group was close to that of the group toward him: he had realistically assessed the group's attitude toward him and responded in kind to the group or measured up to the group's expectancy. In other cases, the discrepancy is great as with S29 who shows a rather high, positive attitude toward the group (.710) but is rated low by the group (.037). This may vary in the other direction as with S2, S7, S12, S17, S22 and S23. Perhaps the former indicates an unrealistic assessment of the group's attitude toward her while the latter indicates that either these members are leaving the group or are dissatisfied with its functioning. Such assumptions, however, are based on the premise that individual expression of preference is "honest." S16 and S20 show no discriminations; it is doubtful if this represents their real feelings.

Table IB may also afford a check on leadership and isolation. The leaders previously listed show the following comparative rankings on received choice and received preference scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 on choice</th>
<th>4.5 on preference</th>
<th>2.5 on choice</th>
<th>9 on preference</th>
<th>2.5 on choice</th>
<th>1.5 on preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Borderline or potential leaders had these ratings:
S17: 5 on choice - 4.5 on preference
S23: 6 on choice - 9 on preference
S7: 7 on choice - 15 on preference

A tentative hypothesis might be: where preference and sociometric positions are close, one would tend to confirm the other; when they were not close (high choice and lower preference rating or vice versa), status in the group is better estimated as a resultant of the two ratings.

Since most of the members are in the adolescent and pre-marital periods, the data have been grouped in Table IC according to sex choice and preference. Choices given and received are listed first, positive preferences given and received are shown next. Percentages have been added after the preference figures because of the sex ratio in the group: eleven boys, three of whom did not complete the test, and twenty-one girls, one of whom did not complete the test. It was thought that percentages of positive preferences given and received out of the total possible would be a better basis on which to make comparisons. As can be seen in individual cases, sex seems to be a factor in choice. S15, for example, chooses only girls and is chosen by a girl; she expresses liking only toward girls and receives only one preference liking from a boy (S16 who "liked" everybody); she rejects two boys to one girl. The exception to this consistent pattern is the lack of rejection of her by the boys, the rejection of her by one girl. Others show this same trend to a lesser degree, to confine choice and preference to the same sex: S21, S25, S28, S30, S31. In other cases, individual and group expression are at variance: S6
### Table IC

**Choice, Preference and Rejection**

Grouped on Basis of Sex: Test #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Sex Choices</th>
<th>Sex Preference</th>
<th>Sex Rejections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Given</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symbols:** B - boy, G - girl, # - number
(girl) chooses girls yet is more frequently chosen and preferred by boys: S17 (boy) chooses more girls and is chosen by them, yet is preferred more by the boys.

Looking at the group as a whole, this same trend is apparent in varying degrees. Tables ID and IE represent regrouping of the data on Table IC; the group trends are thus more easily seen. Boys direct 53% of their choices toward boys, 42% of their choices toward girls. The trend is greater among the girls who direct 72% of their choices toward girls, only 28% toward boys. The strength of this trend shows a sexual reversal when preference is considered, however. Boys, on the average, prefer to work with 73% of the boys, 54% of the girls. Girls prefer, on the average, to work with only 46% of the members of their own sex, 42% of the members of the opposite sex. The difference here is slight; further, the percentages are low. Apparently other factors are involved. One obvious one is the expressed indifference of three girls (S1, S7 and S30) which lowers the percentages generally. From previous inspection of Table IC, it was also apparent that some members preferred to work with members of the opposite sex; this would tend to influence the above trend negatively.

Another feature should be noticed regarding rejection. Only one boy rejects another boy while all together the boys reject eight girls. The girls are not so unanimous in their feeling. More girls are rejected by girls than boys by girls, although this is corrected when percentages are considered for there are less boys to reject than girls. Thus girls seem to express indifference and disliking toward
Table ID

Boy's Choice, Preference and Rejection on Basis of Sex: Test #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Choice By S</th>
<th>Percent Given</th>
<th>Percent Received</th>
<th>Rejection Given</th>
<th>Rejection Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

Percent

Average Percent
### TABLE IE

Girl's Choice, Preference and Rejection on Basis of Sex: Test #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Given</td>
<td>Recvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Average Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their own sex more freely than boys.

The various committees were drawn up from choices as to committees and persons as well as preference. Table II shows member choices and assignments. Every member was assigned to a committee of his first or second choice. Rejection was also a major factor in assignment, an attempt being made to minimize the number of rejections per committee (this could not be completely avoided). Leaders were distributed, not bunched on one committee; the distribution was according to choice. It was not always possible to assign a member to a committee containing someone of his choice; where this occurred, rejection was avoided.

Committee choice per se may be indicative of personal interests, abilities and dynamics. For example, eight members list the decoration committee (#2) as their first choice. Of these, three are boys. One, S31, likes to draw cartoons and posters. S17 exhibits no such interest and one might wonder why he chose this committee. The AA, in viewing S17's committee choices, remarked that they were typical: he liked to work behind the scenes with the girls. This may or may not be so but it suggests that committee choice could be linked to deep, dynamic factors. Preparation of food (refreshment committee) may be such an indicator. Certainly at least four of the committees (entertainment, refreshments, decoration and publicity) ordinarily entail different interests, abilities and possibly dynamic needs. Without additional information however, such choices can only function as straws in the wind.
**TABLE IF**

Committee Choice and Assignment: Test #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Committee Chosen</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best</td>
<td>Least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Numbers Designate the Following Committees:

1 - Refreshments
2 - Decoration
3 - Publicity
4 - Arrangements
5 - Games
The all-group party was never planned and executed. The president (S8) was given a list of the committees; due to a variety of circumstances, she postponed the affair. Members were leaving the group so rapidly during this period (S4, S11, S14, S18, S19, S21 and S32) that after a certain time interval, the committees could not be gotten together to function. Thus no one was able to test concretely the results of his expression of choice and preference. The results of test two cannot be said to have been influenced by the results of test one.

II. Test Two

The second test was given late in December of 1948. Officers for the ensuing year had just been elected: S26 as president, S7 as vice-president, S9 as secretary and S24 as treasurer. The adult advisor had expressed dissatisfaction with the way the group had been run: the nominating committee had met a month late, the election had been hurried, the committees should have been appointed already. It was at this point that the observer suggested using a sociometric test as a means of finding group expression regarding them. The test was given and the committees were chosen from the results. The observer had not planned to do this. Committees and chairmen of committees were chosen at a joint meeting of the old and new officers. The plan was to show the officers the sociometric results after they had chosen their committees. This would have avoided infringing on their prerogatives; it would have also afforded an interesting comparison.
Symbol:
- Red lines (numbered) - choice
- Blue lines - rejection
- Circle - female
- Triangle - male

CHART II
Sociogram - Test #2
as to whether the chosen leaders were aware of attractions and rejections in the group. However, both the past (S8) and present (S26) presidents were very much interested in the test and wished to go over the results. The observer interrogated them as to their own choices. S8 thought that S17 (her boy friend whom she since married) would make a good social committee chairman. She was then informed that he listed this committee sixth with three nos behind it. Both decided to use the committees drawn up from sociometric results.

Chart II gives the results of choice and rejection in the usual sociogram. Table IIIA gives the same data with weighted scores for choices received. It will be noted that a new member has been added, S33, and twelve members have been dropped: S3, S4, S5, S10, S11, S13, S14, S16, S18, S19, S21 and S32. In a little over two months, the official size of the group had decreased by a third. Three of the group indicated no personal choice: S20, S26 and S33. Two, S7 and S12, chose S32 who was no longer a member. This reduced the average weighted score (if all choices were evenly distributed) to 3.39.

From these weighted scores, it is apparent that S8 is the leader of the group, with 33. S20 has more than double the average with 18 and others stand rather close to her: S7 and S31 with 16, S17 with 15, and S9 and S30 with 13. Only three members received no choices: S25, S27 and S28. Where rejection occurs, all those rejected have weighted scores below the average weighted score with the exception of S9 and S30.

An interesting consideration here is the positions of the newly
TABLE IIA

Summary of Sociometric Choice and Rejection: Test #2

| Subject | Choices | | | Seco | | | Rejections |
|---------|---------| | | | | | |
|        | Given   | | | Received | | | Given | Recvd |
|---------|---------| | | | | | | |
| 1       | 29      | 9 | 8 | 0     | 1   | 0   | 3     | 0 | 6 |
| 2       | 8       | 20 | 23 | 0   | 1   | 1   | 5     | 1 | 0 |
| 6       | 9       | 7 | 8 | 0     | 1   | 0   | 3     | 0 | 0 |
| 7       | 8       | 6 | 0 | 1     | 3   | 1   | 16    | 0 | 0 |
| 8       | 17      | 1 | 2 | 5     | 0   | 4   | 33    | 0 | 0 |
| 9       | 8       | 31 | 7 | 1   | 2   | 1   | 13    | 0 | 1 |
| 12      | 8       | 26 | 0 | 0     | 0   | 1   | 2     | 8 | 0 |
| 15      | 30      | 9 | 8 | 1     | 0   | 0   | 5     | 0 | 0 |
| 17      | 8       | 7 | 30 | 1 | 2   | 2   | 15    | 4 | 0 |
| 20      | 0       | 0 | 0 | 0     | 3   | 1   | 0     | 18 | 0 |
| 22      | 31      | 23 | 17 | 1 | 0   | 0   | 5     | 1 | 1 |
| 23      | 20      | 2 | 17 | 0   | 1   | 2   | 7     | 0 | 1 |
| 24      | 20      | 17 | 23 | 1   | 0   | 0   | 5     | 0 | 2 |
| 25      | 31      | 26 | 12 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     | 0 | 0 |
| 26      | 0       | 0 | 0 | 0     | 2   | 2   | 10    | 0 | 0 |
| 27      | 24      | 31 | 26 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0     | 0 | 1 |
| 28      | 20      | 30 | 33 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0     | 0 | 2 |
| 29      | 7       | 30 | 8 | 1     | 0   | 0   | 5     | 2 | 2 |
| 30      | 15      | 7 | 9 | 1   | 2   | 1   | 13    | 0 | 1 |
| 31      | 22      | 17 | 26 | 2 | 2   | 0   | 16    | 3 | 0 |
| 33      | 0       | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0   | 1   | 2     | 0 | 2 |
elected officers in the sociometric findings. The new president, S26, has a weighted score of 10. The vice-president, S7, has a score of 16. The secretary, S9, has 13 and the treasurer, S24, has 5. It appears that either the group cannot choose its real leaders or the jobs do not necessarily correlate with sociometric status or the sociometric findings are not truly indicative of position. Actually, several things need to be considered. First, by group consensus, the real leader could not succeed herself in office. Second, S20 who was next in rank had been president and was an old leader of the group. Third, these officers who were elected comprised the "slate" of the nominating committee; S26 was on the nominating committee and indicated plainly that he wished to be president. Fourth, the adult adviser did not feel that S7 would make a good president; this will be discussed later. It would appear that of the alternatives just mentioned as to why elected officers do not coincide with sociometric findings, the inability of the group to choose its own leaders is at least one factor.

Table II B shows the preference results listed as previously. Expressed and received scores are close for S1 (low), S24 (low), S8 (high) and S22 (middle). If relative rank is considered, S2 (low), S28 (low), S29 (low) and S30 (fairly high) are evenly matched. Differences are large for S7 (low-high), S9 (very high-middle), S15 (very high-low), S17 (low-high) and S20 (very high-middle). Most of those rating high by choice have similar standing on preference expressed toward them: S8, S7, S17, S31, S30 and S9. S20, however, is rated
### TABLE IIB

**Summary of Sociometric Preference: Test #2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Given</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II Ba
Summary of Sociometric Preference, Raw Data: Test #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symbols:**
- x - liking
- o - indifference
- - - disliking

**Note:**
For the subject's preferential expression, read across.
For the preferential expression others toward the subject, read down.
much lower as to preference; S26 rates much higher, comparatively, on preference than on choice.

Table IIIC groups the data of choice, preference and rejection on a sex basis. S1, S2, S6, S7, S15, S28, S29 and S30 all show a clear choice of their own feminines sex. In every case, where they are chosen by others, this same sex distinction shows. It might be noted in passing that S6 is the oldest of these and two others, S1 and S7, have just graduated from high school; thus the others are in earlier phases of adolescence. Others showing this trend are S8, S9, S20, S23 and S33; only S9 and S33 are of high school age. For S2, S6, S7 and S33, this carries over into their preference toward the group; a similar group preference is shown toward S1, S15, S28, S29 and S33. It would appear that a strong trend is present for the girls to cliques together. The only exception is S22 (an older girl) and she expresses her liking for boys more strongly in preference. S8 shows a slight tendency in preference to favor boys to girls.

With the boys, this preference for the same sex is not so strong. Only S27 chooses all boys, only S24 chooses two boys. S24 and S26 are chosen more by boys. In personal preference, the trend toward one's own sex is stronger: S24, S25, S26 and S27. The same is found in group preference for all the boys except S25. On the other hand, S17 and S31 (both older boys) show choice for girl co-workers, and especially S17 where it is carried over into those who choose him and in his preferences (strongly).
### TABLE IIC

Choice, Preference and Rejection
Grouped on Basis of Sex: Text #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Sex</th>
<th>Sex Preferences</th>
<th>Sex Rejections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Given</td>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symbols:** B-boy  G-girl  #-number
Tables IID and IIE are regroupings of the data of Table IIC, categorizing for boys and girls. For the boys, choices given and received are quite evenly divided between the sexes. A difference is noted as to their own preference: 57% for boys and 37% for girls. The difference is less when the girl's preference is included, 57% to 42%. With the girls, there is a marked tendency to choose the same sex, 64% to 16%, but not a marked difference in preference. Apparently the girls show greater indifference toward each other and a much greater rejection. None of the boys rejected boys, but girls rejected girls three to one over boys. Thus although the girls choose each other as co-workers, there is ambivalence.

As indicated before, the committees were appointed and members informed. Table IIF shows committee choice and assignment. No exact check was made on how often these committees met. The program chairman, 523, ran this committee all by herself. Socials were held infrequently. Since the group was having difficulty as a whole in functioning, it is doubtful that many committee meetings were held and thus that members learned much from their expression of choice and preference.

III. Inter-Test Comparisons

After a sociometric test has been given, the question arises, what do the results indicate? More specifically, what do they indicate about a church youth group? This question may be treated on different levels. The results may indicate significant aspects of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By S</td>
<td>By S</td>
<td>Of S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>B G</td>
<td>B G</td>
<td>B G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>o i</td>
<td>o i</td>
<td>o i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>y r</td>
<td>r y</td>
<td>r y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>20 47</td>
<td>80 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>40 13</td>
<td>40 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>80 40</td>
<td>20 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td>60 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3 0</td>
<td>60 0</td>
<td>60 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>40 40</td>
<td>80 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 8</td>
<td>340 230</td>
<td>340 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 53</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>57 37</td>
<td>57 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III

**Girl’s Choice, Preference and Rejection on Basis of Sex: Test #2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Percent Preference</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By S</td>
<td>By S Of S</td>
<td>By S Of S</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B G</td>
<td>B G B G</td>
<td>B G B G</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i o i o</td>
<td>i o i o i i</td>
<td>i o i o i</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>y r y r</td>
<td>y r y r</td>
<td>y r y r</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>100 79 83 64</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>100 100 50 42</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>33 36 33 36</td>
<td>2 6 0 0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>100 100 0 36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>100 100 50 29</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>100 36 50 43</td>
<td>0 1 0 1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>0 0 33 43</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 0 17 43</td>
<td>0 0 1 1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 0 17 43</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>50 64 67 43</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 64 0 36</td>
<td>0 0 2 0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6 31</td>
<td>683 621 650 624</td>
<td>3 9 7 9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 64</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>39 41 37 42</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Percent


**TABLE III**  
Committee Choice and Assignment: Test #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Committee Chosen</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best</td>
<td>Least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Numbers Designate the Following Committees:

1. Membership  
2. Program  
3. Missionary  
4. Social  
5. Music  
6. Publicity  
7. Sick
the group as a whole. Are the attractions and repulsions such that the integrity of the group is threatened? Is the group able to put in responsible positions the real leaders? The data may also be viewed from another perspective, the relation of the individual to the group. It might be relevant to ask, what is the individual’s attitude toward the group and the group’s attitude toward the individual? If discrepancies occur, what is their significance?

Still another area is sex choice. Since most of the members are in some phase of adolescence, boy-girl relations figure prominently in their selections of co-workers, in their exclusions.

In order to arrive at any interpretation, one may either take the general conclusions in sociometric literature and apply them to a single test or one may make an inter-test comparison, supplemented by observations. The latter has the advantage of drawing conclusions from the group itself; also a temporal aspect is introduced which may make it possible to note trends and tendencies. It is unfortunate that results from more tests are not available. However, an attempt will be made within the limits of the data at hand.

A. Molar Features

When the two tests are compared, it is to be expected that there would be shifts all along the line and particularly since such a drastic reformulation of the group’s boundaries (many members leaving) has occurred. Table IIIA shows those members who were still in the group at the second test; weighted scores on choice, preference
expressed and received are grouped together for both tests.

Table IIIIB lists all the members relatively (high to low) on weighted scores for choice, preference expressed and received for both tests. All are listed, partly to show the distributions and partly to show the relative positions of retiring members as a group. Looking at the distribution of choice scores, high scores and low (or none at all) are larger on the first test. This may be a confirmation of Moreno’s finding that increasing the choices does not elevate the lower but rather the upper end, i.e., the larger the group or number of choices, the more pronounced become the extremes. Or it may be that in the reformulation process, the position of the members would vary and with this the magnitude of scores. The second test seems to indicate that the group can agree on only one leader and that choices were more evenly distributed. Thus the group may be said to be in a period of transition, of defining its leaders in the new situation. It should be noticed however that more of those withdrawing are at the low end of the choice scale. This might explain why the low end was shortened but does not account for the shrinkage at the high end.

Looking at the expressed preference, the reverse has occurred: the extremes have become more pronounced on the second test, not only relatively but absolutely. It can be seen that, of the old members who filled out the test (first), most cluster around the middle, none are at the low end. This suggests that older members have a more temperate or positive attitude toward the group with this exception: those who did not fill out the test (i.e., had already left the group)
TABLE IIIA

Part I: Inter-test Comparison of Choice Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Score Test #1</th>
<th>Score Test #2</th>
<th>Score Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IIIA

Part II: Inter-test Comparison of Expressed Preference Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Score Test #1</th>
<th>Score Test #2</th>
<th>Score Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>-.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IIIA

Part III: Inter-test Comparison of Received Preference Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Score Test #1</th>
<th>Score Test #2</th>
<th>Score Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>-.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>-.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>-.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>-.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>-.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>-.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
without exception appear on the low end of the received preference scale. Their attitudes might have been more indifferent or negative. However, the withdrawal of members does not account for the pronounced emphasis toward the extremes. It appears that individual attitudes toward the group have become more pronounced on the second test, either "black" or "white". If this is so, there is an increase of instability, a lack of integration; more are indifferent to the group, more are more positive in their feeling.

Turning to the received preferences, further differences are observable. On the first test, scores are rather normally distributed over a large range, almost as great relatively as expressed scores. On the second test, the scores are more evenly distributed (except for S1) but the extremes are chopped off. This is an artifact of the distribution on expressed preference; indiscriminate expressed positive preference (liking everybody) automatically raises the lower end and expressed indifference lowers the high end. Thus the even distribution within narrower limits does not indicate an increase in homogeneity but a decrease in discrimination. An interesting feature of the received preference distribution on test one is the distribution of withdrawing members; generally, they are high or low but not lowest. Choice scores for these are more normally distributed toward the low end. Several suggestions present themselves. First, older members tend toward a certain stable acceptability in the group, at one end or the other. Generally this is high. Those on the low end had either withdrawn previously (S4, S5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Choice Scores</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Exp. Pref. Scores</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Rec. Pref. Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14x</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16x</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16x</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16x</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>14x</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13x</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21x</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4x</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21x</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14x</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11x</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13x</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>11x</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>3x</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10x</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x - indicates members on test #1 who had withdrawn at the time of text #2.
and S10) or were inactive (S3 and S11), yet they are not as low as some active members. Second, this acceptability level differs from choice position: older members tend to fill more of the high acceptability ratings. In a sense, this might be expected for they are more familiar and would have greater skills from long participation. Third, the withdrawal of members with high acceptability may appear to be an anomaly. With such a high acceptability, why should they withdraw? The concept of withdrawal is to be developed in the next section as a function of low preferential position. What is suggested here is that older members may withdraw at a high level of acceptability. Thus the group attitude may not indicate their feelings toward the group; expressed preference may be a better indicator of their intentions. Shifts in ratings might also be good indicators; unfortunately these are not available on the withdrawing members.

A final feature may be drawn from a comparison of the two sociograms: there is a surprisingly low reciprocity of choice on both. On the first sociogram, only three (S3, S14 and S16) choose two who choose them and two of these are withdrawing members. Only five others make one mutual choice. This indicates an "unreality" in choosing on the part of most; included in these are leaders as well as those of low choice received. This condition persists on the second test. S8 has all her choices reciprocated and S2 has two reciprocated although the matching is not exact for both (first to first, second to second, third to third). Apparently integration is not maximal in the
group nor lines of communication well established. This may be due
to the nature of the group: gathering once a week for meetings and
once a month for socials. It would suggest that friendship patterns
pertaining in the community are not represented here, that the group
is an artificial group, so to speak.

B. Individual and Group

On the level of the individual's attitude toward the group, the
sociometric test used seems to give rather significant data,
especially the preference expression. If, for example, an individ-
ual's expressed preference is low, and immediate hypothesis is that
his attitude toward the group is low or negative. This gains
significance when formal aspects of membership are considered.
Membership in a church youth group differs greatly from that of other
groups where sociometric tests have been largely applied: in the
school room, in a reform school. In both these situations, member-
ship is not determined by the individual; in a church youth group it
is. The latter does not take into account indirect pressures:
parental expectancies to attend the youth group, pressures from sig-
nificant adults, the lack of any other social activity to engage in,
and so forth. Nevertheless this greater freedom to belong or not to
belong implies certain significant differences. One is the case of
restructuring the group: individuals may leave easily. Thus low or
negatively expressed preference toward the group may be an indication
of the individual's imminent withdrawal. The group preference cannot
be ignored. Where it is high, the low expressed preference may be only a latent tendency to withdraw. Low or negative group preference may be the condition under which the tendency becomes manifest and affects behavior.

Leaving out middle preference scores and considering only the extremes, there are four possible combinations for each individual: low expressed and low group preference, high expressed and low group preference, low expressed and high group preference, and both high expressed and group preference. These could be thought of as varying degrees of integration into the group:

a) Low expressed and low group preference: this would be the lowest level of integration. The individual has little enthusiasm for the group and vice versa. There would be a strong tendency to leave the group.

b) High expressed and low group preference: this would represent a little higher level of integration. The individual has a positive feeling for the group but it is not reciprocated. It might be said that he has not assessed the situation realistically. Thus this level is essentially unstable: it is to be expected that such a condition would not persist, that either group preference would move up to match the expressed preference or the individual would come to a more realistic appraisal of his acceptance into the group.

c) Low expressed and high group preference: this would represent a yet higher level of integration but one marked by strong ambivalence. The member takes a dim view of the group yet is well
accepted. An example might be a leader who has not been given a job commensurate with his position of leadership; he would be frustrated with this state of affairs and thus would show a low expressed preference score. In general, as with the preceding category, an unrealistic assessment is involved: the frustrated leader is a special case; another might have to do with individual dynamics. There would be a stronger tendency to stay within the group than on the previous level.

d) High expressed and high group preference: this would represent the highest level of integration in the group. Further, those on this level would be leaders or potential leaders.

The above hypothesis is premised on the supposition that expressed preference is "honest" and discriminatory. Where it is not, the hypothesis would lose this meaning.

Several implications of the above suggestions should be pointed out. Low expressed and group preference may not have the same meaning as they would in the school room or in a reform school. In these latter situations, the group represents a larger sample, if not a complete representation, of the youth population. Thus sociometric position in the local school tends to be more absolute than in a church group. A person might not like to work with any of the members of the youth group yet the same condition does not necessarily hold in the community at large: he might have several close friends who belong to other churches, etc. This should be kept in
mind especially when inferences are made from the sociometric results as to individual dynamics: that low status may indicate shyness, poor social adjustment or a lack of abilities. The youth group, for one reason and another, is a highly selected sample of the youth of Westdale; conclusions as to social adjustment do not necessarily follow.

This does not exclude the possibility that social adjustment is a prime factor. In fact, no matter how small or selected the group, it would still figure as a determinant. However, this does suggest another frame of interpretation: preference scores may be directly related to the restructuring of the group, the reformulation of its boundaries. Since members may come and go with comparative ease, scores and combinations thereof may indicate trends toward greater integration or withdrawal.

If the preference scores can be so treated, the question arises, how indicative are they of these trends? What would be adequate criteria of integration and withdrawal for testing this hypothesis? A simple criterion for both would be the attendance record. Other criteria might be participation in group discussions and activities, the amount of enthusiasm displayed. Attendance is the simpler and more objective.

Before proceeding to a comparison, one further consideration is necessary. Is it possible to ascribe to any expressed and received preference score any absolute meaning? For example, why is a low-
low score, (.000):(.000), low-low? It is low-low in comparison with the scores of other members, not in comparison with the preference continuum which theoretically may vary within the limits of -1.0 and -1.0. Another means of comparison is inter-test: a low-low score may be greater or less than a previous score. This temporal comparison may be more indicative at times than a group comparison, and probably would be more useful if more than two tests were available.

It is difficult to establish the categories of high, middle and low because of the variation in spread of scores. For example, a cutting line of (.800) would include two of the present members on expressed score for test one with five for test two; on received score, only one would be included on test one, none on test two. The categories in Table IIIC were obtained by roughly including the upper quarter in "high", the lower quarter in "low". The actual numbers are: Test #1 - Expressed, high includes five, low includes five; Received - high includes four, low includes seven. Test #2 - Expressed, high includes six and low six; Received, high includes five, low includes six.

Also included in Table IIIC is the attendance record for the period from January to May, 1949. This entire period followed the giving of the second test. Since the divisions in Table IIIC are

1. As used here and throughout, the first "low" refers to expressed preference, the second to received preference. Similarly the first score in parenthesis is expressed, the second received preference. The colon between the latter is used only as a convenient symbol to separate them.
# Table IIIC

Expressed and Received Preference Ratings

---

Attendance Record - January to May, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference Ratings</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test #1</td>
<td>Test #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Low</td>
<td>Low - Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>Low - Mid</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Mid</td>
<td>Low - High</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - High</td>
<td>High - High</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Mid</td>
<td>High - Mid</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid - Low</td>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Low</td>
<td>High - Low</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid - High</td>
<td>Mid - High</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - High</td>
<td>High - Mid</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - High</td>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid - Low</td>
<td>Mid - Low</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid - Low</td>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Mid</td>
<td>High - High</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Mid</td>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid - Low</td>
<td>Low - Low</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Low</td>
<td>Low - Low</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Mid</td>
<td>High - Mid</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>Mid - Mid</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid -</td>
<td>Mid - Low</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Attendance = 70%
S.D. of Mean = 17.7
gross categories. Subtler shifts of individual scores may be better noted on Table IIIA.

There are three members (S1, S26, and S29) who show a low-low rating on the last test. For S1, this pertained before. For S28 and S29, this follows from a previous rating of unstable integration. Looking at the attendance table, S29 lies nearly three SDs below the mean, S1 approximately 1.55 SDs below. So far the hypothesis seems to be correct. S28 is an exception, lying slightly above the mean. The reason for this cannot be gathered from the data; S1 and S29 both have circles of friends in the community; S28 is an isolate. Thus, whereas S1 and S29 may find something else to do on a Sunday evening, S28 continues to come. The tendency to withdraw is latent.

Other exceptions should be noted. S33's attendance does not appear in the secretary's book. Although this is probably an oversight, it is also probable that she attended very infrequently. The middle-low rating does indicate an unstable integration, according to the hypothesis, but certainly not such an extreme tendency. Another exception is S27, with a middle-middle rating and a 40% attendance record.

Others in the relatively low attendance bracket are S6, S7, and S31. In two, there is a decline: expressed preference for S6 and S31 is off 50% on the second test; received preference shows a slight decline. S7 shows a gain on both but expressed preference is still very low. These cases are by no means clear and suggest the question
raised at the end of the preceding section: what are signs of withdrawal in older members? (All these are in the upper age bracket of the present membership.) It is doubtful if their preference scores would show an even and steady decline through several tests to a low-low rating. Rather, a tendency toward withdrawal would be indicated in a downward trend only, and a decline in expressed preference might be more indicative than received preference. Among the older members, S2, S17, S20 and S23 also show decline; if the hypothesis is correct, the tendency toward withdrawal is latent for it does not show in attendance. Except for S12, all other shifts are positive.

As to high-high rating, there is almost no relation between it and attendance. Only S26 shows this relation: he is the new president; further, he and his brother (S25) are expected to attend by their parents. Attendance is probably a resultant of several factors, especially on the high end. Other pressures to attend may come from members themselves, from having nothing to do and no friends, from the adult advisers and other significant adults. Thus attendance seems to be a better check on tendencies to withdraw but not greater integration. This suggests that the above hypothesis of integration-withdrawal would be hard to test in a church group: the reduction of extraneous pressures is well-nigh impossible. As with the use of the preference test in school, what is inferred from preferential standing is largely based on commonsense. The hypothesis, though not clearly substantiated in the above data, may yet be helpful to an adult adviser using sociometric tests in a church youth group.
Isolation, according to Moreno, and leadership as well are defined in reference to sociometric choice. Isolation will not be widely used in this dissertation because of the reasons given in the previous section. The youth group does not represent the "population" of youth in Westdale. The word might be used in a relative sense: this member is an isolate in reference to this group. The concept of more or less stable integration in the group is to be preferred, partly because such a relative use would carry fewer overtones of isolation as commonly used and partly because the continuum, integration-withdrawal, is more in line with the concept of reformulation of the group's boundaries, which is a basic characteristic and problem of a group of this type. The strict meaning of isolation has been employed only once so far and appeared in the previous section in reference to S28 where her isolation in the community was noted. At this stage of using sociometric tests in church groups, such an inference could not be inferred from the test data, although it may be a rather common phenomenon: individuals with low-low ratings who are persistent and faithful members of church groups may actually be isolates who find the church a place of at least minimal social acceptance.

Points which are usually subsumed in sociometric articles under isolation have already been covered in the previous section. The approach is a little different from Moreno's: the discussion of relative integration was based solely on preference score not on
choice score. Since this is a departure, choice is discussed here in relation to preference. From the data in Table IIIB, three rank correlations (Spearman formula) were made between: choice and preference received on the first test \( (r = .644) \), on the second test \( (r = .655) \) and on the first test between only those members appearing in the second test \( (r = .644) \). The inter-test agreement is rather remarkable. Not much significance should be attached to these correlations, however, because of the dispersion; several individuals often appear at one rank point. Yet these correlations are suggestive; although high, they are not high enough; one may infer that choice and preference are not synonymous, that the scores for each are measures of different things.

Looking at the data of Table IIIB, some gross discrepancies may be seen. S29, for example, appears at the rank point of 9.5 on choice on the first test; her position on preference is third from last, thirtieth. On a basis of choice, she is not isolated although a close study of the first sociogram would show that those who choose her are on the fringes. It might then be concluded that she was somewhat isolated. But by the same logic, others (S15 and S30) are even more isolated, yet their preference scores are higher than S29's. The remarkable feature is that the choice score of 10 does not give any inkling of S29's preference status. Choice alone does not afford a precise enough measure. This is especially so when we move to the lower end of the choice distribution; eight members are chosen by no one. Are these all isolates? Examples of gross
discrepancies here between choice and preference S4, S5 and S22. Moving up to the choice score of 2, S32 and S18 also show large discrepancies. Examples may also be found among the leaders, although here the divergence of choice and preference scores would not lead to the same conclusion. Choice remains the measure of leadership.

The conclusion seems to be that choice does measure leadership but by no means precisely indicates isolation for, as these tests show, some members may be widely accepted throughout the group yet may be infrequently chosen or not at all. Preference is a better measure of acceptability of a member in a group. Further, and possibly more important, a choice score may mask position in a group which has been defined in most sociometric literature as isolation.

For the reasons already given, isolation will not be widely used in this dissertation. Also, the equivalent concepts, "very unstable integration" or "tendency to withdraw", are based almost entirely on the preference component of the tests, not on choice.

D. Leadership

On the first sociometric test, four of the members had much higher scores than the others, while three others (except S7) had twice the average score and might be considered as in the potential leader class. By the time of the second test, two of the top leaders had left the group. On this test, only one (S6) was a real leader and only one other (S20) had double the weighted score of the group. It is doubtful that such a drastic shift can be explained
by the simple withdrawing of eleven members: the resultant smaller size of the group and the leaving leaders. The effect of this re-formulation would have far reaching effects on the social structure; new alignments and emergence of new leaders would be expected. This change came in a relatively short period, three months. So leadership is to be treated in more detail here.

Consulting Table IIIA, it will be seen that eight members have a weighted score above the average of the group (8.39). The proposed way to study the above shifts is to consider the social atoms of representative individuals of these eight. The reasons for the selection will become apparent.

S8 was chosen because she is the only real leader on the second test and was tied for second (with S20) on the first test. We see that on the first test she twice chose others who chose her and that these choices coincide as to order. Only S14 and S16 show a similar ability to choose mutual partners. On the second test, she has all her choices reciprocated, although the order correspondence is not as good; no others show as much mutuality. S8's atom is smaller on the second test. Only 9 as against 11 choose her. Actually four choices on the first test were given by members who have since left; she thus received more from the present membership on the second test than on the first. Her expressed indifference is much less while that expressed toward her has dropped also. The latter is not due just to simple exodus of members; two additional indifferences are shown, by S27 who did not fill out the test before and S29 who has
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become indifferent to everyone; S6, S7, S15 and S30 are no longer indifferent. Additional features, to be discussed later, are: the expressed indifference of her sisters (S6 and S7) on the first test; on the second test, S8's expressed indifference toward S22 and S23, also the indifference from S22. In summary, on all counts S8 has gained in her position of leadership.

S20 was chosen because of the large decline in her leadership position. Here again the explanation does not lie solely in the withdrawal of members. Although three (S11, S13 and S18) who chose her are no longer in the group, S22 no longer chooses her. S20's present position would be much lower had not S24 and S25 shifted their previous choices from second to first; both are on the fringes of the group. The significant change is the increased indifference, from five to eleven. It will be noted that on the first test, only present members were indifferent, none of the retiring members were.

As it happens, S20 is an old leader; apparently in the reformation of the group, younger members no longer particularly wanted her. No corresponding indifference is found in her expressed preference, although, as pointed out before, there is reason to believe that such does not represent her true feelings. Indifference is shown however in her failure to choose any co-workers. It is interesting to note that three of the members choosing S20 (second text), do not choose S8. Further the choice of S20 and S8 for each other has vanished. A clique is vaguely suggested. In summary, S20 has lost much in leadership position, not only because she is an old leader whose co-
CHART IIIIB
Social Atoms of Subject 20

Test One

Test Two

Symbols:
Red lines (numbered) - choice
Green Lines - indifference
workers have dropped out but also because the present group shows
increased indifference, which is very likely mutual.

S23 has been included, not because she is a leader but because
there were signs of leadership potential on the first test, a ten
point drop in weighted score on the second. Further, she and S22
are daughters of the AA; the importance of this will become apparent.
Her social atom shows several characteristics: although chosen
rather frequently, she is unable to achieve any mutuality of choice;
she shows more acumen where indifference is expressed, meeting it
with indifference or rejection in six instances, only two going un-
noticed; she rejects ten, suggesting she is definite in her feel-
ings toward others and expresses these feelings easily. Relative
to the latter, there is no preference shown on the second test,
suggesting a severe constriction of this discriminatory expression.
All the reasons for this are not known although the following are
suggestive. The second test came at the conclusion of the election
of new officers. She may have been disappointed in the results; her
sister had been nominated for the presidency the year before and had
lost to S6. At the time of the test and later, she was embroiled in
a traumatic family conflict, which is too complex to include. Via a
process of projection, some of this tension was worked off on the
group, both by her and the AA. Put in a nutshell, the AA, S23 and
S22 all held the view that S6 was an inefficient leader. This carried
over to S6 and S7 as well; the AA could not see either as future
leaders of the group. Another factor, aiding this projection, lies
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in the distant past: S8 secured S17 as a boy friend in an under-
headed fashion, according to S22 (who had similar designs) and her
mother. The net result is a vaguely defined split in the group.
Sociometric evidence may be gleaned by a close inspection: S8's
expressed indifference on test two is directed only toward S22 and
S23; on test one, S23 rejects both S7 and S6 who respond with in-
difference; S22 expressed indifference toward S8 and S6 on both
tests, toward S7 on the second. With S23's feeling toward S8 and
S8's ascendancy, S23's position waned remarkably on test two: S12
who chose her before now rejects and chooses S8 instead; only one,
her sister, chooses her without expressing indifference (although
some mutuality is still shown with S2) and indifference generally
has increased. The above conflict has much wider reference than
to this group. As to formal leadership in the group, S23 held a
powerful position as program chairman. Her dissatisfaction with the
way the group was going demonstrated itself while in this position;
pertinent material appears later in the presentation of discuss-
ional results. In summary, although she had little skill in choosing
coworkers and great skill in sensing indifference expressed
toward her, S23 showed signs of developing into a position of leader-
ship on the first test. Within three months, her position had waned
remarkably; she was unable to express her feelings toward other
members on the second test.

S7 is included because of her figuring in the above conflict,
because of her potentiality of developing into a leader on the first
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*Note:
S7 was indifferent to all on both tests, except S8 on Test Two.
test, and because of her position on the second. Her social atom gives a mixed picture. As to choice, she shows a gain: S28 no longer chooses her and is now indifferent while S26 gives no choice at all; added are S6, S9, S17 and S30. The addition of S9 and S30 is significant because they are both younger members who have advanced in position on the second test. However, excluding members who retired, indifference toward her has increased and her own indifference has modified but little. It also is noteworthy that on the first test there is expressed indifference among the three sisters. Some friction is indicated. According to their father, this is shown behaviorally in that S8 asserts herself as a leader among them; S6 and S7 resent this. The friction was evidently less at the time of the second test. In summary, S7's position has strengthened although expressed indifference from the present membership has increased; the only change in her own indifference is in reference to her sister, S8. From other observation, it was found that S7 is involved in a group conflict and is not rated highly by the AA. The expressed indifference and the conflict suggest that S7 is a potential but frustrated leader.

Late in December 1946, just prior to the second test, the group elected the following officers: president - S26; vice president - S7; secretary - S9; treasurer - S24. The following gives their comparative showings as abstracted from Table IIIA:
Only two can be rated in a position of potential leadership and neither of these is president. S7 appears as the logical one, on choice and preference received. Yet S26 and S9 have a positive feeling toward the group which is also an important aspect of leadership. Some of the above inter-test shifts may be ascribed to the fact that the second test came right after the election. S26 very much wanted the job; his expressed preference rises. S9 shows a similar upgrading of her feeling. It has already been noted that members tend to be unrealistic in their choices: there is little mutuality and the tendency is to choose leaders. Thus it might have been predicted that choice and preference would increase toward all the new officers; generally this is so. All show a gain in the group's feeling toward them except S9's slight drop of (.010). Yet, with all this increase, it cannot be said the group was able to put in positions of formal leadership those shown to be leaders on the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test #1</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>S26</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test #2</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test #1</td>
<td>Ex. Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>25-26-27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test #2</td>
<td>Ex. Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>1-2-3</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test #1</td>
<td>Re. Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7-8-9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14-15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test #2</td>
<td>Re. Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17-18-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sociometric test.

Actually, leadership was one of the focal problems. The AA was particularly concerned with it; he made his feelings known in the group. He thought of leadership only in its formal aspects: efficient performance of the duties of a particular office. He could not understand the sociometric definition: a leader is chosen by and is acceptable to relatively more members. Where a basic characteristic of a group is easy reformulation of its boundaries, the kind of leadership sociometric tests measure is all the more indispensable because: a) such is attractive to others and exerts a positive pressure on individuals towards greater integration in the group; b) such has popular support and thus minimizes internal friction. From the AA's point of view, loss of older members and inefficient leadership (which would be an anticipated result since older members had filled responsible positions, younger members would be without experience and skills in these positions) were unacceptable and increased his dissatisfaction with the group.

In summary, the group went through a period of drastic reformulation of its boundaries. For the group, this was more than a simple deprivation of those leaders in the withdrawing members. Leadership underwent changes: only S8 remained as a real leader; S20's position declined markedly; S23 dropped below the average weighted score. New members moved up but due to various factors the AA could not accept them as good leaders (actual or potential). What had been a conflict in a milder form intensified. The group was not able to place in
formal positions of leadership at the annual election those members with higher sociometric ratings. At the same time, extremes of preference became more pronounced. Indifference increased.

E. Sex Choice and Preference

An inter-test comparison of sex choice and preference shows certain general constancies and certain trends or changes. One constancy is the attitude of the girls toward each other as shown by negative preference: on both tests, girls are more indifferent toward and rejecting of each other than boys are of boys. Only one boy rejects another on the first test; none do this on the second test. Girls consistently reject more girls than boys and this intensifies on the second test.

Demonstrating this constancy in relation to positive preference (liking) requires a closer study and a taking into account of certain changes. Girls' choice shows on test one a strong predilection to choose other girls (72% to 26%) which intensifies on the second test (84% to 16%). This may appear as a constancy but probably is a change: the average age of the group has dropped by the time of the second test; several girls are in the pre-dating phase of adolescence. Yet in neither test does this strong predilection show in positive preference percents for the girls as a whole. On the other hand, boys choose boys over girls slightly more on the first test and this is not masked in the positive preference percents. The persistence of positively expressed preference by the boys for boys on the second
test, in spite of a slight favoring of the girls on choice, will be discussed shortly; it involves other factors. A further trend and a further constancy should be noted. For both boys and girls, indifference has increased on the second test. On the other hand, girls express more indifference on both tests than boys. It is this latter constancy which masks the predilection for girls to prefer each other, even when the latter has significantly changed. This is an anomaly: although girls prefer each other as co-workers, they are more indifferent toward and rejecting of each other. Since this ambivalence appears on both test, it seems to be a persistent characteristic of the group. The reasons for this are obscure although it is undoubtedly connected with attractions between the sexes. One reason might be the disproportionate ratio of boys to girls in the group: since the boys are fewer in number, there is more competition among the girls for their attentions. This is not an unreasonable assumption because of the social role the group plays in the population of youth in Westdale. Further, an actual conflict of this type was discussed in the section on leadership. The boys present a different picture: they tend to choose the opposite sex as co-workers much more frequently than the girls yet no rejection and little indifference is directed toward each other.

Another characteristic may be derived from an inter-test comparison: the diminished appearance of boys in positions of sociometric leadership, even though this is not true of their occupation of group offices. The group is now clearly organized around one girl and her
satellites. This explains why the boys choose girls slightly more than boys on the second test; the combined tendencies to make unrealistic choices of leaders and to prefer girls as co-workers are stronger than the tendency to choose one's own sex. The proportion of boys has also decreased; whereas the proportion was 11 to 21, it is now 6 to 15. The combined effect of less boys in less positions of leadership may have an adverse result in time; less and less boys will gravitate toward the group, the ambivalent feelings of the girls may increase. Thus it will function less and less as a means of heterosexual contacts for the youth of the community.

IV. Summary

Two sociometric tests were given to the youth group, the first early in October and the second late in December of 1943. There were "real" tests in that the members were informed that the indication of their choice and preference would lead to placement on certain committees. As the previous sentence indicates, members were asked to state their choice and give their preference. Between the giving of the two tests, eleven members out of thirty-two dropped out and one was added.

In reporting the results, certain standard methods and concepts, commonly used in reporting data from sociometric tests, were employed: Moreno's sociogram, weighted scores for choice and preference, the social atom and other concepts having to do with leadership and attraction patterns. However, when an inter-test comparison was made,
it was felt that these were not sufficient and other concepts were introduced. One of these was the concept of reformulation of the group's boundaries; the youth group differed from other types of groups usually tested in that its members were freer to leave. Several important consequences followed: isolation was dropped as a useful term and replaced by "tendency to withdraw" or "greater or lesser integration into the group"; choice scores and patterns were not sufficient to pick up what is commonly covered in sociometric literature under isolation, preference scores being used to define acceptability and the terms above. Choice scores remained the chief method for defining leaders but preference scores and data were also employed. At the same time that the concept of reformulation of boundaries was introduced, it was also pointed out that the youth group was a highly selected sample of the population of youth in Westdale. This was a further reason for dropping the concept of isolation; it could not be established from the data alone. This also meant that the group was more or less artificial; attraction and repulsion patterns were fragmentary, the relation with other members was often tenuous and limited to the weekly discussion and monthly social, the member was requested to make statements of choice and preference about members older and younger. Thus the usual criterion of mutuality of choice could not be correctly applied.

With the above redefinition of concepts, the data was again presented in an inter-test comparison. It was found possible to note some trends. In the process of reformulation of boundaries, changes
occurred in the group. One member emerged as the real leader of
the group, others diminished in position. Some observations were
introduced, such as the conflict centering about the change in
leadership, to furnish context for some of the sociometric changes.
Preference became more pronounced toward the extremes; the emergent
group was less integrated and was going through a process of re-
structuring. Differences between the status of old and new members
was noted. The concept of greater or lesser integration was applied
to preference scores as they stood relative to others in the group
and to the individual's own previous performance; deductions were
checked against the attendance record. The data was also regrouped
and studied as to sex choice. Here changes were noted also. This
was deemed important as the opportunity for heterosexual contacts
is a major function of the group.
CHAPTER VI

RESULTS OF DISCUSSION TECHNIQUES

The most important meeting of the group is the weekly discussion late Sunday afternoon. Considerable variation was noted by the observer: discussion one night might be lively and extended, on another night flat and brief. Members would occasionally comment on the differences. Late in the spring of 1948, the observer began making sequential records of who spoke to whom. The results were charted and shown to the program committee in the fall. Drama was suggested as a means for getting greater participation. One such session was tried and the necessity for a recording machine was apparent. Such a machine was gotten and first used in the winter of 1949. Concurrent with the use of the wire recorder, several of the members got together before the meeting to study how well the previous meeting went.

The above briefly sketches the order in which various techniques were used. The results will be presented in the same order so that a temporal continuity is maintained.

I. Observer Records

The technique used for on-the-spot observation of interaction was very simple. This was necessary for the prime question of this dissertation was to discover whether a technique, used by a relatively untrained observer in a church group, could yield signifi-
cantly results. When the technique was first used, several members were inquisitive and asked the observer what he was doing. The technique was explained and they were asked to try it out. None did. In spite of this, it is still felt that the technique is simple and can be easily learned.

Briefly, it is this. Each person was assigned a number at the beginning of the meeting according to where he or she sat. This was possible for hymns, scripture reading, prayer, etc., preceded the discussion and allowed time for assigning numbers. When a person spoke (called originator in the presentation that follows), his number was written down, followed by an arrow and then the symbol of the object (called recipient) was noted. This object might be another person, in which case the symbol was his number, or the group as a whole, in which case the symbol was C. Similar notations were made whenever a new member spoke. Length of speaking was not noted: no matter whether the remarks were long or short, they were counted as one origination provided they were continuous, i.e., no one interrupted. The usual distinction between origination and response was not made: all remarks were noted as originations whether they were unasked contributions, in response to a direct question, a refutation of another's position, etc. Every remark was noted as an origination. In the discussion that follows, the word "reception" is used to indicate the receiving of an origination. Only two other distinctions were made in the notational system. All remarks made by the leader which were directly concerned with the presentation of
the material (stories, generalizations and questions read from the material), as well as requests for clarification by the members (such as asking a question to be repeated because it wasn't heard), were classified as topical originations. The reason for this was that they could not be considered as elicited by the discussion. As shall be seen later, leaders varied in the freedom with which they entered into the discussion itself. One made no originations other than directly reading from the book. Others had high origination percentages. The second distinction was to note remarks that did not enter into the discussion proper. These were largely private and between members sitting next to each other, although occasionally some one might talk to another on the other side of the circle, such interchange being unrelated to the topic. Such verbalizations were termed "asides" and are noted separately in the reporting of observations. One further feature should be mentioned: occasionally the group will appear in the records as originator. This usually refers to spontaneous laughing, giggling, etc. In only one meeting was there any spontaneous outbreak of the group directed toward a person, and this toward the leader. All these are referred to as group originations.

A. General Results

The interaction of eleven meetings was recorded via this simple notational system between April 18 and December 5, 1948. There were more meetings but the observer was not able to be present all the time; as was noted before, no one could be persuaded to make them in
his absence. In presenting the results, it was thought best to start with a tabular summary of all the meetings; then the interaction charts for the individual meetings would have a base for comparison.

The question then arose as to what to abstract from the raw data and to include in the tabular summary. Obviously the total number of originations should be, with these exceptions: topical and group originations. Thus in Table IVA, total originations refer to individual originations growing out of the discussion. It will be noted that group originations are included in a separate column. Since meetings varied as to number of members present, the total of individual originations may be divided by this number to get the average number of originations per member. The data may then be inspected to see what percentage of those present attained at least this average of origination. It can also be ascertained what percentage of those present originated at least once. The percentage of originations by the leader is also included. Asides are noted in a separate column.

On the recipient side, a usual distinction is the percentage of receptions by the group, i.e., the percentage of originations directed to the group. Two meetings might differ greatly on this point: one being a simple interchange between individuals, another being group centered. It might also be useful to know how the remainder of receptions were distributed among individual recipients. As with originations, an average per member can be obtained, the percentage
## TABLE IVA

Summary of Data From Interaction Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>APM</th>
<th>PAA</th>
<th>P0</th>
<th>PBL</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Receptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>APM</th>
<th>PAA</th>
<th>P0</th>
<th>PBL</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attaining at least one reception and the percentage directed to the leader.

Table IVA contains a summary of all this data. Considerable variation may be noted. Total origination have a mean of 74 for the eleven meetings with an SD of 42; similarly, the average number of origination fluctuates widely, from less than one to over eight. Member participation also fluctuates considerably. If meeting III is discounted, the extremes are 40% and 74%. This means that never more than three-quarters of those present entered into the discussion and that sometimes this fell to below half. The one measure that shows a rather close dispersion of values is the percentage of members attaining at least the average number of origination for the evening: a mean of 28.6 with an SD of 5.5. With rather high consistency, slightly more than a quarter of the members took an average part in the discussions. Percentages of origination by the leader show wide variation but this was to be expected because of individual differences: every member is supposed to lead a meeting; thus ability in leading is not ostensibly a selective factor. Group origination and asides show the same wide variation.

On the recipient side, group reception show a rather wide dispersion although closer inspection shows that several percentages range around fifty with extremes tending toward the low side. Other measures show the same tendency toward wide fluctuation. When reception are compared to origination, some interesting differences and parallels can be seen. Average reception are lower for individ-
uals and this was to be expected because of the mean for group recep-
tions (43%): however, the wide dispersion still obtains. The per-
centage of those attaining the average is very close to that for origi-
inations but the SD is larger. However, those attaining at least one reception range lower than those attaining one origi-
nation. This means that although a little over a quarter give and receive remarks, fewer are on the receiving end of remarks than the originating end. Something akin to sociometric scores is suggested: a few receive much attention, more receive slight atten-
tion, and quite a few receive none at all. It should be noted that leadership accounts for much of this: the mean percent of leader reception (45%) is much higher than that for leader origination (14%). Yet the wide dispersion of leadership reception, from 13% to 75%, suggests that more than the leading of the meeting enters as a causal factor.

Summarizing Table IV A, except for the percentage of members reaching at least the average number of originations per meeting, all other measures show wide variation when compared as to certain characteristics: total originations for the discussion and average per member, percent originating at least once, average reception and percent attaining the average, percent attaining at least one recep-
tion, group originations and percent of group receptions and asides. This means that level of activity, type of leadership, direction of discussion (to the group or between individuals), levels of partici-
pation and inclusion, and spontaneous originations varied widely from evening to evening. Members were aware of this variation.
Generally, they did not like those meetings with low activity. Feelings as to type of leadership and individual-vs. group-centered discussion were not as freely voiced although the extremely passive, "book-bound" leader was not liked nor a discussion where personal feelings were aroused. Meetings where there was considerable spontaneity were preferred. An interesting speculation is what effect this wide fluctuation had on member expectancies.

Certain consistencies may be noted in individual meetings. When participation is extremely low, asides and group originations do not appear; however, these do not vary directly with increase in originations, i.e., a large total of originations does not imply a large number of asides and group originations. Evidently these more spontaneous forms of participation do not occur until a certain activity level is reached; then other factors determine the amount. When participation is very low, the percent of members originating at least once is low: it is as if the majority were afraid "to jump in". This is obscured as activity increases but in general seems to hold: as originations increase, so too does the likelihood of a silent member speaking increase. Similarly, the percentage of members having at least one reception is low when total originations are low, high when originations are high. Another interesting relation, not too clearly shown, has to do with the percentage of receptions by the group: except for Meeting III, when this is low, total originations are high. This means that when the discussion becomes an inter-individual affair, it becomes more intense also.
The relation of leadership to interaction is not clear. Low origination by the leader in two cases goes with low activity by the group, but not in the third case (Meeting I). A very interesting feature is that highest activity appears with leadership that might be termed "minimally active", i.e., a leader whose originations and receptions are on the low side but not too low.

B. Individual Meetings

Variations in meetings are more easily comprehended by charts showing the interaction; the charts which follow have been devised for this purpose, explanatory symbols appearing on each. The number in the triangle or circle refers to the subject or member. The relative seating position at the meeting is preserved on each chart.

Meeting I (Chart IVa) stands comparatively high on the number of individuals participating and originations directed to the group. Yet its charting shows that it tended toward being an interchange between S20, S36 and the AA. Very few originations are directed at the leader, her own originations are low. S36 appears to have become the actual discussion leader. He is an older member who had left the group before the first sociometric test; he usually played the role of "devil's advocate". The AA also took an active part in the discussion but largely limited his role to interaction with S36; the AA was the foil for the "devil's advocate". Besides are rather frequent but group originations are low. In summary, this meeting is characterized by interaction among a few individuals with S36 be-
CHART IVA

Interaction Record - Meeting I

Symbols:
All heavy lines - 5 origins
All light lines - 1 origination
Green lines - topical origins
Red lines - asides
Triangle - male
Circle - Female
Green circle - leader
Red Triangle - adult adviser
Blue triangle - observer
CHART IVB

Interaction Record - Meeting II

Symbols:
All heavy lines - 5 originations
All light lines - 1 origination
Green lines - topical originations
Red lines - asides
Triangle - male
Circle - female
Green circle - leader
Blue triangle - observer
V - visitor
x - empty chair
coming the actual discussion leader; S22, who led the meeting, played a passive role, with the group for the most part watching passively. However, this interaction among individuals provoked a relatively high percentage (72%) at the one origination level.

The second meeting exhibits some of the characteristics of the first. S11 was the center of the discussion; she took an extreme position on the proper observance of the Sabbath. The leader, S38, played a larger role than the leader in the first meeting. Percent of receptions by the group is the lowest for all meetings. Thus it appears that the discussion was more (a) personal and (b) leader-centered than the first. The percent of at least one origination (74%) is the highest for all the meetings; asides are high, group originations in the middle range. In summary, the meetings are marked by personal interchange of views, with S11 being the chief originator and with S11 and the leader S38, being the centers toward which originations were directed. Almost three-quarters of the members speak at least once, group participation is average and private exchanges high: this individual-centered discussion provoked much activity.

Chart IVC shows that Meeting III was a "dead" one. Only three, besides the official leader, participated; all three direct their remarks to the leader. There are no asides or group originations. It appears that the leader really "led" this meeting.

Meeting IV shows more interaction than the previous one but it is still at a very low level: many members (57%) did not partici-
**Chart IVc**

**Interaction Record - Meeting III**

**Symbols:**
- All light lines - 1 origination
- Green lines - topical origination
- Heavy blue line - 5 originations
- Triangle - male
- Circle - female
- Green circle - leader
- Red triangle - adult advisor
- Blue triangle - observer
- V - visitor
- x - empty chair
CHART IVD

Interaction Record - Meeting IV

Symbols:
- All heavy lines - 5 originations
- All light lines - 1 origination
- Green lines - topical originations
- Triangle - male
- Circle - female
- Green circle - leader
- Red Triangle - adult adviser
- Blue triangle - observer
- V - visitor
- x - empty chair
participate at all and only 24% attained the average of origination for the group; total originations are very low; there are no asides or group originations. Although nearly half of the remarks were directed to the group, the same holds for the leader; very little of the discussion was directed toward other members. The leader is extremely passive, making only one origination not necessitated by the topic. The picture is one of a shy, inhibited leader who can do no more than present the topic. Members who participated were those who generally do and seemed to "carry" the discussion for her, directing their remarks to her. In summary, this meeting is characterized by low interaction and led by a non-interacting leader. Thus the lack of group originations is understandable. The lack of asides in this and the previous meeting seems to indicate that a certain level of interaction must occur before privately speaking to one's neighbor appears, i.e., there must be a certain amount of "cover" for such activity.

These four meetings were charted in the form in which they now appear and were shown to the Program Committee, consisting of S16, S23 and the AA. S16 showed little interest; she left the group shortly after, not filling out her term. S23 and the AA were impressed with two features: the non-participation of some, the large participation of others. Something "ought to be done" about both, this was their conclusion.

Meeting V was the first after the previous charts had been shown to the Program Committee. S23 led the meeting and the results are
CHART IV

Interaction Record - Meeting V

Symbols:
All heavy lines - 5 originations
All light lines - 1 origination
All green lines - topical originations
Red lines - asides
Triangle - male
Circle - female
Green circle - leader
Red triangle - adult adviser
Blue triangle - observer
V - visitor
x - empty chair
interesting: member participation is high (72%), group originations are toward the high end, and half of the member originations are directed to the group. Fairly good interaction is suggested although total originations are lower than the average. S23 is not a passive leader: she accounts for 15% of the originations and 45% of the receptions. In summary, although originations are lower than average, over-all participation is high and largely directed to the group, which itself originates frequently. The leader participated actively.

Meeting VI shows the same number of originations as V and nearly as many directed toward the group. However, only 50% join in at least once; the large portion of the discussion is carried by the leader and three others, S9, S14 and S23. The leader accounts for one-fifth of all the originations and 57% of the receptions. Group originations are not high, asides are few. The meeting appears as a leader-centered discussion with a few others doing most of the talking.

The position of the discussion leader in Meeting VII is the most obvious feature; she makes no originations that are not topical and she has few receptions. Although leading the meeting, she shows no personal involvement. Both the AA and OBS originate more; leaving them out, three members carry the discussion. It is group-centered with no one individual high in receptions. Group and total originations are low, asides in the middle range. In summary, the discussion leader is passive, interaction is low and adult members contribute
CHART IVF

Interaction Record - Meeting VI

Symbols:
- All heavy lines = 5 originations
- All light lines = 1 origination
- Green lines = topical origination
- Red lines = asides
- Triangle = male
- Circle = female
- Green circle = leader
- Red triangle = adult adviser
- Blue triangle = observer
- x = empty chair
CHART IVG

Interaction Record - Meeting VII

Symbols:
- All heavy lines - 5 origins
- All light lines - 1 origination
- Green lines - topical origins
- Red lines - asides
- Triangle - male
- Circle - female
- Green circle - leader
- Red triangle - adult adviser
- Blue triangle - observer
- V - visitor
- x - empty chair
more. The discussion is group-centered but only a little over half of the members (58%) have participated and there is little group spontaneity.

In Meeting VIII, non-participation by many members is the main feature (40%), next to lowest for the whole series. S26 is again present and makes the highest number of originations, but this time the leader (S23) is not as passive as was S22. The results are quite different from Meeting I, when S36 was present, and Meeting V, when S23 was the leader. Total originations are midway between the two meetings but much less is directed to the group. S23 has proportionally less originations and receptions; she does not participate as strongly as before. It is also interesting to note she never addressed S36 directly, even though he directed four remarks to her; S23 rarely directs her remarks at an individual, and then only to a select few. Although member participation is low, group originations are the highest for any meeting; further, two such were directed to the leader, something which never occurred in any other meeting. This suggests a spectator role was played by most, active attention to the interchange among S8, S20, S23 and S36, all of whom are older members. S36 played his role of "devil's advocate". In summary, this meeting shows low member participation, lowered participation of S23 as leader, high individual interchange among the older members. But members participated indirectly through more group originations. In part, the differences between this and Meetings I and V can be ascribed to two factors:
CHART IV
Interaction Record - Meeting VIII

Symbol:
All heavy lines - 5 originations
All light lines - 1 origination
Green lines - topical originations
Red lines - asides
Triangle - male
Circle - female
Green circle - leader
Red triangle - adult adviser
Blue triangle - observer
V - visitor
CHART IVJ

Interaction Record - Meeting IX

Symbols:
- All heavy lines - 5 originations
- All light lines - 1 origination
- Green lines - topical origination
- Red line - aside
- Triangle - male
- Circle - female
- Green circle - leader
- Red triangle - adult adviser
- Blue triangle - observer
- x - empty chair
836 playing his usual role but with a stronger leader of the discussion. This constricted the active participation of the leader and other members of the group.

Meeting IX is a leader-centered discussion; 83 accounts for 32% of the originations, 64% of the receptions. Although only 23% of the originations are directed to the group, participation at least once is high (66%), as is total originations. Group originations are in the middle range. Meeting IV, which 88 led, is also a leader-centered discussion; no conclusion could be drawn from it, however, because the participation was so low. It would appear that 88 characteristically handles the discussion in this fashion. The fluctuation in participation is left unexplained; it may be ascribed in part to difference in the topics.

Meeting X shows low interaction; total originations are low, group originations are low, only a little more than half (52%) of the members participate. The leader is frequently the object of member remarks (64%) but this does not represent a large number because group receptions are so high; she accounts for 13% of the originations. The AA and Obes participate more; because of the low activity, the adult members felt the need to help out.

Meeting XI is characterized by a large number of originations with the highest average per member (8.6). Group originations are high and participation is above the average (63%). However, it will be noted that the leader stands relatively low in originations and lowest of all leaders on receptions (13%). This is very similar to
CHART IVK

Interaction Record - Meeting X

Symbols:
- All heavy lines - 5 originations
- All light lines - 1 origination
- Green lines - topical originations
- Red lines - asides
- Triangle - male
- Circle - female
- Green circle - leader
- Red triangle - adult adviser
- Blue triangle - observer
- V - visitor
- x - empty chair
CHART IVL

Interaction Record - Meeting XI

Symbols:
All heavy lines - 5 originations
All light lines - 1 origination
Green lines - topical originations
Red line - aside
Triangle - male
Circle - female
Green triangle - leader
Red triangle - adult adviser
Blue triangle - observer
x - empty chair
Meeting II, suggesting that highest group activity is reached when the leader is neither dominant nor extremely passive. The AA plays a very active part.

A perusal of the charts yields conclusions similar to those reached from the Summary Table IVA. One significant feature stands out more clearly in the charts, however: high interchange between a few individuals stimulates group activity, particularly when it is coupled with a minimally active leader. This means that the opposite, a group-centered discussion where remarks are directed largely to the group, does not elicit as much activity. One explanation might be that many of the members like to play a spectator role. Another is that individual interchange, i.e., differences of opinion between members, may be a warming-up process: the discussion is less lethargic and as it progresses, more and more are drawn in.

If most of the conclusions could be reached via a summary table, the question arises: What contributions can this form of charting make? Relative to the group, such a chart gives at a glance a picture of the evening's activities. As already mentioned, S23 and the AA were impressed with two features: the lack of participation by many, the high participation of a few. Charting offers another advantage, not shown in the ones just covered: numbering the originations on a chart shows how the meeting progressed. For example, Meeting II was originally drawn in two charts because the numbering or originations made it impossible to include all originations in one chart. During the first half, S32, the leader, played a very minor role: she had
made only four topical and six personal originations; she had only five receptions. All had been the center of the discussion. When the second half of the meeting is included, as it is in Chart IVB, this became far less prominent. Numbering responses also makes it possible to see who consistently evokes group laughter.

The charts also show certain molar (previously discussed) and individual (to be discussed) features in functional relation. An example is S23's leading of two meetings. Meeting V ranks high in number of members participating, in the middle range on group-centeredness; she accounts for almost one sixth of the originations, almost one half of the receptions. In Meeting VIII, all these features are lower; the situation is different because it includes S36. This is all the more interesting for two reasons: she had viewed the first four charts and had determined to increase participation; she was unable to direct any remarks to S36.

Another interesting functional relation appears under the condition of passive leadership. In Meeting VII, both adults "came in" and contribute more; S6, the leader, made no personal contribution. Similarly in Meetings X and XI, the AA contributed more. Meetings I, II, IV, VII and XI are examples of passive leadership where certain members carried the discussion. Sometimes this large contribution by individuals is a result of their involvement but usually not when leadership is passive. Whether it is involvement or just "carrying the ball" depends upon whether or not the group is the discussion center; if it is, personal involvement is not the major factor.
The charts preserve the seating arrangement for the evening. Members are free to sit where they wish; late-comers usually sit opposite the leader in the circle. Consistencies may coincide with sociometric results. For example, out of the four meetings that S15 and S30 both attended, only once did they fail to sit together and this was a night when S15 arrived late (Meeting VII). Vacant seats between individuals almost always indicate that the pair is not friendly. Other factors enter into seating choice. S23, for example, sat next to the leader five times, once only one seat removed, only once further away. Adults usually sit opposite the leader. Sex attraction is another factor, though it usually works in reverse: boys cluster with boys and girls with girls.

In summary, charting of the meetings affords a graphic means for observing different features of the meeting: molar characteristics of interaction, individual differences, functional interrelations, seating preferences, temporal process. Charts are also easily read by interested members and adult leaders.

C. Differences in Individuals

Table IVB summarizes the eleven meetings according to the participation of each member. The percentage of total originations and of total receptions is given for each member for each meeting. Since the role of leader is different from that of participating member and may inflate both percentages, a blue square circles the
### TABLE IVB

Summary of Percent of Interaction  
April 18 to December 5, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Subject</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symbols:**
- 0 - origination, percent
- R - received, percent
- a - absent
- AA - adult adviser
- Ob - observer
- □ - leader
### TABLE IVB
(Continued)

Summary of Percent of Interaction
April 18 to December 5, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Subject</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 R</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 R</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 R</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 R</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 R</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 R</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 R</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 R</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 R</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 R</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 R</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued...)

**Notes:**
- The table uses a notation system where 'a' represents a specific interaction, and 'R' indicates the subject number.
- The interaction percentages are calculated based on the meeting and subject data provided in the table.
individual's score when he or she was leader.

Table IVc further summarizes this data. (Since measures of dispersion were not made on the data contained in Table IVc, Table IVb is included and should be consulted for fluctuations.) In this table, the subject's attendance is given first, followed by the number of meetings in which he made no originations and then by the number of meetings in which he had no receptions. These are followed by the person's mean percent of total originations and of receptions. When these are compared with the averages for the group over eleven meetings (see Table IVa), only thirteen lie above the average for originations (3.95): S7, S8, S9, S11, S14, S18, S20, S22, S23, S24, S32, S36 and the AA. Of these, S18's appears uncharacteristic, S11 and S14 were present only once (this need not infer that their average is uncharacteristic). Seventeen lie above the group average on receptions (2.44) but of these, S6, S17 and S18 would not if they had not led meetings.

These percentages seem to represent rather basic tendencies. From other observations, the high and low originators characteristically function at those levels. S6, S20, S23, S32 and S36 all verbalize easily; they are all older members. All of these also have high reception percentages. Others are consistently low in verbalization: S2, S6, S12, S15, S16, S17, S25, S26, S27, S28, S29, S30 and S33. Most of these are younger members. When the results are compared to sociometric position, the relation is not simple and straight forward. S16 and S17 (brothers) stand high
### TABLE IVB

**Summary of Data on Members:**

**Attendance, Participation and Mean Percents**

**April 18 to December 5, 1949**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Mean %</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols: 0-origination; R-Reception; AA-Adult Advisor Ob-Observer
sociometrically. Eló has frequently told the observer that he
is sensitive to verbal interchange and tries to get the group to
laugh; he does not like to speak in public, to offend or be offended.
It will be remembered that he hesitated to fill out the first socio-
metric test. Omitting the exceptions, sociometric leaders do gen-
erally originate more than non-leaders; those with low sociometric
position are low in percentages of origination and reception.
Further discussion of the scores would lead into too much detail.
Individual differences will be treated in discussing the results,
where the material on each individual will be brought together.

D. Summary

Before going further, it should be noted what this method of
observation does not include: it does not assess group process in
the discussion. Such questions as to whether or not the group
arrived at a clarification of the topic and certain conclusions
about it, how varied were individual positions in reference to the
topic, what roles were played by members, are not handled by this
method. A complex scoring of interaction plus gross observation
(anecdotal) of the meeting would be necessary to handle such
questions. These methods were not attempted for a variety of
reasons: lack of observer skills, the improbability of the use of
such techniques by church personnel, the effect which use of these
methods would have on the members, the difficulty of communicating
the underlying rationale, and so forth. The purpose was to try a
simple, teachable method that might be used in a church group and
that might give some significant results.

What are the values of this method? It has shown large
variation between the meetings on the following features: amount
of origination, percentage of members participating, type of dis-
cussion (group- or individual-centered) and some relations between
the type and amount of interaction, type of leadership. It has
shown these consistencies: about 29% of the members attain the
average amount of participation or more; individuals tend to main-
tain a high or low level of origination and reception. Certain
interrelations were observed: activity must rise above a given
level before spontaneous forms of participation appear; extremely
passive leadership generally evokes little activity unless other
members "carry" the discussion or personal involvement occurs, but
very active leadership does not correlate with highest activity;
rather the "minimally active" or permissive type of leadership
does; individual involvement seems to "warm up" the group, help-
ing silent members to speak.

The charting of interaction is easily read by members and
adult leaders. Further, because seating arrangements are pre-
served, significant consistencies may be noted, relating to choice
preference, sex attraction and so forth.

II. Role Playing

Drama was used only once; it was led by the observer (see p. 60).
Since no record was made, only a subjective report can be given. Those present enjoyed the preliminary warming up period; several giggled a lot. The situation of a teacher dealing with a problem student was briefly outlined. S9 and S25 volunteered to play the role of teacher and left the room. No one volunteered to be the pupil. The group spontaneously "elected" S31; he was a high school senior and had given the teachers a lot of trouble. It was decided that parental non-interest was at the root of the pupil's problem. S25 was called in and merely told that S31 was a poor pupil and had been kept after school for a talk. S25 tried to enter into the situation but laughed so much he had to quit. S9 was called in and given the same brief details. She played a "bossy" role, made no attempt to inquire into his difficulty sympathetically. S31 responded in kind. The observer broke off the heated argument after five minutes. A discussion followed in which S31 was asked about S9's approach; the group joined in the discussion.

It appeared to the observer that this discussion was getting too "hot" for S9 so a role reversal was suggested. By this time, the group was thoroughly involved in the situation. After S31 went out, suggestions as to the basis for S9's poor showing as a pupil (not to be revealed to S31 who was now playing the role of teacher) came popping from all quarters. A spirited discussion developed only to be cut off by the AA who pointed out that S9 should pick her own role. Shyness was finally decided as the basic reason for her failure in school. In the drama that followed, she was unable
to play such a role, she exhibited similar argumentative tendencies and S31 reacted in kind. A discussion followed on what the group thought a good teacher should be.

As a means of increasing member participation in the discussion, drama proved very successful. Unfortunately since no record was made throughout, no comparison could be made. The observer's subjective estimate was that participation was much higher than at any other meeting he had attended. As a means of drawing out significant material on member problems, it appeared to be a good instrument. S28 was among those suggesting shyness. A content record would be highly informative.

Drama was not a planned part of any discussion that followed this one (the observer used it more informally when he led a meeting later but again no record could be made). The observer had to "push" to try it once. He offered his services but no leader seemed to want to use this method. Moreover, the young people had considerable autonomy in choosing and planning their programs; there was a limit to what an adult could suggest.

Drama appears to be a good instrument for increasing member participation and for indicating areas of concern. There are certain dangers, however, particularly that of shaming a participant. Only an adult should attempt its use; he should be aware of the dangers. It would also have to be adapted to the customs of the group. This suggests that an intensive study is necessary.
III. Group Study By Some Of The Members

Members had expressed dissatisfaction with the discussions and the group as a whole; several were leaving and the period of transition was not welcome to some. The observer felt that a study group might be helpful: interested individuals could meet and air their views about the group; skills, such as leading a discussion or putting on a drama, might be explored. So two questions were appended to the second and sociometric test: 1) Are you interested in group study? 2) Are you interested in moderatorship training? Some were interested in learning how to be moderators, some in studying the group, and some showed interest in both.

Only four (S2, S12, S25 and S26) came to these sessions, scheduled just prior to the Sunday evening discussion. The problem of leading a meeting was taken up first, how a leader could do a better job. They recognized that for some this was a very difficult job. The observer suggested that the leadership role might be split in two parts: a) that of presenting the topical material, and b) that of moderator, leading the discussion. The four looked at other moderators they knew (town meeting, church business meetings) to see what skills were necessary. They concluded that moderators should know parliamentary law and should know how to "run" a meeting; they also concluded that such skills would not be too helpful in leading the youth group.

By this time, a wire recorder had been obtained and the four listened to previous meetings. The interaction charts were also
available. They all felt that the moderator should: a) be prepared, b) recognize a member when he made a contribution, c) be sensitive to how well the discussion was going and stop it if the topical material was over the members' heads, d) use techniques for drawing more members in. Recognizing the speaker might be looking at him, agreeing with what he said or repeating it again in different words. One technique for drawing more members in was to go around the circle asking everyone the same question; they felt this was a poor method and should be used only as a last resort. Generally, the four seemed content bound; they were particularly concerned about the topic. It should: a) be interesting, b) include Biblical subjects occasionally, c) be down to earth and not abstract (if the general question didn't go over, it should be broken down into more specific sub-heads).

Each of the four took a turn at being moderator, i.e., sitting in front to aid the leader with the discussion. Uniformly, they did nothing. This was a new role and the group had no experience with it. Even considering this, the observer was somewhat puzzled at their failure. Other data explains it in part: all four were very low on participation (see Chart IV); the Rorschach protocols are illuminative. These four were motivated to attend the group study sessions by their own lacks. The experience of trying to be a moderator was not a total loss. Certain lacks stood out more clearly for them. Members should talk more and more intelligently about the topic. Bashfulness was recognized as a major problem for several; they
should be helped. Older members dominated the discussions; this should be mitigated. The four also sensed that fear of hurting others' feelings constricted participation; there should be some means of lessening this fear.

An interesting development came when S2 had to lead the discussion one evening. The material in the book was scanty; she came to the study group quite flustered, desiring help. The others immediately offered suggestions; before the session was over, she was more confident. During that evening's discussion, S25 functioned as a prompter, asking questions about points that had been raised earlier in the study group. Talking about it at the next study group meeting, the four came to some interesting conclusions. The leader who was to present the topic should be consulted to see if he would like help. If so, he should be invited to the study group to talk over and plan the discussion. It was important to get confidence in one's self and to know the topic.

This incident points up another fundamental characteristic of the group. It will be remembered, from the discussion of sociometric results, that the group is characterized by easy reformulation of boundaries (members may leave easily) and by a certain artificiality of member-relation (age differences are great; they do not meet each other frequently outside the confines of the group). From the above incident, it can be seen that there was little pressure to "get things done" in the weekly discussions. Thus a member could come or not come, take part or not take part as he wished. When goal-pressure
was increased, as in the group study incident just related, productivity increased. This whole area, the effect of definiteness of goals on production in this type group, could be intensively studied.

While the study group was working on the function of the moderator, the observer suggested that each might act as observer at the regular meeting. Each took a turn and looked for the following features: who talked, who talked and said something, what was their overall estimate of the discussion. Each reported his impressions at the end of the meeting; they concentrated mostly on criticizing non-participants.

In conjunction with these four members acting as observers, the observer gave the whole group an end-of-meeting questionnaire consisting of five evaluative questions. The results will be presented in the next section on sound recordings. The purpose was to see how close the observer from the study group came to the group consensus about the discussion. All the members were very much interested in hearing the results of the questionnaire.

In summary, the results from having a study group appear generally favorable. The four who took part did not learn any skills in playing the role of moderator. They did arrive at some interesting conclusions about group process and factors inhibiting it; this seemed to give them more confidence in participating. The fact that they could recognize such problems as shyness and hurting the feelings of others tended to objectify their own attitudes toward taking part.
The experience of helping a leader who sought aid was illuminating. They functioned well in assessing the evening discussion. It would appear that such a study group is a useful technique: a) it is a way of helping those who feel they need help; b) it draws the attention of the whole group to the "how" of discussions; c) it fosters a greater goal tension, a need to "get things done".

It cannot be said, however, that this technique was completely successful, that its possible uses have been fully explored. Only four members from the youth group attended; these were largely motivated by their felt inadequacies. A more intensive study is suggested and also a more extensive one. It should be tried in several groups of this same type.

IV. Sound Recordings

Transcriptions of the discussions on a wire recorder were started toward the end of January. Data from only three meetings is presented hereafter. Due to rallies, special church meetings and early cessation of activities, there were eight less discussion meetings than usual. Special programs such as a play on race prejudice, a missionary film, a mother's day program, etc., reduced the number of typical meetings further to a total of six. The observer was unable to be present at all of these.

Sound recordings proved to be less significant than they were expected to be. Total interaction could not be secured because asides were not picked up at all, occasionally individual speakers
could not be identified, nor could the speakers be identified when more than two spoke at once. It was often impossible to determine the direction of origination, whether toward the group or another member. Content was made available but it was not always complete, because of pitch and volume variation. Further, for any accurate scoring of content, such as that method used by Bales, too many cues were missing. A simplified version of Bales’ categories was tried; there were sections where no scoring could be made and in other places essential cues were missing. It appears that content analysis has to be done on-the-spot, on "live" interaction; recordings are then useful as a check.

However, recordings did make possible a fairly accurate estimate of time consumed by most of the members, especially those who spoke up. By replaying and timing with a stop watch, the length of each origination could be gotten to the nearest second. This filled a gap, for by the previous method no distinction was made between verbalizations of two seconds and one minute. In the data that follows, it should be remembered that the number of originations ascribed to each member is not absolute; totals are less than the absolute totals for the group and for the individual, especially where he is an infrequent speaker.

Tables VA, VB, and VC summarize the data for these three meetings respectively. They show for each member present his: origination and percentage of the total originations, time consumed and the percentage of the total time, average time-response. All the percent-
TABLE VA

Sound Recording - Meeting XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origination</th>
<th>Time in Seconds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols:

( ) - enclosed topical origination
made by the leader, S7.

AA - Adult Adviser
Ob - Observer
Gr - Group

Group Averages:

a) Average expected percent of origination is 6.67%

b) Average expected percent of time consumed is 6.67%

c) Average time per origination, excluding topical and group originations is 8.8
### TABLE VB

#### Sound Recording - Meeting XIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origination</th>
<th>Time in Seconds</th>
<th>APR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ject</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(142)</th>
<th>(20.1)</th>
<th>(11.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

**Symbols:**

- ( ) - encloses topical originations made by the leader, 62.
- AA - Adult Adviser
- Ob - Observer
- Gr - Group

**Group Averages:**

a) Average expected percent of origination is 6.67%

b) Average expected percent of time consumed is 6.67%

c) Average time per origination, excluding topical and group originations, is 7.7'
### TABLE VC

Sound Recording: Meeting XIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Time in Seconds</th>
<th>Aver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Peg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Peg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

Symbols:
- ( ) - encloses topical originations made by the leader, S26.
- AA - Adult Adviser
- Ob - Observer
- Gr - Group

**Group Averages:**

a) Average expected percent of origination is 5%

b) Average expected percent of time consumed is 5%

c) Average time per origination, excluding topical and group originations, is 10.1"
TABLE VD

Sound Recordings - Individual Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>Average Percentages</th>
<th>A TO</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g s d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>18.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symbols:**
- Orig. = stands for origination
- AA = Adult Adviser
- Ob = Observer

**Group Averages for the Three Meetings:**
- Average Origination Percent = 6.11%
- Average Time-consumed Percent = 6.11%
- Average Time Per Origination = 8.17"
ages are based on totals with topical and group originations left out. Meeting XIII is only a partial record, what was taken on a fifteen minute spool. The individual's percentages of origination and time consumed, and his average time per response are average for the three meetings in Table VD. These may be compared with mean percentages of origination in Table IVG. S8 and S23 are still high originators; their percentages for time consumed are less than for originations, i.e., though talking much each contribution was shorter than the average. S20's percentage has dropped but is still above the average; her percentage of time consumed is higher than for origination which means that she talks relatively longer than the others. S32 also shows a drop but is still above the average. S2, S7, S22, S26, S31 and the AA all show increased percentages. For S2, S22, S26 and S31, this is not significant. Fluctuations as high as their scores on these three meetings may be found in the first eleven meetings. They also tend to vary a lot, "coming in" on only certain discussions. Since the second sample of meetings is so small, a consistent increase cannot be inferred. S9's pattern of participation seems to have changed; she contributes more on the average and the percentages of participation from meeting to meeting are evener. It will be remembered that she is one of the younger members and was elected to the office of secretary at the beginning of the year. The adult adviser shows a marked increase. Actually an increase is shown on the last two meetings of the first series (see Table IVB). It will be noted that the percentage of time consumed
is double the percentage of originations on the last three meetings; further, he spoke almost a third of the time for all the meetings. One can only speculate as to the reason for the large increase in originations. The adult advisor was dissatisfied with the older members leaving and with the way the group was functioning. Younger members tended to speak rarely. He may have felt it necessary to speak oftener to liven up the discussion.

Of the ten meetings of the group from the latter part of January through April, three were led by adults, two by S23 who was the program chairman, and one each by S6 and S20 who were old and seasoned leaders. S2, S7 and S26 conducted the other three, the three that were recorded. Although they lacked skills, were unsure of themselves and were somewhat hesitant about leading, all of these were older members too. In short, none of the younger members had the job of leading a meeting. S23 ran the programs this way because she felt that previous discussions had been poor, leadership could not be entrusted to the unskilled. Apparently this produced little change in averages of the low originators. S6, S12, S27 and S28 made no recorded contribution. S2, S7, S15, S17, S24, S25, S26 and S30 still remained low.

Summarizing, sound recordings did not prove nearly as effective as anticipated. Originally planned to pick up content where drama was a part of the discussion, no change arose to use the recorder in this way. Probably it would have proved more useful here but there are definite limitations. Unless an interaction record was kept, it
might be impossible to identify the speaker. Also vital cues are missing. As to the other characteristics quantified by an interaction record, sound recordings are a very poor substitute. However, they do make it possible to estimate rather accurately the time consumed by different members; this is a characteristic that needs to be measured as the example of the adult advisor using a third of the time shows. Yet it is doubtful if the recordings would be extensively used in this fashion; it is a tedious process to abstract the duration of speaking from a recording. The observer also thought that recordings would be useful in group study: interested members could listen to the discussions and make suggestions for improvement. But it was a boring process for those who participated in the study group (some of the recordings were over half an hour long). Thus it appears there is no substitute for on-the-spot observation; sound recordings are useful only as an adjunct.

V. Member Evaluations Of The Discussions

As was previously mentioned, the member-observer gave his summary of how well he thought the group had done. All those present were also asked to rate the meeting on the following questions:

A. Post Meeting Satisfaction: How do you feel tonight's meeting was? (1) - Poor (2) - Mediocre (3) - All right (4) - Good (5) - Excellent

B. Aspiration Level: When you came, what did you think tonight's meeting would be? (1) - Poor (2) - Mediocre (3) - All right (4) - Good (5) - Excellent

C. Progress Estimate: How much do you feel this meeting contributed to the goal of the meetings of our group. (1) - Nothing (2) - Not very much (3) - Some (4) A considerable amount (5) - A great deal
## TABLE VE

Summary of Data - Post Meeting Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Question</th>
<th>Ratings of Meetings</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Low - 1; High - 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Weighted Scores For The Three Meetings:

- A = 3.70
- B = 3.23
- C = 3.56
- D = 1.72
- E = 1.72
D. Experience of Frustration: Were there times during the discussion when the way things were going bored, upset, or irritated you? (1) - Never (2) - A few times (3) - Fairly often (4) - Frequently (5) - Very frequently.

E. Frustration Release: If you were bored, upset, or irritated, how often were you able to express this or change the way things were going to your greater satisfaction? (1) - Never (2) - A few times (3) - Fairly often (4) - Frequently (5) - Very frequently.

The results are summarized in Table VE. Meetings XII and XIV show very similar averages or weighted scores, except for the level of aspiration (B) which has gone up. Meeting XIII shows quite different scores (except for the level of aspiration which is the same as for Meeting XII): satisfaction with the discussion is down, there was more frustration and less ventilation of it, yet the progress estimate is up significantly. This is the meeting S2 led and asked the study group for help in preparing it. It was also the meeting in which the adult advisor's percentage of origination (16%) and especially the percentage of time consumption (44.5%) were quite high. In the discussion, the adult advisor did not agree with the topical development; neither did S20. This much is evidently mirrored in the post-meeting evaluation, the increased frustration, and the relatively lower ventilation of it. The increase in progress estimate is hard to fit in, although it should be noted that this significantly affected the level of aspiration on Meeting XIV which followed the next week. Two explanations are suggested. First, it was noted before in discussing the data on interaction records that high individual interchange tended to increase group activity, especially where the leader was "minimally active", and that this inter-
change might function as a warming-up process. Thus, although personal feelings are aroused (as shown in the increase in frustration) and although the members do not like this and are afraid of it (as previously mentioned and as shown in this data in the lowered post meeting satisfaction), the members also like the increase in activity and feel that "something has been done." Second, discussions in the youth group tended to be rather tepid and to arrive at "pat" conclusions, those in the book. However, activity increases when there is some one who plays the role of "devil's advocate". In this meeting, there was no one who played this role but the discussion was also not taken from the book, so that the same effect was achieved, with the AA and S2O acting as foils. Thus no pat answer was achieved and post meeting satisfaction was lower; but they had scratched more than the surface, leaving the question open, so the progress estimate was higher.

Looking at the post meeting evaluation technique very broadly, it appears to be a useful instrument. It shows that the aspiration level is lower than post meeting satisfaction. Although this is a positive sign, it indicates that anticipation is in the middle range, not too much is expected. Frustration seems to be low and what is felt is frequently, though not always expressed. The averages also seem to reflect felt differences between the meetings; thus the technique seems to discriminate between them, and if used over a considerable period of time might point to preferences of the members. Further exploration of its use seems warranted.
VI. Conclusions

Several different techniques have been presented in this chapter, together with the results. Two were primarily instruments for recording group activity in the discussions. One was the interaction record, a simple method of noting who spoke to whom. Results showed wide fluctuations on these characteristics: number of originations, member participation, leader activity, direction of originations (group- or individual-centeredness). The results showed consistencies, primarily those of individual participation at a high or low level and the tendency of a quarter of the members to reach the average level of activity. Certain interrelations were also observed: spontaneous forms of participation do not appear at very low levels of activity; highest activity goes with high individual interchange (less group-centeredness in direction) and leadership of the "minimally active" (permissive) type. The interaction records have a further usage if charted: they show at a glance the group activity on a simple level and thus may be inspected by members or adult leaders having minimum skills.

Sound transcription was the other technique used for recording. Originally planned to obtain a verbatim account of role playing sessions, it was never used for this. It was not effective for getting the data obtained by interaction records. As to content, it was impossible at times to identify the speaker; vital cues were missing for simple categorizing. Yet it afforded a fairly accurate means of measuring time consumed by originators which filled an
important gap; it was noted in passing that this is a tedious process. As a teaching device, it was not satisfactory; members who studied the group discussions were soon bored by listening.

The other techniques described in this chapter might be described as participatory methods; they were used primarily to increase member participation in the discussion or interest in the group. The first of these was drama. Subjectively, it appeared very successful to the observer. There was the danger of "shaming" participants; the difficulty of fitting it into the group's customs was not overcome. Further study is indicated.

Group study was another technique. The aim of providing skill-training in leading discussions was not achieved; participation by the four who were in the study group was not materially affected. But these were motivated by their lack of thinking about the problems of the youth group and their gain in confidence, it would appear that some progress was made. One incident, where the members of the study group aided a leader in the preparation of her topic, highlighted the low goal-tension in the youth group's discussions. It was felt that further applications and study of this technique would be valuable.

The one activity which members of the study group performed successfully was playing the role of anecdotal observer, reporting to the group his or her impressions of how well the discussion went. Arising out of this, a further technique was used: each member present at the discussion was asked to make five valuative judgments
about the meeting after it was over. The fluctuations shown in
the three meetings where it was employed were very suggestive; the
members were very much interested in the results. This technique
also warrants further study.

In the chapter which follows, results from the Rorschach test
are presented together with a few brief remarks about each individual
tested. The Rorschach test was included in this research project
for the purpose of seeing whether or not the techniques covered in
this and the previous chapter yielded significant information about
individuals. After the presentation of the Rorschach test results
in the next chapter all the material on each member is pooled and
compared with the Rorschach interpretations; this is contained in
Chapter VIII. Thus analysis of the group at the level of the
individuals who compose it is stressed in the next two chapters.
CHAPTER VII

THE RORSCHACH TEST

The Rorschach test was included in the project because it was felt that some check on the data obtained from the other techniques was needed. The writer did not feel competent enough to interpret the tests given. Charles Atwell, Chief Psychomist at the Boston Psychopathic Hospital, kindly consented to review the scorings and to make a "blind" interpretation of each protocol.

I. Descriptions of Subjects and Rorschach Interpretations

All of the Rorschach tests, the summaries of which appear in this chapter, were given in the winter and spring of 1949. The youth group had shrunk in size, from thirty-two to twenty-one members. Fifteen of these were given the test (see p. 36); one of these, S28, failed to make a response on the first four cards. Fourteen summaries are included with comments by Mr. Atwell. A brief description accompanies each summary. All remarks such as grade in high school and so forth refer to this period in 1949, unless otherwise indicated.

A. Subject 1

Sl is a girl, a sophomore in high school. Her mother is a member of the Church. Her father died suddenly, about six years ago when she was eight or nine. Sl was apparently very attached to him; he took her fishing, walking in the woods, etc. Her mother has had to work hard nor has her employment been steady; she has worked in
the mills, done housekeeping, quantity cooking and other such jobs. Her mother is jolly and friendly but does not dress in the latest fashions and apparently has few friends. What S1 thinks of her is not expressed but S1 is quite shy, blushes easily and has few friends. Due to her mother's working, she has had to spend quite a bit of time alone at home. Now her grandfather lives with them. She is a pretty girl but very retiring. She sings in the choir regularly. She may be aware of her family's status in town.

B. Subject 2

S2 is a girl, a senior in high school; she is very large in size. She is the youngest of a large family which lives on the outskirts of town. The family is affiliated with the Baptist Church in the industrial center nearby. S2 was a member there but started coming to the group meetings with the AA; she felt she was not well accepted by the young people at the other church. She joined this church in the spring.

The observer does not know the family too well. Her father is a farmer (she has recalled seeing him slaughter animals) with not too large an income. The family lives by itself and does not appear well integrated into the community.

S2 appears jolly but is quite nervous when engaged in conversation. She finds it hard to lead a meeting. She has been secretary of the group but did an inadequate job. Others of her age group say she is undependable.
Subject: 1  
(Female; age, 16)

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCFY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App:</td>
<td>D/1Dd!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq:</td>
<td>Irregular (Reversed on I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp:</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/R:</td>
<td>1'15&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/1R:</td>
<td>1'1'4&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses on last three: 29%
Responses on first seven: 29%

Mr. Atwell's comment:
She feels very insecure: there is a high amount of shading and not too adequate use of it. There is also a considerable amount of anxiety: H to Hd ratio and the x. She has capacity for good social rapport (high FC) but I suspect she is too fearful to use it. She tends to back away and withdraw from people, as shown in the high A% and other H responses which she could have given but didn’t. The very long delay on Card IX shows color shock and that on Card VII shows shading shock. An anxiety neurosis is indicated. Anxiety is further shown in her preoccupation with death.

There is a fairly reasonable number of Ps but the high Dd and the ratio of Hd to H are not good signs.

* The complete protocol for this and each summary which follows may be found in the Appendix.
Subject: 2
(Female; Age, 18)

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>F+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Ls</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App:</td>
<td>(W)D DdI</td>
<td>FV</td>
<td>An</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq:</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp:</td>
<td>5/4.5</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Bt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses on last three: 52%
Responses on first seven: 41

T/R: 46.2"
T/IR: 33.2"

Mr. Atwell's comment:
Looking at the protocol, feelings of inferiority, of being laughed at, appear in the first response. Color shock is shown particularly on Cards II and III, also on IX. Uncertainty is shown on Cards III and X; suspicion is indicated at the end of Card V. She is afraid of her feelings of aggression and repressed them; oral aggression is indicated on responses 21 (VI) and 39 (X). There is shading shock on Card IV. Her M's are not so good; four appear in H's and she didn't want to see M on Card III. The color responses are not so good; two on Card IX are particularly poor. And responses come in with color: two on II and one on VIII. From the summary, obsessive-compulsive tendencies are indicated: high ideation, high M, high S, high Ra, high Dd and a low percent of Rs on the last three cards. Trends to the contrary are the low P, the uncertainty, the low F%, the FV which functions as a means of control and the FY which indicates introspection. The high H and Ad show psychologic constriction as does the An. This also appears in her approach: the constriction affects intellectual function.

Summarizing, neurotic shock and anxiety are uppermost: her control is not working too well. Indicators are: color shock, shading shock, high H and Ad, low F% and high An. This seems to be centered around her aggressive feelings. Trends to the contrary: FY and FV (energetic and introspective) and FC (possibility of good human relations). Thus her characteristic coping mechanisms are: ideation, passivity and withdrawal.
C. Subject 6

S6 is a girl, sister to S7, S8, S32 and S36. She graduated from high school last year with S8 but is older than the latter. She is seventh of a family of twelve children. Two other sisters besides those mentioned have preceeded her in the youth group. Most of the children take an active part in the church program: seven sing in the choir, one teaches a Sunday School class. The family is well liked but has had financial difficulties. Because of this several in the town look askance at the father who is jolly, outgoing and friendly in nature. The children have all worked in the family business from a young age. The work has been hard; the children are eager to "get out from under".

S6 is quite shy, blushes easily. She takes a "back seat" when other members of the family are around. She does not like to lead a meeting; she has held no responsible jobs in the youth group. She wants to get away from home and to study to be a beautician but this has not been possible under the circumstances.

D. Subject 7

S7 is a girl, a senior in high school. She is more robust than S6; like the other girls she is quite pretty. She is somewhat shy and reticent though not as much so as S6. She was elected vice-president this year; this is the only important job she has held in the group. She sings in the choir regularly and joined the church
Subject: 6
(Female; Age 20)

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W - 3</th>
<th>M - 4</th>
<th>H - 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>C - 1</td>
<td>Rd - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CF - 2 (1 minus)</td>
<td>A - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>FC - 3 (2 minus)</td>
<td>Ad - 8 (1 x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY - 3 (1 minus)</td>
<td>An - 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

App: (W)d(Dd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F+ = 15</th>
<th>F- - 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seq: Regular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F+ - 65%</th>
<th>A - 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exp: 4/5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S - 1</th>
<th>F - 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FM - 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T/R: 28m

T/LH: 23.6"

Responses on last three: 80%
Responses on first seven

Mr. Atwell’s comment:
The high A% may be a reaction to the examiner. She is concerned about sex (Cards IV and VI) and also shows hypochondriacal tendencies. The An responses are not good form.

With the C, CF and minus FCs, I would expect emotional lability. However, there are signs of considerable passivity. The FY comes in on color cards, a very unusual occurrence, and indicates not so much inferiority as a linkage with emotional expression. Aggressive tendencies are deeply repressed. She is impulsive intellectually, and jumps at conclusions; this may account for the lowered F+%. Summing, I would not expect explosive emotionality but rather a poor handling of it. The FY in color shows oversensitivity. I have a feeling that this girl wants to be friendly but doesn’t know how to go about it, as indicated by the FC-.

She is somewhat afraid of new situations and prefers to know what the situation is (the comparatively slow response on Card I). The long delay on Card X may be due to the disorganized nature of it. Thus she is somewhat insecure. There is no shading shock, however. Related to the passivity mentioned above is her good M. Her emotional reactions are taken out in fantasy and her aggressive tendencies may be similarly expressed.
Subject: 7  
(Female; Age, 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4 (1 minus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>1 (minus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>2 (1 minus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq:</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp:</td>
<td>4/1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/R:</td>
<td>28&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/1R:</td>
<td>19.2&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses on last three: 69%  
Responses on first seven: 69%

Mr. Atwell's comment:
The additional response on Card I is significant: she isn't letting herself go at first. This is further shown in the longer reaction time on the same card. However, the quality of her response picks up after the test is over. She is afraid of expressing herself but makes a good recovery from her fear. This response is also significant in that she may identify with the person in the middle and feels she is being pulled in two directions. Sex shock is shown on Card VI.

She has fairly good control over her emotions: good M and a good FC to oppose the CF-. The high W shows a high intellectual drive; with the good M, this shows good capacity. She is very sensitive to criticism: the FY and qualifying. Her interpersonal relations are good as shown in the M and Hs with no Hds.

There is evidence of creative ability but the M to FM ratio shows that it is taken out in daydreaming. Further, none of the FMs, except the reindeer, are the usual ones; there is much too much daydreaming.

The number of Ps is a little high. She tries to be over conventional to guard against criticism. Thus there is a conflict between wanting to be creative but not quite daring to be.
several years ago. From the conversations at the girls' club, study classes and other sources, it is apparent that heterosexual relations are a problem; she has spoken of being afraid of "buck niggers", men in cars, etc. This concern she shares in common with the other girls. She has similar feelings about getting away from the family business as the other girls.

E. Subject 8

88 is a girl, graduating from high school last year. She is the dominant one of the three here discussed: she tells the others what to do at work; she has held several important jobs in the youth group and was president last year. She goes steady with 817. Since the giving of the test, they have married, partly out of immediate necessity. 88 is ambitious and wishes to get ahead. The family had planned that she should go to designing school in the fall. With all her push, the AA felt she was an ineffective leader. She has now dropped out of the group, as well as 817. She was unhappy living with his mother and they now have an apartment of their own.

F. Subject 9

89 is a girl, a freshman in high school. She goes to the school in the mill-town because her mother does not think the local one is quite good enough. Her father who is a doctor and served in the army decided not to come back to his family after the war. Apparently he was closely attached to his mother as a boy. 89, her sister and
Subject: 8
(Female; Age, 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+ = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F- = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rc = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses on last three: 82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

App: WJ(D)
Seq: irregular
Exp: 3/2
T/R: 39
T/IR: 28.5

Mr. Atwell's comment:
On Card VI, there is probably sex shock: an over-preoccupation with the phallic area and her failure to give a response in the beginning. The F+ is too low; it is probably involved with the sex shock.

The M is good and is in terms of creative ability rather than in terms of fantasy. However, the A% is too high, showing evasion. There is clear cut evasion on Cards IV and VI. The high A% and good M do not go together: she was inhibited by the testing situation.

There is some immaturity, impulsiveness and instability. She has only CF responses and all are on Card IX, i.e., there is color shock (long reaction time) and color responses break through but then she returns to F on Card X. She is afraid of her own emotional reactions, afraid to let herself go freely.

If she is artistic, then the use of shading and CF would be good.

The Hs and no Hs are a good sign. There is very little anxiety. The Ps are healthy.

The high W indicates a drive to make a good impression. Her ability is high average to superior. On the whole, it is a rather healthy record.
Subject: 9
(Female; Age, 15)

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W = 6</th>
<th>M = 3 (1 minus)</th>
<th>H = 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>M.FY = 1</td>
<td>Hd = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CF = 4 (2 minus)</td>
<td>A = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FC = 1</td>
<td>Ad = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TVFC = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FV = 4</td>
<td>Ge = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY = 2</td>
<td>An = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq:</td>
<td>Slightly irregular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq:</td>
<td></td>
<td>F4 = 31</td>
<td>Bt = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq:</td>
<td></td>
<td>F- = 14</td>
<td>Fr = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Bl = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp:</td>
<td>4/6.5</td>
<td>F+ = 69%</td>
<td>Rh = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/R:</td>
<td>6.3&quot;</td>
<td>A = 52%</td>
<td>Na = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/IR:</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>S = 12</td>
<td>Ob = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P = 10</td>
<td>Re = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM = 8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses on last three: 65%
Responses on first seven: 65%

Mr. Atwell's comment:
The large number of CF's show that her emotions are interfering with intellectual function.

Also there are strong aggressive trends as shown by the high S, high CF and the chopping off things (from the record). She is extremely strong willed and stubborn, if not negativistic.

She is somewhat impulsive (T/IR): she is carried away by the obvious and jumps to conclusions (high D and P). She has some anxiety as shown in the H to Hd ratio. There are trends to be a little dramatic.

On the whole, the record looks fairly good although she is a very stubborn girl. There is too much violence and death at the end of Card X.
mother now live in an apartment in the home of his parents; his parents side with S9's mother. The mother is small, quiet and shy. She works in an office in the mill-town. She appears very devoted to her children and has few outside activities. The town is sorry for her and critical of her husband.

S9 in many ways is quite different from her mother. She is eager and impulsive; she dresses well and pays much attention to her grooming. She is a faithful attendant at the girl's club, tries to tell as interesting stories but does not quite succeed. She does her work as secretary very efficiently; this seems characteristic of other work she does.

G. Subject 12

S12 is a girl, sister to S11 who is also a girl and older than she. S12 is a sophomore in high school, studious but somewhat "slow" according to her parents. Her father was for many years a teacher in the local school but recently gave this up for more lucrative work; money has been and is a topic of family concern. Now the family has a new house, built by the father. He is a very outspoken man, apt to voice an opinion and stick to it before thinking it through. The teacher role he played was of a dominating sort; yet he is jolly, quick-witted and friendly. Both parents are members of the Church. S12, as S11, is apt to take quite a conservative position on some religious and moral issues which are not necessitated by the climate of opinion in the local church (such as strict observance
Subject: 12  
(Female; Age, 15)

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Hd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>CFYF</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 minus</td>
<td>Bt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

App: (W)DiDa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F+</th>
<th>F-</th>
<th>T+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seq: Regular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F+</th>
<th>F-</th>
<th>T+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/R: 60.8'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T/IR: 43#

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Fr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Atwell's Comment:

She is somewhat oversensitive, the FY and FV. This may account for the long delays (T/IR). She has fairly good emotional control: the 2 FC, the CFYF, good CF and good M. Intellectually, she tends to be somewhat impulsive, jumps to conclusions. There is evidence of anxiety. In spite of her capacity for good interpersonal rapport, she doesn't use it - H is seen in small detail. M is also seen here. This indicates she overreacts to people, i.e., in seeing H and M in small detail, she is "cutting them down to size" where they are no threat.

The FY and FV indicate passivity, but she is not going to be pushed around (high S). She is stubborn, but staying where she is. The low P shows withdrawal tendencies. The high FM shows she is immature for her age; also autistic thinking. The lung responses (9) and 20) are evidence of hypochondriacal tendencies and particularly the justification on the first one (R 9). Her cutting off of responses on Card IV and of Y means that her father overwhelms her and she has to run away.

In general, these are the important characteristics: over sensitivity, passivity, strong anxiety, definite immaturity for her age.
of the Sabbath). She is a pretty girl, scrupulous in dress and neatness. She is shy and somewhat inhibited in expressing her opinions but very definite when she does. Since the change in her father’s job and their moving to a new house some distance from the center, she does not participate as fully in the social activities.

II. Subject 20

S20 is a girl who has almost reached the age limit (24) of the group. S21 is her brother; he is older and a deacon in the Church. S20 has been in the group a long time and held various important jobs; she has also been president of the associational group (and now is one of its adult advisers) and has attended the national denominational convention of the youth group as a state representative. Her parents are Scotch emigrants. Her father has some history of alcoholism; her mother rarely ventures out of the home. There are other children in the family, all older and married except one brother. S20 is primarily concerned with getting married. She works on an army post and previously worked in an office in a large factory in mill-town; she does not appear interested in her work. S20 also teaches in the Sunday School; she and S21 are the only ones of the family closely attached to the Church. She appears quite affectionate, docile and eager to please. Some have said she is not too dependable.
Subject: 20  
(Female; Age, 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Resp. on last three: 31%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App: WIDI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq: Irregular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp: 0/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/R: 1'27&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/1R: 1'16.5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+ = 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F- = 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hd = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Atwell's Comment:
She is a neurotic individual - hysteria. There is emotional instability. She has mood swings, how marked, I do not know. She probably has emotional outbursts, temper tantrums. Both shading and color shock are shown. Theoretically, shading shock indicates deep seated anxiety but in this case I think it indicates depressive trends. According to Beck, no H and two Hd together comprise a sign of depression. Thus on one side there is the high CF and color shock; on the other there is no H and three Hd plus shading shock with no use of shading at all. Sex shock is definitely shown on Card VI.

Her F+ is very good which shows that her emotional reactions do not interfere with intellectual function. Her mental ability is high average.

She is capable of M but was afraid to express on the test because of her reaction to the tester.
I. Subject 23

Subject 23 is a girl, a senior in high school. She was adopted by the AA and his wife at the age of eight because their other daughter adopted in infancy, S22, was "getting spoiled". Both girls are the same age; S22 graduated the year before. S23 came from an orphan's home in Boston; she can recall very harrowing experiences as a child. When she was first adopted, it took her some time to realize that she would no longer be shifted from home to home. Except for two or three incidents in the first year after her adoption, she has been a model girl. Her marks are good, she is president of her class and twice has won good citizenship awards. She is very definite and outspoken in stating her feelings about people not in the family (teachers, classmates, etc.), whom she likes and dislikes. She is of heavy build, is not very pretty, and has a malformed eye. She has no dates, partly as a result of her own inept remarks. Recently she has become the center of a conflict situation, too complex to describe here.

J. Subject 24

Subject 24 is a boy, a freshman in high school. He is a state charge and boards with a family in the parish. The father in this family has a similar history; recently he had a nervous breakdown but has recovered somewhat. He is angry at the church members because they are not friendly enough and turn a deaf ear to his suggested improvements. The mother in the family is a cripple; though healthy
Subject: 23  
(Female; Age, 19)

Summary:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
W & M & H & F+ \\
1 & 2 & 1 & 28 \\
D & C & A & F+ \\
35 & 1 & 13 & 3 \\
Dd & CF & Ad & F+ \\
13 & 6 & 13 & 3 \\
49 & 49 & 49 & 49 \\
\end{array}
\]

App: D Dd  
Seq: Irregular  
Exp: 2/9  
T/R: 54.2"  
T/IR: 22.9"  

Mr. Atwell's comment:

She is a neurotic with an hysterical trend. There are too many exclamations, an overly dramatic quality. The excess of CF (and general trend toward C and not F) and the indication of color shock on Card VIII (delayed response time) show this hysterical trend. The low M and high A% are further indications. She is not able to function at the level of her intellectual capacity (low W), is emotionally unstable and labile, and probably has mood swings.

Strong signs of anxiety are present: the imbalance of H to Hd, Ad equal to A, less productivity on Cards IV and VI, and the absence of Y. The latter means that she over-reacts and thus is not able to handle her anxiety.

There are strong aggressive tendencies, as indicated by the high CF and S responses; signs of control are lacking, no Y. She has a potential for good social rapport as shown in the FC. But the ego-centric elements are strong: she insists on her own way and has strong emotional reactions.

The large number of Dd suggest an obsessive-compulsive trend and this is rare in hysteria.

On the content side, the large number of food responses show a craving for affection; she feels she doesn't get enough.
Subject: 24  
(Male; Age, 16)

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Dd</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Hy</th>
<th>Gg</th>
<th>Cg</th>
<th>Ci</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>Bt</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Fi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-20$</td>
<td>$-16$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$-8$ (1 minus)</td>
<td>$-4$ (1 minus)</td>
<td>$-5$</td>
<td>$-16$</td>
<td>$-5$</td>
<td>$-3$ (1)</td>
<td>$-3$</td>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td>$-5$</td>
<td>$5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

App: W!!!(D)  
Seq: Irregular  
Exp: 9/5.5  
T/R: 19.3"  
T/1R: 8"  

Responses on last three: 31%  
Responses on first seven: 81%  

Mr. Atwell's Comment:  
The high W shows too much drive for intellectual achievement and recognition, which may represent to him one way of gaining affection. He should be a radical, highly idealistic and unwilling to compromise. However the rebellion (high S) and aggressive feelings (S and CF) are expressed in M, in inner living. The M is more in terms of fantasy; the fact that he expresses M through animals shows that fantasy is a means for expressing aggression. This inner living is further shown in the low Ps and low F%, as well as the CF in M. He definitely feels inferior.  

Overt expression of the above would be placidity on a negativistic level.
and able to do housework, she stays at home. Both seem to appreciate S24's position and have included him in the family; he has the same privileges as the other children. S24 is affable and friendly. He was very much pleased at being elected treasurer and chosen to attend a summer youth conference. He has done the work of treasurer well. He has a reputation among the young people of "talking big" and doing little. He participates in school activities. The mother says that school activities exhaust him: after football practice, etc., he comes home and goes to bed; he has no energy left over for his chores.

K. Subject 25

S25 is the younger brother of S26. Their mother is superintendent of the Sunday School, their father is treasurer of the Congregational Church in mill-town and a member of the school board in Westdale. S25 is a freshman in high school and is looked upon by his parents as the smartest of the boys; his IQ is around 120. He is tubby, quite tall and jolly; he is also shy and quite easily embarrassed. He is competent, earns his own money; on occasion, he affects a studied passivity. He plans to study for the ministry but has not yet joined the Church for he is not in favor of the merger contemplated by the Congregationalists.

L. Subject 26

S26 is a senior in high school, quite shy and inhibited. His
Subject: 25  
(Male; Age, 15)

Summary:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3 (1 minus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>5 (2 minus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appt:</td>
<td>WDJ(Dd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq:</td>
<td>Irregular trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp:</td>
<td>3/6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/R:</td>
<td>21.5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/IR:</td>
<td>8.6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hd</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>5 (1x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aq</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ls</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses on last three: 46%
Responses on first seven: 46%

Mr. Atwell's comment:
There are some neurotic tendencies but I can't get excited about them - except the low P. These tendencies are characteristic of adolescence. There is too much CF but there are FCs to compensate. There is some anxiety present: the immediate Hd response on the first card, the H to Hd ratio.

He wants to be different: there is definite non-conformity, he wants to stand out from the crowd. He should be able to get along with others (FC); he somewhat afraid to try (the Ms are not so good). The Hs show he is reasonably sensitive to the demands of others. He is definitely outgoing in nature (Exp.).
Subject: 26  
(Male; Age, 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>5 (4 minus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>1 (minus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appl</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq: Irregular to confused</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp:</td>
<td>Q/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/R:</td>
<td>22.6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/1R:</td>
<td>11.6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses on last three: 46%
Responses on first seven

Mr. Atwell's comment:
There is definitely color shock, neurotic shock. He has strong feelings of insecurity and is grasping for something to hang onto: precision alternatives, color description followed by Y on Card II, lack of H.

He is afraid of his own emotional reactions which are highly impulsive: he does not have enough control over them - no H, no FC with a lot of GF, C and S. There is not enough insecurity (Y and W) to compensate for the S and C. He is strong willed and demanding of others. He has a strong intellectual drive which is not realized - low F and lack of H with high W. His responses are not too good. There is overcompensation for inferiority feelings.

The lack of H is definitely an antisocial sign; he is fearful of interpersonal relations. He withdraws and this is his control.

In summary, this is definitely a neurotic record: insecurity and fear of people are the most important features with strong aggressive trends that do not come to expression. There may be a projection of these feelings on to others, thus intensifying his fears.

mother says he has always been this way but she is finally getting him out of it somewhat. She herself has a reputation for being outspoken and likes it. He is aware of this shyness and has tried to put himself forward more, in seeking the presidency of the group and in being more friendly with the girls. He plans to go to an agricultural school to study fruit growing (since gone) but is undecided about it. Mentally, he is somewhat slow, having an IQ slightly below normal; he is slow in speech. He feels he has more capacity than he does.
mother says he has always been this way but she is finally getting him out of it somewhat. She herself has a reputation for being outspoken and likes it. He is aware of this shyness and has tried to put himself forward more, in seeking the presidency of the group and in being more friendly with the girls. He plans to go to an agricultural school to study fruit growing (since gone) but is undecided about it. Mentally, he is somewhat slow, having an IQ slightly below normal; he is slow in speech. He feels he has more capacity than he does possess and probably has been sensitized on the point. His interests are agricultural and mechanical. He has always earned his own money (money is a concern to his parents — they are "thrifty") and has raised a sizeable sum for college.

M. Subject 29

S29 is the eldest girl of a family of five children; she is a freshman in highschool. The family is not too well off financially; her father has intermittent work and has occasionally been involved in illegal proceedings, one of which was recently publicized in the parish. He is shy and abusive; apparently he and his family have always been known to "keep their own company". He is also quite friendly. The mother is a friendly, hard-working woman, always ready to give her time and effort to civic functions (scouts, school lunch, etc.) and to church work (president of the middle aged women's society, finance committee, etc.). Recently she has gone to work to support the family; she is intensely proud. S29 does not like to do
Subject: 31
(Male; Age, 18)

Summary:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4 (1 minus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>5/43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rcc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

App: (W)D!(Dd)

Seq: Regular with irregular trends

Exp: 4/1

T/R: 16.2"

T/1R: 8.8"

Responses on last three responses on first seven: 62% (1)

Mr. Atwell's comment:

He overcompensates for color; he is unsure of his responses on cards VIII, IX and X; color disturbs him. The Ps are very high - he is overconventional because of anxiety, his fear of expressing his emotional reactions. There is a recognition of his own inabilities and an unwillingness to accept them. Yet he isn't going to be pushed around by anybody, but he comes around to doing the conventional thing. He overweights the Ds indicating he is over-impulsive and jumps to conclusions; thus the lowered Ps. The M is in terms of creativity, not fantasy. This tends to offset the compulsiveness of Ds. He can make use of this creativity but he doesn't as fully as he should. The FY indicates sensitivity (as well as feelings of insecurity) which is probably the reason for his over-conformity; his fear of criticism. He tends not to make friends, is shy and reserved (M, FY and Hto Hd); he prefers to work by himself. Feelings of insecurity are shown in the Y going off into intangibles and the H to Hd.

The over-all picture: anxiety, fear of his own emotional reactions, a marked effort to repress his affect, marked conformity as a means of getting along with people (insecurity). The M is cheerful, showing good potentialities. There is intellectual impulsiveness.
the work required by her mother's absence; she likes to dress
carelessly and to appear sophisticated. The sister next to her in
age is an exact contrast. She is a pretty girl, a little heavy
for her height, and very friendly. She is also shy and retiring,
does not often speak in public. She sings in the choir and does
it faithfully.

N. Subject 31

S31 is a second son, a senior in high school. His father
was sexton of the Church but resigned due to a difference of
opinion with the trustees; he has the reputation of not holding a
job long but works hard on any job he undertakes and does it per-
fectly or not at all. S31's mother has been organist of the Church
for years; the choir has a wide reputation and she has been the
organizer. She does part-time playing with orchestras and earns
a sizeable income thereby; she owns the house and spends much time
improving it. Recently S31 has joined the choir. He appears happy-
go-lucky and carefree. He is well liked by the other young people
but irritates a few (such as S23) by his actions in school. He
is a discipline problem to the teachers. On the other hand he is
shy and retiring. He has an old Ford which he bought by working
after school and Saturdays in a store; he was unable to take part
in school activities because of this.
II. General Considerations

One striking feature of the Rorschach results is the high amount of maladjustment and psychologic disturbance among the young people tested. Only three records were described by Mr. Atwell as healthy, those of S8, S9 and S25. Five were classified as neurotic, those of S1, S2, S20, S23 and S26. The others show varying degrees of disturbance.

One explanation is that the Rorschach test was not standardized on this age group. In adolescence, much more psychologic disturbance is to be expected; what would be termed neurotic at an older age is more or less a normal phenomenon in the transition from childhood to adulthood. In general, this explanation would seem to hold although it is by no means sufficient. Allowances were made for this factor by Mr. Atwell in his interpretations (see S25's summary). Further, if this were the only factor operative, one would expect the younger members to be more disturbed than the older ones. But this is not the case. Four out of the five neurotic protocols are those of older members.

Another explanation lies in the test situation: the test administrator was the minister of the Church; due to the young people's perception of him, there was constriction in the test situation. Mr. Atwell has noted some of the effects, particularly the heightened percentages of animal responses in some instances (evasiveness) and the constriction of movement responses. The high percentages of animal responses can be discounted to a certain extent but the con-
striction of movement responses presents a greater difficulty because what a subject might have done is clearly an inference and cannot enter into the interpretation. Yet this situational factor does not account for the large amount of disturbance shown in the records.

Northway's suggestion (pp. 56-57) is that maladjustment and psychologic constriction go with isolation. As already pointed out, the concept of isolation is not a useful one in sociometric position in reference to the youth group, consequently her hypothesis would not be tested. But there is negative evidence against it: neuroticism was not limited to those who were poorly integrated into the group. It is true that the neurotic picture is different for the leader than it is for the member poorly accepted by the group. Both S20 and S23 who were leaders show hysterical trends, a basic outgoingness and emotional lability. The results do not, however, show the simple correlation that Northway's hypothesis implies.

Still another explanation is that there were selective factors operative in choosing the subjects. All the members of the group were not tested; perhaps the minister selected those whom he thought were more disturbed and so forth. It appears that such selection was not operative: all who could be gotten to take the test were asked; there is good reason to suppose that those who could not be gotten to take the test were more severely disturbed and inhibited (for example, S27 and S28).

A further explanation is possible. The grave disturbance shown
in the subjects may be partially the result of social conditions pertaining in Westdale. Some hints of this appear in the brief descriptions accompanying each summary; a systematic portrayal could not be done within the limits of this project. Undoubtedly other factors of a more particular nature are operative, such as the relation to mother or father or sibling. The fact remains that the members as a group show considerable mental disturbance. Thus it must be concluded that the Rorschach records highlight the necessity for a more effective and intensive program of education which aims at the betterment of mental health among these young people.
CHAPTER VIII

ASSESSMENT OF THE DATA
AT THE LEVEL OF INDIVIDUAL ANALYSIS

As was cited in the first chapter, there are three levels of conceptualization at which study of group change may be made, at the individual level, the level of group process and the institutional level. In this chapter, data on each individual are gathered to see how the material meshes together, whether there is individual consistency. Each subject is presented separately.

I. Comparison of Sociometric, Discussional and Rorschach Results

In the individual presentations which follow, all the data obtained from the techniques used (except from the Rorschach test) are summarized first for each subject, an interpretation is then made and finally this interpretation is compared with Mr. Atwell's interpretation of the subject's Rorschach protocol.

Since all the data will appear in brief, summarized form and in the same form for each subject, the sources of the data are reviewed here. Two sociometric tests were given approximately two months apart, the first in October and the second late in December of 1948. Each person was asked to choose three members he would like as co-workers on a committee of his choice; these choices for each test are listed in each individual's summary. As a result of
this choosing, certain members were chosen by other members; when this occurred, the numbers of the members who chose the subject are listed and a score immediately follows. This score was obtained by assigning arbitrary weights to each choice by another. If the subject was chosen first by another, he was given five points for it; similarly he was given three points for being chosen second by another and two points for being chosen third. The total of such points is his score. There appears also in the summary of data those whom the subject rejected (if any) and those by whom he was rejected (if any). Rejection refers to the third part of the sociometric test sheet (see Illustration I, p. 29a): whenever a check was made in the "would rather not work with" column, this was considered to be rejection or disliking of that person.

The data obtained from this third part of the test sheet are further summarized for each individual in the preference scores. Each check in the "like" column was given an arbitrary weight of plus one, each check in the "indifferent" column was given a value of zero, and each check in the "dislike" column was given a score of minus one. By adding these points or scores and dividing by the total number of these scores, two means or averages were obtained. The first was the preference the subject expressed toward the members in the group by adding all the points from his expression of liking, indifference and disliking, and by averaging these, his expressed (or given) preference score was obtained. In a similar fashion, the liking, indifference and disliking expressed by all
other members toward the subject were scored and averaged to obtain his received preference score (this may be also called his acceptability score). Both these preference scores are listed for each subject on each test and are gotten from Table IB for test one and Table IIB for test two. Occasionally in the interpretations, the individual's expressed or received preference will be referred to in more detail, i.e., whom he preferred to work with, was indifferent to or disliked working with and vice versa. The tables on raw preference data (IBa and IIBa) are the sources of this information.

In the individual summaries presented in this chapter, one further sociometric measure is included, that of sex liking. This refers to the first or "like" column of the third part of the sociometric test sheet: 1) what percentage of the boys and girls the subject preferred to work with; 2) what percentage of the boys and girls preferred to work with the subject. A boy might like to work with only boys or with some boys and all the girls, and so on. The percentages for each subject are obtained from Tables IC (test one) and IIC (test two). Sex choice, whom the subject chose or who chose the subject on the basis of sex, will be referred to occasionally in the interpretations and is gotten from the same tables; similarly, sex rejection is mentioned and the information is contained in the same tables.

Data from the discussions will also appear in the individual summaries which follow. This information is gotten from two sources.
The first source is the interaction records which covered eleven meetings from April 15 to December 5, 1948. The subject's attendance record is given first for these eleven meetings, then the number of meetings in which he made no originations and the number of meetings in which he had no receptions. After this, there follow two percentages, one for his originations and one for his receptions. The original sources for these averages are the individual meetings: the number of his originations and his receptions were divided by the total originations and receptions for that meeting in order to get the subject's percentages. These percentages for all the members are contained in Table IVB. The different percentages for each individual were summed and divided by the number of meetings he attended in order to get his average percentages of origination and of reception, which appear in the summaries that follow. These are gotten directly from Table IVB.

The other source of discussion data is the sound recordings which covered three meetings in the spring of 1949. The number of meetings attended is listed and the subject's percentage of origination which was obtained by the same averaging process as outlined above. (No average of receptions was possible since direction of an origination, who was the recipient of it, could not be obtained from the sound recordings.) The percentage of the total time which each member consumed was figured out for each meeting as well as the average time in seconds for all his originations. These averages which are to be found in Tables VA, VB and VC,
were further averaged for each member over the three meetings and the results appear in Table VD. Figures from the latter table are the ones which appear below under the heading of sound recordings.

A. Subject 1

Female; Age, 16
Summary of data from techniques:
Sociometric:
Preference scores: given .000; Received -.111
Sex liking: given none; received 13% boy; 11% girl.
Test 2: Chooses S28, S9 and S8. Rejects none. Chosen by S8 (2nd); score is 2.
Rejected by S2, S12, S17, S22, S29, S31.
Preference scores: given .000; received -.055.

Discussion:
Interaction records: attended 5 meetings, absent 6.
No originations in 3 meetings, no receptions in 4.
Average: origination 2.8%; reception 0.2%.
Sound recordings: no attendance.

On both sociometric tests, S1 shows indifference toward all the members of the group. The weighted scores of group preference expressed toward her are in both cases negative, slightly less so on the second test; these would be more negative were it not for the fact that some members expressed indiscriminate liking. She is rejected by more members than anyone else. S1 is thus not integrated into the group. A strong tendency to leave was predicted and this was demonstrated in her attendance record in the spring of 1949 (47%). On the first test, positive preference expressed by boys
and girls is low and about equal for both; on the second test, no boy says he would like to work with her but positive preference by the girls has tripped. She chooses only girls on both tests. Some difficulty is suggested in boy-girl relations; actually S1 dates boys from out of town and this may be the explanation. On choice, she chooses only one who chooses her (S8 on the second test); some irreality is shown in her choice of S9 whom she does not know very well. However, her choices are more on her own age level than for others.

Discussion data indicates that her participation level is low; in five meetings she attended out of eleven (interaction records) she does not originate in three. In one meeting she accounted for 11% of the originations but had no receptions. So discussion and sociometric data seem to bear each other out: she is a shy and retiring girl and not accepted or recognized in the group. Some remedial action was indicated and the observer spoke to the AA about S1, stressing two points: 1) her father having died, the AA might function as a substitute father; 2) her lack of inclusion in the group might be mitigated by his attention.

The Rorschach results fit the above data; S1 has an anxiety neurosis. She is insecure and although having a capacity for good social rapport she is too fearful to use it. The preoccupation with death may have some linkage with her father's death. The strong withdrawal and schizoid tendencies may be hitched with her regression in speech. In general, Northway's proposition is upheld, that con-
comitant personality maladjustment accompanies extremely low
position in the group. In S1's case, the capacity to achieve a
healthier adjustment is a good sign.

B. Subject 2

Female; Age, 18
Summary of data from techniques:
   Sociometric:
   Test 1: Chooses S20, S23, S8. Rejects S1, S3, S22, S29,
       S30, S31.  
       Chosen by S11 and S19 (2nd), S31 (3rd); score is 8.
       Preference scores: given .161; received .556.
       Sex liking: given 27% boy; 40% girl;
       received 50% boy, 53% girl.
   Test 2: Chooses S8, S20, S23. Rejects S1.
       Chosen by S23 (2nd), S3 (3rd); score is 5.
       Preference scores: given .050; received .316.
       Sex liking: given 00% boy, 14% girl.
       received 33% boy, 29% girl.

   Discussion:
   Interaction records: attended 8 meetings, absent 3.
   No originations in 5 meetings, no receptions in 4.
   Averages: origination 1.5%; reception 1.2%.
   Sound recordings: attended 3 meetings.
   Averages: origination 5.33%; time consumed 2.8;
   time per origination 4.03".
   (Leader once: origination 10%; time consumed 5.7%;
   average time per origination 4.6"

Sociometric results are on the low positive side for S2's own
expression, becoming lower on the second test; group preference is
in the middle range but shows the same downward trend. The lowness
of her expressed score is due to her high rejection on the first
test; it is interesting to note that all whom she rejects, except
S31, are not well known to her. This suggests fear of people rather
than dislike; it is directed mostly to girls. S31 is the clown in
her class; she may dislike being the object of his jokes. Although
girls threaten her the most, she chooses only them; her expressed preference shows the same trend. A difficulty in boy-girl relations is indicated; the difficulty is not reflected in the group's expression of sex liking, however. The difference between expressed and received preference scores is significant; she has not been in the group too long and this means that she is not able to assess properly the attitudes of others toward her, her tendency being to err on the side of rejection and indifference. Definite psychologic constriction is shown. Discussion data substantiates this. She took no part in five out of eight meetings covered by the interaction records and her origination and reception averages are quite low. The average for the meetings sound-recorded shows an increase in origination but this is traceable to her leading a meeting.

The Rorschach summary coincides with this appraisal. She has feelings of inferiority, fear of being ridiculed, poor interpersonal relations, strong aggressive feelings and fear of them, psychologic constriction (neurotic shock and anxiety).

The difference between S1 and S2, relative to Northway's assumption, may be noted in passing. S2 cannot be described as being an isolate in the group, yet her maladjustment appears more serious than S1's. This points up the value of having more than one indicator, that of isolation in the group. Thus the individuals chosen, expressed preference, rejection (in particular) and characteristic participation patterns may serve as additional indicators in assessing the idiosyncratic pattern.
Female; Age, 20

Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:

Test 1: Chooses S9, S8, S32. Rejects none.
Chosen by S26 (3rd); score is 2. Rejected by S23.
Preference scores: given .270; received .519.
Sex liking: given 27% boy, 30% girl;
received 88% boy, 72% girl.

Test 2: Chooses S9, S7, S6. Rejects none.
Chosen by S7 (2nd); score is 2. Rejected by none.
Preference scores: given .158; received .474.
Sex liking: given 00% boy, 21% girl;
received 50% boy, 43% girl.

Discussion:

Interaction records: attended 9 meetings, absent 2.
No originations in 6 meetings, no receptions in 7.
Averages: origination 0.9%; reception 2.8%.
(Leader once: origination 00%; reception 21%).
Sound recordings: attended 2 meetings, absent 1.
No originations in either meeting.

S6 has a low positive position on sociometric choice, a high
middle standing on preference which drops slightly on the second
test. Her own preference does not match the group's preference
and goes down as the group has shrunk. She chooses only girls and
each time two of these are her sisters; although a member of the
group for a long time, she does not feel secure enough to venture
much beyond her sister relations. From a rather even preference
toward working with boys and girls on the first test, she would like
to work with no boys on the second; her feelings do not coincide
with group expression, the percentage of boys always being greater
than that of girls. However, there is a large drop in boy percent-
age, suggesting that heterosexual relations have changed for her in
the group and this is the case; she is worried about dating and has
not expressed interest in any of the boys now in the group (she is
older than all the boys). Discussion data shows a very low level of participation; though leader once in the series of meetings covered by the interaction records, she made no personal contribution. Her average of receptions is as high as it is because she led this meeting; the group does not pay her much attention. In meetings sound-recorded, she made no recorded origination. The difference between her own expressed preference and that of the group is a little more difficult to interpret here because she is an old member; it may mean not so much a psychologic constriction as dissatisfaction with the group. The fall in percentage of liking expressed toward the boys suggests that she is dissatisfied with the smaller group. However, her choice of sisters and her low participation level strongly underline psychologic constriction; this appears to be the explanation. She is inhibited, unsure of herself in relation to others and thus is passive and retiring.

Features of the Rorschach coincide with the above picture: her passivity, her fear of new situations, her lack of skill in being friendly. However, the motional lability is not shown in the data above nor her repressed aggressive tendencies. In this respect, she differs from S2, for S6 shows no rejections; her defenses are working better, she is not as severely maladjusted. The overall picture is of an inhibited and shy girl, not extremely maladjusted and with not too much ability. Sex is a problem area for her.
Female; Age, 16

Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:

Test 1: Chooses none. Rejects none.
Chosen by S29 (1st), S26, S28, S32 (2nd);
score is 14; Rejected by S23.
Preference scores: given .000; received .556.
Sex liking: given none;
received 75% boy, 53% girl.

Test 2: Chooses S8, S6, (S32). Rejects none.
Chosen by S29 (1st), S6, S17, S30 (2nd), S9 (3rd).
Score is 16. Rejected by none.
Preference scores: given .050; received .632.
Sex liking: given 0% boy, 7% girl;
received 67% boy, 57% girl.

Discussion:

Interaction records: attended 5 meetings, absent 6.
No originations in 2 meetings, no receptions in 2.
Averages: origination 4.1%; reception 4.4%.

Sound recordings: attended 2 meetings, absent 1.
Averages: origination 4.1%; time consumed 2.05%;
time per origination 3.5".
(Leader once: origination 7%; time consumed 4%;
average time per origination 5.0").

S7 expresses complete indifference on the first test and chooses
no one; on the second test she chooses her three sisters and ex-
presses liking only toward S8. This is in marked contrast to group
expression: she is in the sub-leader class with weighted scores of
14 and 16; her received preference score is in the high middle range
on the first test, second highest on the second test. Integration
in the group is unstable due to her feelings, not the group's. She
has been a member a long time and so her indifference may represent
dissatisfaction with the group but the difference suggests that
there is psychologic constriction which inhibits her in her apprais-
al of reality. This is further borne out in her choice of none but
sisters, and one of these had left the group. Interpersonal re-
lations are a problem area, and apparently heterosexual relations too for she is indifferent toward the boys even though they like her very much. The discussion data does not fit in so well with this picture of her. Although she did not participate in two out of five meetings she attended (interaction records), her averages are above the group's. Thus although she does not always participate and is frequently quite passive, she can join in rather freely. She is not as inhibited behaviorally as S6. This tends to minimize the interpretation of psychologic constriction.

From the Rorschach summary, S7 appears to be oversensitive, afraid to express her emotions and careful in new situations. This fits the sociometric results and the interpretation of psychologic constriction. However, she shows a strong intellectual drive and has the capacity for it; this seems to coincide with her ability to participate. Actually she has had little chance to express this drive; S8 is more dominant in the home, S23 has been classpresident in the school. But the conflict is not merely external, it is also internal, her oversensitivity and her fear of her own emotional reactions and of new situations. Yet she shows good capacity for interpersonal relationships and is not as indifferent as she seems (overconventionality). Thus she is still able to participate. Except for the fantasy, it is a healthy record and she may work through her constrictions.
Female; Age, 19
Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:
Test 1: Chooses S17, S20, S26. Rejects none.
Chosen by S17, S16, S32 (1st), S1, S6, S9 and S20
(2nd), S2, S13, S14 and S24 (3rd); score is 25.
Preference scores: given *774; received .667.
Sex liking: given 82% boy, 75% girl;
received 88% boy, 58% girl.
Test 2: Chooses S17, S1, S2. Rejects none.
Chosen by S2, S7, S9, S12 and S17 (1st), S1, S6,
S15 and S29 (3rd); score is 22. Rejected by none.
Preference scores: given *695; received .737.
Sex liking: given 100% boy, 79% girl;
received 83% boy, 64% girl.

Discussion:
Interaction record: attended 9 meetings, absent 2.
Originated in every meeting, no receptions in 3.
Averages: origination 19.8%; reception 17.7%.
(Leader twice: origination 44%; reception 60%)
origination 30%; reception 64%)
time per origination 6.2s.

S8, from being one of the leaders on the first test, became
the leader on the second; she ranks highest on both choice and pre-
ference scores. Further, she expresses high preference which in-
creases on the second test. She apparently would like to work with
everyone but S22 and S23; this is probably linked with differences
already mentioned. Thus she is well integrated in the group at a
high level, except for the afore mentioned conflict. She is well
liked by the boys. Her own preference scores are higher than the
group scores, indicating that she misjudges the feeling toward her
slightly and that she errs on the side of expansiveness. Thus she
is outgoing in nature. The discussion averages show the same out-
goingness and ease of expression. However the high averages are
inflated by the percentages when she led the meetings. Inspecting
Table IVB, it appears that she either participates minimally or maximally. As a leader she consistently dominated the discussion. Thus her behavior exhibits two characteristics: she has a high drive to lead; yet she does not appear compulsively consistent in her high participation. The latter is probably a healthy sign.

The Rorschach test gives a healthy record. She has good capacity for interpersonal relations but there is impulsiveness and immaturity, centering around fear of her own emotional reactions. She has a high drive to make a good impression and her ability is good. In general, this coincides with the data above, all except the immaturity and impulsiveness. This may be what the AA objected to in her. The sex shock in the Rorschach could not be inferred from the other data; it probably relates to her enforced marriage to S17 (the protocol was obtained a little prior to the estimated date of conception].

F. Subject 9

Female; Age, 15
Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:

Test 1: Chooses S14, S8, S21. Rejects none.
Chosen by: S6 (1st), 1 and 15 (3rd); score is 2.
Rejected by S14.
Preference scores: given .806; received .481.
Sex liking: given 91% boy, 75% girl;
          received 50% boy, 53% girl.

Test 2: Chooses S6, S11, S7. Rejects none.
Chosen by: S6 (1st), S1 and S15 (2nd), S30 (3rd);
score is 1.2. Rejected by S11.
Preference scores: given 1.000; received .471.
Sex liking: given 100% boy, 100% girl;
          received 50% boy, 43% girl.
Discussion:
Interaction records: attended 6 meetings, absent 5.
Originated in every meeting; no receptions in 3.
Averages: origination 6.9%; reception 3%.
Sound recordings; attended 3 meetings.
Averages: origination 9.33; time consumed 5.75%
time per origination 6.25".

S9 is in the middle range on choice and preference scores expressed toward her in the first test; in the second test, she rises to the sub-leader level but the group preference is slightly lower. In both tests, the group preference scores are far below her expressed scores; the complete liking on the second test may have been affected by her election to the office of secretary just prior to the giving of the test. But she does a poor job of assessing the situation: she likes the group much more than the group likes her. Not psychologic constriction but an outgoing impulsiveness seems to be the basis for the poor assessment. Unreality is demonstrated in her choice too: she picks older members, frequently the leaders, yet in two instances her choices are met by rejection (both boys). Yet, she is rather astute in her choices; there seems to be a drive to get ahead in the group and she chooses well. She is a younger and quite new member. The discussion data shows the same outgoingness. Her origination average is over that of the group; no other young member has such an average. Her receptions are lower which means that the group is apt to pay less attention. Her origination average picks up on the meetings which were sound recorded; she is gaining confidence in self-expression, and may become a dominant participant and leader.
The Rorschach test gives somewhat the same picture, except that the aggressive trends shown could not be inferred from the data above. The misjudging of group feeling appears to be linked with her needs; perhaps the impulsiveness is an outlet for her aggressive feelings. On the whole, outgoingness is the main characteristic and the record is quite healthy, considering all the circumstances.

G. Subject 12

Female; Age, 15
Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:
Test 1: Chooses S14, S23, S17. Rejects S1, S3, S4, S15, S24, S25, S27, S28 and S29. Chosen by S20 and S28 (3rd); score is 4. Rejected by none.
Preference scores: given .194; received .593.
Sex liking: given 45% boy, 50% girl; received 63% boy, 58% girl;
Test 2: Chooses S8, S26, S32. Rejects S1, S22, S23, S24, S27, S28, S29, S30. Chosen by S25 (3rd); score is 2. Rejected by none.
Preference scores: given -.053; received .383.
Sex liking: given 33% boy, 36% girl; received 33% boy, 36% girl.

Discussion:
Interaction records: attended 9 meetings, absent 2.
No originations in 5 meetings, no receptions in 7.
Averages: origination 0.8%; reception 0.7%.
Sound recordings: attended 3 meetings.
No recorded origination.

The sociometric scores S12 receives from the group are in the middle range on the first test; and although remaining there on the second test, they have dropped significantly. Her expressed preference scores are consistently lower and show the same drop. The lowness is due to her high rejection rate, nine on the first and
eight on the second. She is one of the younger members of the group. Both her choice and rejection are significant for she rejects largely her own age mates and chooses only older members. S12 thus likes to appear too mature for her years, is dependent upon elders and has difficulty with her peers. This may be the constriction that makes her underestimate reality: her liking for the group is much lower than the group's for her. S12's choices and rejections also show an interesting shift. She chooses no one on the second test whom she chose before; she also rejects S22 and S23, something that no other member did. She has aligned herself with the new leader. Her rejections plus the other features point to two inferences: she has trouble in interpersonal relations; she vents her feelings and thus may have strong aggressive tendencies. She shows constriction in group participation: out of nine meetings attended (interaction records) she failed to participate in five and had no receptions in seven. Both averages are very low. This is even more extreme in the meetings which were sound recorded; she shows no origination at all. She appears to be a severely inhibited girl with a lot of inner tension, possibly a good deal of inferiority.

From the Rorschach summary, much of the above is explained. She is oversensitive and has strong anxiety; her coping mechanisms are passivity and autistic thinking. Yet she is not going to be pushed around; she has strong aggressive tendencies. Although having a good capacity for interpersonal relations, people arouse
Anxiety in her and she has to "cut them down to size". In the above data, by liking older members, she mitigates the threat. The overall picture is definite immaturity for her age.

H. Subject 15

Female; age, 14

Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:

Test 1: Chooses S30, S13, S9. Rejects S26, S27, S28. Chosen by S30 (3rd); score is 2. Rejected by S12. Preference scores: given -.032; received .185. Sex liking: given 00% boy, 10% girl; received 13% boy, 26% girl.

Test 2: Chooses S30, S9, S8. Rejects none. Chosen by S30 (1st); score is 5. Rejected by none. Preference scores: given 1.000; received .278. Sex liking: given 100% boy, 100% girl; received 00% boy, 36% girl.

Discussion:

Interactions: attended 7 meetings, absent 4. No originations or receptions in 5 meetings. Averages: origination 0.4%; reception 1.6%.

Sound recordings: attended 2 meetings, absent 1. Averages: originations 1.5%; time consumed 0.7%; time per origination 4".

Since no Rorschach was given S15, a few descriptive remarks are made here. Her family is affiliated with the Unitarian Church; S15 teaches a Sunday School class there. Her father is a farmer; her mother helps teach a small kindergarten school and is very good with children. S15 is the eldest, there being three smaller brothers. She is heavy of build, jolly but shy, a freshman in highschool. She is very friendly with S30 whose sister, S13, was long a member of the group; this friendship is her major reason for coming.

The sociometric scores of group expression toward S15 are low positive, increasing on the second test. This was to be expected.
for S15 is a very new member of the group. The significant characteristic is the relation of her expressed preference scores to those of the group. On the first test, hers was very low, due in part to her rejections; on the second, she shows complete liking. The latter is not a true estimate of her feeling for she could not get over her dislike of S28 and S29 (age mates belonging to poorer families in the parish) nor her aversion to boys. Both scores show an improper estimate of reality, the first is constrictive and the second is impulsive and expansive. She appears to be essentially outgoing in nature, yet she is somewhat insecure in interpersonal relations. Further, she has aggressive tendencies which bother her and over which she has only partial control; her reaction to frustration or insecurity would be stubbornness and emotional lability. The discussion data emphasizes the inhibitory aspects. Out of seven meetings (interaction records), she fails to participate in five and her origination rate is very low; her reception rate is higher which may show that the group exhibits some deference toward her. In the meetings which were sound recorded she shows an increase in origination. In summary, she is basically outgoing in nature marked by impulsiveness and some emotional lability; at the behavioral level, this is not expressed in group activity so there is conflict. There are signs of control and growth so that the conflict is not too severe.
Male; Age, 20
Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:
Test 1: Chooses S8, S14, S13. Rejects S1, S10, S26
and S29.
Chosen by S3 and S24 (1st), S4, S12 and S23 (3rd);
score is 19. Rejected by none.
Preference score: given .258; received .741.
Sex liking: given 40% boy, 38% girl;
received 100% boy, 65% girl.
Test 2: Chooses S8, S7, S30. Rejects S1, S26, S29
and S33.
Chosen by S3 (1st), S24 and S31 (2nd), S22 and S23
(3rd); score is 12. Rejected by none.
Preference scores: given .200; received .611.
Sex liking: given 20% boy, 47% girl;
received 50% boy, 53% girl.

Discussion:
Interaction records: attended 11 meetings.
No origins or receptions in 5 meetings.
Averages: originations 2.5%; reception 2.9%
(Leader once: origination 7%; reception 13%).
Sound recordings: attended 3 meetings.
Averages: origination 1.67%; time consumed 1.03%
time per origination 5.6".

No Rorschach was given S17, so a brief description follows. He
is the youngest son of a family of four; his father died when he was
young. His mother has been very overprotective, both toward him and
S16 who is the next older brother. S17, though tough and strong of
build and popular with the boys, is very dependent and easily hurt.
His mother was sorry that he had to marry and take on such "large
responsibilities" at so young an age (he is 20). S17 is jolly, likes
to joke but is abusive and rather shy. He is not mature in handling
his affairs. He sings in the choir faithfully and has a fine, well-
trained voice.

S17 stands quite high on sociometric scores expressed toward
him but both preference and choice scores show a decline on the second test. Appearing as a potential leader, he remains a diminished one. His own preference expression is much lower than that of the group toward him, partly due to his rejections. A partial explanation of this constriction and failure in reality assessment may be found in his sex choices and preferences. Out of six choices, he chooses only one boy. Preference, which on the first test was slightly in favor of the boys, is skewed in the opposite direction (likes seven girls, only one boy). This is all the more remarkable when group preferences are studied; he is much better liked by boys than girls. As the AA once commented, "SL7 likes the girls". Another interesting feature is that he rejects only girls. This suggests a heavy dependence on and interest in the female sex; what the boys feel is of little consequence. Moreover, if the girls are not responsive, he rejects them. This apparently ties in with his experience with his mother: women give affection and he needs affection for he is very dependent. Strong aggressive trends are also apparent and they are fused with his dependency needs. There are also feelings of inferiority and insecurity, what expansiveness he has is constricted. There is also immaturity which might explain why he remained a potential leader somewhat diminished.

On the discussion data, he shows low participation. He attended all the meetings (interaction records) but did not participate in five. His origination and reception averages are below average and
would be lower still if he had not led a meeting. The origination average on the meetings which were sound recorded is closer to his accustomed group behavior. Though an old member, constriction is the important characteristic and probably is linked with the constriction mentioned above.

J. Subject 20

Female; Age, 24

Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:

Test 1: Chooses S16, S8, S12. Rejects none.
Choosen by S2, S11, S22 and S28 (1st), S3, S13, S18, S23 and S24 (3rd); score is 25. Rejected by none.
Preference scores: given 1.000; received .615.
Sex liking: given 100% boy, 100% girl;
received 88% boy, 79% girl.

Test 2: Chooses none. Rejects none.
Choosen by S23, S24 and S28 (1st), S2 (2nd);
score is 13. Rejected by none.
Preference scores: given 1.000; received .389.
Sex liking: given 100% boy, 100% girl;
received 50% boy, 28% girl.

Discussion:

Interaction records: attended 5 meetings, absent 6.
Originated and had receptions in every meeting.
Averages: origination 16.6%; reception 24.6%.
(Leader once: origination 18%; receptions 57%).
Sound recordings: attended 2 meetings, absent 1.
Averages: origination 9.5%; time consumed 13.55%;
time per origination 12.65".

S20 was one of the leaders on the first test: her choice score was second by one point, her preference score tied for first. On the second test, both scores diminished remarkably. Since she is an old leader and has held many jobs in the group, the scores show the rapid decline of a leader. Yet she expresses liking for all members on both tests. This does not represent her true feelings, as cited before; there is strong reason to believe that she felt it
wrong to show preference in a church group. This distortion of her actual feelings suggests that repression may be a characteristic coping mechanism (a strong super-ego). Whatever the reason, the universal liking is also indicative; she is essentially outgoing in nature. The failure to assess reality better shows this outgoingness to be impulsive in nature. The discussion data shows similar trends. In five meetings (interaction records), she participates in every one. Moreover her origination rate is very high and is consistent; her reception rate would be nearer this level if she had not led a meeting. On the sound recorded meetings she has a somewhat lower rate. She is not inhibited in discussions and verbalizes easily; since she is so consistent, there is a compulsive quality to it. She is essentially outgoing in behavior.

The Rorschach record shows her to be severely maladjusted. The severity of this maladjustment does not appear to the writer to be in the above data, except for two features: her need to show universal liking and her high, consistent participation rate. Generally, the data fits the Rorschach findings in other respects, except the mood swings and temper tantrums. The latter do not seem consonant with her leadership position and the consistency of her verbalization; nor has the observer noted such behavior. There is a likelihood that she does behave in this manner, however. She is the baby in the family and evidently her mother does many menial jobs for her; her mother may come in for some abuse. In summary, the severity of her maladjustment was not indicated by the data; however,
the outgoing, labile type of personality was shown and the tendency toward repression, both of which are marked features in hysteria.

K. Subject 22

Female, Age 19
Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:
Test 1: Chooses S20, S17, S23. Rejects S1, S1.0, S11 and S24.
  Chosen by none. Rejected by none.
  Preference scores: given .097; received .593.
  Sex liking: given 27% boy, 20% girl.
  received 63% boy, 58% girl.
  Chosen by S31 (1st); score is 5. Rejected by S1.2.
  Preference scores: given .579; received .421.
  Sex liking: given 100% boy, 36% girl.
  received 50% boy, 43% girl.

Discussion:
Interaction records: attended 11 meetings.
  No originations in 4 meetings, no receptions in 6.
  Averages: origination 4.9%; reception 4.6%.
  (Leader once: origination 3%; reception 6%)
Sound recordings: attended 3 meetings.
  Averages: origination 6.67%; time consumed 13.03%;
  time per origination 11.03".

No Rorschach test was given S22 so a brief description is given here. She was adopted in infancy by the AA and his wife. Since they could have no children naturally and efforts to adopt others were unsuccessful, S22 was the center of parental affection, especially the AA's. (A large need to give succorance was and is present in the AA. He married the wife in spite of a condition which made her a semi-invalid for years. Later this was remedied and she took a more active part in community affairs. This change in status made it increasingly impossible for him to carry on normal hetero-
sexual relation; a normal, healthy female was a threat when a dependent one was not.) They thought her spoiled and later adopted 323 when both were eight years old. The latter has been a model child, closely bound to home. Around the age of twelve, the parents began having trouble with 322; she became "boy crazy". In their minds, this has persisted until now and is worsening. She graduated from high school last year and is now in training as a nurse. Her school marks were low; her parents say she is lazy around the house. She does her work in the hospital with little enthusiasm. She feigns a blase manner, likes clothes and affects a slouch. 322 is an old member of the group. She was nominated for the presidency last year but was beaten by 38; her father was disappointed that she didn't get the job.

Her choice position is nil in the group on the first test; it rises on the second. Yet her preference scores show she is well accepted by the group; she shows a decline on the second test but this is relatively slight positionally. The significant feature is her own expressed preference scores, quite low on the first test and rather high on the second. From under-estimation she swings to over-estimation; this suggests that her view of the group varies easily, is affected rather directly by the mood she is in. Emotional lability and aggressive tendencies are suggested by her rejections, impulsiveness by her over-estimation of the group. Basically, she is outgoing in nature, but her moodiness and expression thereof may constrict her expansiveness; this instability may
account for her failure to be a leader in the group. It should be noted also that with her declining estimate of the group there also appears only a slight interest in the boys; in an expansive mood, she would like to work with them all. At the time the second sociometric test was given she was going with S31. Constriction and expansiveness thus seen linked with dependency needs, inferred from her over-interest in boys.

Discussion data shows considerable fluctuation (see Table IVB). Out of eleven meetings attended (interaction records), she does not originate in four yet her percentage for one meeting went as high as one-seventh of the whole discussion. The same holds in the meetings which were sound recorded. Normally, some fluctuation would be expected; here it appears marked and characteristic of S22, confirming the inferences reached from sociometric data.

L. Subject 23

Female; Age, 19

Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:

Test 1: Chooses S14, S20, S17. Rejects S1, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S10, S25, S26 and S27.
   Chosen by S19 (1st), S2 and S12 (2nd), S18, S22 and S22 (3rd); score is 17. Rejected by none.
   Preference scores: given .194; received .667.
   Sex liking: given 45% boy, 55% girl;
               received 75% boy, 63% girl.

Test 2: Chooses S20, S2, S17. No preference.
   Chosen by S22, (2nd), S2 and S24 (3rd); score is 7.
   Rejected by S12.
   Preference scores: given none; received .350.
   Sex liking: given none
               received 33% boy, 43% girl.
Discussion:

Interaction records: attended 10 meetings, absent 1.
Originated at every meeting; 1 with no receptions;
Averages: origination 17.2%; receptions 16.3%.
(Leader twice: origination 13%; reception 45%)
origination 8%; reception 23%)

Sound recordings: attended 2 meetings, absent 1.
Averages: origination 24%; time consumed 20.7%;
time per origination 7.85".

From a rather high position on choice and preference, S23
drops significantly on the second test. This represents a moving
toward the low level of her expressed preference on the first test;
she states no preference on the second test. Her low, expressed
score is largely due to the large number of her rejections, the
highest in the group. She thus has definite opinions about the
members and expresses it easily; emotional lability, strong aggres-
sive trends and perhaps insecurity lie behind this easy expression
of rejection. The net result is a psychologic constriction of her
ability to assess reality. The discussion shows high origination
and reception throughout; behaviorally, she verbalizes easily, al-
most compulsively. Thus outgoingness is a characteristic and fits
with the ease of expression noted in her rejections. A further
interesting feature of her origination rate is that it drops when
she leads a meeting; apparently acting as the target for discus-
sion threatens her. In summary, S23 is a girl who expresses herself
easily, even her aggressive feelings. This may explain the drop
in her sociometric position; such is a distinct threat to group
solidarity. Her outgoingness and constriction conflict.

The data is borne out in the Rorschach record: she is neurotic
with hysterical trends. She is insecure in interpersonal relations and overreacts; thus she transfers her feelings easily to others. The strong aggressive trends aid and abet this; control is lacking. Unlike S20, her intellectual capacity is impaired.

M. Subject 24

Male; Age, 16
Summary of data from techniques:
Sociometric:
Test 1: Chooses S17, S20, S3. Rejects none.
Chosen by S16 (3rd); score is 2. Rejected by S12, S22, S25 and S29.
Preference scores: given .355; received .185.
Sex liking: given 50% boy; 28% girl;
received 43% boy; 30% girl.
Test 2: Chooses S20, S17, S23. Rejects none.
Chosen by S27 (1st); score is 5. Rejected by S12 and S29.
Preference scores: given .200; received .263.
Sex liking: given 40% boy, 13% girl;
received 40% boy, 30% girl.

Discussion:
Interaction records: attended 7 meetings, absent 4.
Originated in every meeting; no receptions in 4.
Averages: origination 4.1%; reception 2.1%.
Sound recordings: attended 2 meetings, absent 1.
Averages: origination 1.5%; time consumed 91.95%.
   time per origination 11.6".

The significant feature in the sociometric data for S24 is his choice of co-workers. He is one of the younger, newer members, yet he chooses older members and leaders in the group. On test two, he is chosen by S27 who, according to S24, is a close friend; yet S24 does not choose him as a co-worker. With the exception of S27 on the second test, S24's expressed preference shows the same characteristic without exception: he is indifferent to every one of his own age group. This is borne out in those who reject him; with the ex-
ception of S22, all are younger members. He is not able to reject them in return. Dependency and passivity constrict his assessment of reality. There is however a reality component: S24 got his job as treasurer through the efforts of S16, an older leader; his expressed preference scores are rather close to those of the group. The relation of his expressed preference scores to those of the group's shows a shift: from overestimation, he changes to a slight underestimation. This might have been expected for the group has changed, there are less older members to satisfy his dependency needs. He is not aware of the improved feeling of the group toward him. In the discussion data, he participates to the extent of the average in those meetings covered by interaction records, but this falls markedly in the later meetings (sound recorded). Receptions are lower than originations. Not much significance can be attached to this data other than the normalcy of his participation and the lack of attention, relatively, by the group.

The Rorschach record is rather unusual. The very great drive for intellectual achievement is an outstanding feature; Atwell ascribes it to his need for affection. Another feature is the high M and S; there are strong aggressive feelings but they are worked out in fantasy. The IV and FY show control through placidity and definite feelings of inferiority. This turmoil, lived out almost entirely in his head, may explain the fatigue after school activities, mentioned by the mother; it may also explain his choice of older co-workers. In summary, the high drive toward intellectual
achievement as a means of gaining affection, the placidity and the inferiority fit with the above data, but the strong aggressive feelings and the great amount of inner living do not show in the sociometric and discussion data, although the resultant immaturity is indicated.

N. Subject 25

Male; age, 15.

Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:
Preference scores: given .419; received .148.
Sex liking: given 70% boy, 43% girl; received 43% boy, 15% girl.
Test 2: Chooses S31, S26, S12. Rejects none.
Chosen by none. Rejected by none.
Preference score: given .526; received .316.
Sex liking: given 80% boy, 40% girl; received 20% boy, 36% girl.

Discussion:
Interaction records: attended 11 meetings.
No originations in 8 meetings; no receptions in 10.
Averages: origination 0.4%; receptions 0.7%.
Sound recordings: attended 3 meetings.
Averages: origination 1.33%; time consumed 0.3%;
time per origination 2".

Superficially, S25's choice pattern resembles S24's in that older members are chosen. S25 also rejects age mates on the first test and clearly shows a preference for boys. The second test shows these changes: he chooses a girl of his own age who formerly rejected him; he rejects no one. He continues to pick older members and to prefer boys. Dependency and difficulty with his peers, as in the case of S24, is indicated but the second test shows a trend to the contrary. S25 has no choice score but the preference score
of the group toward him rises significantly on the second test; he is moving toward greater integration. His own expressed preference scores are consistently higher than the group's toward him by a rather wide margin. Basically, S25 is outgoing in nature; his impulsiveness leads to improper assessment of reality but this is not too great. The discussion data does not substantiate this outgoingness. In eleven meetings attended, he failed to originate in eight, had no receptions in ten; a little improvement is shown on the meetings which were sound recorded. Thus there is conflict; although basically outgoing, behaviorally he is not able to show this. Apparently he is aware of the difference. The bases of constriction are probably insecurity and feelings of inferiority, an immaturity based on dependency needs (mentioned above). The outlook is positive: both expressed and received preference scores show positive acceleration, the latter more than the former so that the gap between them is less.

The Rorschach results seem in line with the above. A possible different interpretation of S25's choice of older members is that it is linked with his desire to stand out from the crowd rather than dependency needs.

0. Subject 26

Male; Age, 18
Summary of data from techniques:
Sociometric:
Test 1: Chooses S31, S7, S6. Rejects none.
Chosen by S6 (3rd); score is 2. Rejected by S15, S23.
Preference scores: given .774; received .370.
Sex liking: given 90% boy, 71% girl; received 71% boy, 35% girl.
Test 2: Chooses none. Rejects none.
Chosen by S12 and S25 (2nd), S27 and S31 (3rd); score is 10. Rejected by none.
Preference scores: given .895; received .526.
Sex liking: given 100% boy, 80% girl; received 60% boy, 51% girl.

Discussion:
Interaction record: attended 10 meetings, absent 1.
No originations or receptions in 7 meetings.
Averages: origination 1.3%; reception 1.3%.
Sound recordings: attended 3 meetings.
Averages: origination 5%; time consumed 4.17%;
time per origination 8.13".

S26 shows a positive rise toward leadership, on group choice and preference, on the dropping out of rejections of him. But this gain does not seem quite enough to warrant his position as president.
The striking feature is his large expressed preference scores in relation to those of the group. The second test may have been heavily influenced by the circumstance that he had just been elected president. In any case, this high preference which S26 expressed signifies a basically outgoing nature; the fact that it is too high in comparison to the group's signified that S26 cannot assess the reality situation too well, his expansiveness is impulsive. This impulsive-ness is caused in part by a high drive for achievement; he felt that he should have the presidency because others had other important jobs and he had none. The discussion data points to a conflict for, as with S25, he is not able to live out his expansiveness. In ten meet-ings (interaction records), he does not originate in seven; his origi-nation and reception averages are low. Although he does better on the later, sound recorded meetings, he is still below the average in
spite of the fact that leading a meeting inflated his averages. Although he does better than his brother, S25, actually the constriction is more severe for he is three years older, he shows a greater outgoingness sociometrically and also a greater irreality in his perception of reality, and he holds the most responsible position in the group; this is in conflict with his basic tendencies. His high drive to attain status shows compensatory activity for feelings of inferiority (he must be aware of his basic tendencies and his failure to live them out) and possibly a means for gaining affection.

Generally, the Rorschach results bear out the above inferences. Perhaps the most significant feature, not clearly shown in the data above, is his antisocial tendencies. Behaviorally, this is easily observed but his fear of people, lying at the root of his low participation, is masked by his high expressed preference score. However, the preference scores could not indicate this as well as his extra- verse tendencies; under the circumstances, it is illuminating that the scores should coincide with the experience balance, for behaviorally he does not show this outgoingness even in his own family.

P. Subject 27

Male; Age, 16
Summary of data from techniques:
Sociometric:
Test 1: He did not fill out the questionnaire.
  Chosen by none. Rejected by S12, S15, S23.
  Preference score: received .185.
  Sex liking: received 51% boy, 20% girl.
Chosen by none. Rejected by S12.
Preference scores: given 0.150; received 0.421.
Sex liking: given 60% boy, 00% girl;
received 60% boy, 43% girl.

Discussion:
Interaction records: no attendance.
Sound recordings: attended 1 meeting, absent 2.
No participation.

Since no Rorschach test was given to S27, a brief description
is given here. He is a sophomore in high school, extremely shy and
retiring, slow in speech and actions. He has a younger brother who
appears to be the opposite. His father works on three different
jobs, gets little sleep and has no time for outside activities.
His mother is retiring, although she takes part in the middle-aged
women's group in the Church. Neither of the parents are members
of the Church or attend its services. S27 has been singing in the
choir of late. From the mother's remarks, she takes the side of
S27 as over against the father, who occasionally punishes S27 severely
and feels very guilty about it afterward. A close mother relation
exists. S27 likes animals and tinkers with an old Ford he has bought.

There is so little data on S27 that only a few generalizations
may be made. He is not interested in the group as shown by his
attendance record and his expressed preference score. He chooses
and likes to work with only boys. His feeling toward the group is
much lower than the group's toward him. Thus constriction is
apparent in his judgment of reality; since no other data is available,
insecurity in interpersonal relations seems the chief cause.
Female; Age

Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:

Test 1: Chooses S20, S7, S12. Rejects none.
   Chosen by S30 (2nd); score is 3. Rejected by S2, S12, S15, S17, S25.
   Preference scores: given .452; received .000.
   Sex liking: given 16% boy, 00% girl;
              received 13% boy, 21% girl.

Test 2: Chooses S21, S30, S33. Rejects none.
   Chosen by none. Rejected by S12, S17.
   Preference scores: given .000; received .263.
   Sex liking: given 00% boy, 00% girl;
              received 17% boy, 43% girl.

Discussion:

Interaction records: attended 7 meetings, absent 4.
   No participation.

Sound recordings: attended 3 meetings.
   No participation.

An attempt was made to give S28 the Rorschach test but she made
no response on four cards. She looked at each of the four for at
least ten minutes apiece; at the end of forty-five minutes, the test
situation was terminated at her request. Her only volunatry comment
came on Card III when she asked, "Are you supposed to see designs
in these?" Evidently the testing situation and material constituted
a grave threat to her.

She is a very inhibited girl; she seldom speaks and when she does
her voice has an unclear, hoarse quality as if from disuse. She is
a freshman in high school, the eldest of a family of five children.
She is a double cousin of S29; their fathers are brothers, their
mothers are sisters. Thus the previous description of S29's father's
background holds for S28's father's; he is very reticent, hard to
meet and works intermittently. His wife works in a factory in mill-
town to provide enough money for the family. Like S29, S28 has the
job of taking care of the children while her mother works; but
226 rebels, misbehaves in school in order to be kept afterward
and is absent from the home as much as possible. The next oldest
child is a boy and he does the work for her. She has no close
friends although she is frequently at 229's house. She is small
for her age but a pretty girl; she gives the appearance of a wild
deer, afraid of people.

Her sociometric position in the group is very low but rises
somewhat on the second test, and the number rejecting her decreases,
Her choice of co-workers is quite unrealistic on the first test al-
though she does pick one from her age group (who rejects her); the
second test shows marked improvement, for although the ones she
chooses do not choose her, all show positive preference. But the
second test also shows complete indifference on her part. Taking
a shot in the dark, a basic conflict is indicated: she is by
nature extravertive (her preference for the group on the first test
was too much higher than the group's score) but her inhibitions are
too great. Thus she has poor control over her feelings (basically
aggressive but she is too fearful to express them and so lapses
into apathy), feels very inferior and is extremely insecure in inter-
personal relations. The discussion points to severe constriction on
the behavioral level: in all meetings attended, she makes no origi-
nations. The picture is of a girl with great constriction and
anxiety, insecurity and inferiority feelings, yet with a basically
outgoing nature. This intensifies the conflict; she is definitely
neurotic.
Female; Age, 14
Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:

Test 1: Chooses S7, S14, S31. Rejects S10, S24. 
Chosen by S1 and S30 (1st); score is 10.
Rejected by S2, S12, S17, S25.
Preference scores: given .710; received .037
Sex liking: given 64% boy, 85% girl;
received 13% boy, 21% girl.

Test 2: Chooses S7, S30, S6. Rejects S1, S24. 
Chosen by S1 (1st); score is 6. Rejected by S12, S17.
Preference scores: given -.100; received .263
Sex liking: given 00% boy, 00% girl;
received 17% boy, 43% girl.

Discussion:

Interaction records: attended 5 meetings, absent 6.
No originations in 4 meetings; no receptions in 5.
Average origination: 0.8%.
Sound recordings: no attendance.

The main feature in S29's sociometric data is the wide fluctuation in her expressed preference scores. From a very high score lessened by two rejections, she drops to complete indifference with the exception of two rejections. At the same time the group preference score increases on the second test, although her choice score decreases and she rejects the one member who chooses her. Both extremes show an incapacity in reality testing, though for different reasons: the overestimation to an outgoing, impulsive nature, the underestimation to psychologic constriction. The rejections emphasize the outgoingness; there is considerable emotional lability and strong aggressive tendencies not too well controlled. Thus there is conflict and the resolution of it seems to be passivity. The outgoing tendencies are not shown at the behavioral level in the group; her participation is almost nil.
The Rorschach record seems to bear out these inferences, except the strong aggressive feelings. Strong anxiety and the failure of her defenses to work properly account for the constriction mentioned above; the outgoingness and lability are shown in the experience balance. The schizoid tendencies are not a good sign. She feels the need for help and feels into conventional forms of behavior. So far, she has not been included in the group; she has obtained little benefit therefrom.

S. Subject 30

Female; Age, 14
Summary of data from techniques:
Sociometric:
Test 1: Chooses S23, S26, S15. Rejects none.
Chosen by S15 (1st); score is 5. Rejected by S2.
Preference scores: given .000; received .296.
Sex liking: given 00% boy; 00% girl;
received 13% boy; 42% girl.
Chosen by S15 (1st), S29 and S29 (2nd): S17 (3rd);
score is 12. Rejected by S12.
Preference scores: given .706; received .474.
Sex liking: given 67% boy; 57% girl;
received 67% boy, 43% girl.

Discussion:
Interaction records: attended 6 meetings, absent 5.
No originations in 5 meetings, no receptions in 4.
Averages: origination 0.2%; reception 1.2%.
Sound recordings: attended 2 meetings, absent 1.
Averages: origination 0.5%; reception 0.05%.
Time per origination 2".

No Rorschach test was given to S30, so a brief description is given here. She is third from the youngest in a family of eight girls and one boy. The family attends the Episcopalian Church in mill-town. S30's older sister, S13, was long a member of the group; S30 attends because of this and her friendship with S9 and S15.
Her father is a baker; he has always cooked the breakfast for the group following the annual Easter sunrise service. She is very shy, embarrasses easily, and is quite unobtrusive. She is a freshman in high school and is thus one of the younger members.

An interesting feature of S30's choice is that all are of her own age group; although shy, she seems very well liked by them. Her sociometric choice scores reflect this and show that she is a potential leader in the group. This is borne out in group preference scores; by the second test she has the highest score of any of the younger members. Perhaps this may lie behind her shift from a low to very high expressed preference score. Still a conflict exists between psychologic constriction and a basic outgoingness, the fluctuation is too wide. The constriction is further shown in the discussion data: she participates rarely and at a very low level. The constriction may be due to feelings of inferiority; the overexpressiveness may be hitched with strong dependency needs. Yet withall, she is moving into a higher level of positive integration into the group.

T. Subject 31

Male; Age, 18.

Summary of data from techniques:

Sociometric:

Test 1: Chooses S16, S14, S2. Rejects S11. Chosen by S26 (1st), S29 (3rd); score is 7. Rejected by S2.

Preference scores: given .548; received .556.

Sex liking: given 30% boy, 52% girl;

received 100% boy, 45% girl.
Test 2: Chooses S22, S17, S26; Rejects S1, S9, S33. 
Chosen by S22 and S25 (1st); S9 and S27 (2nd); 
score is 16. Rejected by none. 
Preference scores: given .250; received .500. 
Sex liking: given 40% boy, 40% girl; 
received 80% boy; 36% girl. 

Discussion: 
Interaction records: attended 10 meetings, absent 1. 
No originations in 3 meetings, no receptions in 5. 
Averages: origination 3.5%; reception 1.9%. 
Sound recordings: attended 1 meeting, absent 2. 
Averages: origination 10%; time consumption 12%. 
time per origination 12". 

Two or three features are significant in S31's sociometric data. 
On the first test, his expressed preference score and that of the 
groups are very close; this suggests a good assessment of reality. 
His first two choices are of old, male leaders in the group; the 
trend to choose older leaders is continued in the second test. But 
he is chosen by younger members largely and thus his choice is only reciprocated once. His expressed preference shows quite a drop on 
the second test, suggesting that the group is no longer as attractive as it has been. Some dependency and immaturity is suggested. 
His leadership position is definitely increased by the second test, 
but it is doubtful if he ever will develop into a group leader for 
the reasons outlined above (on the second test, the only member of 
the younger set toward whom he expresses positive preference is S30). 
He rejects only girls, which further suggests dependency needs; two 
are rather dominant females, indicating that he doesn't want to be bossed. Discussion data shows an average of participation slightly 
less than that for the total group. Actually there is considerable fluctuation; this probably is normal, though the tendency is too
much toward the non-participatory side. There is some behavioral
constriction.

The Rorschach record is an interesting one; it differs from
the above data and inferences drawn therefrom. A graver picture
of S31's adjustment process is shown. He is more constricted than
appears behaviorally and sociometrically. Further, the constric-
tion that was observed in the data and the errors in choosing recipro-
cally were ascribed to dependency needs, not to anxiety. The two
views may not be at too great variance for the root of dependency
upon leaders in a group may well be anxiety; this could also
account for the inability to play the leader role securely.

II. Conclusions

In treating the data on individuals in this fashion and relat-
ing it to the Rorschach summary, certain assumptions were made.
Perhaps it would be well to make these assumptions more explicit.

The first assumption was that all the data on the individual
were significantly interrelated. If the evidence was conflicting,
then a similar conflict was inferred in the individual.

Second, it was assumed that the data were characteristic of the
individual. Thus, for example, a member might show a low expressed
preference score. Objectively, this might be related to certain
stresses or frustrations in the group as in the case of S7 who ob-
viously was a potential leader yet was not formally recognized as
such in the group. But her indifference was more than a rational
reaction to external circumstances; it was also a reaction characteristic of her. Treating the sociometric data in this fashion often appeared contrary to the behavioral facts. S26 is an example. His behavior could hardly be described as outgoing, extraverted. Yet his Rorschach test bears out this interpretation. Thus it was assumed that a high expressed preference score was indicative of outgoing tendencies. Generally this proved so; it will be noted how much more useful the preference score was than the straight choice score. The reason is apparent for preference (how subject felt toward every other member and they toward him) gives data on individual trends as well as position in the group; choice score gives only the latter. Also preference scores gave a truer picture of the individual's position in the group on the low end of the choice scale; thus a member with no choice score, as S22 on the first test, may have a middle position in the group.

Third, a relatedness between what the individual expressed and what the group expressed was assumed. This was more than the assumption of individual consistency. The specific hypothesis used was that where group and individual preference scores differed, the member showed poor judgment in assessing reality and this varied directly with the difference. When the data is gone over microscopically, there are various factors which cast doubt on this assumption. For example, some members expressed complete liking when it was manifestly not so. Others expressed complete indifference. Such might tend to vitiate the effectiveness of using the
group expressed preference score as a valid indicator of inclusion or exclusion of the member. Yet in practice this hypothesis seemed to work reasonably well.

Fourth, certain features of the group were assumed as significant in the individual's expression of choice and preference. The specific features were age, sex and position of the members; whether those chosen were leaders or fringe members, girls or boys, old or new. Moreno makes a similar assumption in describing choices as real or unreal.

A fifth assumption (more a matter of a rule-of-thumb and already mentioned) was to use the discussion data as a behavioral indicator. If sociometric data differed, it was inferred that the latter represented the inner tendencies within the individual which did not find overt expression in behavior. In writing up the data, inferences from these assumptions were made and then an attempted integration, as suggested in the first assumption.

Lest it appear that these write-ups of the sociometric and discussion data were made independently of the Rorschach tests, it should be clearly stated that they were not. The Rorschach tests were given concurrently with the collection and classification of the other data. Although an attempt was made in the write-ups to deduce only from the sociometric and discussion data, the Rorschach protocols were remembered in many instances and could not help but affect the write-up. In fact, without the Rorschach tests, the above assumptions would not have evolved.
It will be noted that the use of the data so far has been almost wholly diagnostic. This would naturally be a consequence of comparing the data with the Rorschach tests. Diagnosis was by no means the only aim of the project; action with resultant individual change was another. Yet diagnosis is a legitimate line of inquiry, if only to sensitize the adult youth adviser to certain problems. For convenience, two important areas may be distinguished:

1) the individual in relation to the group and 2) the individual as he is successfully (or not) adjusting, growing and internalizing stated goals of Christian education.

The relation of the individual to the group is important on a very elemental level. If he is a marginal member, there is a strong probability that he will leave the group and that he will be less affected by its influence. The nature of this particular group and membership in it was such that leaving was relatively easy. The weighted preference scores were treated in this fashion. Checked against attendance records, a low expressed and received preference score did not always lead to accurate prediction of withdrawal; however, it did in two extreme cases and, from other observations, appeared to be latent in those with low scores not showing attendance drop. Tests over a period of time may also show trends, whether toward integration or withdrawal. Since a member's received preference score (how the group feels toward him) may be in the middle range or even high without his having any choice score (being chosen as a co-worker by others) at all, it seems possible to assess integration
into the group other than on a leader-isolate continuum. One of
the goals for the individual would be progression from low to
middle or high acceptability in the group; this would represent a
gain in socialization among his peers, a vital necessity for the
adolescent. The diagnostic use of sociometric tests in this area
would be very helpful to an adult adviser.

It is also important to know how the individual is doing in
his adjustment processes, the area of mental health. Acute anxiety;
lack of emotional control, strong aggressive trends either repress-
ed or labile, overdependency and other disturbing features do not
appear conducive to the growth and Christian maturing of the in-
dividual. These areas of disturbance need to be spotted. The
combination of scores offers some possibilities of rough assess-
ment. Thus low expressed preference would indicate constriction,
high expressed preference an outgoing tendency. Discrepancies be-
tween expressed and received preference would show a deficiency in
reality testing. Discrepancies between expressed preference and
group participation would show internal conflict since both are
measures of the individual. Other, more specific trends are in-
dicated in choice and preference when compared with aspects of the
individual chosen. An interesting relation is shown in S23 who re-
jects the most and also shows ease of participation: the label is
hysteria but in terms of the dynamics of personality, it signifies
emotional lability and ease of transference. S2 shows a different
set of relations with a large number of rejections. A specific
finding of this study was that while rejection is a serious sign its specific meaning depends upon the individual configuration.

Besides the diagnosis of areas of disturbance, constructive progress may also be noted, although as far as this project goes the relationships are not at all clear. Part of the reason for unclarity was the short length of the time-slice. Observational data cover the longest period and that was only a year; there are large gaps in these data too. Some of the members do seem to show progress though, particularly S9; others are S6, S15, S25, S26 and S30. Codification of content would measurably increase the refinement of assessment in this area.

Yet the techniques should do more than afford a basis for assessment of individuals by an adult adviser; they should also be instruments of change as action methods. Here too the results are not too clear, whether or not these techniques do bring about change. Sociometric tests were only tried twice and the results of the first test were not carried out into action. The results of the second test were used in committee assignments; whether or not change resulted is not known. That change is to be expected can be inferred from S8's reaction. She knew the results of the first test for, as president, she was given the committee assignments; on the second test, she chose S1, rightly inferring that the latter was a hard member to place. Similar change might occur.

Relative to the other techniques only fragmentary inferences can be made. Group study seemed to help S2 and S25. The former gained
confidence in leading a meeting and did a creditable job; S25 found a new role, that of prompter and clarifier. S12 and S26 showed little change however. The role playing technique which was used between the two sociometric tests seemed to have a mixed effect: S9 and S31 were the main participants and as a result S9 chose S31 on the next test but he rejected her.

The project has not begun to scratch the surface in this area of change through action. It appears to the writer that additional measures of change are necessary for an accurate check. What these measures would be is a question. They should, for example, be able to pick up thoroughgoing change. Thus, although the sociometric test is both a diagnostic and action technique, which measures and brings about change of the individual in the group, it would be necessary to know, as far as aims in Christian education are concerned, whether a positive progression toward integration into the group was paralleled in other areas of the member's social living. Put in another way, has the employment of sociometric tests led to a general improvement in interpersonal relations (less anxiety, inferiority or aggression), not just a specific improvement in relation to other members in the group. Tests to check such additional change should be given at the beginning and end of the time-slice sample. These tests should tend toward projective techniques, not toward attitudinal tests of the Thurstone variety where the object of the attitude is well defined. Perhaps the Sentence Completion Test or something akin to it would be good, for it deals more with
dynamic content (specific relations such as in the family, age mates and so forth) than does the Rorschach test.

To summarize these conclusions, the action methods used offer good possibilities for assessing the integration or non-integration of the member into the group and for assessing certain areas of difficulty. Moreover, conclusions reached from the data fit fairly well conclusions reached from the Rorschach test. But although the diagnostic values appear good, no conclusions could be reached as to the value of the methods in affecting significant change. Additional measures other than the techniques themselves would have to be administered at the beginning and end of the period chosen for study. The period studied should be longer and the life of the group less turbulent. This is not to underestimate the value of the diagnostic use of these techniques; as important and needed instruments in the hands of adult church leaders. The possibility of good assessment from simple techniques is very encouraging. One valuable result would be the better orientation of the adult leader to the reality in which he participates: the youth group which is comprised of concrete individuals.
CHAPTER IX

ANALYSIS AT THE GROUP PROCESS LEVEL

Data furnished by the techniques may be conceptualized, not only in reference to individual members, but also in reference to group process. What do the results indicate about how the group functioned? An underlying assumption of this project was that the action methods used would affect group process; at least this seemed warranted by the review of the literature on research. Thus, as at the individual level of analysis, the methods were assumed to perform two functions: 1) by providing data on certain aspects of the group (interpersonal attractions and repulsions, participation patterns, leadership and so forth), it would be possible to study how the group functioned; 2) the methods would affect the functioning of the group either directly or indirectly. These functions would not always be separable; such is implied in their being termed action methods. For purposes of analysis, however, it is useful to separate them.

I. Assessment of Group Process

For reasons similar to those mentioned in the discussion of results at the individual level of analysis, assessment was the chief outcome of using the techniques. To put it in other words, the major contribution of these techniques was what they revealed about how the group functioned, not how much or in what manner
they changed the group's functioning. Nor was this a small contribution. As in any group, each member does his own assessing. One of the values of adult leadership is the supposed greater skill of the adviser in assessment, with the consequence that he is able to help the group deal more realistically with its problems.

During the spring and early fall of 1948, several felt problems were expressed by members: the older members were getting in the way of younger members, topics were not interesting to all, discussions were inferior, the adult adviser was getting stale, and so forth. From the data gathered, can it be said that these individual characterizations of group process were correct? The answer seems to be partly yes and partly no. Attendance in the spring of 1948 was much better than it was ever to be afterwards; participation in discussion was as good or better than it was to be. Sociometric choice shows older members in leadership positions (only two, S7 and S23, were still in high school); on received preference scores, all the older members still in the group (except S11) ranked high. Thus older members were liked and were leaders of the group. On the other hand, greatest expression of indifference was found among the younger members; uniformly, they had the lowest preference scores. The difficulty was not correctly appraised by the members concerned: though holding positions of leadership, the older members were very much liked; the trouble was the poor integration of the younger members. This was to be
expected, but the failure in assessment meant that a very great strain was placed on the group: younger members had to be integrated without the aid of older leaders and the enthusiasm which a larger group engenders. Some with low acceptability scores never did become integrated and withdrew. This feeling on the part of the older members that they were in the way and should withdraw may in reality have been not a mistake in assessment but a statement of their desires: they were no longer interested in the group and wished to withdraw.

Leadership was another felt problem, particularly of the AA. In 1948, S8 was president of the group; from other observations, it was known that the AA did not think much of her as a leader. Yet a study of the sociometric results showed her to be a very strong leader in the group; what is more significant, the Rorschach records indicated that she was probably the healthiest member in the group. Apparently, the group had chosen wisely. After the first test, the importance of S8 and her sisters to the group was pointed out to the AA; he was unwilling to accept the results of the test as representative of group feeling. What might have happened if he had decided to work with these members will never be known. In 1949, the group was led by non-representative leaders; thus a further strain was imposed upon the group, the frustration of members' desires as to who should lead them. The election of these officers cannot be ascribed to the AA. It is possible that his dissatisfaction may have contributed very
indirectly. Other, more important factors were causal. The sociometric results merely point up a crucial failure in group function, the election of non-representative leaders.

Yet another feature of the sociometric results was the low reciprocity of choices; rarely did members choose those who chose them and, when this did occur, it was largely among older leaders. Other features substantiate this, especially the wide spread in age. The group was rather artificial in that there was little contact among some of the members outside the youth group. Not only did the individual member lack the experiential base for making choice and preferential statements about many of the other members; his own friendship circle (from school, home contacts, and so forth) was not well represented in the group. Certain consequences followed from this artificiality. Low choice and preference scores did not show isolation but lack of integration. The cohesiveness was much less. The group was also characterized by ease of reformulation of its boundaries; members could leave freely. This in combination with the artificiality placed a further strain on the group: the attraction to other members was a basic factor in this group, exerting pressure on a member to remain; the fragmentary character of the attraction patterns therefore meant lowered cohesiveness and heightened ease of reformulation of boundaries.

A large, influential factor on attraction of members for each other was sex. Since the age spread was so large, averages of sex
choice and preferences merely smoothed out these differences in some cases. The boys afford an example of this. Older boys chose girl co-workers while younger boys chose boy co-workers. When averaged, these choices even out each other. However, there were some general characteristics in sex attraction that emerged on the sociometric tests. First, girls in general chose girls for co-workers more than boys, three to one on the first test and six to one on the second test. But, second, this did not appear in girls' preference scores; the average score was on the low side and was about the same toward boys as toward girls. Thus girls were more indifferent to each other and to the group than boys were. To this is added a third factor: the girls rejected each other more than they did the boys. This is in marked contrast to the boys; in both tests, only once did a boy reject another boy. This ambivalence among the girls is puzzling. It may be due to the smaller number of boys proportionally: the group did not afford enough heterosexual contacts for the girls. It may be that girls express their indifference and disliking more easily than boys. In any case, it is an important fact to know. As far as the overall picture of the group is concerned, it may be better to put boys, where possible, in leadership positions. Also, the continuance of the girl's club may be a therapeutic aid. One further feature should be noted: with the older members leaving, the general tendency to prefer a member of the same sex appeared to have increased generally.
Besides the interrelations between members, the interaction of the group merited study and was begun with the interaction records. The most significant characteristic was the wide variation between meetings when quantified for certain aspects: amount of participation, member participation, direction (toward individuals or the group) and spontaneity. Undoubtedly the wide variation had a confusing effect upon member expectancies; the lack of evenness would put a strain on the group's functioning. Some relationships were noted in these fluctuations. One was type of leadership and amount of participation: highest activity occurred, not with extremely passive or dominant leadership, but with a "minimally active", permissive type. The interaction for each meeting was charted and shown to some of the members and the AA; these charts proved easy to read and individuals were able to come to their own assessments of the meetings, trying changes in the discussions as they saw fit.

Another felt problem was the lack of leadership skills. With the withdrawal of older members, often the younger ones felt incapable of leading a meeting. A class was started in order that interested members might learn something about the role of moderator and also might study the discussion meetings. Four of the members attended these sessions faithfully from the interaction data, it was seen that all were extremely inhibited in the group discussions. Thus these four were motivated by their own lacks; when given an opportunity, they tried to do something about this felt
problem. Toward the end of these class sessions an incident occurred (the study group helped a leader prepare for the evening discussion; no inhibitions were noted by the observer among the four study group members) which pointed up an important characteristic of the evening discussions: there was very low goal tension in the youth group; this meant there was little pressure on the members to be productive. This plus the other general characteristics of the group, artificiality of interpersonal relations and ease of boundary reformulation, plus the specific strains and stresses already discussed made it very difficult for the group to function.

Sound recordings were also tried and proved quite ineffective. However, a fairly good estimate of time consumed by each individual was made possible and an interesting feature emerged: the AA consumed on the average a third of the discussion time. The interaction records showed that he participated more as the group grew smaller. Domination of the discussion was strongly indicated, increasing toward the spring of 1947. Thus another functional aspect of group process was increased friction between members and the adult leader. This friction was terminated by the executive committee asking for another adult leader.

A measure of group sentiment toward the discussions, the post-meeting questionnaire, was started late in the project as an outgrowth of the study group. The results showed definite assessment possibilities: member expectancies were lower than evaluations of
the meeting itself; satisfaction with the meeting as well as feelings of frustration and frustration release showed changes, indicating that members were sensitive to differences between meetings; the progress estimate also fluctuated showing that members had some notions of goal objectives, that a particular meeting influenced their estimate of its contribution to those objectives. The post-meeting questionnaire had the value of giving some group estimate of its own productivity. Members of the study class also gave their estimates as individuals in the role of anecdotal observer. They did a creditable job thus giving the group a tool for assessment.

In summarizing this section, two levels of assessment may be differentiated. First, the techniques revealed certain general, molar characteristics of the youth group. The main ones were:

1) The group was artificial as to member relations. A member did not meet many of the other members outside the activities of the group; only a portion of his friendship group in the community was represented in the youth group. This artificiality was shown sociometrically in the low reciprocity of choice.

2) Members were free to leave and thus group boundaries were easily reformulated. This was a basic characteristic of the group by definition but it was concretely underlined when older members left, even though they were well integrated in the group sociometrically.

3) The group showed low goal tension in its weekly discussions.
This was graphically demonstrated in the study class when four inhibited members participated freely when faced with a definite and immediate problem.

4) The girls in the group showed ambivalence toward each other as a whole. Though they chose girl over boy co-workers by a wide margin, the same trend did not appear in preference. The reason for the latter was the large amount of indifference expressed by girls. Further they rejected girls more often than boys and this latter trend increased.

5) Participation in the discussions showed wide fluctuations. The effect on the members was to lower their expectancies and increase their dissatisfaction.

All these factors in combination made it difficult for the group to function properly and minimized the general cohesiveness.

Second, it was possible to assess some specific problems and aspects of the group's process. Some of these were:

1) The relation of older members to younger ones. The older members felt they were in the way and should get out; they pointed to the criticisms by younger members that the discussion topics were too abstract and to the lack of participation by younger members. Sociometric data proved that this was not the case, that the older members were well liked and played a vital role in the group. Their leaving crippled the group. An immediate sociometric effect was the large increase of low expressed preference scores on the second test.
2) Leadership. Sociometric data, as well as Rorschach records, showed the group was well led in 1948, even though this leadership was not fully approved by the AA. In 1949, the group failed to place in important offices representative leaders.

3) Heterosexual contacts. As the group declined in size and the age of members decreased on the average, the group moved toward problems customarily met in early adolescence where expressed preference is largely confined to the same sex.

4) The relation of the AA to the group. Friction increased between members and their adult leader as shown in the AA's unwillingness to accept the sociometric results as representative of member attraction patterns and his increased dominance of the discussions. The group terminated this relation with him at its final business meeting, late in the spring of 1949.

5) Moderatorship. A surmise consequence of older members leaving was the reduction of member skills available in the group. A study class was started for training moderators of discussions and for observing group process. The fact that four inhibited members faithfully attended these classes showed the surmise to be correct. Interaction records also indicated that type of discussion leader was intimately related to amount of productivity.

Other aspects and problems were revealed by the techniques but the above are the more important ones and are representative.

In conclusion, it may be said that the techniques proved useful for assessment purposes. The fact that the information was not fully
utilized does not lessen this value but rather raises other problems which have to be met in other ways. Most of the characteristics and problems listed above are basic ones: they set the limits and define the field in which action techniques may be employed. For example, what could be done in a classroom or reformatory could not be done in this group because the conditions are different. It is necessary to be aware of these conditions.

II. Techniques and Group Change

Change resulting from the use of the techniques is not so clearly demonstrable; changes which occurred and which could be traced to the techniques were small, in most cases not quantified. Because of this smallness, in the discussion that follows what was expected is discussed in relation to the change (if any) that happened.

The ideal change to be brought about by sociometric tests was the improvement of member relations. Such improvement involved a complex of factors: evolving leadership satisfactory to most in the group, good reciprocity of choice, increased discrimination by members in selecting co-workers, less isolation and rejection with better integration of such members into the group. Under the circumstances, no change in any of these variables can be traced to sociometric assignment because the results of the first test were never carried into action. There may have been some effect from the test itself. Faced with the problem of making choice and pre-
ferential expressions, members may have thought through their feelings toward each other and made a revision on the second test. An example of change without assignment was S8, who received the results of the first test; on the second she chose the often rejected member S1. Some improvement in choice reciprocity was noted on the second test.

Another feature should be noted in passing, the resistance of some to filling out the test the first time; such was not nice in a church group. There was less of this expressed overtly on the second test. This may be a positive sign; members were able to face the necessity of bettering their discrimination with less guilt. Apart from these fragmentary features, not much change can be ascribed to the sociometric tests. In fact, trends in an opposite direction from improvement of member relations occurred; group choice of leadership worsened and poor integration of some members plus expressed indifference increased.

Besides changes in member relations, the sociometric tests were expected to orient the adult leader better. The results could be used for assignment therapy, individual counseling or a topic for group discussion. The AA was disinclined to accept the results as valid, particularly with reference to leadership. This was a significant failure of the project. The observer felt that a partial explanation of this failure was his usurping the AA's role; changes were introduced into the group by the observer which were not the AA's idea. Both he and the group could not help but be
aware of this. Publicly, he was in favor of trying anything new; privately, he thought much psychology was nonsense.

An expected result of observer records was the stimulation of interested members to assess, discuss and initiate changes in the weekly discussion. By and large, the sound recorder proved to be a very ineffectual instrument for this purpose. Charts of the discussion interaction fared better. The AA was for using drama and also material closer to personal dynamics (similar in kind to the Bullis and O'Malley material, p. 24). A series on human relations was tried; the adults were enthusiastic but leaders did not like the material so the idea was dropped. S23 looked at the interaction charts and had her own solution: only older members and adult advisers were chosen to lead meeting. She followed this line of attack to the end of her tenure of office in the spring of 1949. Members of the study class also gave suggested solutions. The interaction charts sensitized several to the variations in weekly discussions but ideas as to proper mode of attack differed widely and no integrated program emerged. Drama proved effective for increasing participation and revealing consistency in personality (S9's behavior); but the danger of shaming was great and so were the obstacles to its use by members.

The expected change resulting from the group study class was two fold: 1) enabling interested members to increase their skills as moderators, and 2) getting interested members to study more intensively the "how" of the discussions. The first aim apparently was
not achieved for the four members of the study class were not able to function as moderators and their participation averages remained low. Subjectively, however, the observer felt quite a lot of progress had been made. These four were quite severely inhibited psychologically; slow progress was to be expected. Positive signs were S2's leading of a meeting with increased confidence and S25's development of the prompter role. In the study class itself, participation by all was very high. Other gains resulted too. Each of the four was able to play the role of anecdotal observer, to make a fair estimate of the discussion in a verbal report to the whole group at the end. Further, the sound recorded meetings showed much higher participation. This cannot be wholly ascribed to the study group. As was noted before, the AA's productivity increased markedly during this period. But the study group was also an influential factor.

One further qualitative change was noted. The post-meeting questionnaire aroused a lot of interest. As the questionnaire showed, member expectancies were below their estimates of the meeting itself; this may have been one of the reasons for the show of interest, for low expectancy was widespread and the questionnaire made it public. Another reason for their interest lay in the two questions on frustration: they had never been asked before if they were bored or irritated and if they had been able to do something about these feelings. This legitimized, so to speak, the expression of their inner private feelings. The effect of the questionnaire and other discussion techniques was to sensitize the members to the "how" of group dis-
cussion (drama must be exempted because they were so interested in what was going on they did not notice their increased participation). But the effect was not altogether positive. Already aware of the decreased size of the group and made sensitive by statements about why the group was doing poorly, the group was over-critical of itself at times. Anecdotal observers were prone to pick on the poor features of a discussion, overlooking the better features. In general, the results from the post-meeting questionnaire were high and this was encouraging to the members.

What can be said in summary about the effectiveness of these techniques as agents of change at the group process level? They were not used long enough to show change; the huge transition through which the group went also made it impossible to arrive at any quantitative estimate. There were a few positive signs suggesting that a large amount of change could be expected. With regard to sociometric tests, there may be a limit to the change possible due to the reticence of members of a church group to state their true feelings. Certainly there are areas where improvement is needed and sociometric tests may help: better choice of leaders, more reciprocity of choice and the progression of members with low acceptability scores to a higher position in the group. Sociometry may also be a powerful instrument in the hands of an adult leader; he may thereby assess more realistically the situation pertaining in the group, and reduce the sources of conflict and tension between himself and the group. Group study classes may afford a method for
increasing both the skills of members and the goal tension of the group. Interaction records appear well adapted for furnishing pertinent information about the discussions. The post-meeting questionnaire may be very useful in helping the group to assess its own productivity; the role of anecdotal observer may be developed and bring similar results. All the techniques may function together to sensitize the group on how it functions, reducing the wide variability.
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the project was to employ action techniques in a church group where discussion and member participation were the basic methods of achieving the educational aims of the Church. It was hoped that positive results, particularly of a practical sort, would come from their employment. These expectations were stated in the beginning chapter in the form of four criteria; whether or not the criteria were met will be discussed in this chapter. Besides expected results, there are others which were not anticipated in particular; these may be divided roughly into 1) significant features pertaining to the group studied and 2) wider implications for the Church as a general, cultural institution.

1. Adequacy of the Techniques Used

The use of action techniques in a church youth group has definite limitations. Unlike a laboratory experiment, rigid controls cannot be maintained; there cannot be too much manipulation or disturbance of the usual state of affairs. Yet it was felt that such use is a legitimate aim; if the techniques are to be evaluated, their workability in a concrete, ongoing group is a test of their usefulness. Thus in a project of this type, conclusions must deal more with pragmatic questions, not so much with the neat testing of hypothesis. So four criteria were cited at the beginning of the dissertation as pragmatic measures of the value of these techniques.
A. Potentialities for Diagnosis and Assessment

The first consideration should be a valuative one: Were the techniques any good? The answer is in the affirmative. First, they gave significant information about the individual members. By including expression of preference as well as choice in the sociometric test, it became a more discriminating instrument. Whether the member was expansive or constricted in his expression could be determined. By considering the preference of all others expressed toward him, it was possible 1) to see his position of acceptance into the group and 2) to compare this with his own expression, testing his perception of reality. Further, the sociometric data could be more minutely studied to find characteristic trends of the member in his interpersonal expectancies. When all these factors were compared with the member's participation in the discussion, which was a quantative measure of his behavior, areas of conflict were often demonstrated. Moreover, conclusions reached from the interplay of these factors fitted in remarkably well with the Rorschach interpretations. Thus it may be concluded that these techniques yield important information about the dynamics of behavior.

An overstatement of the case is not intended. Much further study is necessary to derive more rigorously the meanings of various combinations of these factors. One defect was that the severity of maladjustment was frequently not derivable. Another caution is necessary. Even if, after a thoroughgoing study had been made, it became clear that patterning of the variables (such as indifference, rejection, ex-
pansiveness, high or low participation and so forth) represented a certain state of affairs in the individual, this would not necessarily mean that an unskilled youth leader could correctly interpret these signs. There is every reason to suppose that some theory of personality is a prerequisite for interpretation, except at a very superficial level. A further area of study is indicated: how easily an adult leader may become skilled in the interpretation of results. In general, the signs that these are discriminating instruments are very hopeful.

Second, the techniques revealed important characteristics of the group as a whole. The writer is inclined to believe that the most important of these characteristics were: 1) the artificiality of member relations, 2) the ease of boundary reformulation, and 3) the low goal tension within the group. These characteristics may very well be rather universal in church groups of this type. If so, it is necessary to explore more fully the limits these characteristics impose on what methods may be used and what educational aims may be achieved. Much loose thinking has been done about church youth groups, particularly about the role and function of the adult leader in them. Such a leader has to be able to "work well with youth". The consensus among lay people is that such skill is not able to be taught; either a person has this ability or he hasn't. Further, youth programs of this type have by no means been uniformly successful. The suggestion offered here is that the characteristics of such groups often have not been understood, their limits not explored.
B. The Techniques as Agents of Change

A second criterion was that the techniques should bring about change in the individual through their use. As was previously mentioned, not much can be said on this point. The methods were not tried long enough. It is felt that if they are employed consistently, change will result, within the individual and within the group. Certainly change is needed. There were a few positive signs, the chief being the consistently higher level of participation in the later meetings. There is reason to suppose that sociometric assignment would bring about positive shifts of feeling of members toward each other. The young people also appreciated the chance to work in a study group together, dealing with problems that were more personal than appeared on the surface.

Even if the change expected from each technique had occurred, this would have been only a beginning step for, as suggested in the first chapter, what is desired is a fundamental and thoroughgoing change which is consistent with the aims of Christian education. The ultimate aim is thus change in personality; change in group process and in individual behavior in relation to the group are only tools whereby this further purpose may be achieved. It is not the intent of the writer to gloss over the further and fundamental difficulties involved. There is the question of how much change in the individual may actually occur under optimum conditions in a group of this type. For example, is it possible for a member who is insecure, anxious and fearful of people to achieve a healthier adjustment gen-
erally in interpersonal relations by participation in a youth group? It is the writer's opinion that the techniques used are not enough; additional measures of assessment, such as projective tests of the content type (Thematic Apperception Test and Sentence Completion Test), are at least necessary. There may be other action methods developed. However, the techniques employed may be beginning steps and should be tested further.

C. The Criterion of Simplicity

This criterion was also cited as a necessary characteristic of any technique used in a church group; the reason was that the personnel is largely unskilled in psychologic theory. Most of the techniques met this criterion but proof was not in the project for members and the AA did not employ many of the methods. This conclusion is reached from the observer's experience. Two techniques proved difficult to use, sound recordings and drama. It was concluded that sound recordings did not yield enough reliable data to be worthwhile as a recording technique although they might be useful as an additional aid. Drama (role playing) was thought to be a very good instrument but hard to use in the particular situation; much more work needs to be done with it. The sociometric test, interaction record, group study class and other evaluative measures all appeared to measure up to the criterion of simplicity. Some of these have already been used in schools by unskilled personnel. It may be that as the field of action methods develops, other and simple measures
will be evolved. This is an important criterion if instruments of change are used on a wide scale, and this was implied when the study was begun on a church group.

D. Adaptability of the Techniques

The adapting of the techniques to a concrete situation was not successful, although it was not wholly unsuccessful either. The largest failure was with the adult leader. He never used any of the methods himself; there was reason to believe that he was not convinced of their worth. Perhaps the criterion of adaptability (except in a rough and qualitative sense) was not a legitimate one for this project. Features of the interpersonal relation between the AA and observer set very definite limits to what could be done. Looking at it from the AA's point of view, the observer introduced changes (this was really the AA's prerogative) about which the AA knew nothing and therefore in which he could see no value prior to their use. The educational situation stressed throughout as necessary for this type of project was democratic, participative and discussional; there is no reason to suppose that the AA should be an exception. Put in other words, the proper situation for the AA learning new skills and techniques should be similar to that for the youth, a discussion group for adult leaders.

As far as the group itself is concerned, although the members were aware of the methods used and showed some sensitivity, the techniques caused no serious disruption in its functioning. This was in
part due to the way the techniques were used. Role playing for example, was urged until one session was tried; it was not pushed beyond this point. Sociometric tests were used in drawing up the permanent committees of the group but it was the presidents, old and new, who decided to name the committees in this fashion. Those who attended the group study class did so on their own initiative. But although the group was not pushed too far, this approach meant that certain limitations were not overcome. Only two sociometric tests were given because situations were lacking and could not be developed for giving any more "real" tests. Although some members were intensely interested in group study, none could be persuaded to make and chart an interaction record. Nor did the study class lead to much increase in moderator skills.

It is unlikely that either the AA or the members had more than a dim inkling of the power of a discussion group as an agent of change and education or of the skills necessary for efficient functioning. Consequently, little sense could be seen in making some of the innovations. The progress that was made resulted largely from some of the techniques meeting felt problems, those of individuals and of the group. This may suggest that the adaptation of any specific technique is part of a larger strategy: 1) felt problems must be explored and used as motivators for innovations; 2) there is a need for certain type of method which gradually sensitizes the group to the potentialities of democratic participation. The post-meeting questionnaire (five questions whereby members expressed evaluations of the discussion)
appears to be the best beginning instrument; a next step might be the training of anecdotal observers to report to the group their estimates of its discusional process, and finally the making and interpretation of interaction records. Put in other words, when the group is sensitized to the "how" of its process, other methods may more easily be introduced.

Thus the problem of adapting the techniques in some respects reduces to the more fundamental one of adequate motivation. Action research depends upon and utilizes the desire for change and for dealing with felt problems on the part of the group and of its leaders. Since difficulties were met in this area, specification of them would be beneficial for future research.

The motivation necessarily varies with the type of technique undertaken. Thus with a sociometric test, the motivation of the adult advisor is the prime consideration, since the youth cannot give the test and since most of the information is kept confidential. In this project, such motivation was not developed. One reason has already been pointed out, the lack of a training class for adult advisors. The interpersonal situation of the minister suggesting changes to the adult advisor was not democratic. Other features mitigated against adequate motivation: the minister knew too much about the adult advisor's family situation; the adult advisor shared his daughters' opinions of the group and his outlook was biased. But more than adult
motivation was necessary. Stating one's choice and preference

toward other members was, for several members, contrary to

the official Christian "love-everybody" ideology of the group.

Better preparation of the group for the test as well as

better youth-leader acquaintance with such preferential ex-

pression in other situations (at summer camps or associational

conferences) would help to reduce feeling against its use.

Thus research at a higher level, for youth leaders as well as

adult leaders, is indicated.

Psychodrama also may be introduced only after proper

motivational preparation. However, in this project, more

than lack of motivation was operative. The adult advisor was

very enthusiastic about using drama, but role-playing required

skills which neither he nor the youth had. Thus its use is

not recommended unless a pre-test has been made and skills

acquired. Both the adult advisor and the group were un-

acquainted with this type of spontaneous drama.

One other technique, the interaction record, was not used

by the members or the adult advisor; yet proper motivation for

its use does not appear to be difficult. Since the observer

was trying out the method himself and needed the data obtained

therefrom, he went ahead and made the records. Had he not

made the records and had others been encouraged to experiment

with such, members might have used this technique. In summary,
motivation is a central problem in action research, especially with respect to the adaptation of action methods to the local situation. Those methods which bore directly on felt problems were used and effected the greatest change. Where motivation is lacking, it must be induced.

II. Particular Conclusions about the Group

The discussion of the results with reference to the criteria leaves untouched some further conclusions that may be reached from this study. From the Rorschach interpretations, it appears that the young people as a whole were seriously disturbed, in their interpersonal relationships and in their inner living. There is an immediate need for the Church (or some other institution) to aid them toward a healthier adjustment. Aid would probably have to be of a diversified form: 1) individual counseling by the adult leader, minister or other adults of the Church; 2) discussional material that is closer to the member's problems and discussional process that enables the members to express (catharsis) and objectify their psychic disturbances; 3) positive growth in interpersonal adjustment through the continued use of "real" sociometric tests; 4) the adult leader functioning as a substitute parent. It must be concluded that at present the church educational program is not coming close to helping the members with their inner tensions, and apparently has done little in the past.

These are strong indications that this extensive psychologic
disturbance among the members is traceable to the wider social relations in the community, that the status and social position of the families represented by their children in this study are significant, contributing factors. This points to the need for a community study and the necessity of the Church's program to be directed, not primarily to the youth but to their families. In the large majority of cases, the power of the father in the family was weak or there was no father. The writer feels that the better adjustment of the father to and the better inclusion of him into the community (a more respected citizen) is crucial. Many church programs for youth overlook this feature; such programs attempt to aid the adolescent independently of the family unit and consequently are largely ineffectual. The maladjustment is too severe to be treated independently of the family; nor can the family be aided without reference to its embeddedness in the community structure. Thus it is concluded that the family should be of prime concern in remedial action; the family must be helped, particularly the father, to achieve a more respected status in the community.

When the project was first conceived, stress was placed on testing simple techniques that might be used by unskilled church personnel. Thus the Rorschach test was included, not as a tool for assessment, but as a tool for checking the results of the other techniques. Now it appears to be an indispensable instrument for in some cases a far greater degree of disturbance was shown than could have been otherwise surmised.

However, common sense prompts the conclusion that the wide use of
the Rorschach test would be impossible. So the question arises again: Could this state of affairs be predicted from the other techniques? Apparently the severity of disturbance could not, at least in individual cases. Degree of disturbance was not found to correlate with position of leadership in the group, degree of the member's acceptability to the group, or his expressed feelings toward the other members. Severe maladjustment was found among leaders and marginal members. It seems that conclusions reached in other studies (such as of a class or grade in school) could not be applied to this group. In this group, maladjustment was the common characteristic. As a result, the high percentage of maladjusted members would be reflected, not so much in individual scores, as in the general group pattern of attractions and repulsions. The second sociometric test (on which group a representative sample of Rorschach tests was obtained) did show a skewed scattering of expressed preference scores: very high positions were filled (liking of everybody) with a heavy concentration of low scores (high indifferences expressed by the members toward each other) while the middle range was poorly filled out. Thus the gravity of individual maladjustment might have been gotten from the picture of the group as a whole. But the certainty of such a conclusion depends upon further studies of other groups of a similar type.

III. Wider Implications

The final conclusion of the previous section has implicit within it a further conclusion: an action research project of this type
cannot be successful when carried out in isolation. This has been mentioned again and again in a variety of contexts: 1) this group is a biased sample of the youth of the community; 2) it is artificial in that member relations are not as close as in other types of groups; 3) members may freely come or go; 4) the maladjustment of members in this group appears to be more general than in groups described in other studies so that conclusions derived from these other studies did not fit this group; 5) community social structure is a large determinant. Until other projects are tried in similar church groups, it will be impossible to determine whether these features are rather universal (or universal to certain social situations, such as a rural community) and to draw further important conclusions.

These are not the only reasons for further studies and wider referents. It may be that the Church as a general institution within American culture is largely oblivious to the acute, inner disturbances of people and thus to the problem of inventing therapeutic aids. An obvious place to begin is in the seminars. There is a great need for concrete studies of communities and parishes at the institutional level of analysis, this to be carried on concurrently with studies at the primary (face-to-face) group and individual levels of analysis. The gravity of the situation would be apparent and so too the necessity for better action methods. There would be the further problem, why this lack of knowledge has persisted for so long. Undoubtedly fundamental dynamic factors will be found to have contributed to this blindness and to the easy reliance upon what has been termed inspirational-repressive modes of therapy.
There is another conclusion, that crucial action skills may not be learned via such an isolated approach as was undertaken in this project. This applies to the adult adviser in particular. He can best learn in a group of other adult advisers. In such a group, these techniques could be presented, discussed, tried out and further refined. The same approach may be utilized for young people who are leaders; summer conferences are one possibility. Groups might be organized at the associational or district level of grouping of churches, possibly even at the regional level (statewide or for New England). Basic skills would involve at least the areas of leadership, techniques designed to improve interpersonal relations and group functioning, counseling (adult advisers), and dynamic discussion.

V. Summary

The results may be summarized as being far from complete. Progress in some areas was better than in others. The most fruitful conclusions came in the area of diagnosis and assessment, on the individual and group process levels. Perhaps this was a necessary outcome in any beginning attempt at structuralizing this field of study and for a clearer statement of the problems to be differentiated. Except for drama and sound recordings, the techniques were thought to be simple enough for use in a church group with this added observation that interpretation would be limited by the worker's (whoever used the techniques) theory of personality. Changes resulting from the techniques
were not clearly demonstrated but there were positive signs. It was concluded that the techniques brought about no serious disruptions in the group but on the other hand they were not fully adapted to the group. Adaptiveness of any technique was seen to be a part of a larger strategy to sensitize the group and adult leader to the potentialities of democratic participation.

The Rorschach results pointed to the seriousness of the situation: members were not, as a whole, well adjusted and healthy mentally. There is a pressing need for the program of the Church to deal more realistically with this condition. It may be that the severity of maladjustment is a localized phenomenon. If so, the techniques should be continued, counseling service should be provided, and the weekly discussions should come closer in content to member problems. But it was felt that if this were a localized phenomenon, more than these techniques are necessary. The member's family must be aided in its adjustment to and inclusion in the community social structure.

Irrespective of whether or not the large incidence of inner disturbance was peculiar to this group, an action project of this type labors under difficulties because it is carried out in isolation. Other studies are necessary, if only to afford a basis for comparison. Also action skills cannot be acquired by the adult adviser and youth leaders in such a limited situation. Projects must be carried on concurrently at an inter-church level. Even this does not appear sufficient; the clergy needs training also. So it is strongly
recommended that theological seminaries institute a program of concrete research at three levels of conceptualization: that of the institutional, the primary (face-to-face) group and the individual. Such a program might have many consequences other than just a better assessment of concrete problems within parishes. Tools would be developed for effecting change (institutional, group and individual) via action. Training of the clergy would be affected; mutations in denominational organization and structure might also occur with the emphasis on functional requirements.

A final conclusion seems warranted: action methods may be employed with profit in a church group; thus further and more intensive study should be undertaken.
Subject: 1  

Response

I.  1'5"  2'50"
   1)  Halloween scene - grave stones.  
       Dd F+ II
   2)  And ghosts.  
       D M H
   3)  Cat  
       Wg F+ Ad

(She turned the card frequently throughout - she did not inquire about it.)

II.  1'5"  2'45"
   4)  Two baby elephants.  
       D F+ A
   5)  Two snakes, the darker red.  
       Dd F+ A

III.  1'0"  7'50"
   6)  Couple of cannibals standing over a pot.  
       D M H P (FM)
   7)  Monkeys hanging up or some kind of animals.  
       D F+ A
   8)  Like something you'd find in a biology book.  
       D F U F Y Bi
   9)  Butterfly right in there.  
       Dd F- A

IV.  7"  3'20"
   10)  Looks like some little animal you find 'neath the microscope, microscopic animal.  
       W FY A
   11)  Head of a dragon like you see in a child's book.  
       D F+ My

Inquiry

Grave stones, the ghosts and those could be ghosts.  Q. By the appearance. You read about it - halloween with ghosts around, grave stones. The shape.

Looks like head, the arms held out and a sheet over all.  

The eyes here, and the mouth.  You can't see the nose - can't see a cat's nose at night.  This can be the ears and the face.

Have to use your imagination - their trunks up.  The way it's shadowed right there, here as if the elephants face.

As if it wined right down and this is the head right here.  Q. Mostly the way it wandered down.

(Laughs).  They look like cannibals and a pot down here.  Q. Just the first impression.

It wasn't a person, gave me the impression of monkeys or some kind of animals.  Q. They do hang by their tails and there tales are quite long.

Just see a lot of diagrams and made me think of one.  Q. The shape of it.  

No, it's the color in it and the way the color is - darker and lighter.  A butterfly has four wings.  Q. The shape right down here.

Whole thing.  It's not of any particular shape and they do change shape.  Q. Shape and the way its colored.

The eyes, ears, mouth and horns; the lines aren't straight.  Q. Coloring gives the impression of scales.
Rorschach Protocol

12) Pair of feet.  
   D F+ Hd P

13) Leg of a turkey  
    D F+ Fd P

14) Wings of a bat.  
    D F+ Ad

15) Profile.  
    D F+ Hd

16) Grasshopper's head.  
    D F+ Fd

17) An Indian with headdress on.  
    Dd FY Hd

18) Body of a lion.  
    D F- A

VI.  22"  8'0"

19) Skinned animal.  
    D FY A P

20) That could be a boat.  
    D F- Tr

21) Speckled trout's head.  
    Dd FY Ad

22) Head of a tape worm.  
    D F+ Ad

VII.  3'15"  10'14"

23) Wing of a chicken after all the feathers are out.  
    D F- Fd

24) A Japanese - they make cartoons of in the papers or something.  
    Dd F- Hd

VIII.  20"  7'54"

25) The inside part of a fish.  
    D FC AP

26) Wolf, hyena or something like that.  
    D F+ A P (FM)

27) Elephant head and trunk.  
    Dd F- Ad

Subject: 1

The toe and heel.

It looks like a drum stick. I guess it's because we had a turkey for Xmas and we've been eating it ever since.
I don't know what made me think of it.

The nose and face.

Don't know.

The dark and the tiny bits of light could give the appearance of feathers. These are legs as if lying down, tail, other legs has under him; that would be the head and down here his back.

The whole thing in there appeared as if somebody killed an animal and stretched it out. Leg there and leg there. Color in there.
That is the bottom part and that the back part and the smoke stack, if its a steamer boat.
Sort of speckled in here, eye and the shadow comes down here like a fishes head.
Eyes here and that in there. Q. I saw a picture in a biology book - looked something like it.

It's stiff and looks something like that after the feathers are picked off and its dead.
The buck teeth, eyes, head, just as if in a cartoon.

The back bone and the way its colored.
The way its standing, the head and eyes and back.
The trunk and head. Q. If black, I would see it if the black was darker here and the gray lighter here.
Rorschach Protocol

Subject: 1

IX. 5'15" 6'42"
28) Sea coast, deep fog and a lighthouse off in the distance.
D CF FV LS
29) Long end of a gun being fired.
D FC Im
30) Looks like a balcony.
Dds FC AR
31) A bulldog standing up on his hind legs.
D F+ A (FM)

X. 30" 6'17"
32) Two spiders.
D F+ A P
33) Two dogs.
D F+ A FM
34) Head of an old man.
D F+ Hd

The darker green is the land, that's the coast, the green ocean, orange might be lighthouses. Q. Foggy in there, green mist.
As if looking down on it. Firing is the change of color. Q. May be something down in here, end of it but hasn't much to do with it. Cement, opening in there. Q. Opening and color.
Eyes and tongue hanging out, nose, paw and back legs.

I don't know, just don't like spiders. Looks puffed up; spiders have eight legs.
I got a little dog, he howls when a train goes by - sits up like that.
Nose, eyes and back of his head.
Rorschach Protocol

Response

I. 22" 1'55"
Oh, heavens.
1) Looks like a face laughing at me. Ds M Hd
2) Claws of a lobster. D F+ Ad
3) A cliff. Dd F Ge
4) Form of a body - legs, whatever you call them. D F+ Hd P
5) A face. Dd F+ Hd

II. 23" 2'11" (Smiles)
6) Looks like something you see on a X-ray machine. Ds Fy= An
7) Pair of hands clasped. D M Hd
8) Looks like some kind of bug right there. D F+ Ad

9) Looks like a face cut in half - eye, nose, mouth. D F- An
Did you make these?

III. 1'4" 3'33"
I don't see anything in this one (23""). I don't see anything in this one. (E - Do you want to look a little longer? Oh, I see what you mean.
10) These look like two people. D M H P
I think these are crazy.
11) Looks like back of turkey when the feathers are up. Dd F- Ad
Do you take just the impression or grooves right there (she points to upper left lateral red detail)? E - just anything you see.
12) Looks like bird right there. Dd s F- A

IV. 1'80" 3'15"
13) That looks like something - in the middle of a park, water-fountain, figures in a water-fountain. D Fy- Art

Inquiry

Two eyes and laughing. Q. Just the eyes and mouth.
The way they clamp together, two of them, two claws.
It sticks up in the air.
The shape of it, the drawing.

Nose sticking out - reminds me of W. C. Fields (laughs) - he's a crazy.

Might be lungs - no, ribs. No, ribs have bones. I've seen pictures.
Q. Both sides are alike. Q. Opening in here and sides that are alike.
Just looks like hands. Reminds me of a church steeple now.
Looks like a barn swallow. The tail comes out. (laughs) That's not a bug. A bug with wings (extends the percep).
The hole of the nose.

Two people bending forward, head and arms and legs.
Like you draw a picture of one at school.
The head and tail.

There's the head, form, arms. The heads are together, they are back to back and the arms are side by side (demonstrates). Q. Human bodies.
Horschach Protocol

14) Looks like a moth - one of the kids brought one to school - a mammoth moth.

15) Some one who is ding toed.

(Laughs). D M Rdo

I don't know how you get anything out of this discussion, this interview.

16) Whiskers of a cat.

Dd F+ Ad

17) Cliff. Dd F- Ls

18) Looks like a long street right there.

Dd Fy Ls

19) Looks like something from an airplane.

D FV Ls

20) Looks like a totem pole.

D F+ Art

21) Looks like a dirt digger.

Dd F+ Imp

22) Looks like cross section of earth in a biology or science book.

D Fy Ge

23) Face of a dog. Dd F+ Ad

24) A horse standing up in the air on hind legs.

D F- Ad (FM)

25) What do they call those things that form in limestone caves upside down?

D F+ Mn

26) Face of a person, hair done up - face of a girl.

D F+ Hd P

27) I was thinking that looked like a map of some country but I don't know what it is.

D F+ Ge

Whole thing. Wings, feelers, tail.

Sort of goes in here, knees; toes go in. The feet aren't there.

Sticking out on both sides.

In the movies, car coming along - shows what would happen if the car came to the edge and fell off.

Dark streaks where the tires have gone, cars have worn the road. The middle is right there.

Plot of ground, view from airplane. Fields. Could see the road from there too, very narrow. Q. The bumps, the specks, marks right there. Face right here, arms out-spread.

You know, a dirt digger comes down and picks up dirt (demonstrates). It's open. The teeth of it are right there.

The different colors, different shades, different types of layers of earth. Might look like a well when they give you an outline of a pump or something.

Don't see whole thing. The front paws sticking up in air. This could be part of the body.

Points coming up.

Hair done up, front of hair, nose and chin.

The shape.
### Rorschach Protocol

**Subject: 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIII.</strong> 15&quot; 3'05&quot;</td>
<td>25) Don't know whether it is a bear or fox. (laughs) D F+ A (FM) 29) Something out of a chemistry book - different colors and shapes. W CF An 30) Somebody knock-kneed again. Dd S F- Hd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IX.</strong> 1'25&quot; 2'25&quot;</td>
<td>Oh, dear, these things are ---. I don't see anything ---. I didn't mean for you to write that down. Whole thing. Like in modern art, get different parts of the body all jumbled up - looks all jumbled up. (E - What if it were black or grey? Would it still look like modern art to you?). No. This here - the middle of a flower, you know, when you cut open an iris. Where colors have run together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X.</strong> 8&quot; 5'10&quot;</td>
<td>32) Might look like the middle of a flower - that's about all. D F+ Bt 33) Looks like water hit a painting and smudged it all over. D C Art 34) Looks like head of a grasshopper. D F- Ad 35) A peach stone. Dd FC Fd 36) Lumps or goats with horns on them. Dd F- A (FM) 37) Sea shell. Dd FC Ad 38) I think they call them - in lilies, they have knobs on them for pollination. D FC Bt 39) I don't know if two animals or two people fighting - two faces looking at each other and angry look on them. D M A 40) Looks like you see on a map, the shore line goes in and strip of land goes out. Dd S F- Ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>XI.</strong> 8&quot; 5'10&quot;</td>
<td>Feathers, eyes. That orange part. Q. The shape of a stone and same color too. Feet are up in the air; they are jumping. The shape of it, the twist of it, the color - different shades. Probably be like that (turns card around). Isn't it Easter lilies that have yellow things inside - no, they're green. It's tiger lilies. Probably animals - don't look like people. 41) Doesn't the outline of New York look that?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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41) White spots in blue could be lakes.
Dd F Ls

Subject: 2

White spots in here.

Total Time: 52'22"

318
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Response

I. 25" 1'20"
1) Looks like some kind of a bird.
   W F+ A
2) Looks like a deer.
   D F- Ad

II. 10" 1'05"
3) Looks like two animals fighting.
   W M A
4) Couple of dogs.
   D F+ A P

III. 15" 1'30"
5) They look like people (laughs).
   D M H P
6) Looks like legs of some animal.
   D Fy Ad
7) These red things look like somebody after an operation.
   D FC H
8) D CF- An

IV. 10" 1'37"
9) This looks like a bear's skin.
   W F+ Ad P
10) This looks like wings of some animal, fool.
    D F- Ad
11) These look like feet.
    D M Hd P
12) This looks like a spinal column.
    Dd F- An

V. 15" 1'27"
13) This looks like the beak of a bird.
    Ds F+ Ad (FM)

Subject: 6

Inquiry

Looks like wings, this part like the tail and then up here like part of the claws.
These things up here made me think of it - looks like head.

This looks like body and that would be the head. The way they're crouched - got their paws together just closing in.
These look like ears of a dog, this up here would be the nose but not that and not the red.

Looks like they're bending down a little, that's the head and that's the body.
These here look like new born babies (#7).
These here look like the feet, looks like they had fuzz on the legs, hairy animal.

New born baby - looks like head, body and cord. E. Black or grey? No.
Lungs - never really seen lungs, I guess red part - this in between doesn't count.

These look like the ears, that was the front of the head, this looks like the back of it.
This part looks like wings - kind of dropped down.

Looks like somebody standing with feet apart. Q. This could be the foot and that going up is the leg.
Hasn't got bumps like on a spinal column, just straight. Q. Just that it's so straight.

Looks like a bird flying along, got his beak open.
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14) This looks like wings
   D F+ Ad X

15) This looks like a snail's
    head up there.
   D F+ Ad

VI.  34"  1'38"
16) Looks like a butterfly up
    there.
   D F+ A

VII. 12"  1'58"
17) Looks like a plant that
    grows.
   D F- Bt
18) Looks like a person's head
    without that there.
   D F+ Hd P
19) This reminds me of a cake or
    something.
   D F- Fd
20) This reminds me of icicles.
    D F- Ls

VIII. 18"  1'30"
21) Looks like rats when you
    turn them up to the side
    (laughs).
   D F+ A P
22) This looks like a body,
    what a person's insides
    would look like.
   D Fy- An
23) This looks like a mountain.
    D F+ Ls
24) These two things look like
    pillows.
   D FC- Hh

IX.  33"  1'15"
25) Looks like clouds.
    D Fy CL
26) Looks like wings on a bird.
    D F- Ad
27) Looks like trees.
    D G Bt

Subject: 6

These look like wings but not placed
in right way to go with head.
That looks like horns and this start-
ing down is neck. Looks like back
view of it, not front.

Looks like wings, each side; rest
is just the back.

Looks like a plant is shooting up only
it isn't very plain. Looks like it's
sproutin' some other leaves.
This is nose, head and chin; just
back shape of the head.

Looks like a big oversize cake, a big
oversize cake, frosting on it; each
part separate though. Q. on frosting.
These crinkly edges.
Looks like they're hanging only they're
upside down.

Looks like head, body and legs.

Looks like X-rayed, what part of inside
would look like. Q. Those shaded
parts look like an X-ray. Q. The
shape of it. Q. Black or gray? No.
This looks like peak and coming down
side view.
Two square pillows covered with blue.
Q. Just the shape.

Shaped round on edges, looks like clouds
floating along. Q. - if black or gray,
still look like clouds? Yes.
Looks like they're flying.

The green of this made me think of trees,
just the color.
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Subject: 6

X. 1'06" 3'38"

28) Looks like rushing water. 
   D CF Na

   Looks like it's just splashed out of something and running in all directions. Q. Just that's blue. Just the shape of them and the color too.

29) Looks like a person's lungs. 
   Dd FC- An

   Mouth, nose and forehead. They got on some kind of cap.

30) Looks like somebody's laughing. 
   Dd M H

   These things sticking out look like claws in front.

31) Those look like crabs crawling along. 
   D F- A (FM)

   They look like they're jumpin', back of their legs, head and front legs (from inside out).
   Head, that's some fur, front paws, hind legs, tail.
   Ears, eyes and bottom of head.

32) These look like reindeer. 
   D F+ A (FM)

   Cherries and stem.

33) These look like dogs. 
   D F+ A

   Head, horns, front legs and back legs.

34) This looks like a rabbit. 
   D F+ A P

   This looks like a bull. 
   D F+ Fd
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Subject: 7

I. 22" 1'50"
1) Looks like a cat.
W F+ A
Can you turn it any way?
2) Additional on inquiry.
W M H

II. 25" 1'32"
3) Looks like a crab.
D F- A
4) Additional on inquiry.
W M H P

5) These two things look like somebody's feet.
D F C G
6) That looks like a monkey's profile.
D d F+ Ad

III. 8" 1'03"
7) Looks like a man doing something. I don't know what.
D M H P

8) These two things look like palm trees.
D F- Bt
9) That looks like a fish too, a crab.
D g F- A

IV. 15" 4'7"
10) Looks like a flying squirrel. It doesn't look like much.
W F+ A P (FM)

V. 8" 3'1"
11) Butterfly.
W F+ A P

12) This way it looks like a bat.
W F+ A P

Whole thing. Eyes, nose, looks something like ears,

Whole thing looks like two women pulling on something; people with pointed hats.

Those little things sticking out, look like feelers, shape of it.
E - If black or gray? Yes.
(From location chart) This way looks like two people playing patty cake, like they're dancing feet together and clapping their hands. Big hairdo.
Two red ones. I don't know why.
Q. Looks like somebody's feet with stockings on. Q. Red shoes or socks. Or like women down in Africa with big bottom lips. This is the eye.

One of them could be a man working but two of them could be men dancing or jitterbugging. Looks like they were pushed apart but wind was blowing on their backs.
The shape of it, the way it looks. The trunk and big top.

These are claws. Q. That looks like mouth. Wasn't all the way finished.

Those little things up there are antennae and the wings and the shape of it.
The way the wings are held. I don't think any of these things stick out of the head.
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Subject: 7

VI. 35" 1'11"
Whistles.
13) Looks like a head of a worm. Doesn't look like anything.
   D F+ Ad
   (holds at arms length.)
14) Additional on inquiry.
   W F+ Ad P

Some of them have those little things on their neck. Q. The eyes. Just the shape of it - so small.

Looks something like a bear's skin without a head, two arms and feet. Don't know if the tail is that big or not though.

VII. 33" 1'05"
15) Looks something like a rabbit or donkey, rabbit I guess.
    W F- A (FM)
16) One half looks like clouds.
    D Fy G L P

That's the ears, kind of a big head and tail. Standing on a stone.
Q. Shape of things and ears sticking up.
Sometimes looks like clouds you see in the sky especially just before it is going to rain.

VIII. 33" 1'05"
17) Looks like a dog or gopher.
    D F+ A P
18) Top looks like a tree,
    Xmas tree.
    D F+ Re

Looks like a dog's body but doesn't have a nose of a dog. One of these dogs without a tail. - homely looking.
Skraggly around the edges, small needles on a tree. The point too.
E - Black or Gray? Yes.
(On location chart) This thing looks like a ship - one of the old fashioned kind - ship here, water and sails.

IX. 20" 1'05"
Heavens.
19) That's got color that looks like a sunset.
    W CF - Na
20) That thing in the middle looks like a tree except for the color.
    D F+ Bt

Looks like there's rays coming thru it, the sun is above.

This pink looks like leaves and this the trunk.

X. 18" 2'37"
21) Looks like a bug, potatoe bug.
    D F- A
22) Two bugs climbing up a pole.
    D F+ A (FM)

These look like legs, antennae, sticking out of head, mouth & eyes. (Red parts) - I can't think of a thing for them.
A grasshopper's head right there.
24) Looks like a person going to dive. 
   Dd M - R

25) Reindeer in there too. 
   D F+ A (FM)

26) Looks like things on the 4th of July, rocket. 
   D Fy- Fi

27) The blue things look like spiders. 
   D F+ A P

Subject: 7

Looks like a bull now. The horns. Running 'cause the feet are stretched out far. Q. The way it was standing at an angle, almost going to jump right in. 

Like it was jumping over something. The antlers and how front feet go way back when they jump. 

This one looks like an airplane because of the shape of it right down at the end here. And this is the wake, not a wake but one that writes in the sky. 

The other one looks like a rocket shot up in the air - it's descending. All the legs like. Spider has so many legs.

Total Time: 12'33"
I.  10"  1'55"
    Is there any special way you hold it?
1)  Butterfly, I guess
    W F+ A P

2)  Some kind of an insect, a butterfly.
    W F+ A

II.  55"  1'55"
    Oh, I'll be darned.
3)  Looks like two crows, two blue jays.
    D F- A (PM)
4)  or two people arguing.
    W M H P
5)  Probably bears.
    D F+ A P

III.  50"  1'50"
    Two women; they're doing some kind of work. It
    looks like a bowl; they're washing.
    D M H P

IV.  40"  1'05"
7)  Looks like some kind of a design or symbol.
    D F- Art

V.  7"  1'05"
8)  Looks like a butterfly.
    W F+ A P
9)  or an insect.
    W F- A

Are you supposed to see just insects on certain ones?

VI.  1'48"
    I can't make anything on this one.
10)  (Additional obtained on inquiry.)
    W F- A

VII.  10"  45"
11)  Looks like two people dancing.
    W M H
12)  or a map.
    W F+ Ge
VIII. 18" 1'16"
15) The pink things look like two mice crawling, looks bigger than mice, could be a bigger animal but I don't know what it could be.
D F A P

IX. 52" 1'27"
14) A lantern.
W CF Ro

15) In the middle is some kind of a wall.
D s CF Ar

Like a Chinese lantern, the colors made me think of the Chinese. The way it was shaped, as if made out of paper. That looks like illumination and that like the bulb.
This brown. You remember our old brown wall with the holes in it - it's the first thing I thought of.

X. 15" 1'17"
16) A grasshopper.
D F A d

17) A lot of different kinds of animals - spiders
D F A P

18) and stuff and frogs.
D F A

(The question regarding whether she meant the whole card.)
Well, it isn't all animals.

19) Those look like two elves.
D F A H

20) That looks like a dead horse.
D F A Dh

21) That looks like a dog.
Dd F A (FM)

The two eyes and the face, the shape of the face. (Black or grey?) I don't know.
Big long legs.

The legs are bowed.
The nose and hat.
The way its head is bent back, four legs and a bloated stomach.

It's lying down.

Total Time 13'40"
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Response

I. 5" 1'15"
1) A bat.
W F+ A P

2) A bell.
D F+ ob

3) A funny face.
D D F+ Hd

4) Something that looks like your tonsils.
D D F- An

5) Two little men.
D D M- H

6) A bird, a chicken.
D D F+ A (FM)

(Near the beginning, she asked if it were alright to turn the card; she did considerable turning throughout.)

II. 8" 1'25"
7) A lobster like.
D CF- A

8) A head of an animal with horns.
D F+ Ad (FM)

9) An eagle.
D D F+ Ad

10) A dog without a tail.
D F+ A P (FM)

III. 3" 1'45"
11) A ribbon
D CF Pr

12) D F+ AP

Subject: Q

Inquiry

A bat, altogether - a few things that wouldn't be a bat; just wings would go and no head - that's the way you see a bat, isn't it?
Oh a bell with a ding-dong thing; something interrupts it here.
Funny man - eyes here and tongue sticking out. A funny face at halloween - mostly eyes and nose and teeth.
When you look down some one's throat, they look like that.

Looks like a priest - mostly because hands are crossed, untidy hair, nose and one foot showing a little bit.
There are two coming towards each other.
Looks mostly like a baby bird, not a chicken; no feathers on the head, a baby bird just born and hollering for worms.

With horns, reminds me of one but doesn't look like one; maybe because its red. Little things, scales, no not scales. It is the same on both sides like a lobster.
Animals with big horns that charge at you like in story books. That looks like a design in a horse's head. He's fat like he's coming toward you. The ears are two little things on top of his head.
The head, the round part of it brought it to my mind.
The whole half (without red) - cut off after the tail. He's running and all.

Ribbon there with a bow. Butterfly too but mostly a ribbon. Q. For one thing it is red and it looks like a ribbon all prettied up.
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13) A pot with smoke coming out and a man coming out.  
D M FY H

14) Some sort of fish.  
D F+ A

15) Head of a seal.  
Dd s F- Ad

16) Trees (She held the card at arm's length and did it rather frequently throughout.)  
D FV Ls

IV.  3"  2'8"

17) Oh, the skin of a possum, I guess.  
W F+ Ad P

18) Oh, a skin of foxes.  
D F+ Ad

19) Head of an eagle, I think it's an eagle. More like a duck; it would be a duck.  
D S F+ Ad

20) An animal with a turned up nose but I don't know what kind.  
D F+ Ad

V.  3"  1'54"

21) Oh, a bat.  
W F+ A P

22) Oh, a butterfly too.  
W F+ A

Subject: S

Smoke coming out of a pot. Hands on hips. More like a man only no hair and sleek eyes. Like the story - what was it? Genius, that's it, there are really two geniuses.
Tail and legs on it with feet or wings down and a big log face like a shark laughing, you know how it is. Long sleek body with V tail made me think of it.
A seal or a beaver. Just that part of it with the eye. Maybe the fish coming down brought it on.
Two trees here and one into the background with a little cut off as if the sun was taking the leaves off - you know, how it does when you take a picture and the sun is shining on the leaves.
They're good big ones. Q. Looks like leaves crinkly; the trunks are big and wide, like old trees, they are old trees. They're throwing a shadow on the road.
I can't figure out what those red things (lateral red) are supposed to be.

A skin of a possum - the whole thing. I don't know what brought it on except the head had a white mark in it.
When a lady wears it around her neck. The legs brought it to mind. The head is cut off and that is the tail.
Kind of a duck that has a white place on the neck or on it; just the head, cut off at the neck.
Oh, I can't think of the kind, like in Uncle Wiggly book. Cut off at the neck, no down to here - would be tail and paws.

Has wings up and a little part of the head showing; seems as if there are two heads but I just cut one off.
Q. Whole thing.
With two little things on the head.
Q. Wings and two little things that come up in the head.
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23) Head of a crocodile.
   Ds F+ Ad

24) Profile of a Man's face.
   Dd F+ Md

25) Head of a rabbit, a little rabbit.
   D F+ Ad (FM)

VI. 2'20"

26) Gee, I see skins of animals in every single one. Here's another skin.
   D F+ A

27) A funny bird with whiskers.
   D F+ A

28) A map of Texas.
   D F- Ge

29) Looks like a scene with reflection of trees in the water with the sun just going down. It's pretty.
   D IV Ls

30) Some sort of leaf, half a leaf.
    D F+ Bt

31) Looks like bombs falling over water (strakes hand down over it). Reflection in the water.
    D Fy Ls

VII. Oh! 12" 2'30"

32) Looks like a mouth of water where water comes in, where the sea comes in.
    Wa F+ Na

33) And locks that let boats in and out.
    D F+ Ge

34) Head of a chicken.
    D F- Ad

Subject: D

He's got his mouth open and eyes sticking out like they do. There are two of them. Just the head. Little nose and big chin; looks like Santa Claus, big beard.

With fur and two ears sticking up; looks like he is looking over a fence or something.

I can't tell what kind of animal.

Q. The lay-out of it - even on both sides.

Whiskers with mouth open, two eyes like on top of the head when flying. I don't know what made me think of that. The things come down. Mexico - Texas comes down into it and California off here. I don't know what brought it to mind.

There's water down below and above a regular scene. Light way back in back. Sun right there coming down over the trees. Q. Right to about there because the rest is dull; and not the winged part. Oh, I can see it clearly; it's pretty.

I thought of it because of the points. Looks as if there is a stain on it or something.

Bombs exploding in air here, it may be ack-ack. Seems like the other scene. It is at night and over here bombs are bursting and here are enemy guns. Hazy. All this too - shining in the water.

Just the white. It was white, could be water, sea with the ocean coming into the sea. No shape, maybe the color white.

A lock, nothing in particular shows it. Those two things where a boat goes in with two gates. Just the openings. It opens into the ocean on both sides. A little baby chicken - the beak and back. It is cut off, like it is sitting on a nest.
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55) (Holds card at arm's length.) And head of a rooster with comb only and the comb going the wrong way.
D F- Ad

56) A little boy with stocking cap on, sticking his tongue out, no he isn't either.
D M H P

57) Seems like a water faucet.
D F- Hh

VIII. 8" 3'35"

58) A wild animal, I can't think of what it is like.
D F+ A P

59) Crawling with blood from its foot.
D C F E L

60) Looks like an X-ray of some one's stomach.
D s F- An

61) Picture of two dogs - turned around a little.
D d F+ A

62) Picture of rocks with something going over them with reflection in the water and there are bones in the water and mud and a bridge in the distance.
W FVFC Ls

63) Another animal, a funny animal, peering out from behind.
D d F- Ad (FM)

64) A cow without any ears.
D F+ Ad

65) That's all. Oh, there's a goat with little things hanging from his chin and horns cut off a little.
D F+ Ad

66) Something as if dropped in a well of water and circles around.
D s F+ Ru

Subject: 9

The beak and eye and bump over his beak.

More or less just his head.
There are two of them looking at each other. They look like they're mad at each other.
That looks like the pipe and that's the faucet.

Sleeking along bent. With blood dripping from its foot -
two feet, one from front and one from back.

Cut off the little ear for the stomach. The black would be left out - just the white itself.
Q. It looks like bones, like an X-ray.
The long ears brought it to mind.

Rocks with the animal going over them with reflection in the water. The mud is the brown there and the bones.
The bridge - one little gray piece.

Looks like an eagle peering up behind the animal except its the same color as the rock. Q. Nose like an eagle.
The big eyes and the mouth. The whole pink with that little part cut off.
The pink thing made me think of it.

It looks like it's far away. It looked like the color of water - the white. Q. The round things, they are cut off.
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47) A skull of an ox.
Ds F- An

48) A man with a beard.
D F+ Hd

49) Another shore line with a group of trees showing into it with tower in back showing into it and mist over all.
D F+ Vs

50) Two funny looking faces with horns and nose and head.
Ds F+ Hd

51) Like shells you get in the water.
D F- Bt

52) Man with mouth to the side and open. (She demonstrates) usual F- Hd

53) Picture of a catapillar.
D F+ A (FM)

54) And one of a rabbit.
D F+ Ad P

55) Two awful, awful queer sort of animals with horn things - fighting - over a stick.
D F+ A (FM)

56) Some kind of animal with a scarf around its neck and gold things hanging down.
D FC A(Cg)

57) A baby drinking, no eating a turkey without a head.
D M H

58) A chicken with all the feathers cut off and the head still on.
D F- Ad

Subject: B

Just all the white, the same as the X-ray only the ears are included. Q. Just looks like a skull with a line down through it.

Looks like a V shaped beard, like Dickens. Looks like the bust of a man - all the pink. The high collar comes up there and a mustache besides the beard.

Trees and tower in the back - the yellow line - and mist over all. Q. That's what I was looking for in all these since I saw that first one. I like those scenes. So I looked for it and saw it. Q. The way they come up in a picture, the trees.

Like a little baby with a nose and horns coming out of it, or an elf. And something on its head, like a cap.

Just the horn part, the points made me think of it.

Mouth, eyes, nose and sort of hazy over the top of the head. Looks like some sort of mad man.

Squirrel, has tail and little legs all along. The eye sort of sticks out.

The head of a rabbit. Q. The long ears and nose.

The eyes and mouth and legs.

I don't know what brought it to mind.

The blue is the turkey and the baby is sort of sucking on it. Q. The nose and eyes for the baby.

Two long things for beak, that brought it on and down there are the legs.
59) A dead duck, looks like its being carried by a dog - not by a dog. Just a little of the mouth shows. 
Dd CF- A(d) (FM)

60) A woman's atomizer for perfume only there are two squeezers on it instead of one. D F- Pr

61) A fork in the road with a policeman's thing in the middle and two cars on either side. 
D FV Ls

Subject: 9

The yellow brought it on. There is the neck and the body. The dog's mouth is the little bit of brown.

There's the bottle and the two squeezers. Q. The two squeezers made me think of it.

Two cars and the policeman's thing in the middle. It is far away.

Total Time - 21'27"
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Response

I. 45" 5'27"
Oh my Lord. What do I see here?
   turns it slowly and deliberately.
1) Well, that's a helmet.
   Ws F+ Aq
   How many do you see?

2) There's a mask there too.
   Ws F+ A

3) And a bell, part of a bell.
   D F- Hh

4) There's a woman with a great big, well picture hat on.
   D F- Hd Cg

5) A little boy that looks kind of surprised (laughs).
   (Edging) Dd M Hd

II. 32" 4'25"
   (Laughs or grins - turning frequent but slow).
6) Tail end of a horseshoe crab.
   D F- Ad

7) There's a parasol.
   Ds F+ Pr

8) Sun reflected on deep blue sea (laughs), dark ocean.
   D CFYF Na

9) I see an X-ray development, looks as though TB is setting in, like the ones we saw over at the hospital.
   Dd FY- An

III. 25" 4'15"
10) A skeleton of a frog.
    D FY- Ad

Inquiry

Can you turn the card any way? (She turns it slowly and deliberately.)

1) That's where your head would go. Q.
   The way it's shaped around and these
come right out from the ears.
   Reference to older days.

2) Like a cat, there's the eyes and
   mouth. You see them on Wheaties
   boxes. Q. Just the way the eye parts
   are shaped and the mouth.
   There's the gong.

3) Nose and mouth (laughs), this is her
   neck and big hat, beach hat extra
   big ones.
   The way the eye brows go right up there
   and big eyes (mimics).

4) The long prongs at end like a tail,
   little feet there and the shape of
   the back of it.
   Just the outline, handle, goes right up
   into the white and down.

5) Either this side or this side. Q. The
   light red spots; ripples like that on
   water. Q. Just the spots here. Q. Kind
   of red like the sun when it goes down.
   When the biology class went over to
   the hospital at MB, they showed us
   x-rays. And the dark lines look like
   ribs, and just the outline of the red,
   just down and up. They showed us one
   and it had a dark outline like TB.
   Q. black or gray? Would it still look
   like that? I think so. Q. It isn't
   the color? No.

6) This is the side of it, and leg, front
   leg, up by the head, the head is right
   here. Q. Just the way it's shaded in,
   the lightness and darkness of it.
11) A butterfly (laughs).  
D FY A P

12) Bird perched on the end of a stump.  D F+ A (FM)

13) Two branches of a tree.  
D FY Bt

14) Pond lily.  
Ds FY- Bt

IV.  53"  3'12" (Turning)
15) Half of a big pine tree.  
D F- Bt

Gee, I can't get anything out of that.

V.  1'06"  4'8" (Turning)
16) Profile of a man.  
D F+ Hd
17) A bat (2'6")  
W F+ A P

18) An open pair of pliers.  
Ds F+ Im
19) A wish bone.  
D F+ Fd

VI.  52"  4'21" (Turning)
20) Some one's lung.  
Dd F- An
21) A leg of a fancy table or chair.  D F+ Hh

22) A canyon, a little stream way down in the bottom of it.  
Ds FV Ls
23) An igloo (laughs).  
Dd F- Ar

Well, it's just the shape of the wing there and the dark towards the middle of it, darkest part.  Q. The darkest part of the butterfly is in the middle, the wings are light.  Q. black or gray, still? If it was shaded, I'd see it the same way.  
This part is the stump or branch on a cliff.  This bird here kind of bent over.  
This right here, logs, more of a branch, on a tree in winter time.  Q. Just a broken branch there.  Q. This is like snow or ice on the end of it.  Right here, kind of broken off.  Q. These are like petals where shaded and the white spots are the center. That right there is a little stem of it and water right around it.

Right here, coming down, these are the branches and that's a big one. That's the stump.  Q. Just the way it's shaped.

The forehead, nose, mouth and chin.  

Big wings, feet right here, didn't have much of a head on it.  Q. Just the shape.  
Just the shape of it.

This is the end and top. Just the shape of it.

Think it was right up here.  Q. Just the shape of it.  
The dark part.  Q. This is the bottom and right up here. One like it out in the dining room.  
This is the little stream, you're looking down and lightness and darkness are different levels of land.  Q. Stream? the white. 
That's the outline, this white.  Q. The sunset shining and those are the rays out.  Q. Sunset? These little lines.  Q. on igloo? The semicircle.
Rorschach Protocol

VII. 28"  3'16" (Turning a little faster)
24) An old fashioned lamp
    shade.  Ds F+ H1
25) Face of a scotty dog.
    D F+ Ad
26) Two people standing by a
    tall pole.
    D F Im
    Dd M H
27) Door chimes.
    Ds F Wh
28) Cat that's been frightened
    by a dog (laughs).
    D F+ A (FM)

Right around here and some of them
have push buttons on them.
They have a kind of square face.
This light spot is the eye.  This
is the chin, the darker spot.
Pole going down there and two people
on either side; seem to be holding
it up.

This upside down, just this white
part right here.  Q.  The shape of
it right down here.
There's the cat's face, kind of a
big bushy tail.  Seems to be popping
off boxes or something here.  But
it's in the shade and can't see it
very well.  Q.  Busy tail.  Big tail
and little lines - looks like fur.
Q-shade?  Can't see the feet or
rest of outline, either behind some-
thing or in the shade.

The roof of it here and these are
stilts, the little lines.  Q.  Seems
kind of greenish in some places.
Q.  Just the slope of the roof.

There's the fish right there and this
front paw is in the water, and the
fish is in the bank.  Q-water?  Part
of foot gone and leaning towards.
Pink polar bear.
Just this half.  The color hasn't got
anything to do with it.  Q.  Seems to
be a smaller one and one in back or
in the distance.

There's the sleeves, the waist and
the skirt.  Kind of the top of it
there.  Mostly the shape of it.  Cuffs
on the sleeve and the little line is
like a belt.
This is the grass (pink) and this is
the fountain.

Goes right up to here, this is water
and splashing out over.  Q.  water?
The color
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35) A big street light.  
    $D_s F+ Ls$

36) A bear – an ugly bear.  
    $D_s F+ Ad$ (FM)

37) Bottom of a shady tree.  
    $D F- Bt$

38) Bottom of the ocean with all kinds of plants and everything.  
    $W CF Na$

39) An empty sea shell.  
    $Dd F- Na$

40) Two lobsters fighting among themselves.  $D F+ A P$ (FM)

41) The head of a sea horse.  
    $D F+ Ad$

42) An inch worm.  
    $D FC A$ (FM)

Subject: L2

This part of the dress. This down here is the glass, the globe. The white part is the shade. Q. Just the shape of it.  
There's the nose and ear and little light spot is the eye and this is the open mouth – teeth right there. Q. Just the outline.  
Shape of the bottom of the tree. Q-shady tree? Just seems to be big and the branches are low to the ground.

(Turning a little faster.)  
Just the whole thing. The colors and all and the shapes.

The yellow one. This is the end and the other end is broken off, where the dark part is – indicates broken part of the shell. Q. The shape of it – there's a special kind you see on the beach.  
This here – all legs and claws. Q. Two right there. Q-fighting? They're all in a tangle.  
Just the shape of it.

They're kind of dragging themselves along. Q. The shape and color. Q-dragging along? Kind of comes up in a hump.

Total Time: 41'33"
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Response

I.  17"  1'40"
Oh, my gosh.
1) To me, it looks like some sort of bug.  D F+ A
2) (On handing the card back she said) - I thought of a bat when I first looked at it - only doesn't look like wings.  W F+ A P

II.  1'50"  2'20"
Oh, crimmny. Just look at these things one way, right? This one's got me stuck completely.
3) A little more shape and it would look like a couple of bears having a fight.  D F+ A P (FM)

III.  1'10"  4'10"
4) They got heads like chickens - I have a great imagination.  D F- Ad
Are they supposed to represent anything at all? Can't figure out what those red splotches could be. But the rest of it I couldn't figure out what it would be all about.

IV.  1'25"  1'50"
Are they supposed to represent anything in particular? This is quite a one.
5) Almost looks as the head and feet are at the same end but what it would be is beyond me.  D F+ Hd
6) Feet (scored separately).  D F+ Hd P

(Head?) The shape of it and the spots - could almost have two eyes.

V.  30"  2'12"
7) Makes me think of something that would fly.  W F+ A
The way it's shaped, would almost look like a pair of shoes.  Q. The bottom outline of it.

8) So far they've all resembled some kind of animal - insect. the shape of an insect.  D F- A
The way it's spread out. The whole thing without that.
Subject: 29

Just the way it hit me. Q. Probably the wings wouldn't be the same as a butterfly — it was the closest thing at the time and the body section.

have it.
The head of a worm. See it in a cartoon. The way it's spotted — as if two eyes and the dark splot could be the rest of the face. Just the way it was standing on top of everything else — that one point stood up. Almost like a head with arms stretched out.

There is.

Way these were resting on this.
Q. Shaped like heads.

Shaped like a face.

Colors I think made me think of that.
Q. The way the splotches are arranged made me think it was something finer — the way it would grow in the sea.
The top part shaped like a mouse's head. There would be three feet but I don't know where the fourth one would be.

Total Time - 27'29"
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Response

I. 18" 2'08"
1) Eyes and mouth of a Jack-O-Lantern
D E F+ Art
2) Looks something like the head and hat of Paul Revere and as if he had a cloak on.
D F+ H G C
This is hard, I can't do this.

II. 10" 2'40"
Oh heavens.
3) Looks like an animal - has ears, long nose, neck and goes down like that.
D F+ A F
I'm trying to make something out of the red things but they don't make sense.
4) These things remind me of sprouts on potatoes but they certainly don't look like potatoes.
D E C F Fd

III. 40" 2'45"
Oh Lordy
5) This looks like part of an animal's head with beak.
D E A d
6) And a deer's head without antlers.
D d F A d
7) This could be a branch with little things coming out.
D F+ B d
8) This thing looks like something like a rooster flying thru the air with something long hitched on. Head looks like one.
D F C A (F M)
9) A ribbon a child would wear in the hair or a bow.
D C F B P
10) This thing. Half of it looks like a little animal or fish and this part is the feet or little things he uses to swim with.
D F+ A

Inquiry

Pointed like eyes, looks like a smiling mouth.
Faint figure of a face, cloak - just like he has one on.
Two feet and sort of pointed little ears.
They're sort of white - they stick up and are pointed.
The head of an animal, heads on them something like a duck.
The shape of the head and the nose.
Just the shape.
The color and shape of the thing; crown of a rooster.
The color and the shape - looks like a bow I used to wear in my hair.
The shape; maybe the color.
Rorschach Protocol

Subject: 23

IV. 23" 3'03"

Oh heavens; this is terrible, this is horrid.

11) This looks something like an eagle - no feet but head and neck.
   D F+ Ad

12) There's a little shadow in here that looks like a face of a woman - has hair and
    face and very large nose.
    Dd F+ Hd

13) This side looks like a witch with a long nose but this one up here looks like
    Pinocchio - the nose is shaped different.
    D F+ Hd

V. 30" 2'30"

Oh, mercy upon us.

14) Looks something like a moth but its head is split.
    What was in fell out.
    W F+ A P

15) Looks like a back of an animal, back and leg. I can't make out which kind.
    D F+ Ad P

VI. 15" 5'08"

Oh, I can't do these things; they're horrid.

16) That long thing looks like a caterpillar with wings.
    D F+ A

17) Looks like two small people looking into a pit like.
    Dd M+ Hd

18) I found a hound dog, a hunting dog.
    Dd F+ Ad

    And the head of a little baby deer, just sort of his face. Maybe a horse.

VII. 20" 6'00"

These are horrid.

19) An elephant's head with its trunk.
    D F+ Ad

    Looks like the tail of a shark but I can't find the shark.

The shape of his head and comes out here like a bird bulges in the stomach.

The hair is sort of light - white, and a good profile.

Just sort of the front profile.

The wings and feet and the head should be together.

There's his head, tail and leg.

The head - round and two big black eyes.

I thought I saw two heads.

Looks like long ears.

I can't remember.

The trunk and eye and then looked like the shape.

I can't remember.
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20) Right in here is like the head of a crow and his mouth is open.
    Ds F- Ad
Head round like a bird, beak pointed but open.

21) This right here looks like just the body of a butterfly; wings don't look very good.
    D Fs Ad
    Looks like a face right here of one of the nursery rhymes.
    I can't remember.
    Very pointed nose.

22) A scotty dog!
    D Fs A
    Tail, eye, ears, nose and a very good face.

23) This looks like a wire haired terrier and the two dogs have their noses together. Dd F+ Ad (FM)
    He's kissing this dog right up here.

24) Backbone - only a little bity bit.
    Ds F+ An P
    Nerve centers and things coming out. Little things coming out.

25) Looks like an animal with only three legs and a funny tail. D F+ A P
    General shape. Color rather fascinating, brings it out better.

26) Looks like orange sherbet.
    It really does.
    D CF Fd
    With one scoop on top. The color very much and shaped like two scoops.

27) Looks something like an eagle That’s the way I saw one once. The
    with wings spread way out, no shape.
    head and feet dangling in the air. D F+ Ad
    It was flowing down thru the middle.
    Sort of ripply on the side.
    Dd F Rl
    I can’t figure that out; I really don’t see anything.

28) The first thing I thought of was the Jordan River.
    D F+ Ad
    The shape.

29) Looks like rocks on a cliff and they go up; there’s a big one. D F+ Na
    The shape of the object and sort of an imprint inside. The color in that one too - it reminded me of biology.

30) Those two things could be fossils. Little imprint in each. D F+ Na

IX  8”  6'13”
31) Four scoops of strawberry ice cream. D CF Fd
    Sort of round and pink, sort of drippy.
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32) Looks something like a tree with things coming down.
   D F+ Bt

33) A billy goat.
   D F+ Ad

34) These look like three people and one is giving something to one in the middle - handing something.
   Dd M H
   And this one looks like shepherds and they have robes on. They're working on, painting - no-touching something - part of a tree or some sort of idol they've come to.

35) One of the spots of ice cream looks like a man with gray hair, tusk coming out of nose, gray beard and eyes.
   D F+ Md P

36) Looks like a vase but has two holes - looks like it goes right thru so must be on both sides.
   Ds FC Rh

37) Two light houses up on rocks, there's the water and they are up on rocks.
   D FVCF Ls

X. 8" 7'55" looks like Monty Willy.

38) Two blue birds.
   D CF A (FM)

39) Two things look like buffaloes standing on hind feet with tails down.
   D F- A

40) Looks like a face on a totem pole. Dd F+ Md

41) Looks like a little beaver crawling.
   Dd CF A

42) Here's a fish, just
    Dd F+ Ad

43) half of a fish.
    D C Na

---

Subject: 23

General shape of it.

Shape of mouth and long whiskers and head sort of like that. Well, maybe the color, sort of white.
Heads and bodies.

Heads made them look like people and robes. Brighter colors made it stand out better.

Looks like Monty Willy.

Sort of looks like it might curve up under. The bright colors here. We have a vase at home like it. The general shape.

The green looks like water and the darker looks like rocks and the two pointed things look like light houses.

Sort of flying, the wings and head. Just the general shape. The color first.
The tail and the feet and the shape of the body - big thru it.

The eyes and funny nose and general shape.
Has tail, head and face and feet, could be a shaggy dog. Sort of plump. I think the color made me think of it.
Little mouth and eye.

Reminded me of swimming into water.
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Subject: 23

44) Looks like a crab.
   D F+ A P

45) Here's a giraffe.
   Dd F+ A

46) And the head of a rabbit.
   D F+ Ad P

47) And a wish bone.
   D F+ Fd

48) Looks like a frying pan with potatoes all chopped up in it, fried potatoes in all tiny pieces.
   Dd FC Fd

This thing here is a little odd creature.

49) Looks like a dog but the middle is narrow, but leaping thru the air in a curved shape but running.
   D F- A (FM)

Had all little feelers.
Doesn't really look like one.
Long neck and two ears and four feet.

Two long ears, the way the head is shaped, little nose and big eyes.
Just the shape of it.

Long handle, sort of round, light coloring inside makes it look like potatoes.

I don't remember.

Everytime I see four legs I think of a dog. Head looks like a terrier, ears are dark brown, legs and tail.

Total Time: 44' 22"
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Response

I. 8" 1'17"
1) Part of a cow there.
W F+ Ad
2) Looks like a fellow passing the ball from center in football. W F M- H
3) Head of a four-eyed dragon.
W F+ Ad

II. 5" 1'43"
4) Looks like an explosion.
W CF Cl Fi
5) A volcano erupting.
W CF Na Fi
6) A pair of pants that got split at the seam.
F F- Cg
7) Two pigs kissing each other.
D M A
8) An old ash can blown apart.
W F CF- Hh Fi

III. 3" 32"
9) Looks like two women doing their washing.
D M H P
(Additional on inquiry - could be two witches.)

IV. 8" 1'15"
10) Looks like the rear end of an elephant.
W F- Ad
11) Looks like a fat fellow sitting down.
W M H
12) Looks like a boy trying to jump over a tree stump.
W M H

V. 5" 46"
13) Looks like a butterfly right off. W F+ A P
14) Like the skin of a deer.
Which ever way you look at it, it looks like a butterfly.
(There was some edging.)
W FY- Ad

Subject: 24

Inquiry

Whole thing - horns, nostrils, and mouth.
The hands down there, the way he's bent over.
Four eyes, big mouth and horns.

Black clouds and red flames.
The black would be the mountains, that the flames and the lava down there.
It's split at the seams, the great big hole in it.
The shape of the heads and the shape of the noses.
The whole thing: the back of the ash can, the hole where the shell went thru it and this would be the explosion (S tells about firing on the range.)

Just the black; just the way they're standing, the shape of the head and body.

Legs, upper of half - taking in whole thing practically.
The shape of this part, the head, the body, the feet and the legs and this could be the stool.
The tree stumpa and the general shape of the boy.

The shape of the wings and the feelers.
From the legs, back and sides of it and the ribs. Q. Well, the skin that goes over the ribs.
VI. 8" 1'0"n
15) Looks like the skin of a
horse. 
W FY Ad P
16) Looks like a coat somebody
tore apart. 
W F- Gg
17) Looks like some kind of
insect. W F+ A

VII. 7" 1'03"
18) Looks like two rabbits
sittin' on a rock. 
W F- A
19) Looks like two animals
sittin' on a cloud over a
church. W FY Cl
20) Hb FY Ar
21) Looks like an ash tray. 
W FY Hh

VIII. 15" 2'20"
22) Looks like two monkeys
climbin' up a tree. 
D F- A (FM)
23) D F+ Bt
24) Looks like a boy's suit
tore apart. 
Dg F- Gg A (FM)
25) Looks like some kind of
animal crossing a gap. 
Wg FY A (Na) P (FM)

IX. 8" 45"
26) Looks like a fancy vase or
an ash tray whichever one
you want to say. 
Wg CT Hh
27) Looks like a dog blowing
some smoke and in the
D M A
28) smoke is a dragon: looks
like the same thing the
other way. D F- Cl
29) (Dragon scored separately) 
D F+ A

Subject: 24

The skin of the legs, the back and
the stomach skin. The tail might
be down the middle.
The part in the middle would be the
post it was hanging on. There's a
piece down here (flame detail) and
the other piece is up here — (arms out).
The general body, the fuzz around
the neck, the head and feelers.

The general shape of it.

The animals, the clouds and the church
down here. This here looks like a
church and far away; this would be up
and over.
The bowl of an ash tray and two figures
on it. The way it's shaded and it
looks round.

Two monkeys and a general tree. Just
the way the spots are shaped.

It should have been "Two monkeys
tearing a boy's suit apart". The
way the feet are placed - one foot
is pulling the shirt and the other
is pushing it.
The way the animal is - one foot front
and one foot back and one being brought
forward. Two cliffs and one cliff over
here. I should have said "This is a
reflection". Q. I saw the whole card.

The sides of the vase going up. Fancy
colors, fancy shape.

All but the orange part. The pink
would be the dog, the green the
smoke and the dragon.
20) Looks like an alligator swimming toward a dog.  D FIFC A Cl (FM)

21) Looks like two witches over some kind of brew.  W M GF H (Hh) P

X.  9"  1'25"

32) A couple of deers in here.  D F+ A

33) A couple of crabs.  D F+ A P

34) Looks like two dogs kissing each other.  D M A

35) Looks like two animals standing back in a shock of surprise.  D M A

36) A couple of dragons in here.  D F+ A

37) And a couple of birds.  D F- A

38) A couple of toads sittin' in front of a weed.  D F- A Bt (FM)

Alligator – shape of the head; clouds up here (q) – the color of it; and the pond down here – just the way it's shaped, the reflection and so forth; and the dog. That would be the pot and the fire down there and the witches up. The pot is the green part – the shape of it.

Just the general shape.

General shape of the body and horns sticking out all over. The way their heads are put together. Just this; the way they’re bent back.

The general shape of the body – I’ve seen pictures like that lots of times. The brown would be the beak and the tail here. The shape of the tail and head and body. The general characteristics; the way they're sittin'.
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Response

I. 5"  1'02
1) Well, that looks like the devil.  Ws F+ Hd
2) A man you make out of a pumpkin for Hallowe'en.  
Ds F+ Rc
3) Could be a wildcat or tiger cat.  Ds F+ Ad (FM)

II. 20"  1'30"
4) Looks like a bear, reflection in a lake, half in a lake.  
Don't know what the red is.  D FY Adx
5) or rabbit.  
D F- A
6) Could be a scientific experiment with cultures or something.  
W CF Sc
7) Injured animal with blood around.  D CF Bl A

III. 7"  1'23"
8) Looks like a Chinese design, like a lantern.  
D F- Rc

It might be a person, a man smiling.  Doesn't look too much like him, could be.  
That's all.
9) Looking at half of it, looks like a man - side of his face.  
Ds M- Hx

IV. 5"  47"
10) Looks like a bear rug you have in the living room.  
W F+ Hx P
11) A monster, such as you have in murder movies, crouching in for the kill.

W MA

Subject: 25

Inquiry

Eyes and teeth and the - fangs almost; 
outgrowth to make him look ugly.  
Triangular eyes and sharp cut mouth.

The cut-away here and smile or smirk its got on its face.  Mostly just the 
mouth though the eyes might have a 
little to do with it.

The head, eyes, mouth and all furred up.  
The other half in the lake.  Q. - fur?  
Ruffled a little bit - little lines 
look like fur.  Q. - Lake? The way 
its divided.

Ears up here and tail.  Little like a 
nose on the end.

More the red that gave the color to it - like in a mold, looked all ruffled up.  
Q. More the whole thing but the red brought it out more.

The animal here with blood running out of its feet, like its feet run over.

Flat on the bottom and curves here.  
Q. Whole thing except the red; red in here might be a design on the lantern.  
Couldn't remember

Opening right here might be smiling.  
Forehead going in.  Nose right in here.

The big feet coming out here, head and 
paws.  Q. - else? The whole thing 
gives impression.

More the big feet.  Saw the preview of a 
movie one time - the monster had great big feet.  Maybe the broad body and big 
shoulders (8 bunches his shoulders and 
is sweating).
Subject: 25

Wings and small feet.

Looking down, like you're riding on his back and you can see the antlers sticking up.

Rolling hills or mountains. Q. Dark like.

Bear rug again, heavy big feet and its head and kind of flat out.

Wings, feathers and head on top.

Bird again. Q. Whole thing, but now just the top.

Head, eyes, nose and mouth, feathers sticking up. Arms stretched back.

Q - feast? Just usually dances at a feast.

Army boot, the toe here. And old, could be split or torn maybe. Pretty near the whole thing except the top - the way it's broke up. This could look like a worn out snap that could snap around the foot or ankle. Whole picture is too old, torn - Q. Kind of battered, made uneven, like it was torn.

Sides here, square sail and top sail.

Q - else? And mast down the middle.

Just that part there. Q - mountains?

I just imagined the mountains they were going up.

More just the roof, like a thatched roof. Q - anything make you think of thatch? No, just kind of the way its covered.

The sharp wings. Q. Each is a wing.

Q - black or gray? The color kind of matches the butterfly - a butterfly is usually a bright color.
Rorschach Protocol

24) Looks like a dome.  
    Dd F Ar

25) with a green lake.  
    D CF Ls

26) Looks like little feet.  
    Dd FC Hd

27) The blue looks like spiders.  
    D F+ A P

28) Looks kind of like a cavern or cave down here.  
    Dd F+ Ls

29) Looks like a rabbit’s head.  
    D FC Ad F

30) Looks like a thing you put in the fireplace to keep the logs up.  
    D F+ HH

31) That could be frogs maybe, cut open – veins and things.  
    D FC- A

32) That could be a snail.  
    D CF A

33) Looks like a tiger on a coat of arms.  
    D FC Art

34) Might be able to make this look like a deer running.  
    D F+ A (FM)

35) This might look like a whale coming in to catch something.  
    Dd F+ A (FM)

Subject: 25

Really separate on the blot but kind of matched.  Q. Semi-circle, half a circle.  The color.

Little lines would be the toes and the light pink would give it the color.

With all their legs and little hairs on them.  Like the Flume, cut away.

In here with ears sticking up.  The gray color kind of suggest that.  The legs suggested it and the heavy frame, not so heavy but the framework of the lower half.  The color might have a little bit to do with it and veins, lines coming out of it.  I ran over one with a lawn mower one day and all like veins, arteries coming out all over it.  The color and the way it kind of curls up there and little legs.  Looks like it’s coming out of the rabbit’s eyes, I don’t know why.  Just the yellow, standing up like they’re brave.  And the color, like you’d see – a golden tint to it.  Back legs, horns; body and head would be kind of cut out.

Like its mouth open, very thin bottom jaw and thick top one.

Total Time: 12'21"
Rorschach Protocol

Response

I. 7" 1'08"
1) Looks like a butterfly.
   W F+ A P
   Or a bat.
2) Or insignia
   W F+ Art
3) Looks like a prehistoric animal.
   D F- A (FM)
4) Looks like a three dimensional mechanical drawing picture.
   (edging)
   Dd s VF Art

II. 25" 1'32"
(Laughs) - This is a weird one.
   Well, it's a comparison.
5) Looks like a mountain - not really - like a kid would draw one.
   D F+ Ls
6) Looks like an insignia too.
   W F- Art

III. 27" 1'32"
7) Looks something like a tunnel, a wind tunnel for aircraft.
   D s F Ar
   Might be like the structure of a building, hollow.
8) Or the backbone of a fish with three points.
   D F- Ad
9) Looks like a trench.
   D d F Voc
   Additionals:
10) I just saw a kind of a rat or mole. D d F- Ad
11) And a butterfly. D F+ A P
12) And a parrot. D F+ A

Subject: 26

Inquiry

Two front wings and back wings, two bumps there eyes and two things there front feet.
Whole thing would be like a wing, paws and eyes and nose.
Airplane insignia, wings and design.

Just half of it, the wings, high backbone, feet and head, and the ground it was standing on.

Two things there are kind of shaded, giving three dimensions.

The dark black and bright red. Would be the top, not the bottom where it's mixed in.

Just the black part, not the red - it's not a good mountain. Q. Rough peaks there and shaded sort of indicates rocks, way the ink runs down.

Two points up there and center built out.

Just be the black, not the red, and the white in the middle.

Like some of those quonset huts: don't have any center posts, just the arc.

The backbone of a fish goes kind of in three ways, goes down that way and that way and shoots up a little bit here.

The arch there.

Head here and the back.

(Inner red).

(Outer red). Looks kind of like one.
Subject: 26

Head (down), body and feet sticking out. Q. The head is big, might be something like a rhinoceros.

Might omit these two little jiggers. But has a little head, has bigger wings but shaped like that — points like that. That's the way they look when they're flying. Would include the tail and head, the whole thing. Bolt going thru and spring steel here. Q. The curvature of it.

Might cut off corners to cut off wind resistance. This would be the motor. Q. The fins etc.; way it comes down the center.

Mouth up here and four feet, without this here. Q. The way its laid out definitely. Just half of it. Like cut out on a prairie, that's where the cloud would touch the ground and that would be curving right up. There's your handles. There would be the spool for winding the rope on. The whole thing.

Put your rope around here and tie it right on those.

Dome shaped

Like a lobster. Claws, mouth and two feet, fin and tail.

A lobster is larger and has something in the back to push them with, jaws, mouth and paddles. Here the little tentacles they feel with.
Rorschach Protocol

24) Half of it might be a map - isn't any country but somewhat like one.
D F+ Ge

25) Edging) Might be a harbor. D G F+ Ge

VIII. 7" 1'50"

26) This one, the way the colors are, might be a sea fish, tropical fish.
W CF- A

27) The top part looks like a leopard or wild cat.
D F+ A

28) Top part looks like a jelly fish, not really a jelly fish. Something that looks floppy and flabby.
D F- A

IX. 12" 1'55"

29) Looks like some coral, a special kind of it.
W CF- Na

30) Might be a kind of flower vase that way.
W CF Hh

31) Looks like some kid just threw some paint on a paper that way.
D C Art

32) Edging) Might be kind of like a crab or lobster when you look at it that way.
W F- A

33) That part looks like a big tack. D F- Im

Subject: 26

Half of it - not like any country.
Q. Well, this could be Spain over here, and here the Pyrenees divides it and then France and the stick out could be Italy - not in right relation but it reminded me of it. They don't really have them like this; would make a good harbor.
You could have all your docks right around here and your fortifications right here at the entrance to the harbor.

Mouth and kind of spread out. The whole thing would be the fish.
That would be the tail and the fins.
Q. The line is the nerve line and runs down the center of the fish.
And the colors, sometimes tropical fish are colored.
Right there.

You'd be under water looking up at it. Q. That there comes down. Q. Spread out. A jelly fish is really round and that's sort of square.

Built up, start and build up and the top. Q. The colors.

Flowers would be put in there. You'd have to cut those off. Q. The pastel colors would go well with some flowers. Q. The way the thing is fluttered around.
Splashed water colors. Q. The messy appearance.

Tail, jaws, mouth there and the big jiggers to chew would be the tips.
That would be its paddles.

Part there and the line down - a big thumb tack.
Rorschach Protocol

34) Looks like a flock of birds. D CF- A

35) A bush or tree. D CF- Bt

36) Might be like a map too, with islands and what not. Ws F Ge

37) Kind of a bell that way, a dinner bell. Ds F- Hh

Subject: 26

All these dashes look like colored birds, spring time birds. 
This would be the bush. The color, like a bush in flower and the black 
would be the main stem. Little spots being islands.

Bell there, bell clapper and handle.

Total Time: 13'56"
Response

I. 55" 3'40"
1) Looks something like angels seem to.
   D F+ H
2) Looks like a person here.
   D F+ Hd P
3) Two angels taking a person off somewhere, yet it hasn't got a head.
   W M H
4) Looks like a profile.
   Dd F+ Hd
5) Right down here looks like feet and legs.
   D F+ Hd

(Before the first response, S asked if it would be alright to turn the card, after having already done so. S turned the card frequently and also all the cards throughout; there was considerable nervousness.)

II. 7" 3'0"
6) This looks like bears' heads. The nose makes it look that way.
   Dd F+ Ad
7) Like a dog or something.
   D F+ Ad
8) Looks like a butterfly.
   D F+ A P
9) Looks like a pair of socks.
   D F+ Gg
10) Looks like a profile here on the side.
    Dd F+ Hd
11) That looks like a church but still it doesn't.
    Ds F+ Ar

III. 12" 3'20"
12) Looks like figures of boys.
    D M H P
13) Looks like a kettle, only those things are in the way.
    Dd F+ Hl
14) Like the inside of a skeleton.
    D F+ Hd
15) A pair of high-heeled shoes and legs.
    D F+ Hd

Inquiry

Wings and head make it look like an angel.

It is like a person, body, skirt and legs.

The angels are grasping the person with their arms, going up in the air, up to heaven, like it just died, like taking the soul off. (Demonstrates movement upward with body.)

Nose and cheeks make it look that way.

The feet make it look that way, you can see one going off that way.

They have short pants on, back and head and neck.

That in between seemed as if they were bending over to pick up the kettle. It first looked like a bean-pot.

Something like ribs - the way around.

The shoes have high heels.
16) A parrot on a stick-like thing.
D F+ A

IV. 5" 3'40"
17) Like a pair of shoes.
D F+ Cg P
18) It looks like a man from Mars.
W F+ H
19) Looks like a dog's head and part of its body.
Dd F+ A (FM)
20) Looks like part of an old fashioned stove only these things make it look funny (she laughs).
D F+ Hl
21) This looks like the top to a rattlesnake - you know, the head.
Dd F- Ad
22) Looks like a profile.
Dd F+ Hd

V. 10" 2'0"
23) Looks like a bat.
W F+ A P
24) Part of a profile right there.
D F+ Hd
25) Those look like grass-cutters.
D F+ Imp

VI. 5" 3'0"
26) That looks like a totem pole.
D F+ Art
27) Looks like a skin spread out.
D F+ A P
28) There's an Indian profile right there.
Dd F+ Hd
29) These look like birds.
Dd F- A

Subject: 22

Like a beak here, and this sticking out (tail) and this going in (stick).

The heel and toe made me think of it.

The whole thing looks like it - little head and big body. The shape of his head made me think of it.

The whole thing made me think of it; looks like its lying down.

The legs and these two things in the middle make it look like a stove. It could be the whole thing up to here with the funny stick-out places.

That's the head, then it gets bigger you remember, and then smaller.

The noses make them look that way.

The whole thing. Just the wings made me think of it.

The nose made me think of it.

The prongs.

The two eyes, the darker blot interior, those two things sticking out and those ugly things sticking out all made me think of it.

It's flat and spread out and that looks like head.

The big nose made me think of it and the sharp indent. (She runs finger over her own nose). These little things with the peaks on top - look like hills. They look like woodpeckers standing up straight.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects. No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30)</td>
<td>That looks like a hawk's head. Dd F- Ad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31)</td>
<td>There's a little man's face in there. Dd F- Hd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32)</td>
<td>There's a fish eye. Dd F- Ad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33)</td>
<td>It looks like a lady with a feather in her hair, turning her head around backwards.</td>
<td>Straight made me think of the feather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34)</td>
<td>It looks like a Scotty dog. Dd F+ Ad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35)</td>
<td>That looks like a skirt and a girl's leg. D F+ Cg Hd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36)</td>
<td>It looks like a beast. None of these look exactly like something. D F+ A P (FM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37)</td>
<td>Looks like a skeleton. D F+ An F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38)</td>
<td>Looks like a dog. Dd F+ Ad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39)</td>
<td>Those are teeth there. Ds CF Hd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40)</td>
<td>That looks like a design in a sweater. D F+ Art Cg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41)</td>
<td>Looks like a flower but still doesn't. D IF St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42)</td>
<td>That is like a crown. D F- Pr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43)</td>
<td>That looks like flesh. Dd C An</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44)</td>
<td>Antlers on a deer. D F+ Ad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45)</td>
<td>An alligator. D CF &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46)</td>
<td>There are four teeth. Dd F- Hd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The curved neck made me think of it.

The eyes and nose and lips made me think of it— you can see them if you look closely.

It's that darker spot. It is little and narrow— that made me think of it.

The profile made me think of it and the feather sticking up. Just sticking up, straight made me think of the feather.

The square nose made me think of it.

(S couldn't say why it looked like a skirt). It's the leg. It looks like she's running. The leg looks as if it was fasting.

It has four legs, looks as if it was crawling up on somebody; no ears though.

Bones between (?)— ribs like the other.

It's just the profile of the dog.

They look like teeth; they seem to have roots on both sides.

It's that without the middle part. (S had difficulty explaining why it made her think of a design). It's just the design.

The specks made me think of it.

It's the shape made me think of it.

Just the color of it.

The points going up made me think of it.

It looks kind of scaley, green and the eyes.

They look like teeth only not very white. More like teeth of a comb; the lines made me think of it.
Rorschach Protocol

47) Part of a map.
   D F+ Ge
48) Part of moose but no antlers.
   D F+ Ad
49) Sky.
   Dd C Na
50) Over here's a moose with antlers.
   D F+ Ad
51) Profile of a man.
   D F+ Ha P
52) X.  1D"  240"
53) These look like spiders.
   D F+ A P
54) And a worm's head.
   D FC Ad
55) The head of a sea horse here.
   D FC A
56) Some kind of dragon.
   Dd F+ My
57) Strong man.
   D F+ H
58) Looks like a profile - two profiles.
   Dd F+ Ha
59) That's a stick.
   Dd F+ Obj.
60) Looks like mixing colors.
   W CF Art
61) Like a wish bone.
   D F+ Fd

Subject: 23

The whole green part - the different shape made me think of it.
Same as 45 - the nose made me think of it.

Because of the color of it.

The eye and nose.

The scrawny looking legs.

The horns like and the green on them.

The shape of it and the green.

The dark red all the way down. The little feet under it made me think of it.
The small legs and waist, the large shoulders and the little head.
The nose made me think of it.

Looks like a stick.

Whole thing - looks like mixing colors.

The two little things, and the middle things, and the two things going up.

Total Time: 29"5"
Forschach Protocol

Response

I. 20"  45"
1) Looks like a bat.
   W F+ A P
   Additional: Only supposed to see one?
2) Oh I see two on here I missed.
   Is it too late to add them?
   D FY- Hd

II. 10"  1'20"
3) Looks like two old ladies having a fight.
   (Handed card back, Do you see anything else?)
   W M H P
4) Two animals nose to nose.
   D F+ A P (FM)
5) And a butterfly.
   D F+ A P
6) Either a finger or a thumb, two of them.
   Dd F- Hd

III. 5"  1'03"
7) I see two people putting something in a big pot.
   D M H P
8) And a butterfly.
   D CF A P
9) Branches from a tree.
   D F- Bt
10) Additional on inquiry.
    D M- Hd

11) Some kind of a face like a mask.
    D F+ Art

IV. 13"  50"
Can you hold it anyway you want to?
12) I see some animal here, looks like a prehistoric bird.
    W F- A

Inquiry

The whole thing, the way the head is shaped and the wings.

Two caricatures of FDR, nose isn't quite right but will pass. Q. Shaded right there and the eyes, the chin mostly.

Just facial expression with pug on top. Q. Whole thing.

The whole black part. Just the shape of it, the head with the ears sticking out.

Two things sticking down and the wings. Q. The body there, the was it's separated by the white mark there.
The dark line across there reminded me of the knuckle. Q. The way its curved and the shading on top - looks like it's bent over.

Looks like they got aprons on, that white part. Q. Whole thing except the red.
The red is outstanding there in the middle, made me think of it.
Things might look like branches hanging down with leaves on them.
The more I look at it now, looks like two little men hanging down with cigars in their mouths. Looks like has big tall hat on. Nose, cigars, got something in their hands, the body; looks more like elves.
Eyes, nose and mouth. Q. The way its dark in there, cheeks are usually darker.

Head there, eyes, wings. That's what made me think of prehistoric animals - see some tails flying around.
4) v

13) Pair of shoes
   D F+ Gg P

14) A flower,
   D F+ Bt

V. 2nd
15) Oh, a butterfly.
   W F+ A P

16) Looks like some animal with a big, big nose.
   Dg F+ Ad

VI. 7th
17) Some kind of animal skin rug.
   D F- Art

18) D F+ Eh P

19) Two faces.
   D F- Hd

20) Totem pole.
   D F+ Rc

21) Another small face.
   Dc F+ Hd

22) When you hold it upside down you can see two more faces.
    D F+ Hd

VIII. 7th
23) I see a house with smoke coming out of the chimney.
    Dd FY Le Ch

24) Two rabbits.
    D F- A

Subject: XI

Boots. That perfectly straight line made me think of the heel. Looks like they got a hole in the sole - end curves up.
Looks like the leaves. Q. see all the little veins through it.

Whole thing. Q. Those look like the little things that come off the butterfly’s head, the feelers.
The nose and chin.

I used my imagination. Looks more like a cartoon. Looks more like a cat with whiskers and everything. The thing which made me think of it the most was down to here.
But the position of the rest is what made me think of the rug. Sometimes you see something run over in the funny, perfectly flat - and that’s what made me think of a cat.
Nose, mouth and chin.

Base of it there and goes up. The two dark spots are the eyes and nose, and the wings here - the way they stick out.
Nose, brow and mouth too.

This way you see two different faces, nose and mouth here and beard. Q.
Also the eyes - the two white spots.

House is right there, windows are the two dark places in the middle - that’s why I noticed it. Q. This line and it’s night too, that was part of it.
Q. The way it’s emphasized by the darkness; probably that’ll show I’m crazy. Q. The way it’s darker down here - the light stands out.
With long ears and tails. Q. The facial expression.
Rorschach Protocol

25) Looks like islands too, somewhat. Ds F+ Ge

26) Additional:
   D F+ A

27) VIII. 6" l'll"
    Tree
    D F+ Bt

28) A skeleton, skull I should say. Dd S F- An

29) Some kind of a weird face too.
    Ws F- Hd

30) An animal.
    D F+ A P

31) IX. 4" l'05"
    Two clowns.
    Ds F+ A P

32) Two funny faces.
    D F+ Hd

33) Two prehistoric men, their heads. D F+ Hd P

34) A billy goat.
    D F+ Ad

35) An alligator.
    D F+ Ad

Looks dark as though surrounded by water. Q. The way these things stand out like coves, little inlets. This might have something to do with it. Isn't it Calcutta in India that has fingers sticking out into the water? That made me think of the water too. I can also see a scotty dog with a long tail. Q. Square face like and eyes right there.

Looks like an old pine tree, trunk and dead branches sticking out there. Q. Just the shape — pine tree is usually triangular. That's the eyes there and the nose. Q. Right there looks like teeth. Same thing upside down. Includes the whole thing. Right around there, that's the hair. Those are the eyes, just those pink places. The teeth are right there — the white spots. Right there. That one was pretty plain. I noticed the eyes, they go into the face.

With hats on. All of the orange part. They have big stomachs. Q. Eyes and mouth and hat. Nose and lower lip. Mouth comes down and teeth and they have high silk hats on. Q. They look like a couple of old drunks all dressed up. Low brow, big nose — neanderthal men. Q. Big necks, head comes down straight. The billy goat has horns and whiskers. Q. The way it fades off looks like whiskers. Q. Chin is kind of dropped down. Some thing without the horns and the jaw isn't dropped down, looks like he's in the water. Q. The way the eyes come up in a half circle.
Rorschach Protocol

X. 4" 1'44"

36) Two grasshoppers standing by a tree.
   D M A

37) Two poodle dogs.
   D F+ A (FM)

38) A wish bone.
   D F+ Fd

39) The roots of a tree, two tree stumps.
   D F+ Bt

40) A grasshopper
   D F- Ad

41) D F+ Ad P

42) Two clowns.
   D Fy Hd

43) Two islands
   Dd F- Ge

Subject: 31

Having an argument, right there.
Q. Just the way things are coming out of their heads.
Looks as though they're show dogs.
Q. They're barking for something, teasing.
The way the two ends stick down.
The roots. Q. No semblance of order.

Just that part right there.

Could be a rabbit too or a cricket.
Q. Just seems to be looking right at you, the eyes.
The face line. Q. (anything else).
No, unless the way it's shaded, the way it's black on the front and seems to shade off.
Those two yellow places. Q. It stands out above the rest like the dogs and wishbone.

Total Time: 10'33"
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1. Theoretical Background. The development and elaboration within psychology of a dynamic framework for the study of personality has been expanding for many years. More recently, with the impress of field theory, the need for conceptualizations at two other levels, the group and the institutional, has become apparent to social psychologists. It has also become increasingly clear to some that action methods had to be developed if significant theoretical advances were to be made. At present, the focus is largely on the primary (face-to-face) group. The most significant contribution in this area was made by Kurt Lewin and his protégés, in systematizing this field of study and developing action methods. J. L. Moreno and his school have also made large contributions; sociometry and psychodrama are widely used tools.

Many religious leaders have been impressed with the results of the dynamic study of personality and have appropriated its theoretical outlook and various therapeutic methods; the more recently developed action methods in which the group level of conceptualization is assumed appear to have a wider applicability in Protestant parishes.

The aim of this project was to employ some of these action methods in a church group where democratic discussion was the prime educative tool. It was thought that these methods should be: a) adaptable to the group in which they were employed; b) simple in rationale so that unskilled personnel might use them; c) reasonably valid for assessing important characteristics of the individuals and group; d) effective in bringing about individual and group change through their usage.
2. **Group Chosen.** A youth group in a Congregational Church was chosen for the study. Members who ranged in age from 13 to 26 carried on all functions of the organization with a minimum of adult supervision. The core meeting was a weekly, Sunday evening discussion period and worship service; the constitution stated the individual and group objectives of this meeting. Since the town was rural with very minimal provision for social activities, the group had a larger social function than is usually the case. The constituency of the Church was from the middle and lower classes, the upper class belonging to another church; this stratification was extremely marked in years previous.

Four months prior to the beginning of the study, the membership was fifty-five; the war was a contributing factor, older members remaining in the group for want of other activities and returning soldiers making heterosexual acquaintances there. Within a year, the membership shrank to twenty-one; six months later, the group voted to terminate its relation with the adult advisor. Thus the study was made in a period of rapid group change.

3. **Techniques Used.** After reviewing research, two specific action methods were chosen, sociometry and psychodrama. For various reasons, it was decided to use only "real" sociometric tests and to extend Moreno's original test of only choice to include preference. Since some researchers are of the opinion that sociometric testing may yield significant data about individuals, the Rorschach test was included as a check. It was also decided to use psychodrama as a
role-playing instrument; Bavelas’ methods was followed.

Two further areas of action techniques were also chosen, discussional and observational. As to the former, concentration was on the "how" of the group process rather than the "what" (some manipulation of the content of the discussions was tried, however). Techniques used were a) study of group process and moderatorship by interested members, b) setting up the role of anecdotal observer, and c) a post-meeting evaluative questionnaire filled out by all members of the group, the results of which were reported back to the group. Two observational methods were tried, a simple notational system for quantifying interaction and sound (wire) recordings. The latter were available to the group for replaying; data from the interaction records were given to interested members.

4. Results. The techniques were employed in such a fashion as would least disturb the group's functioning. Only two situations could be found for giving a "real" sociometric test. Psychodrama was used only once; both the adult advisor and the writer wished more but the youth did not and they planned the programs. The same results occurred when manipulation of content was tried. Fourteen of the twenty-one members completed a Rorschach test. Interaction records were obtained on eleven meetings; none of the members nor the adult adviser could be persuaded to make such a record. Sound recordings were obtained on three meetings. The class for group study was enthusiastically attended by four members. Members functioned well as anecdotal observers; the post-meeting questionnaires were well received.
Sociometric results are presented via the sociogram and social atom (leadership) as well as tables showing weighted scores for choice and preference, for the effect of sex on these, and for inter-test distributions. Interaction data are presented by charts for separate meetings and by tables for individual indices and group characteristics; sound recorded data are presented by tables with the added variable of temporal duration. Rorschach summaries and interpretations are included in the text together with brief individual sketches; complete protocols are contained in the appendix.

a. Group Level. Unlike most groups studied sociometrically, members did not approximate a population, tele relations were artificial in many cases. The group was also characterized by ease of boundary reformulation (ease of joining or leaving). From the class in group study, it was also apparent that there was low goal tension in the discussion meetings. These characteristics define the limits of what may or may not be done in a group of this type. Certain concepts developed in other sociometric studies were not applicable.

Discussions varied widely in amount of interaction, members participating, spontaneous verbalizations, leadership participation, group centeredness of the discussion and other characteristics. Generally, highest activity occurred when there was high individual interchange and minimally active leadership; passive or dominant leadership was not conducive to high participation.

b. Individual Level. The data on individuals were highly significant. The two sociometric tests afforded some measure of the
member's constancy or change in choice and preference, given and received, as well as other idiosyncratic features. Choice remained largely a means of measuring leadership while preference gave a more precise measure of acceptability. Observational records afforded a measure of participation; most members were remarkably consistent.

All the information on each member was pooled, interpreted and then compared with the Rorschach interpretation (appraised by Mr. Charles Atwell, Chief Psychometrist, Boston Psychopathic Hospital). It was concluded that agreement was good, although the severity of maladjustment indicated on the Rorschach test was often not discernable in the other data. Individual case studies throw light upon the problems of leadership of the group. Of the fourteen Rorschach protocols, only three were described as normal; five were neurotic and the other six showed varying degrees of disturbance. Allowances were made for adolescent turmoil and the testing situation. Unless psychologic disturbance is much more frequent than is commonly supposed, other explanations must be sought; there were definite indications that social stratification was a factor.

5. Conclusions. Regarding the criteria previously cited, it was concluded that the techniques contributed most in the area of assessment, of individuals and of the group. This was felt to be a very large contribution, particularly because of the potentialities for better orientation of adult youth leaders. Except for sound recordings and psychodrama, it was concluded that all the techniques were simple enough for church personnel to use. Those techniques which bore dir-
ectly on felt problems of the group were more easily adapted. Similarly those techniques which the members used and which dealt with the "how" of discussion process (group study, anecdotal observer and post-meeting questionnaire) affected the greatest change, namely in the increase in interaction.

With regard to the other action methods, the adult advisor was unwilling to employ an interaction record, carry through a sociometric test or lead a psychodrama; members were also unable to use the two latter techniques. Close attention to the problem of adequate motivation was seen as a necessity in the planning phase of action research.

Research must also be carried out at higher levels where training for adult and youth leaders is offered outside parishes and under conditions similar in nature, namely a democratic discussion group. Psychodrama appears to be a technique requiring special skill and training.

In general, there is strong evidence that action methods may be employed with profitable results in parishes; the Rorschach test results point to the necessity of using methods which effect dynamic change within the individual. It is therefore strongly recommended a) that theological seminaries institute a concrete program of research, conducted in parishes at the individual, group and institutional levels of conceptualization, and b) that the usefulness of action methods in church groups where democratic discussion is the major educative tool be more fully explored.
Judson D. Howard, son of Charles P. and Elsie J. Howard, was born March 6, 1916 in Kansas City, Missouri. There he attended grade school, high school and junior college; he received the degree of Bachelor of Arts at William Jewell College in 1937. In 1940, he graduated from the Andover Newton Theological School. In the same year he became minister of a Federated Church in New Hampshire and was ordained in June of 1941. Shortly after, he was married to Miss Esther Currier of Plymouth, New Hampshire. A daughter, Susan, was born in 1942 and a son, Dean Charles, was born in 1948. After serving as a chaplain in the Army Air Corps for nearly three years, Mr. Howard enrolled for graduate study at Boston University in the fall of 1946; he received the degree of Master of Arts in psychology last summer. He is now pastor of a Congregational Church in Massachusetts.