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The purpose of this study was to discover the structure of the friendships exhibited by the two units, Pine Grove and White Valley, at the Camp Fire - Girl Scouts Day Camp, Atlanta, Georgia. Specifically, the study was to show the sociometric patterns of the two units, and the patterns of acceptance and rejection; To discover personality traits that were characteristic of girls being chosen and rejected more than others; To discover whether factors such as religion, belonging to another group, socio-economic accidents influenced the choices of friends.

The study was limited to two units, Pine Grove and White Valley, and the spontaneous choices of friends as of one day, June 24, 1948.

Data concerning the choices of friends in two units, Pine Grove and White Valley was obtained by administering sociometric tests. The schedule and the measurement of individual behavior in groups was instrumental in determining why girls were chosen or isolated as friends. Interviews with the camp directress and the adult unit leader gave additional information on the behavior and background of the
girls. A sociogram was drawn and the choices of friends tabulated.

In Pine Grove Unit, every girl received at least one choice and one mutual choice. The four most popular girls received at least eighteen of the thirty-three possible choices. Two girls received three mutual choices.

Girls selected as their friends those persons who possessed personality traits that appealed to them. It was noted that the most popular girls were physically attractive, neat in appearance and possessed positive personality traits. They came from families of high economic and social status and tended to mutually choose each other as friends.

The unpopular girls who did not rate high as choices for friends were less orderly, dressed dirtily and came from families of low economic and social standing. Most of the time, these girls behaved in an antagonistic and uncooperative manner.

There was a tendency for the girls to select as friends those girls who were known to them before coming to camp. The place of contact was the school in most instances.

In White Valley Unit, there were five girls who were not chosen by any of the girls. The four most popular girls received thirty-two of the forty-two possible choices. Seven girls did not have any mutual choices.

The girls who were most popular were those girls who were friendly, kind and possessed a sense of humor. These
girls come from families of high economic and social standing. The unpopular girls were characterized as being "dirty," "smelly," "saucy," and "greedy." These girls came from homes of low economic and social standing. Most of the time these girls did not participate or cooperate in the plans made by the other girls.

The girls tended to choose friends among the girls that they had known before coming to camp. The girls who belonged to the Catholic church and attended the same parochial school had a strong tendency to select only girls who were Catholics.

Sociometric placement of girls into cabins and units can be beneficial in the camp program. Girls who are placed where they will not be isolated and they feel that they are among friends will make a better adjustment in camp living and happier campers.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The social aspects of groups cannot be minimized because every group is social in nature whether it is an interest, activity, or a discussion group. In carrying out the objectives and program of groups, there is always a flow of communication between those persons who lead and those persons who follow. In the close intimacy of a group, interaction between group members is increased. They type of interaction may be demoralizing so as to create conflicts or to prohibit the successful attainment of objectives.

The presence of leaders, cliques, mutual choices of individuals, and rejected members are some of the characteristics of groups. The choice patterns of a group may be affected by the imposition of adult values, socio-economic factors, personality qualities, racial prejudices, and religious dogmas. Group work is seeking to utilize democratic principles in all areas, especially in the areas of leadership and program planning. The essence of true democracy is missed when individuals in the group are completely rejected and lost in the group process. Rejected individuals over a long period of time may become a threat to democratic society.

Jacob L. Moreno says:

A system of society must be realized to which all individuals belong spontaneously; not only by 'consent' but as 'initiators;' without exception, not 99.9%. The one individual left out may turn out to become the singular scientist criminal using means of lethal destruction, not toward one or another fellow man but toward the total race of man, his total world.¹

¹Jacoby L. Moreno, "Future of Man's World," Sociometry, VIII (December, 1945), 541.
The negative effects of repeated rejection on personality cannot be minimized. Personality patterns are indicative of the degree of social development that has taken place and are important in defining an individual's status in a group. Rejectees are potential psychopaths and social misfits. Because of their failure to become socially integrated, the rejectees may develop domination drives which can become dangerous.\(^1\)

It is through the medium of the group that the individual finds himself. The individual has an opportunity to develop wholesome personality if he can choose those whom he likes and their friendship is offered in exchange. Unrestricted expression of ideas and the feeling of ease gives the individual an opportunity to express feelings and impulses which may have been repressed.

Many studies have been done in the area of personality development and social behavior, but the research in interpersonal relations, particularly acceptance and friendship, has been done only recently. The development of interest in group work and social psychology has thrown much light on individual behavior in groups. Out of this research, the science of sociometry has developed. In the areas of leadership, acceptance, rejection, and friendship, sociometry is adding constantly to the knowledge of human interaction.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to discover the structure of the friendships exhibited by two units at the Camp Fire-Girl Scout Day Camp;

\(^1\)Mary L. Northway, "Outsiders," *Sociometry*, VII (February, 1944), 17.
specifically:

(1) To show the sociometric patterns of the groups and the patterns of acceptance and rejection.

(2) To discover personality traits that were characteristic of children being chosen more or rejected more than others.

(3) To discover whether factors such as belonging to another group, religion, employment after school, or socio-economic accident influenced the choices of friends.

Scope

This study was limited to friendship patterns exhibited by the Pine Grove Unit and the White Valley Unit, Camp Fire-Girl Scout Day Camp for Negro girls, June 14 to July 2, 1948. The ages of the girls were eleven to thirteen in Pine Grove and nine to ten in White Valley.

The study was further limited in that the spontaneous choices of friends were as of one day, that is, June 24, 1948.
Individuals in Groups

Sociologists have spent a tremendous amount of time in doing research on culture groups and other segments of the population. Of especial concern has been the nature of individual relationships as they develop in small social groups. These intimate associations affect the successful adjustment of the individual.

Sociologists have long recognized that one of man's basic desires is to gain status and that if the position in which he finds himself is satisfactory, he resists any threat to the retention of his position.¹ Status is, however, a consequence of interactions that take place in the group.² There is continuous competition for privileged status.

One's status is dependent to a great extent on the ability to adjust to individuals in a group. Through social relationships, standards are being set up and status distributed in varying degrees to members of the group. Florian Znaniecki says, "Every individual plays a role in the group, and the group is represented as a kind of super-synthesis of social values ascribed to its members."³

Individuals like to be useful participants in society, and society,


²Ibid., p. 7.

at any given moment, is represented by the life of the small, intimate
groups of which the individual is a part. Identification with the group
not only satisfies a basic need but is a primary characteristic of human
behavior.¹

Through social contacts and relationships, each individual is
striving toward the satisfaction of a need or needs. Several methods may
be used to obtain the satisfactions desired. Domination, regression,
skills, and associations with certain members may aid in the accom-
plishment of the desire, be it a need of love, a need of recognition, a
need of adventure, or a need of security.²

The social relationship is dynamic; the degree of social distance
or nearness is forever increasing and decreasing in any given situation.
The person whom you like to work with, to associate with today may not be
your choice next month. Out of group relationships come different
individual personalities.

Because people spend a considerable portion of their time in groups,
and it is through the media of groups that socialization takes place,
sociologists, psychologists, and social workers have devoted much time to
discover facts concerning the dynamics of interpersonal relationships.

Definition and Nature of Sociometry

The word "sociometry" is derived from two Latin words, "socio"
meaning companion and "metrum" meaning measure. Jacob L. Moreno gives his first definition as "a mathematical study of the psychological relationships between individuals in a group." Later, he revised the definition as follows: "Sociometry is a method for discovering, describing, and evaluating social status, structure and development through measuring the extent of acceptance and rejections in a group." Leslie Zeleny says, "Sociometry is a science of measurement of interpersonal reactions."

By employing the science of sociometry, the relationships between individuals in a group, the social status and degrees of social distance, cliques, and cleavages can be shown graphically. The results of sociometric tests are graphed and their final form become the sociogram, presenting an analysis of a person's position in the group organization. The sociogram points out vividly the persons who are dominant in the group. Perhaps as great a value as the purpose of the sociogram is its simplicity and comprehensiveness. Charts portray the essentials of our findings and reduce the multitude of facts and observations to a few

---


4 Leslie Zeleny, "The Value of Sociometry to Education," *Sociometry, VI* (October, 1943), 493.

simple lines.\textsuperscript{1}

The information to be graphed is obtained from the administration of the sociometric test. However, much information concerning social behavior and the choice of friends can be secured through observation, casual conversation, and the narrative record. Information obtained through these latter can be valuable after the sociometric test has been given.

The sociometric test is a simple method of revealing actual, natural groupings and diagnosing personal association patterns.\textsuperscript{2} Each individual is asked to indicate with whom he or she would like to associate in a common experience. Spontaneous choice of workmates, playmates, or committee workers for a stated purpose is the central consideration.

Helen Jennings sets the following criteria for sociometric tests:

1. The situation should be real for the choosing; choices are not hypothetical but are made for an actual occasion.
2. The test is not an end in itself, but the results should be put in effect. Work to be done with other members of the group should utilize the choices shown by the sociogram.
3. There should be an element of immediacy to the choosing.
4. Motivating elements should be emphasized.\textsuperscript{3}

Significant Contributions of Sociometry

In 1928 and 1929, Jacob L. Moreno sought answers to the questions of friendship, choices of friends, acceptance and isolation, and leadership. At the New York Training School for Girls, five hundred girls were asked to name with whom they would like to live. Through the

\textsuperscript{1}Ruth Schraff, "Charting Social Distance," Sociology and Social Research, XIV (July, 1930), 567.


\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 5.
medium of an interview, the girls also decided on the girls with whom they would not desire to live within the institution. Among the large number of girls in the institution, Dr. Moreno found many cases of rejection. Among the two outstanding cases of rejection were two girls named Diane and Emily. The two girls had contemplated running away from the institution but after transferring to a new cottage, they found new friendships, became well-liked, and no longer had the need for running away. With shifts of associates, the group functioned better, more acceptance was evidenced, and racial antagonism diminished. ¹

In penal institutions, there is a trend toward the sociometric placement of inmates. The National Committee on Prisons and Prison Labor, upon the invitation of the officials of the American Psychiatric Association, held a round-table conference with Dr. Jacob L. Moreno to see what could be done to develop socialized correctional institutions. ² Dr. Moreno believed that morale of the inmates would improve if the inmates were placed in units where interaction would have therapeutic value. Dr. Moreno then recommended the separation of the ill, the handicapped, and the diseased persons, and further recommended that the rest of the inmates be placed in social units based on social and psychological analysis. Dr. Moreno says:

> Man lives within groups, and his actions are regulated by the group. ... Social classification of inmates is a necessity because prisoners participate in unusual types of groups and are thusly influenced. ³

---

¹Grant Hubley, op. cit.

²Jacob L. Moreno, Group Method and Group Psychotherapy (New York, 1932), p. 7.

³Ibid., p. 21.
Even in mental institutions, patients are placed so that personality characteristics supplement or complement the personality of the associates.\(^1\) In one instance, for example, three women with mental disorders were placed in units by sociometric methods. There was an improvement of all three in units by sociometric methods. There was an improvement of all three because of the interaction that subsequently took place. This method is particularly beneficial to such psychotics as do not respond to medical or psychological treatment but need that security which derives from satisfactory group association.

The sociometric method is also used in the selection of desirable foster parents for dependent children.\(^2\) The child selects the parents, and the parents select the child, by a variation of the sociometric test called the Parent and Family Test.\(^3\) The real children in the family help select foster brothers and sisters. Assignments in foster homes are based on choices between parents, their own children, and the adoptive child.

Sociometry has thrown some light on the ever-present problem of juvenile delinquency. Through testing of home, school, and neighborhood groups, information has been gotten as to when delinquency is about to begin, how, and where.\(^4\)

The group on Intergroup Education of the American Council of Education, in cooperation with four schools, has been instrumental in developing

\(^1\)Grant Hubley, *op. cit.*, pp. 408-09.
\(^2\)Jacob L. Moreno, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-97.
\(^3\)Grant Hubley, *op. cit.*, p. 408.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 412.
sociometric techniques. The project was initiated in January, 1945, for the purpose of the exploration of new ideas and materials and the mobilization of school and community resources to improve human and group relations.¹ Through concerted efforts, schools have isolated and changed administrative policies that inhibit relationships between students. Teachers have used the sociogram to find high and low spots of morale and in solving behavior conflicts. In doing class projects and working on committees, teachers have found that pupils derive the most benefits from a project if their workmates are those whom they desire to work with and the feeling is mutual.

Lloyd Allen Cook, at an educational conference, spoke on the use of sociometric methods. Two principals of schools were desirous to experiment with the idea of sociometry. The group selected was a 10th grade social studies class that did projects as classroom assignments. The aims were: (1) to determine by the sociographic test the friendship structure of the group, comparing first and second semester sociograms for changes and stabilities and (2) to improve the learning situation by democratizing pupil attitudes and behavior.²

In doing the study, group patterns in the community were studied. Home backgrounds were investigated. A "guess who" test was given: this test called for the pupils to identify other pupils by certain personality traits. Data showed that children from the upper economic class received many choices on every positive item such as "best dressed," "best liked," "leader,"

---


and "lots of fun." The children from the lower economic class were characterized as "dirty," "smelly," "fighter," and "dumb."

This study revealed that the class was grouped into factions; that with the implementation of sociometric findings, social interaction increased and there occurred an increase in friendship making; also, that individuals changed positions in the group and that cliques were broken up.¹

Applications and Value of Sociometry to Social Group Work

To the individual, the group affords an opportunity for participation and self expression. It is through group participation that much of the personality is formed. Certain feelings are destroyed or utilized in the relationships of the group. J. C. McCaskill says that the group molds the lives of the members and each member feels the presence of the group from every quarter.²

Sociometric grouping gives individuals in groups the security that they need. By using sociometric methods, individual domination is lessened and potential leadership is not destroyed.

Since one of the basis for group formation is interest, the chances are that interest is increased if a group is formed out of a sociometric study. Group activities are bound to be more successful if individuals in the group have a lively positive interest in one another. Esprit de corps is based on the interest and the loyalty that group members have and

¹Ibid., pp. 259-260.

the tone of morale that the group has.\(^1\) Sociometric grouping enhances just this. The morale of the group is, after all, largely a matter of optimal participation by the individual group-members. Charting a sociogram will reveal such obstacles to participation as cliques and cleavages.

Optimal participation, in the last analysis depends upon the relationship between the leader and the group.\(^2\) In a free atmosphere, the leader is quick to sense acceptance and rejection. On the other hand, in the tense situation where children are afraid to express themselves, the leader may not know until some serious conflict arises that cliques were threatening to disrupt the group, or that John is actually rejected and Susie is not as popular as the leader thought. Sociometric techniques take the guesswork out of group leadership.

Sociometric techniques can further be applied to social group work agencies. Since most of the work done in group work agencies is done by volunteers, sociometry can increase the effectiveness of the work by improving working relations between volunteers and paid workers, board and staff members. Leona Kerstetter suggests that a sociometric test in the form of a questionnaire be used for assigning volunteers and staff to committees. She contends that sociometry can be used in the area of public relations of the agency and also in industry in selecting foremen and representatives from the workers.\(^3\)


\(^2\)Helen Taba, *op. cit.*

\(^3\)Leona M. Kerstetter, "Sociometry and Social Agencies," *Sociometry*, VI (October, 1943), 255-57.
CHAPTER III

PERSONALITY AS A FACTOR IN FRIENDSHIP

Part I. Analysis of Pine Grove Unit

The choices of friends in Pine Grove Unit are diagrammed on page 14. The sociogram shows the spontaneous choices of the girls at the time the sociometric test was administered. The sociometric test question was, "Friday, Pine Grove Unit is going to have a cook-out; we need small groups to build fires, gather wood, etc. Name three persons whom you would like to work with for the 'cook-out.'"

The presence of many mutual choices is characteristic of groups composed of older children. From the fourth grade on, there is an increase in the number of mutual pairs of friends and an increasing complexity in group structure.¹ In the Pine Grove Unit, all the girls received at least one mutual choice.

The Adult Unit Leader said there were indications that esprit de corps was high in the group. Good attendance on the part of the girls indicated interest in the day camp program. In comparison with the White Valley Unit, there was a noticeable absence of conflicts. In the selection of partners and small groups to work on latching, fire-building and cook-outs, each girl knew or had a good idea who would choose to work with her.²

¹G. Murphy, L. Murphy, and T. Newcomb, Experimental Social Psychology (New York, 1937), p. 632.

²Statement by Alice Houston, Adult Unit Leader, Pine Grove Unit, Camp Fire-Girl Scout Day Camp, Atlanta, Georgia, Personal Interview, June 28, 1948.

13
Date Given: June 24, 1948

Legend:

- Girl
- One Way Choice
- Mutual Choice

1, 2, 3 = Respective Degree of Choice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ameda</th>
<th>Betty</th>
<th>Carol</th>
<th>Catherine</th>
<th>Cora</th>
<th>Frieda</th>
<th>Johnnie</th>
<th>Juanita</th>
<th>Mildred</th>
<th>Theresa</th>
<th>Verdell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ameda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>3</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>Carol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choices As:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Choice</th>
<th>Second Choice</th>
<th>Third Choice</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ameda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOCIOMETRIC TEST ANALYSIS

Pine Grove Unit  
Atlanta, Georgia  
Camp Fire-Girl Scouts Day Camp  
June 24, 1948

Number of girls:  11

Sociometric Test Question:  "Friday, Pine Grove is going to have a cook-out; we need small groups to build fires, gather wood, etc. Name three persons whom you would like to work with for the 'cook-out.'"

Choices asked for:  3

Total number of choices made:  33

Maximum number of possible choices:  33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total on Choices Received</th>
<th>Tally on Mutual Choices Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Over Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Five</td>
<td>Population Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices not Reciprocated</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is noteworthy that the lines going from Johnnie and Mildred end in arrows except in one case each, when the choice is mutually reciprocated. These two girls, on the basis of the sociogram, were the least accepted among the group.

Betty, Carol, Frieda, and Juanita occupy the center circles. This center position indicates that these four girls were the most popular.

The three adult unit leaders expressed astonishment over the fact that Theresa, the camper unit leader, received only three choices inasmuch as Thresa always gave advice whenever a situation arose and she was unanimously chosen camper unit leader.

The girls who received only one or two choices are placed in the outer circles. This position indicated that they did not rate high in social status. These girls were not aggressive but in most instances appeared timid and retiring. In two cases Johnnie and Mildred behaved in an antagonistic manner toward members of the group.

Personality factors affecting the choice pattern.—The term personality refers to the manner in which individuals present themselves to other individuals. The word is derived from the Latin word persona, meaning an actor's character mask. Similarly, the more obvious personality traits may be said to be characteristic of the individual, with the result that he comes to be regarded as honest, cheerful, dependable, friendly or whatever. Personality may be defined as "the total picture of individual behavior as it can be characterized by his fellowmen in a consistent way."\(^1\)

Data secured by means of the schedule on page 33 of the appendix showed that girls who were chosen more than other girls had many positive traits of personality. Camp activities, certainly, afford the individual ample opportunity to reveal her basic personality traits, be they positive or negative.

Psychologists have found that the more likable qualities of personality are cheerfulness, tolerance, veracity, sympathy, tact, unselfishness, modesty, and gratitude. The traits of personality ascribed to Betty, Juanita, Frieda, and Carol by the girls in the unit were friendliness, activeness, leadership, respectfulness, sense of humor, cooperativeness, neatness, kindness, loyalty, and cheerfulness.

In interviewing the girls, it was learned that what the girls expected of the girls with whom they chose to work was the capacity "to be friendly." "Being friendly," to the majority of the girls, meant "to smile a lot," "share lunch," "bring water from the headquarters," and "to greet them." Associates, for the majority of the girls, were expected to be "respectful." To the girls in the unit, "respectful" meant "not saying bad words," "not being impudent," and "obeying parents and the adult unit leader."

The form used by the adult unit leaders in measuring individual behavior in groups is found in the appendix on page 34. These individual studies showed that Betty, Frieda, and Juanita were intelligent, friendly, alert, and cooperative girls. All three of these girls came from families of high socio-economic standing.¹ In carrying out the day camp program,

¹Statement by Phyllis W. Dews, Field Director, Girl Scout Council, Atlanta, Georgia, Personal Interview, June 27, 1948.
they were eager to participate in the program and would start activities without the assistance of the adult unit leader. They were active, full of fun; and enthusiastic. In making plans for cook-outs, hikes, and other camp activities, they were aggressive enough to express their opinions and to give advice when needed.

Carol, who received a large number of choices, did not rate high on the adult unit leader's study. Carol was disliked intensely by one or two of the girls. However, Carol was chosen often by other girls in the camp although she did not participate freely or suggest group activities. Carol failed to assume responsibility for group projects even when it was her turn. On one occasion Carol was supposed to get water for the dinner meal. When the other girls told Carol that it was her turn, she shrugged off the hint and hid, so that she would not have to carry out the assignment. In eating "nose bag" lunches, Carol seldom shared and often, in conversation, ventured destructive personal criticisms of the other girls.

One of the adult unit leaders felt Carol's popularity was due to her personal attractiveness as well as to her negative aggressiveness. Carol wore very striking clothes; compliments were given her by the other campers on the playsuits that she wore. Carol had long black hair which the other girls liked to curl or playfully pull.

Carol was full of ideas which were not suitable or desirable for the group.¹ Carol always thought of some mischief making and would lead the group in doing these things. For instance, she thought of stealing apples

¹Statement by Alice Houston, Adult Unit Leader, Pine Grove Unit, Camp Fire-Girl Scout Day Camp, Atlanta, Georgia, Personal Interview, June 14, 1948.
from a nearby farm and throwing bugs on one of the adult unit leaders.

It seemed that the group admired Carol because she did what they feared to do. *A child in a group is well accepted because of what he is and what he does rather than what he refrains from doing.*

Mildred and Johnnie, who received fewer choices than the other girls, rated high on the individual child study but were not popular as choices for associates in camp activities. These two girls, less orderly than the other girls, came from below average homes. Mildred and Johnnie were of dark complexions and dressed rather dirtily. At lunch time, they had less food to share with the other girls.

In this study of Pine Grove Unit, it was revealed that those girls who were mutually chosen were those who possessed, for the most part, similar personality traits or traits that supplemented or complemented the needs of a particular girl.

Eight out of the eleven girls in the unit knew the girls whom they chose before coming to camp. Those girls who knew each other before coming to camp were in the same classes or knew each other at school. In three instances, the girls lived in close proximity to each other and played together in the neighborhood. Johnnie, Theresa, and Verdell, who did not know any of the members of the group before coming to camp, made friends in camp. Kaper duties and partnership in games and firemaking made possible close association among the girls.

In the unit, there was a tendency to select friends nearest the same

---

1Merle E. Bonney, "Personality Traits of Socially Successful and Socially Unsuccessful Children," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXIV (September, 1943), 450.
age. For instance, Juanita's age was fourteen years; the ages of the
girls whom she chose were thirteen years. These girls were
Catherine, Frieda, and Carol, who were among the oldest girls in the unit.

"As age increases, the tendency to select chums and friends near one's
own age increases. Propinquity, school, and grade set the framework for
the association."

In addition to the adult unit leaders, the unit was guided by a
camper unit leader who represented the unit at council meetings. Theresa
held this position. Theresa rated low in social participation, social
status and social tendencies on the adult leader's study. It is quite
possible that her position as camper unit leader influenced her choice
position that she held with the girls. Theresa was greedy, quarrel-
some, compromised reluctantly, and was critical of other people. Theresa
was hostile to authority and full of ideas that were sometimes contrary
to the plans of the group. However, she was able to maintain status in
the group. Theresa had been enrolled in the day camp program for two
previous summers and knew the camp procedure and leaders. These factors
might have affected the choice pattern.

A majority of the girls chosen most often were physically attractive,
neat in appearance, and possessed other desirable traits, among them
activeness and skill.

Other factors that influenced the choice patterns were the length of
friendship with persons before the camping season and the influence of
adult thinking. All of the girls expressed the idea that they selected

---

1John E. Anderson, "Development of Social Behavior," American Journal
of Sociology, XXXIV (May, 1939), 843.
friends whom their mothers would approve. "Parents are the immediate source of attitudes and patterns of social behavior and mediators of values."¹

Socio-economic factors were a minor factor in the selection of friends. In one case, one of the three most chosen girls selected a friend on the expressed basis: "I like Frieda because she has money to go to movies with me."

Part II. Analysis of White Valley Unit

The patterns of acceptance of the White Valley Unit are shown graphically in the sociogram on page 23. The sociometric test question was: "Monday, we are going to set up a model unit for Parents' Day. There are some people whom you like to work with more than others. We need small groups to work on latching, building fires, etc. Select your first, second, and third choice of persons whom you would like to work."

In Pine Grove Unit every girl received at least one mutual choice. In White Valley Unit, however, there were seven girls who did not receive any mutual choices.

Barbara, Beverly, Jacquelyn, and Jeanne are placed in the center of the sociogram on page 23 because they were chosen more often than the other girls. The barrage of arrows leading to the center circles indicate the popularity of these girls. The social isolates are placed on the periphery of the circle. A tendency for the isolates to choose very popular girls was noted.

¹G. Murphy, L. Murphy, and T. Newcomb, *op. cit.*, p. 371.
SOCIOGRAM

Date Given: June 24, 1948
Legend:

○ = Girl

→ = One Way Choice

↕️ = Mutual Choice

1, 2, 3, = Respective Degree of Choice

White Valley Unit
Camp Fire-Girl Scout Day Camp
Atlanta, Georgia
Ages: 9-10

MARCIA

CAROLYN

WILLIE

LAURINE

JACQUELYN

CARRINE

BARBARA

JEANNE

MARY H.

BEVERLY

MARY B.

NARREIT

CHARLE
Sociometric Tabulation
White Valley Unit
Camp Fire-Girl Scout Day Camp
Choices Received By

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barbara</th>
<th>Beverly</th>
<th>Cabborie</th>
<th>Carolyn</th>
<th>Corrine</th>
<th>Harriet</th>
<th>Jacquelyn</th>
<th>Jeanne</th>
<th>Laurine</th>
<th>Mary B.</th>
<th>Mary H.</th>
<th>Willie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabborie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</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>Carolyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrine</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquelyn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</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>Laurine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary B.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</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>Mary H.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chosen As:
- **First Choice**: 2 3 1 1 0 0 0 4 2 0 1 0 0 0
- **Second Choice**: 4 1 0 1 1 0 2 1 3 0 1 0 0 0
- **Third Choice**: 0 5 0 1 1 0 1 5 2 0 0 0 0 0
- **Total**: 6 9 1 3 1 0 3 10 7 0 2 0 0 0

---

*Note: The table represents a sociometric tabulation where each row indicates the number of choices received by one individual from another. The diagonal represents self-choice, which is not applicable in this context.*
SOCIOMETRIC TEST ANALYSIS

White Valley Unit

Camp Fire-Girl Scout Day Camp

Atlanta, Georgia

June 24, 1948

Number of girls: 14

Sociometric Test Question: "We are going to set up a model unit for Parents' Day. There are some people whom you like to work with more than others. We need small groups to work on latching, building fires, etc. Select your first, second, and third choices of persons whom you would like to work with."

Choices asked for: 3

Total number of choices made: 42

Maximum number of possible choices: 42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tally on Choices Received</th>
<th>Population Size: 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over five</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tally on Mutual Choices Received</th>
<th>Population Size: 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choices not reciprocated: 27
In the sociogram of Pine Grove Unit, each of the most chosen members, Betty, Carol, Frieda, and Juanita, went outside occasionally to chose other members for the larger group. For this group of four girls, with a possible twelve choices, seven choices remained within their small group while five choices went outside. However, in White Valley, the most chosen members chose other popular girls to work with them on the project. All the choices of Barbara, Beverly, Jacquelyn, and Jeanne, the most accepted members of the unit, remained within their group with but one exception, and that was Jacquelyn, who chose one girl outside the chosen girls as her third choice. There was a prevalence of one-way choices leading from the rejected members to the center of the circle where the popular girls were placed.

**Personality factors affecting the choice patterns.**—In White Valley Unit, there were, as is to be expected, varying degrees of acceptance, ranging from "always chosen" to "never chosen." There were in this unit as many as five instances of complete isolation: Corine, Laurine, Mary B., Mary H., and Willie.

Individual studies made by the Adult Unit Leader showed that generally the girls in the unit who were not chosen or seldom chosen had personality traits that were antagonistic to other members of the group. All five girls who were isolates were disliked generally by the girls in the group. Cabborie, Willie, and Mary B. were liked by only a few of the girls in the group. Their participation in camp activities was not extensive. All of these five girls either walked out on activities or threatened to stop them and often did. Little or no initiative was shown
by them in starting group activities. In this group of isolates, the girls liked to argue and to start fights. One was a tattler and won group disapproval by telling Adult Unit Leader the name of the girl who threw paint on a dress.\footnote{Statement by Pearl Simmons, Adult Unit Leader, White Valley Unit, Camp Fire-Girl Scout Day Camp, Atlanta, Georgia, Personal Interview, June 30, 1948.} The adult unit leaders noticed that the less aggressive children were less popular in the group. These individuals had a tendency to be withdrawn, poor mixers, and sensitive.

Typical characteristizations of the isolates by some of the girls:

"I don't like Gabborie because she is a tattler."

"Mary stinks."

"Laurine teases and hits me."

"Corrine is dirty and eats all the time."

"Willie says bad words and is suacy."

The most popular members of the group were confident, well liked, chosen often, and took initiative in activities. These girls radiated enthusiasm, friendliness, and cheerfulness. They were leaders, able to influence other members of the group.

The group rated friendliness and kindness high as the reasons for which they selected their associates. Cooperativeness and a sense of humor were not cited at all.

Mutual choices were the products of old friendships. With the exception of one case, all of the persons mutually chosen had known each other over a long period, at school and/or in the church.

Girls who were able to do things, to be friendly, and to lead were
chosen by girls who possessed similar qualities.

Looking at the structure as a whole, the clique composed of the most girls seemed founded on socio-economic factors and individual abilities. They were from families which enjoyed a higher economic standing than that of the majority of the girls.

Eleven out of the fourteen girls were Roman Catholics and attended the same parochial school. Only two of them chose girls who were non-Catholic. In these instances the non-Catholic girls lived in the same neighborhood as that of the girls who chose them.

The basis for the selection of friends in the unit seemed to have been based on qualities of personality and character desired by others. There was no tendency for Girl Scouts to choose only Girl Scouts or Camp Fire Girls to choose only Camp Fire Girls. Those girls who were more aggressive, self-confident, leaders, and friendly were chosen more than those who did not possess positive traits. Mutual friends and choices were the results of long association, economic position, personality traits, and possibly religious affiliation.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

The social values of groups cannot be minimized because of the interaction that occurs between members of the group. Individuals may derive self-confidence, a feeling of security, and the recognition that they seek by participation in groups. The type of interaction that takes place in a group may be harmful in that the individuals in the group may not attain the social development that association in a group is supposed to provide. The negative effect of rejection and isolation on the personality cannot be overlooked. The rejected individual or isolated individual may become a psychopathic individual or a danger to society.

Since individuals spend a considerable portion of their time in groups, psychologists, sociologists, and social workers have devoted time to discover facts concerning the dynamics of interpersonal relations. Dr. Jacob L. Moreno has given the measurement of social status and interpersonal relationships the name, "Sociometry."

The purpose of this study was to discover the structure of friendship patterns exhibited by two units at the Camp Fire-Girl Scout Day Camp. By utilizing the methods and techniques of sociometry, the selection of associates was obtained. The specific aim was to show graphically the patterns of acceptance and isolation in the two units. Particular attention was given to the discovery of personality traits that were characteristic of the popular as well as unpopular girls. The effect that social, economic, and religious factors had on choice patterns was noted.
Pine Grove Unit

In Pine Grove Unit, every girl received at least one choice and one mutual choice. The four most popular girls received eighteen of the thirty-three possible choices. Two girls received three mutual choices.

Girls selected as their choices those persons who possessed personality traits that appealed to them. It was noted that the most popular girls were physically attractive, neat in appearance, and possessed positive personality traits. They came from families of higher economic and social status than most of the girls in the unit. The most popular girls tended to mutually choose each other as friends. All of the girls selected friends whom their mothers would approve.

The unpopular girls who did not rate high as choices for friends were less orderly than the other girls, dressed dirtily, and came from families of low socio-economic standing. Most of these girls behaved in an antagonistic and uncooperative manner.

There was a tendency for the girls to select as friends those girls who were known to them before coming to camp. Most of the girls knew each other at school.

White Valley Unit

In White Valley Unit, there were five girls who were not chosen by any of the girls. The four most popular girls received thirty-two of the forty-two possible choices. Seven girls did not receive any mutual choices.

In White Valley Unit, the girls who were most popular were those who were friendly, kind, and possessed a sense of humor. The most popular
girls came from families of high economic and social standing.

The unpopular girls were characterized as being "dirty," "saucy," "smelly," and "greedy." These girls came from homes of low economic and social standing. Most of the time these girls did not participate freely in the unit activities and would not cooperate in plans made by other girls.

The girls tended to choose friends among the girls that they knew before coming to camp. The girls who belonged to the Catholic Church and attended the same parochial school had a strong tendency to select only girls who were Catholics.

Sociometric placement of girls into living and work units can be beneficial in the camp program. Girls when allowed to choose other girls to live and work with will be happier campers and will make a better adjustment in camp.
# APPENDIX A

## SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF GIRL</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time in group</th>
<th>Leader's name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you know the person before coming to camp?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In School</td>
<td>In church</td>
<td>In Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At camp</td>
<td>On playground</td>
<td>In other groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long?</th>
<th>One year - two years</th>
<th>Two years or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why do you like the persons you have chosen?</th>
<th>Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First choice</td>
<td>Kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second choice</td>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third choice</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your mother select your friends?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

MEASUREMENT OF INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR IN GROUPS

SOCIAL STATUS

A. How well liked is the child?
1. Disliked by all
2. Disliked by one or two
3. Usually liked by all; occasionally "on outs"
4. Liked by all; rarely on outs
5. Liked by all

B. Is the child chosen on teams for group games?
1. Never chosen; rejected
2. Chosen rarely; usually rejected
3. Chosen often
4. Always chosen in own skilled activity
5. Always chosen or accepted

C. Do the children turn to him for advice?
1. Never asked; unasked advice usually rejected
2. Occasionally asked for advice
3. Sometimes gives advice
4. Almost always for a few things
5. Always turned to for all things

D. Is he influential in making group decisions?
1. Always opposed no matter how good the idea
2. Not any influence; rarely arouses opposition
3. Not very influential; but not always on losing side
4. Usually carries the group with good ideas
5. Always swings group

SOCIAL AND INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION

A. Does the child participate in group activities?
1. Walks out or does not participate
2. Threatens to quit and often does
3. Joins most; sometimes reluctant
4. Joins readily; urges others rarely
5. Joins readily and urges others

B. Does he take initiative in starting group activity?
1. Never suggests or starts activities
2. Rarely suggests activities
3. Joins others in suggesting activities
4. Makes suggestions by himself
5. Starts activities without leader

C. Does he exhibit skill in any of the activities?
1. Does everything poorly
2. Some average; mostly poor
3. Average; excels in none
4. Above average; excels in some
5. Excels in most activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Does he have physical stamina for participation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quits soon after game starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quits before others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gets tired when most of the others are tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can go on to other active games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bursting to continue after many games</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Does he assume responsibility for group projects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Avoids it even though it is his turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assumes responsibilities reluctantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Needs a little stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Always accepts responsibilities given him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Volunteers for his share</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. How persistent is he in his work or play?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quits when losing or hits any snag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quits after several attempts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quits after many attempts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quits only after exhausted from trying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sticks until last detail of difficult task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Does he enjoy himself?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Never enjoys himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enjoys himself half of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enjoy most of the activities but occasionally does not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rarely does not enjoy himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enjoys every activity tremendously</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. How creative is he?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Never creates, copies only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Less creative work than copying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some creativity; some copying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More creative than copying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Always has creative ideas or is creating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Does he complain about things?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Always griping about nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gripes at slightest difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gripes whenever he is justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gripes when more than justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gripes when conditions are unbearable for him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. Does he participate in co-ed activities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Avoids or quits activities with opposite sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shies away but will join with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Needs a little stimulation before mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Among the first to join in co-ed activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Leads others in starting co-ed activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOCIAL TENDENCIES

#### A. Is he possessive or does he share his things?
1. Greedy; wants to get his share, biggest and first; never lends things
2. Pushes hard to get his way; rarely shares his things
3. Pushes little for his share; sometimes shares his things
4. Expects his just share; usually shares his things
5. Rarely pushes to get his; always shares his things

#### B. Is he critical of other people?
1. Destructive, personal criticisms
2. Vague, impersonal criticisms of others
3. A little critical, with good intentions
4. Vague but friendly criticism
5. Concrete and justified; friendly criticism

#### C. How well can he "take it" and "dish it out"?
1. Can only "Dish it out" maliciously; can't take it at all
2. Can take only a little; gets malicious easily or withdraws
3. Gives and takes in a friendly manner
4. Breaks down after a "tough beating," but takes it nicely up to that point
5. Takes anything on the chin

#### D. Does he truly get along with others?
1. Ruled only by own desire; never compromises
2. Compromises reluctantly if he is getting his own way in the greater part of the deal
3. Won't give in if others will not compromise a little
4. Usually compromises to work out a fair arrangement
5. Gives in to please others

#### E. What are his standards of honesty?
1. Rarely truthful or honest
2. Cheats whenever in a tough spot
3. Usually truthful; cheats or lies once in a while
4. Rarely cheats; even in a tough spot
5. Always honest, though it means losing

#### F. Is he quarrelsome?
1. Always starting quarrels
2. Gets into serious fights often; starts them many times
3. Fights back when pushed hard; avoids serious fights
4. Overlooks little things and gets into fights slowly and rarely
5. Peaceful but not submissive; fights when feels strongly

#### G. Is he a bully?
1. Always bullying
2. Usually "takes it out" on others in a special situation
3. Rarely pushes or hits smaller children
4. Hits others when they start
5. Protects little children from bigger ones
H. Does the child day dream?

1. Always seems to be in a dream world; never knows what’s going on
2. Has to be stimulated back to activities
3. Brought back to group easily when he wanders
4. Usually intent upon activity; rarely day-dreams
5. Never day-dreams

I. Does he have confidence in himself?

1. Has no confidence; shy; never shows his work
2. Needs stimulation to come forward
3. Modest; likes to show work at proper time
4. Comes forward by himself
5. Over-confident; boasts; shows off

J. How sensitive is he to leader’s and other children’s attitudes?

1. Easily and cries immediately
2. Disturbed when offended; easy to get back
3. Disturbed when offended but recovers soon by himself
4. Disturbed only slightly; laughs it off
5. Nothing disturbs him

K. Does he have confidence in social relationships?

1. Withdraws from meeting new people; does not mix
2. Needs to be urged to meet new people; poor mixer
3. Usually ready to meet new people; fair mixer
4. Comes forward with others to meet new people; good mixer
5. Outgoing; strikes up new acquaintances immediately on his own

EMOTIONAL TENDENCIES

A. Is he stable?

1. Moody, alternates between depression and elation
2. Usually hard to anticipate what mood will be
3. Usually even tempered; occasionally moody
4. Sometimes moody, but has good reason
5. Even tempered

B. Has he control over his emotions?

1. Gets hysterical or excited easily
2. Gets excited more often than he should
3. Gets excited at appropriate time
4. Rarely gets excited
5. Never gets excited

C. How does he handle a crisis situation?

1. Goes to pieces
2. Needs attention before he recovers balance
3. Gets a little excited; will cool down with a little help
4. Gets slightly excited, but calms down immediately by himself
5. Takes it, cool as a cucumber
D. Does he have nervous mannerisms?
1. Shows many nervous mannerisms at all times
2. Shows nervous mannerisms
3. Shows some mannerisms, but only when upset
4. Few nervous mannerisms
5. Never exhibits any nervous mannerisms

E. Is he courageous?
1. Fearful of doing anything
2. A little afraid; takes few chances
3. A little afraid but goes through with most things others do
4. Takes reasonable chances; shows little fear
5. Takes reasonable chances, no fear

F. Is he affectionate with an adult?
1. Complete indifference
2. Shows affection when given affection
3. Affectionate except when crossed
4. Strives to be near leader; but can accept second place
5. Accepts place as part of group

G. How does he react to authority?
1. Rejects authority completely; defiant
2. Accepts with pressure and persuasion
3. Accepts with reasoning
4. Occasionally needs to be reasoned with
5. Usually accepts authority

H. Does he display hostility to an adult?
1. Hits leader or speaks maliciously whenever he has an opportunity
2. Behaves aggressively to leader when angry with him
3. Occasionally gives leader friendly blow or pokes fun
4. Rarely shows any overt sign of hostility
5. Never shows any hostility toward leader

GENERAL OBSERVATION

A. What is your estimate of his general intelligence?
1. Inferior
2. Below average
3. Average
4. Above average
5. Superior

B. Is he personally attractive?
1. Repulsive all the time
2. Disagreeable
3. Likeable most of the time annoying some of the time
4. Likeable rarely annoying
5. Likeable child
C. Does he take good care of his things?

1. Keep things scattered helter skelter
2. Needs to be told to take care of things
3. Mostly orderly, occasionally not
4. Rarely orderly
5. Keeps things neat and orderly

Summary

Other characteristics which were noted:

My interpretation of this child's behavior:

My recommendations regarding future work with this child:
## APPENDIX C

### TABLE 1

PERSONALITY TRAITS DESIRED IN FRIENDS IN PINE GROVE UNIT AT CAMP
FIRE-GIRL SCOUT DAY CAMP, JUNE 24, 1948

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Traits</th>
<th>Degree of Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Humor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfulness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neatness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reasons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table of original data.
### APPENDIX D

#### TABLE 2

**PERSONALITY TRAITS DESIRED IN FRIENDS IN WHITE VALLEY UNIT AT CAMP FIRE - GIRL SCOUT DAY CAMP, JUNE 24, 1948**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Traits</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperativeness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Humor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neatness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Play</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Table of original data.*
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