

This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 67-9951

LAUDERDALE, Michael Lynn, 1941-
A STUDY OF SMALL GROUPS IN SOCIALLY
DIFFERENTIATED SETTINGS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1967
Social Psychology

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

© Copyright by

MICHAEL LYNN LAUDERDALE

1967

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

A STUDY OF SMALL GROUPS IN SOCIALLY
DIFFERENTIATED SETTINGS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
MICHAEL LYNN LAUDERDALE
Norman, Oklahoma

1967

A STUDY OF SMALL GROUPS IN SOCIALLY
DIFFERENTIATED SETTINGS

APPROVED BY

William R. Hood
John P. Morris
Leon W. Dineen
A. Z. Richards
A. D. Kelly

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation as conceived and carried out went far beyond the efforts and abilities of a single individual.

To Dr. Muzafer Sherif I owe a heavy intellectual debt. From the very inception of the project he provided guidance and encouragement and gave of his time freely and warmly. Most assuredly, from him I have learned the discipline and enthusiasm that science demands. I cannot hope to ever fully repay the obligation.

To Dr. William Robert Hood I owe an equally sizeable debt. In my moments of greatest disappointment he provided me with support, and then the time, freedom and encouragement to complete this task. His suggestions were subtle but effective; his manner forthright but kind. For not only his intellectual stimulation but for his most rare qualities of humane understanding, I am most appreciative.

To my committee, Drs. J. R. Morris, Arnold Dahlke, Alex Ricciardelli and Leon Ginsberg, thank you. Your continued support throughout the past years is indicative of your concern for the student and his goals.

To Pat Lauderdale, Ray Bard, Pat Hart and Sam Mazman consider this study as yours too. You like myself find this now a part of

you.

To Betty Frensley for her typing, editing, bookkeeping and warm interest I wish to express my appreciation.

Finally to my wife and parents, I wish to express my gratitude for their unfailing assistance, understanding and support through what were many times long hours.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Brief Historical Perspective.....	8
Current Trends in Small Group Research.....	13
II. PROBLEM.....	23
III. METHOD.....	28
Subjects and Settings.....	28
Methodology and Procedure.....	29
IV. RESULTS.....	39
Group I.....	42
Group II.....	60
Group III.....	78
Group IV.....	90
Between Group Comparisons.....	111
V. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	117
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	127
REFERENCES.....	131
APPENDIXES.....	136

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Spearman Rank Correlations for Status and Sociometric Choices Measurements for Group I...	48
II	Spearman Rank Correlations for Status and Sociometric Choices Measurements for Group II...	65
III	Spearman Rank Correlations for Status and Sociometric Choices Measurements for Group III..	81
IV	Spearman Rank Correlations for Status and Sociometric Choices Measurements for Group IV...	96
V	Extension of the Median Test for Scores on Estimation of Family Income.....	112
VI	Components of Total Chi Square from the Extension of the Median Test.....	113
VII	Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance of Estimated Value of Family Dwelling for All Groups.	114
VIII	Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Police Violations for All Groups.....	115

A STUDY OF SMALL GROUPS IN SOCIALLY DIFFERENTIATED SETTINGS¹

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The general concern of this study is with the formation and functioning over time of groups and the relationship among individuals within groups. Such a study, of course, reaches into many areas of social psychology and for that matter, other social sciences. For example, under the heading of group study can be subsumed a whole host of important topics for social psychology such as conformity-deviation, attitudes, power, compliance, prejudice, conflict, leadership, norms, communication and others. For the social scientist the group is a small social unit that enables him to view dynamically a great many important phenomena as they actually occur. It is certainly for such reasons that the study of various kinds of groups holds such a

¹ This study was initiated under the direction of Muzafer Sherif, then Director of the Institute of Group Relations and supported from a National Science Foundation Grant No. 6-24973 and a predoctoral fellowship of the National Institutes of Mental Health No. 1-F1-MH-28, 140-01 (BEH).

prominent place in the social sciences and receives so much attention.

Of course to delineate the concepts and phenomena is only part of the problem. Just as large a task is providing suitable methodologies and instruments with which to measure the concepts. Indeed as operationalism has taught, concepts are intimately related to the tools and measures used to attain them. If theory is to be built from empirical and experimental data then theorizing can go no farther than the measurements that are available at the time. Then, as an integral aspect of this study, tools and instruments are developed, modified and adapted to fit the task at hand. If the scientist has concern for the validity of his findings he must be ready, especially in the field, to fit his methods to the phenomena, not force the phenomena to fit some convenient test or favored technique. As an illustration in point, if a scientist seeks information about socially taboo or unacceptable items, direct questioning about the items may lead to evasion, fabrication or open hostility. Just to clothe himself in the rainments of science does not assure the investigator that his respondents will be open or completely truthful. Far too often field techniques dealing with human groups have failed to take fully into account a common human reticence to open oneself to an investigator. Especially in regard to items that are ego-relevant yet socially unacceptable is the person often slow to "tell all he knows" to a stranger.

On the other hand too often laboratory techniques have avoided many of these knotty problems of human life such as ego-relevant

issues and settled for problems with variables more suitable for the laboratory. These variables such as seating arrangements or verbal versus written communication, though authentic, may be something less than critical in the great majority of groups. Such lesser variables may only assume importance when one has grasped the main outlines of the problem and has achieved methods for handling more critical variables.

For this study the concept "group," itself, is a most important variable. Of course, so are the individual and the cultural and social system, but first, let us specify the limits (cf. Levy, 1953) of the definition of "group" and some of its characteristics. First the point should be made that not all social gatherings or situations are groups. A number of unacquainted people waiting at a bus stop, though they have a common purpose in awaiting the bus, does not constitute a group. This aggregation may more properly be termed a togetherness situation. Such togetherness situations represent one end of the limit of the definition of group. Of course from togetherness to group is a continuum and a togetherness situation may develop into a group if interaction continues over time. There seems to be no definite upper limit to the definition, group, unless it is complete formalization of norms, roles, membership, etc. Such is the case of many informal groups that they do in time codify their norms as laws, specify membership and otherwise become institutionalized. Groups then may vary from highly formalized and enduring entities to relatively transitory informal units.

In terms of properties characteristic to groups, the basic essentials seem to be one or more mutually shared goals, a set of norms regulating behavior relative to group concerns and a set of roles defining reciprocal expectations for members. It should be noted that role implies for a given member both a status position in the power structure and a popularity position in the affect structure. A given role may vary with respect to status position or may be tied to that position. Moreover, the concepts, role and norm, are in some ways closely bound up. For example, the leader's role with respect to an important norm of the group may be well defined and allow little deviation. On the other hand for a norm of lesser importance the latitude of expected behavior may be considerably larger.

A group may be defined as a social system that to varying degrees has structured relations among its component parts (members), maintains itself over time and is oriented to goals of some kind. Also to varying degrees the group governs the behavior of members both within and without the social context. In this study the groups are all small and much interaction is face to face.

Tightness or cohesiveness of groups vary. In many respects cohesiveness is a function of how well stabilized are the reciprocal expectations of behavior among members and the total consensus of members on important concerns of the group. Stabilized expectations for a member's behavior refer to his role, and expectations or consensuses of the total group for important matters refer to norms. To the

extent these ideal behaviors, expectations and consensuses are unstable then cohesiveness is low.

As cohesiveness of groups varies so does the stability and consistency over time. As a system over several months or years total membership may turn over but norms and goals may remain the same. On the other hand membership may remain relatively constant but goals, norms, and individual roles may shift extensively. Consequently the conception of a group as a static, stabilized system of interaction and reciprocities may blind one to several highly important characteristics of groups.

Especially when studying phenomena at the early stages in the development of a science the investigator encounters difficulties in devising appropriate and heuristic concepts for organizing, describing and explaining the phenomena. Radcliffe-Brown (1957) notes that there are few if any rules to guide one in the choice of units to use, yet the choice is not an arbitrary matter. He indicates that the appropriateness of a concept or unit is dependent upon heuristic qualities; whether it opens leads for knowledge and explanation. In this study the individual and his small group represent two needed concepts to deal adequately with the problem. A third needed concept seems to be that of culture or large social unit in which the individual and the small group operate.

These three concepts along with the discussion in the preceding pages and the general methodology for studying natural groups under field conditions have come from or were greatly influenced by the works

of Muzafer Sherif from the classic autokinetic study (1936) to An Outline of Social Psychology (1956) and Reference Groups (1964).

This means that if we are seeking to explain the behavior of individuals and the workings of small groups we must specify some characteristics of the culture. Is it urban or rural; industrialized or agrarian? What are the prevailing sociopolitical ideologies? What are the dominant family structures? What sort of vertical class mobility do individuals have? In a given area what are the individual's aspirations? What are seen as major deprivations? A social psychologist must be aware that norms, values and structures of the culture and society certainly affect individual behavior and group process. So does the immediate physical and social setting. Thrasher (1927) found his greatest concentration of youth "gangs" in the interstitial areas of the city. Where youth had a great deal of free time; where there was less emphasis in school and school related activities; where Boy Scouts, the YMCA and church organizations had less impact, these boys gravitated to their own groupings. A necessary condition for the formation of groups is for people to be in a common situation such that interaction in some way improves the situation and meets a need or needs. Common predicaments in themselves are not enough. The individuals must also see in interaction a means for alleviating the current condition.

The effectiveness of groups in calling forth desired behavior may also vary from culture to culture. Indeed in a highly patterned society such as India, internalized cultural directives may be such that

individuals are far less likely to take initiative with their peers than individuals from Western societies. This was much the conclusion reached by Gardner Murphy (1953) in a UNESCO project in India where an individual's behavior was more greatly changed by directives from an authority than by decisions in a group of peers. In a stable well-patterned society undergoing only slow social change or just beginning to experience rapid transition, prevalent cultural norms provide ready-made standards for behavior and in a new situation people will rely on these standards. Thus with India, its traditional caste system and integrated set of roles for almost all members of the society provide in most situations recourse to a norm or an authority that indicates appropriate behavior.

On the other hand the existence of a stable, integrated and slowly changing culture does not mean that individuals of such cultures always slavishly conform to some authority or leader. Miller (1953) reports that among the Fox Indian hierarchical arrangements in society and acceptance of authority as known in the European world hardly existed with this tribe. Here, though the society is ordered, no person is permanently vested with authority. Position is indicative of differentiation not power. When a person like a war chief must order and direct activities of others, these others maintain the right to act or not act, and furthermore when a war party returned, the war chief underwent rites to symbolize the revoking of this temporary power. In such a society where external direction and personal authority are so repugnant, there

still must be some source for regulation and order, or chaos would prevail. With the Fox the answer lies in the extent to which cultural directives were internalized thus obviating the need for external directives supplied by individuals in leadership positions. Thus "... he [the Fox] felt individually responsible for knowing and acting in accordance with the regulations of his society. An order was an insult; it implied that he was inadequate in his knowledge and performance of traditional rules of correct behavior" (1955, p. 286).

From studies with other cultures such as the Indian of Asia and the Fox it is evident that norms and values of the greater society are found reflected at the individual and interpersonal or small group level. Such findings then should sensitize the investigator of small groups to the limitations in generality his findings may have until they are cross-checked both within different areas of their culture and then with findings from other cultures. Such a concern then is manifested in this project where natural groups are studied and compared at three different and distinct socioeconomic levels within a single area. Any scientific statements made about these findings must be done with the stipulations that the results come from one cultural area.

Brief Historical Perspective

Before outlining fully the subject of this research it is necessary to achieve a brief historical perspective of the development of the study of small groups. This necessity results from the large variety

of disciplines that gave birth to small group research and the current often contradictory findings.

Many things pass under the rubric of small groups. The scope of research methods is wide and too often the discrepancies between findings are a function of methods and what is to be considered a small group. Too little is known of cultural variations that may affect the group and such factors as class, nationality, sex, age, physical surroundings and so forth are rarely specified. A brief view of the history of small group research and perusal of current approaches will place the present undertaking in a clearer perspective.

For many years social scientists and philosophers have been concerned with the relationship between individuals and social groups. During the nineteenth century from such concerns there developed the several academic disciplines including psychology, anthropology and sociology that take these phenomena as their domain of study. Great theorizing and prominent names held sway in this period with such pioneers as Wilhelm Wundt, Sigmund Freud, Herbert Spencer, Lewis Morgan, Auguste Comte and Emile Durkheim to name but a few of the more prominent.

To somewhat oversimplify, in these earlier years psychology primarily concerned itself with a search for the elements of the human mind; sociology sought to build a grand model of social life; and anthropology, much influenced by Darwinian thinking, tried to construct the evolutionary path of human societies. In some ways these aims all

proved to be blind alleys, in part because of too narrow a conceptualization of the problem, in part from a lack of appropriate tools and methodologies, and part, too, because of the overwhelming complications of human social life.

By the twentieth century new trends and approaches began to emerge with somewhat less grandiose goals in mind. A highly significant development was the realization that an individual in a social context behaves markedly different from an individual in an alone situation. Triplett (1908) found that children in a task of winding string with a fishing reel had higher performance in a together situation as compared to alone. Simmel (1955) was writing (1902) theory that centered not on total societies or similar large social units but small face-to-face groups. At Chicago under Park and Burgess ambitious researchers initiated a naturalistic observational study of small informal groups operating within the larger social system.

Much in the psychological Zeitgeist like Triplett were the alone-togetherness studies begun in Germany by Moede (1914). This approach was brought to America by Münsterberg who in turn introduced it to F. H. Allport. Throughout the twenties, Allport and his associates studied the "social increments" and "social decrements" resulting from performances in togetherness and alone situations (1921). Sherif (1935), Dashiell (1930), Blake and Mouton (1957), and Hood and Sherif (1962) in later years demonstrated that physical presence was not necessary to produce social effects since humans are capable of conceptualizing

other individuals performance on tasks. However, all these studies dealt with individuals performing under some kind of social or personal influence, but not in groups. A group implies something more than just sheer presence of several individuals involved in a similar or the same task (Pollis, 1965).

In contrast to the experimental framework of these studies were the naturalistic observations of social groups appearing in the works of Thrasher (1927); Shaw (1930, 1931); Zorbaugh (1929) and Whyte (1943). Thrasher conducted a seven year survey of the interstitial (poverty and slum areas) regions of Chicago and documented repeatedly and richly the ubiquitous nature of small groups among youth, groups of the utmost importance and reference for the individual. However in terms of methodology and technique Thrasher leaves few clues (1963). More explicit is Shaw's statement of methodology whereby he combines the use of the boy's "own story" with a check with available objective data. Certainly the Chicago studies of this era dealt with genuine groups and provided a long needed start on methodologies for observing and investigating these phenomena. Their findings invariably indicated the presence of spontaneous groupings; that these groupings had some semblance of internal structure; that much of the individual's identity was invested in these groups and that in most, if not all, cases the groups had secrets that they were reluctant to share with any outsider.

Working with much the same phenomena but concentrating on a single group was Whyte's Street Corner Society (1943). In an extended

study covering approximately two years Whyte lived in an Italian slum area in Boston and watched and interviewed group members during their casually patterned activities. Whyte's methodology, in some ways quite similar to the classic anthropological method, was to appear as a recognized "participant observer" to the group. In addition to his observations Whyte reconstructed situations by interviews with the members. Among Whyte's contributions were a relatively complete picture of life in such a group, an insight into group structure and norms and a view of dynamic process in a group over a time interval.

In 1934 Moreno (Who Shall Survive) introduced sociometry as a tool for measuring the internal affect structure of a group. Essentially, a sociometric technique requests each member to choose other group members he likes and reject those he does not like. Tabulation of such data from each member of a group produces a network of the group's affect structure (Secord & Backman, 1965).

Lewin, Lippitt and White in 1939 presented one of the earliest studies of groups formed for a specific experimental purpose. Until this time much of the preceding studies had dealt either with preexisting natural groups as in the Chicago tradition or were mere togetherness situations that lacked many of the social properties characteristic of groups (e. g. Sherif, 1935). Lewin et al., found that the type of leadership, autocratic, democratic or laissez faire, imposed on a group greatly affected group process. Especially the autocratic group as compared to the democratic had less cohesiveness or solidarity, and

commanded much less member loyalty. It could be said that there was much less consensus on important goals in the autocratic group. Thus characteristics of internal group structure greatly affect other aspects of group functioning and member attitudes.

Current Trends in Small Group Research

By the late forties and early fifties small group research had become a very substantial academic endeavor and a great variety of approaches began to crystalize from the early traditions. One system (Bales, 1950) presents a method of coding interaction into specific categories. There are twelve of these categories, six of which pertain to task orientation and attainment and six which pertain to socioemotional aspects of interaction. The structure of the category system is such that most elements will consist of verbal behavior though non-verbal phenomena are not totally excluded.

Bion (1952; 1961) and Thelen (1954) have developed a similar approach to analyzing and quantifying group interaction based on work with therapy and similar groups. However, the Bion-Thelen formulation permits a given item of interaction to be scored simultaneously in work and emotional categories. The implication of this is that any unit of behavior has at least two identifiable dimensions, goal or task orientation and emotional content.

Recently Hill (1965) has presented an interaction matrix with four levels of a work style dimension and four levels of a content

dimension that roughly correspond to task and emotional dimensions in other category systems. Hill's like Bion-Thelen's permits scoring in an item of behavior on both dimensions. Hill also has two types of protocols, one for use by an observer and the other drawn from members' responses to a self-appraisal questionnaire. In addition Martin and Hill (1957) like Bales (1955) note that groups go through stages or phases of development and these are reflected in the categorization of the interaction process.

These three systems for the categorization and description of group process were developed and are best used in situations where the experimenter has considerable control over the situation and is free to record the interaction. In the case of Bion-Thelen's and Hill's, these were largely developed from clinical settings while Bale's system, though successfully used in a clinical setting, is the product of a more strictly experimental concern. All three approaches focus on group process especially as task and socioemotional orientation relate to each other. Shortcomings are the difficulty in training raters, the restrictive conditions groups are placed in especially with the awareness of being observed, and finally the lack of generality these groups may have to ones outside clinical or laboratory settings. The last reservation is the general issue of validity and must be a prime concern of any research. On the whole it remains to be seen to what extent these approaches have utility beyond their original settings. Certainly one researcher (Polsky, 1962; 1965) feels that Bale's framework

has much applicability in an institutional setting with emphasis on treatment in groups.

Neighborhood, clinical and experimentally constructed groups are not the only small groups that have been important research topics. From the time of Charles Cooley's coinage of the term "primary group" (1925), the family has been a research topic for scientists interested in group phenomena. Strodbeck (1951, 1954) has utilized the family as a research paradigm for the small group. However, it has been mainly anthropologists that have studied the family group intensively, and such basic works as Bohannon (1963), Lowie (1948), Murdock (1949) and Schneider and Gough (1962) document the great variety of forms the family group may assume.

Probably the largest school or tradition with the small group as its emphasis is the school of Group Dynamics founded by Kurt Lewin and now centered at the University of Michigan. To cover the accomplishments and findings of the many researchers associated with this tradition is a massive undertaking in itself. A list of these research emphases must include studies of group cohesiveness, conformity and deviation, the character of group goals, the relation between group and leader and the structural aspects of groups and special concern for communication patterns. The consistent methodology has been to form groups for an experimental situation, give the group a problem to solve or task to complete and then study aspects of the process. Cartwright and Zander (1960) present one of the better known coverages of the

findings and approaches of group dynamics. However it should be noted that these researchers have not continually devoted themselves to laboratory experimentation. The study, When Prophecy Fails by Festinger, Schachter and Back (1959), is a case in point where a natural group was followed almost from beginning to dissolution.

Less concerned with experimentation but more interested in developing a full theory of small group behavior has been the work of Homans (1950, 1961). This work has emphasized an exchange approach whereby certain needs of members are gratified through interaction in a group. A very similar theory is that presented by Thibaut and Kelley (1959). Both theories explain social behavior from the standpoint of rewards gained and costs incurred to members during interaction. Secord and Backman (1964) note as one of the strong merits of exchange theory is the ability to integrate a wide scope of earlier data and theories.

Muzafer Sherif (1953 with C. W. Sherif) and especially in The Robbers Cave Experiment (1961) with O. J. Harvey, B. Jack White, W. R. Hood and C. W. Sherif have presented a series of experiments that have shown how many of the important and critical aspects of the field and laboratory may be combined in a single design. For example, the Robbers Cave Experiment was conducted in a remote, isolated campground where great control over situational variables could be exercised. The subjects, preadolescent boys, were carefully selected with respect to such critical variables as religious affiliation,

sociocultural background, personal adjustment, socioeconomic class, educational level, prior acquaintance, school adjustment, and physical development among others. In fact over three hundred hours were spent directly in subject selection.

This particular experiment was designed to study phases of group formation, group process including formation of norms, structural differentiation through status and role relations and other aspects of group interaction. Additionally Sherif and his associates were able to study the impact of competition and friction between two of the experimental groups and effects of superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup friction.

The objectives of the experiment itself were unknown to the subjects who felt they were participating in a study of camping techniques. Through the use of motivationally relevant situations and goals the experimenters were able to develop genuine groups that formed not as a result of instructions to do so but as a result of the compelling aspects of the design. Moreover, measurement techniques were so devised that they appeared as contests or otherwise did not obstruct or clutter the natural flow of interaction. With limitations in mind of laboratory type experiments and the age of participants considered, the experiment represents a hallmark in following the formation and functioning of groups over a considerable time interval while still maintaining experimental controls.

Not all the important leads on group formation and functioning

come from contrived and experimental situations. Indeed as mentioned earlier some of the field studies of Thrasher, Shaw, Whyte and others have provided scientists with most accurate descriptions of what groups are and how they form and operate over time. In much the same tradition has been a recent project in Chicago as reported by Short and Strodbeck (1965). Research was initiated there which concerned itself with both general questions of social system and individuals, and with the more specific consideration of the etiology of delinquency. Like other researchers acquainted with phenomena in the field, Short (1965) concerned himself with variables larger than the group level including subculture and institutions. Indeed Short feels that adequate explanation of individual behavior must go beyond group or individual factors to include larger pattern themes and norms of the area.

The main methodology used in these studies closely parallels the tradition of earlier Chicago studies. A participant observer, with the boys' awareness frequents their hangouts with them and to an extent participates in some of the interaction. However because of the conditions of this study as somewhat action oriented, the observer at times acted to restrict certain actions of the group. Such actions on the part of an observer are perhaps laudable in the role of a social worker, but they seriously damage any claim to a reasonable degree of scientific detachment and objectivity.

Another study with some similarities to that of the aforementioned

one and also begun in 1958 were the natural group experiments by Sherif and Sherif (1964). The Sherifs, however, introduced some important refinements in methodology of observation and measurement, many of which were developed in the psychological laboratory. A three-pronged approach was developed whereby the individual in his group in its setting was studied in the same design. To implement the experiments areas of large cities were chosen with respect to social and cultural indices that permitted classification relative to socioeconomic level and ethnicity. Following such specification of the area an observer was chosen to "fit" the given area. By "fit" is meant that the prospective observer be very familiar with the general values and norms of the area and not appear incongruous relative to these ways of life. Finally an observer was chosen about five to ten years older than the individuals to be studied. The age is important because the observer must be old enough not to become too involved in the group so that he becomes a full member; yet not so old that he is far removed from the experiences and concerns of the adolescent's world. Ideally the observer assumed a role as an older "brother" or friend not a full member.

Choice of a group to observe was made by repeatedly checking sites of informal youth interaction and looking for recurrences of interaction among a cluster of individuals. When the observer located such a cluster, he did not contact the boys, but waited until they approached him. This may take quite some time since, as the Sherifs found, groups are often resistant to intruders or newcomers.

Once rapport was gained to some degree the observer began to focus upon some aspect of the group for intensive observation. The phases were, after location and rapport: structure, study of group products, member roles and personal characteristics and finally the natural history of the group. Not until the later phases of the study did the observer initiate any action for the group or attempt to divert or obstruct the direction and rate of the interaction. An important methodological point was that the observer never informed the group that they were an object of study and took great pains to maintain his role apart from the main interaction of the group. This point is especially important in the light of recent studies indicating the distorting effects of experimenter bias and subject awareness in psychological experiments (Orne & Scheibe, 1964; Rosenthal & Fode, 1963; McGuigan, 1963).

In most instances groups were observed from four to six months with an observer filing an observation report from two to four or five times a week. This methodology then makes it possible to study group functioning over a considerable time interval in a natural setting while various aspects of the group are studied intensively during the period.

A review of the history and current findings on small groups does indeed present a plethora of approaches and purposes. Research in the laboratories of clinics, industry and universities has concentrated primarily on the group, its development and functioning. Studies under field conditions have focused a little less on the group many

times and have paid closer attention to social and physical surroundings. Quite often findings from the two types of studies are markedly dissimilar.

Sherif et al., (1961) and especially Sherif and Sherif (1964) have tried to integrate these findings and approaches into a single design. Yet there are still gaps in our knowledge. From Thrasher on, the ubiquity of informal groups among lower class adolescents is granted and again reconfirmed by the Sherifs' findings. But we still do not know a great deal about groups in the middle class and even less about those in upper income brackets. Especially is this true for the upper income bracket where the family income well exceeds ten thousand and where youth are afforded a far wider range of activities and locations than youth of the middle class.

Another question to be asked is: if the setting or social area is held constant, how much variability will there be among groups in the setting? An initial step is to realize that areas separated by considerable cultural and/or physical distance may produce different effects on groups and individuals. But is there variation in a single setting and if so how does one account for it? Do lower class delinquents really feel indifferent or alienated to norms of the general society (cf. Cohen, 1955; Empey & Rabow, 1961; Short, 1965)? To what degree is there consensus on norms or values among groups at different levels in a community? To what extent does a group determine an individual's attitudes, and are their attitudes that an individual holds that are not a

product of his group but perhaps of a larger cultural and social matrix?
What utility does the concept, group, afford in predicting and explaining
individual behavior?

Certainly all the above questions and unresolved theoretical
issues mentioned earlier cannot be answered fully or finally in a single
research project. The goal here is to consider those that at this time
seem most amenable to inquiry and concentrate on them.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM

During the last three or four decades small group studies have increasingly occupied a prominent place in the social sciences. Anthropology and sociology were the first to discover small groups and by the late thirties, psychology, too, became aware of them. It could even be said in some ways this helped spur the emergence of a psychology in social situations or what is today social psychology. Perhaps because small group studies have been conducted in different disciplines, they can be divided into two discernable approaches. The first are the highly naturalistic field studies especially coming from the University of Chicago (e. g. Thrasher, 1927; Shaw, 1930; Zorbaugh, 1929). The other is an experimental laboratory approach as exemplified by Kurt Lewin (1939) and scholars in the Group Dynamics tradition (1961) and the work of R. F. Bales and his associates (1950, 1953, 1955).

The problem here, too, is the study of small groups, but not just for the sake of small groups in themselves. The small group is, in a sense, a fundamental and prototypic social unit. Here we have

individuals engaged in social action, moving in social roles in accordance with norms and placed in some structural arrangement. Power, leadership, conformity, nonconformity, social distance, stereotyping-- a whole host of social psychological concerns appears for study in this natural laboratory. The group then is studied not only for its own intrinsic properties but for whatever insight it may give us to understanding basic social and psychological processes. Here the individual's first social relationships are formed and so too is the fundamental beginning of social phenomena.

As noted there have been two important, more or less distinct, approaches to the study of groups. Both are empirical but one more field oriented and with emphasis on phenomenology; the other more experimental and analytical with emphasis on control. Neither in themselves can represent an adequate and complete answer but are two time honored and classic ways of approaching a problem. In the first approach there is the great danger of inadequate control and even if control is maximized the approach remains essentially observational and descriptive. The second method aims for explanation, but here validity is the problem. If we are not too sure of the phenomena we are studying, and of course this is invariably the case in a young science, then we may fail to recognize them in the laboratory setting or even worse the phenomena may be very difficult to duplicate, especially those phenomena developing over time. Moreover it has been recently shown that if subjects are aware of being studied, this in itself

produces differential effects (Orne & Scheibe, 1964). Certainly then if subjects are aware they are being viewed through one-way mirrors or their voices are being taped, behavior is less than natural.

In the same way just giving instructions to a bunch of unacquainted individuals to "form a group and discuss and arrive at a decision" is no assurance that a group isomorphic to those in the outside world will result. Genuine real-life groups are formed as a result of compelling motives and situations. Because of common frustrations or desires or personal goals individuals are drawn together and find that concerted action makes possible things that cannot be reached or at least achieved as well individually.

Groups are formed for a variety of purposes. Some purposes are clearly explicit in the members' minds. Other purposes like those of youth are more in the form of a restless longing, a feeling of inadequacy or boredom, or just getting together with those who are like you and understand you. At any rate the important point for this study is to note that there must be strong and compelling motives for groups to form and subsist; additionally group products such as norms and roles require extended periods of interaction before they develop. Therefore, genuine groups must have existed for more than just a few hours. Human interaction is sufficiently complex to require a certain amount of time before roles are developed and learned, and consensus on norms is not a thing that occurs immediately. Even the simplest and most circumscribed of groups are sufficiently complex to require

relatively prolonged interaction to develop.

Because of the difficulty and complexity involved in forming groups for experimental purposes the strategy here was to approach naturally formed groups and use a battery of methods and techniques for studying the individuals and their groups over a considerable length of time. In every case no group is studied for less than a period of several months with observation of interaction made three or more times per week. Observations and experiments performed are done in a naturalistic way so as not to clutter interaction nor make participants aware that they are objects of scientific study.

A single observer is primarily responsible for the bulk of observations of each group but his observations are supplemented at various intervals by another observer to secure a check on ratings and reduce intra-observer subjectivity. By using a variety of methods the observer increases experimenter controls and reduces subjectivity.

Groups are located by the observer and no adults, parents, teachers or other authorities are informed of the study until after completion. Such measures are taken to remove the possibility of unnatural and artificial circumstances arising during the period of observation.

Groups are studied at various socioeconomic levels in light of previously cited studies that point to different cultural influences impinging on members of different socioeconomic levels e.g. A. K. Cohen (1955); R. A. Cloward & L. E. Ohlin (1960); W. B. Miller (1958). Sherif and Sherif (1961) were able to obtain twelve groups in

widely differentiated socioeconomic, cultural and ethnic settings in several large urban areas of the Southwest. These groups were studied by several different observers during a period of five years and presented some contrasting examples with respect to cultural and regional differences. In this study a suburban metropolitan area of thirty to fifty thousand is delineated and divided into low, middle and high socioeconomic standing. One group each is observed from the high and low levels. Two groups are studied from the middle level.

Such an approach enables one to more effectively control differential effects from the cultural setting as opposed to using several cultural settings as in the Sherif and Sherif study (1964). In effect several variables such as educational facilities, degree of urbanization, language, ethnic background, religious institutions, employment opportunities, television and radio programming are held constant across groups or their variation is greatly minimized. Of course reducing or holding constant some of these sources of variation reduces the contrasts between groups; yet enough variance, as shall be seen, remains between groups to produce very noticeable differences. Indeed this approach also illustrates how even within a fairly integrated and self-sufficient community, different social or cultural influences appear.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects and Settings

All subjects were white adolescent boys. Religious preference included both Catholic and Protestant. Age range was from 14 to 18. Subject selection was based on membership in a group meeting one of the three socioeconomic criterion levels. As described in the methodology and procedure section groups were located by sending an observer to informal interaction sites within the neighborhood corresponding to the socioeconomic level. All groups were small, face-to-face and had been in existence some time before the study was initiated.

Group I consisted basically of six boys all who had dropped out of school by the eighth grade with the exception of one. This boy completed the tenth grade before leaving school.

Group II consisted of six members with three or four frequent fringe members. All boys were in the twelfth grade during the study.

Group III consisted of a hard core membership of five boys with an equal number of fringe members. During the time of the study the boys were in the ninth and tenth grade.

Group IV consisted of a fairly tight core of six boys. Due to a number of factors this group had the widest age spread of any group. During the time of the study members of the group were in all three high school grade levels.

Methodology and Procedure

In this study subject or group selection is inextricably tied to methodology. The plan in this study required that groups be obtained at low, middle and high socioeconomic levels and studied intensively for a period not less than several months. It was also stipulated that the subjects not be aware of them being an object of study; furthermore, both individual and group level data were to be gathered. Basic methodology is very similar to that presented in Sherif and Sherif (1964, pp. 331-360).

The general setting for the study was a nonindustrial Midwestern community of thirty to fifty thousand population and adjacent to a large metropolitan city. A large college was the preponderant social, political and economic influence in the community. On the basis of property evaluations and interviews with various city and school officials several roughly delineated socioeconomic levels were designated. Appropriate information was collected from group members to test for socioeconomic class.

To draw groups from each of these areas the author repeatedly checked possible sites of informal adolescent interaction. Sites such

as pool halls, bowling alleys, private and public clubs and swimming pools, restaurants and drive-ins proved the most rewarding. After tentative observation two or three promising sites were chosen in the given area to begin group observation.

Actual location of a group was achieved by repeated appearances at the informal interaction sites at suitable times. Usually this meant after school in the afternoon and after seven in the evenings. Saturday afternoon and evenings were also good observational periods. A group was pinpointed by noting frequency and recurrences of interaction of a cluster of boys. Usually it took two weeks to two months to locate a group.

After location and identification of the group the focus was shifted to achieving rapport with the members. Originally it was intended to never approach group members until they had first contacted the observer. Experience showed though that the observer must be receptive to the often boisterous manners of the adolescent and not appear too removed or rapport would be almost impossible to achieve.

Immediately after every observational period the observer wrote a complete report of the happenings in the group for that session. The form of the report consisted of a cover sheet with date, report number, precise time of observation, location and description of interaction sites and a description and names of group members present. All activities in the report were arranged in a chronological order and only behavioral events were recorded. When the observer mentioned

his own feelings or how others felt or otherwise gave some interpretation, this kind of data was indented from the rest of the report. Consequently strict behavioral data including verbal reports were kept separate from any interpretation.

In observing and reporting the observer avoided cluttering interaction or becoming a part of the group. Becoming a part of the group and leading activities or committing oneself to a side in a discussion are all too easy to do. Several means were used to check against this tendency. One method was to note the use of the first person plural we and our in report writing. This and any failure to see group activity as apart from the observer indicated observer subjective involvement in the group.

At no time did the observer inform the group members or anyone that knew them that they were being observed or studied. The observer attempted to appear somewhat similar to members of the group under study except only a little older. For example with Group I, where this methodology was perhaps most difficult to implement, the observer posed as a college student with little interest in school but always ready to shoot snooker or join a party. He often remarked how he was similar to the members when he, himself, was their age. He would observe that school was often uninteresting, that he had wanted a fast car, that his parents were too restrictive and so forth. However at no point did the observer sanction positively or negatively illegal acts committed by group members nor did he participate in illegal activities.

Perhaps the single most important part in this methodology is keeping the observer from becoming a part of the group and blending his perception with theirs. Such a tendency attests to the strong pull groups exert on individuals to engage in interaction and assume the norms and roles; however for scientific objectivity this tendency must be avoided. An observer must, to an extent, adopt some of the appearances and modes of behavior of the group but must on the other hand at all times be fully aware of his task to observe and quantify interaction. Moreover an observer must react to the group not on an individual to individual basis or event by event but must try to achieve a wholeistic picture of the group and view interaction in terms of sequences of action.

When the observer was on a first name basis with the hard core of four or five members of the group, the emphasis was shifted to ascertaining the structural characteristics of the group. It usually averaged from one to two months before the observer was able to go from rapport to this stage. In addition to the criteria of being on a first name basis the observer had to be able to go with the group to several interaction sites. Only then was he able to see sufficient and varied interaction episodes to determine the group's status hierarchy. Moreover, until the observer had fully gained the confidence of the members, he was excluded from many situations of interaction that had illegal aspects.

Several methods were used to arrive at the status structure of

the group. One method was to rank and accumulate instances of leadership in group interaction. Effective initiation of an activity or acceptance of a suggestion was the operationalization of leadership. Special weight or consideration was given to initiation along dimensions of high importance to the group. Mere amount of verbage or urgings alone was not counted as leadership. Leadership occurred only when the group as a whole acted favorably on a suggestion. Ancillary to effective initiative as a measure of leadership was deference shown to certain members and expression of derogation or approval of a member. At all times observation stressed behavioral indices and when interpretations were made they were noted as such.

Rankings on effective initiative were made over a period of ten to twenty reports until a stabilized pattern was reached. If at any time status started to change a new series of rankings were made. Such provisions were necessary because first, it usually took several sessions to accurately and reliably rank status. Secondly, status structure in the group could have changed over time, especially if the group engaged in new activities or gained and lost members.

In addition to the observer's ranking of the status hierarchy a special event was arranged where an independent observer would also make a status assessment using the same measures as noted above. The independent observation, sometimes a special occasion for the group, was not initiated until rapport was highly established and only minimal resistance noted. At this event both the observer and the

independent observer made status rankings; thus providing a check on the subjectivity of the regular observer.

A third method for ascertaining hierarchical characteristics of the group was the administration of a verbal adaptation of a sociometric questionnaire to the members. Usually this did not come until late in the study so as not to damage rapport by arousing the members' suspicions about the observer. As with the other measures the sociometric choices were adopted to appear as natural as possible and not clutter or otherwise interfere with group interaction. Sociometric choices were administered to each member individually and not in the presence of the other members. They were phrased in the boy's language, as much as possible, and covered three dimensions. The dimensions were: popularity, e.g. Who do you like to be with most? effective initiative, e.g. Who usually gets things going? masculinity, e.g. Who is the toughest or best fighter?

The first sociometric dimension is a check on the operationalization of leadership in the observation. "Do group members view leadership as does the external observer? The second dimension is popularity or affect structure of the group. Other researchers have noted that there may be more than one hierarchical arrangement or dimension in groups. Several have noted two sorts of leaders in groups; one, a task leader, the other, a socioemotional leader. This test taps that dimension. Finally, is the masculinity dimension. This dimension reflects the fact that the oft made distinction between content and process in

group theory is artificial indeed. Very often in this culture strength, size and fighting skill is an important dimension in male adolescents' eyes and with their groups. This final sociometric choice is oriented to that consideration.

In obtaining sociometric choices first, second and third choices were asked. If the subject gave more on his own initiative these were recorded. Care was exercised to avoid damaging rapport by forcing the individual to make choices.

When it was possible to make consistent status rankings the study focus was shifted to group norms. It should be noted though that data pertaining to other aspects of the study are not deleted or ignored during any particular focuses or phase of study. The typical report averaged three to four pages and contained information about everything the observer could record relative to the group and its interaction. However since even in a few short minutes it is humanly impossible to record everything occurring in a group of several individuals, the observer selectively concentrated on one aspect for a period of several reports. Since selectivity is in itself a natural process in perception and memory it was used in reducing undesired bias in observation by making it a part of the general methodology.

When selectivity was shifted to general norms and products of the groups, the observer began to look for distinctive aspects of the group. He was able to locate these aspects by comparing the groups to other boys in the setting with respect to such criteria as dress, language

including favored slang and nicknames, cars, activities, dating behaviors, evaluation of school, parents and the police and any other behavior or practice that is common to the members.

The principle activities of a group have norms about how these activities are to be conducted. Often these norms represent the group's more central ones. This is one area of group interaction where norms are expected to be strong and clearly articulated. In identifying norms it is important to keep the status hierarchy in mind. Sherif and Sherif (1965) note that the highest status individuals will conform closest to the ideal for important norms. Low status members, by the fact that their conformity to important norms is less, do not manifest the ideal behavior signifying the norm. On the other hand the relatively frequent derogation and acts of negative sanction to these members are clues as to what appropriate behavior should and should not be. Acts of praise are indicative of appropriate behavior and note is taken of these including who gives and who receives praise. With respect to importance of a norm one measure is how many of the members conform.

With respect to the group's own neighborhood and interaction sites, the setting or social behavioral area, the group may or may not differ radically from prevailing norms. Certainly not all the norms of a group are exclusive to it, no more than the characteristics and attitudes of an individual are exclusive to him. It is the total pattern of all the group's norms, activities, roles, structure, etc. that

contribute to producing aspects of uniqueness. By and large the group's norms may be said to be variations on larger more widespread cultural norms or themes. What enables the group to stand out in its setting is the way certain norms are emphasized, some modified and others relatively ignored. It is well established that social groups have norms. That is not the question. The vexing problem is how to quantify the norms with enough sensitivity to reflect differences between groups even within the same setting.

Once status and other hierarchical aspects of the group are ascertained and the study of group norms and values are completed, the emphasis of the study shifted to analysis of group roles of members and personal characteristics. Here as in other phases much material had already been gathered from reports made on earlier group interaction observations. Then observation continued with selectivity on how a member maintained his particular status position, what resources he had, did he possess some special skill relevant to group interests and so forth.

Besides these general items each member was asked privately what he estimated the family income to be. These questions like other questions were presented in a suitable context and phrased in a manner not to arouse suspicion. In addition another item of information about the groups was gathered from past reports. This was the location and description of each member's home and neighborhood. Independent estimates of the home evaluation were then made by competent individuals.

As the final step in the program the natural history of the group was gathered from all possible sources. With the termination of the study of group interaction, changes in rapport between observer and group were no longer of consequence; therefore interviews when needed were conducted with members, teachers, police officials, friends, etc.

Appropriate data for the history were when the boys first met, how long they have been associating, what happened to former group members, any publicity the group may have had and events the school or community officials might mention that involved the group. If there was an older group of boys that these boys had contact with, this was included, as was information on intergroup incidents, harmonious or otherwise.

The sequence of the data collection then was location of group, rapport, status, norms and group activities, roles and personal characteristics and group history. Sherif and Sherif (1964) do not discuss the reasoning for this order fully except that direct questioning in the last stage can disturb data collection in other stages. Actually it appears that status, norms and group products is an arbitrary order and could be altered.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Within the selected community there were a great many sites that attracted adolescents both from secondary schools and the college. A general list would include drive-ins, pool halls, movie theaters, city recreational sites, a roller rink, bowling alleys and clothing and similar stores catering to the youth. Consequently, there was considerable opportunity for youth from various backgrounds to interact; furthermore, students from the secondary schools were very much aware of the college activities and norms. Indeed in the secondary schools for almost all students, in fact for all adolescents in the area, the college was an important point of reference.

From one point of view there were many similarities among all adolescents in the area. There were common preferences for clothing styles and music. Among almost all males, athletics were important and so was having a car. Money was essential as was quick success, and more often than not success was measured by the yardstick of material accumulations. Independence from adults and mobility assumed large importance while specific occupational goals only seemed

to begin to crystalize as the individual finished high school and either entered college or tried to find employment. Even then, the occupation, itself, did not assume great importance. All these things were important activities and preferences that were widespread and very common to all youth in the setting. These might be viewed as some of the more central and general values of young people in this setting.

But the general values are only half the picture and the first impression. After a few months in the setting, differentiation along these broad themes begin to appear. Certainly access to these goals is one important variable. Though much of their general treatment of delinquency can be faulted, Cloward and Ohlin (1960) certainly note the effect of differential access to cultural goals on adolescent behavior patterns. Indeed differential access to goals and development of variations on larger cultural themes, patterns or norms are two important variables in this study.

Within this general setting it became apparent that socioeconomic position was an important dimension affecting an individual's behavior and his access to institutions including the treatment he received from them. Though there were no definite slum housing areas there were several levels of property evaluations. These levels were not separated though by considerable distances and often from one block to the next property evaluation could change by one hundred per cent or more.

In consideration of other variables often utilized in social area typologies (Bell, 1965), such as indices of familism or ethnicity, the

setting seemed to have a low degree of heterogeneity. However socioeconomic differentiation was sufficient to delineate one area of several blocks that largely fell in the lower income class; and several areas that were middle and high income.

In the lower income area one of the two city junior highs was located and there the student population had a greater proportion of low income individuals than the other junior high. There were also business and recreational areas located in or adjacent to the area and catered primarily to tastes and styles of the individuals.

Four groups are presented in this study. All members were residents of the community for at least eight years. In many cases members of one group knew the names of members of another group, but communication between groups extended no further than this. Group I was from the lower income area and like Group III had attended the junior high within the area. Part of the membership of Group II had attended the city's other junior high as had all of the membership of Group IV.

Group I was studied for a period of ten months. One hundred and ten separate observations ranging from two to twelve hours were made on this group. Group I was in the low socioeconomic rank.

Groups II and III were in the middle socioeconomic level. Group II was studied nine months. Ninety four observations were made on this group with observations varying in length from approximately two to ten hours. Group III was studied seven months. Sixty observations

were made on this group with observations varying from less than an hour to six hours.

Group IV was in the high socioeconomic level. It was studied for eight months with observations varying in length from less than an hour to eight hours.

In accordance with the research plan the four groups will be evaluated separately along the phases of study in the procedures and methodology. Then the four groups will be compared across pertinent dimensions.

Group I

Of all groups, Group I was the most difficult to pinpoint and develop rapport with. Four months elapsed from the time an interaction site was chosen until rapport was reached with all the hard core members. Gaining rapport which is the hardest task in this approach was a vexing problem that had to be managed carefully throughout this study. The source of the group secrecy and resistance to newcomers was not in the least due to the fact that the group often engaged in illegal behavior.

The boys often met in one of two pool halls in the low rent part of the business district where they would shoot snooker and make plans for activities outside the site. All of them were good snooker players--it was an important requisite of any good member--and they would often try to get a stranger to play for money. Several instances of

petty gambling occurred in the two pool halls in the area, and though the owners were aware of it no police action was ever seen. This was not really a source of income for the boys though in the first few months they cleared a nice amount from the observer.

More than anything else the site was a place where the boys could get together, outside of their homes and free from adult supervision. The site was especially important to them in bad weather during the early part of the study, since no members had cars. On the street and in many restaurants in the area the members complained that the police harassed them and told them not to be together. In the pool hall they were known, not bothered and even admired by some.

The pool hall had a fairly regular clientele consisting of young boys about fifteen on up to older retired men. Most of the people knew the group, and some members of other groups and single individuals would occasionally be with the group under study. Indeed in the initial stages it was difficult to delineate the hard core membership since group lines were not too apparent in the pool hall. Moreover there were a number of younger boys, perhaps as many as ten, that participated in snooker games with the group members or would be seen talking to them. These younger boys, usually under fifteen, had access to only one of the pool halls. The other, where the group usually stayed, did not allow younger boys to come in. Some of these younger boys would imitate the dress and mannerisms of the group members.

The hard core membership of the group was reliably identified only when the observer accompanied the group to other sites of interaction. When this interaction took place the looseness of membership quickly disappeared and usually was reduced to six or seven boys. The first member identified was Tom, the highest status member. He was tall, about 6'1" and weighed about 155 pounds. Tom walked with an exaggerated swagger and drug the heels of his shoes. Joe was the second group member identified when he and Tom first approached the observer asking him if he wanted to play snooker with them. Joe was with the group during the first two months of observation but was removed from the group when he was convicted of bogus check charges and sent to a penal institution.

As the weeks went by the observer was able to identify the other group members. One of the more prominent was Coon, the lowest status regular member. Coon was the best snooker player, talked loud and rough, clowning a great deal, but never contradicted Tom. One day two other members suddenly came in together and were greeted heartily by Tom and Coon. One was a tall, nice looking boy, Larry, and the other was shorter and heavy, Howard. Larry, who had been living with his father in another state 600 miles away, had just returned with Howard. Howard, the only group member with a car and a nice one too, a powerful Ford with several racing options, had driven Larry back from where his father lived.

It was nearly four months before the fifth member, Rocky, was

identified, and this was when Coon asked the observer to take them to the larger nearby city. This was the first time the observer had been asked to accompany any of the members away from the interaction site. Until this time the observer had remained very much external from the group with only passing greetings in the pool hall.

This night the observer and Rocky and Coon met Howard and another non-member in the downtown business area of the nearby city near midnight. Both boys had been drinking beer and Howard insisted the observer join them when Coon and Rocky got in the car. The observer declined, mentioning that he had to go to school the next day. A few days later the observer learned from Coon and Howard that an hour after they had last seen the observer, Howard had turned his car over at high speed in the downtown area and demolished it.

From this event on, the observer was increasingly included in all aspects of group interaction. The fact that the observer was almost a part of this exciting event, and moreover since he knew details that never reached the police (e. g. that the boys were drinking) increased the common bond between him and the group. For a group engaged in activities that were often illegal, besides the attempts by police to split them up, it was important to keep their affairs secret. Consequently, the observer had to prove himself repeatedly and was watched for a long time. This fortunate and accidental event was a first and crucial test!

Not long after Howard's accident the sixth and last hard core

member appeared. He was John, Tom's twin brother and was just recently released from a several months stay at a state penal institution. John's presence came somewhat as a surprise since until that time he had never been mentioned. Neither was much ever said about the other member, Joe, who had been convicted and sentenced in the early stages of the observation. Only on three or four occasions was Joe mentioned.

In terms of activities together it was not usual to see all six of the group members together in the pool hall. More often they would appear in twos or threes and spend an hour or two and then leave. This sort of activity continued until seven or eight o'clock at night at which time they would usually be off to more exciting activities. The group would most often appear, in mass, at parties, at Larry's mother's apartment, at a beer tavern in the next county where they could buy beer illegally, or at dances or ball games where other adolescents their age were.

Status within this group was fairly clearcut. Though Coon was the best snooker player in an important activity for the group and made many suggestions, he was lowest in status. Tom, who was tough and daring was the highest. Next came Larry and then very close, John. Though fighting ability was important and John may have been able to best Larry, Larry was friendlier and a quicker thinker than John. John was the member who had been in the penal institution, so he had the reputation of being one of the town's toughest boys; yet this was not

enough to give him leadership in the group. Moreover it is interesting to note that although Tom and John are identical twins, they are not tied for the same status position.

The position next to the bottom was held by Rocky. Just above him was Howard. Neither Howard nor Rocky were ever in much contention for group leadership. They, like Coon, could certainly not have fought any of the top three status men and won. They rarely made suggestions and usually went along with higher status members' initiatives. Howard, but not Rocky, often criticized Coon and berated him for his "big mouth." Coon's position was a result of several things. He was well liked by all group members, was the best snooker player and always was ready to participate in an activity. However, Coon was not too dependable. It was mentioned more than once that he could not be counted on in a fight; moreover, several times members stated that Coon talked too much. In fact it seemed almost incumbent to Howard's role to caution Coon on his statements. For this group, as the difficulty in reaching rapport shows, secrecy about activities was highly important and no one could maintain high status unless he closely adhered to this norm.

Table 1 summarizes data on the structural characteristics of the group. By comparing observed status with the popularity dimension of the sociometric choices, support is obtained for hypotheses advanced by other researchers (Hare, 1962) that there may be at least two hierarchical arrangements in group structure. Clearly leadership as

Table I

Spearman Rank Correlations for Status and
Sociometric Choices Measurements
for Group I

Observed Status with	rho	n	Probability
Independent Observation	.943	6	< .01
Effective Initiation	.972	6	< .01
Popularity	.708	6	> .05
Fighting	.986	6	< .01

Note. -- Source: Appendix A.

operationalized here is something distinctly different from popularity. Moreover, it should be noted that within this group where physical strength and prowess seemed quite important that fighting ability with a rho of .986 compared most closely of all dimensions with observed status.

In collecting sociometric choices the observer must begin to structure group interaction somewhat. Here the extreme resistance to probing began to appear in reactions to the observer. One member, Coon, refused to answer any questions about effective initiative and though these questions to all members were phrased in as much slang

as was possible and given at appropriate intervals, some suspicions were aroused.

With this group the overall impression is that status seems stable at the high and low positions with greatest variability in the middle area. It should be emphasized that status rankings were made with the six core members. However, there were five or six other individuals that were fringe members of the group, and sometimes for a period of a week or two would be as regular as anyone else in participation and frequency of presence. This fluctuation of membership with some regular core members and others who drift in and out seems to be very much a characteristic of adolescent groups in this setting. Consequently, selection of core membership is in part arbitrary with frequency of member presence and the group's knowledge of the whereabouts of absent members as the main criteria for delineating the core members.

Norms and Common Activities

According to the research plan after delineation of the group and ascertainment of status and popularity (affect) structure, emphasis turns to discovering the group's characteristic and common norms, interests and activities. Common norms are those norms which the group shares with other adolescents in the general area. In terms of the definition of group as developed in this research plan, activities or interests are focal points around which interaction develops. In youth groups activities may be working on cars, shooting snooker, playing

basketball or just talking about common interests and enjoying each other's company. In time, common ways of carrying on these activities develop and as they become standardized for all members, they are known as norms.

In Group I activities and interests common to many adolescents in the general setting were cars, girls in general, clothes, and certain influences coming from the college students. Like many other adolescents the members were interested in what other people thought of them and if they appeared as men and not boys. With respect to emphasis this group like others in the setting spent the greatest amount of time talking about topics or engaging in activities related to cars and girls. In almost every group session references to these two topics came up.

Normative aspects of the automobile topic was indicated by a unanimous preference for a new Ford or Chevrolet. Besides being able to specify the motor, transmission and color they wanted, they also, as individuals, specified other speed and power options they would add. Members also had in mind a particular used car they hoped to buy in a year or so; however, all this interest and considerable knowledge to varying extents is typical of most adolescent males in America today.

Girls, in general, was the second large area of interest that these boys had in common with other groups in the setting. The topic came up almost every time that the members got together and plans were

discussed about how to get dates, who to ask, what was the girl like, etc. However, it was the more specific attitudes that these boys held toward girls that set them apart from other groups.

Clearly related with interest in girls was their concern about personal appearance, clothes and the influence of college on these boys. The boys usually wore tan wheat jeans or blue Levis, black loafers and white socks and usually Ivy League-styled shirts. This apparel was no different from that worn by many other boys in high school at the same age and very similar to much worn by college students. The main difference was more in quality, variety and neatness.

The group was aware that the observer was in college and often asked him about girls, parties and clothes at college. One member was very impressed when some out of town boys mistook him for a college student, and several members said they intended to cut their hair shorter and get a fraternity sweatshirt, so they could date college girls.

The group members also frequented the same areas that other teenage boys did such as the pool halls, high school basketball games and drive-ins in the area; however, the two pool halls in the low rent section remained their special domain.

With at least one activity or topic that the members had in common with other adolescents, Group I had certain norms of behavior that made them somewhat distinctive. When dealing with girls the members repeatedly viewed them only as sex objects and spoke of more permanent institutions like marriage with derision. None of the

group dated any girl regularly during the period of observation; however the members maintained contact with several girls with which they could have sexual relations. Boasts of sexual exploits were frequent among members, but dating a girl regularly and not being with the group brought criticism. Twice the members attempted to develop liaisons with college girls, and although rebuffed in their attempts talked with great pride of being able to get inside one girl's apartment. They were chased off by an older male caller.

Certainly a specific norm of this group was the collective attitudes toward school and the fact that all had dropped out. All members with the exception of Howard dropped out before the tenth grade, and he left in the eleventh. Several of the members said school was easy, but dull, and that they would rather be out where something exciting was happening. Several behavioral events occurred where members expressed feelings that students and teachers at the high school thought they were better than them. Along this line several members expressed plans to go back to school but not to the local high school. They also complained that returning to school would mean attending class with kids younger than them. This prospect, especially, made returning to school bleak for the members.

Group I had, far more than any of the other groups, norms favorable to considerable deviation from laws pertaining to drinking, physical abuse and theft. In the first few weeks of observation Joe received a jail sentence, and just after rapport had been established,

John returned from several months in prison. John's offense which consisted of stealing two cases of beer from a tavern in another county was known to all the members but rather than censuring the act, it was eulogized and incorporated into the group history. However all comments by members seemed to indicate the act was not performed as part of a group activity.

Buying beer illegally was the most recurrent unlawful act in which the group members engaged. During periods when rapport was highest the observer was with the group at two different taverns and at Larry's apartment several times where members had beer. The members also knew several places where they could buy beer and had false identification cards stating they were twenty-one-years-old or older.

Drunkenness helped contribute to the accident when Howard with Coon and Rocky along wrecked his new car. All members except Howard told of several instances when they had been jailed for drunkenness.

Related to the number of deviate acts committed by this group were negative feelings and actions toward parents, authorities and police, in particular. Instance after instance was recorded, during group interaction and in individual situations, where boys made extreme and profane remarks about police. Regardless of whether it was the home town or neighboring towns, the police were enemies and not to be trusted. There were some objective reasons for these feelings.

It appeared that the police and other authorities viewed the group as a continual source of trouble and often meted out far harsher punishment to their deviate acts than similar or more serious violations committed by youth in more fortunate circumstances. Indeed, for example, one member, Larry, was jailed for twenty-four hours when apprehended with two boys who had stolen two cases of empty soda pop bottles.

Larry's protests of innocence were to no avail.

The category of distrust of police even extended across family lines. Tom, in speaking of an uncle on the police force said, "He's a cop, and I don't have any use for them. I would like him all right except he's a cop." Negative attitudes were also manifested against school authorities and parents. Every boy in the group left home at least once during the observation period because of trouble with parents especially fathers. The average length of stay was two days.

Since the actions and norms of this group were often deviate with respect to general society, secretiveness and caution became an important norm in itself. Difficulty in gaining rapport attests to this norm. A critical natural happening or experiment happened to test this norm when Howard's car was wrecked. Here not only were the boys drinking illegally, but Howard was speeding excessively. The rest of the group, Tom, John and Larry, learned about the accident the next day. The group spent a number of hours together planning means of keeping from the police and insurance investigators the fact that Howard had been drinking when the accident occurred. This even went to the extent that

Larry planned to testify falsely in court that he had left the beer can in the car the previous night.

Many other instances of helping and sharing were recorded. Certainly a norm existed that each member was to contribute money, food, beer, gasoline, transportation or whatever as much as he could to group activities. Only Coon received censure about not doing his part. In this group there were no findings that status affects the amount of material contribution that a member makes to a group. Howard probably contributed more than any other member; yet he was neither high nor low status, but more in the middle. The fact that he did contribute more was probably a function of personal situation and characteristics than group pressure or norms.

These were the major activities and norms that were characteristic of Group I. Some were more or less specific to it; others were generally shared by the larger adolescent setting. These two aspects of the group's norms will become better delineated as comparison with other groups in the setting is brought out in this section.

Roles and Personal Characteristics

Member roles and personal characteristics are often relative to other members and the activities of the group. In this group physical strength and fighting ability were important; consequently those endowed with personal characteristics in this area could possibly achieve higher status. One aspect of Tom's role in the group was his fighting ability.

All group members conceded that he was the best fighter. However Tom did not hold the leadership role by virtue of his toughness alone. He was tough and daring yet at the same time moody and somewhat aloof from the lower status members. Tom, in addition to his twin John, had two older brothers Ronald and Lun. These two brothers were five or six years older than Tom and were known to the group as some of the town's toughest. One of the brothers was in a state school for boys and at the time of the study in the state penal institution for men. Tom was, next to John, the most difficult to maintain rapport with and was always suspicious of any direct questioning.

His father was a concrete worker, and his mother worked as a cook. He dropped out of school when he was thirteen, and had held a series of irregular jobs but was usually unemployed.

Larry, the most popular member and second in status, was also the poorest. Just after the study began his mother was released from a mental institution, and Larry moved to her apartment. His father was an oil field worker in a western state. What money Larry had came from odd jobs and welfare payments, yet he was hardly a morose individual. He joked a lot, did not seem bothered when the members laughed at him and was very popular with girls.

In contrast to Tom, Larry was open with the observer and usually friendly toward him. In an interview with his former junior high principal, Larry was described as a nice looking, friendly and outgoing boy who was unusually bright. The principal said he had been disappointed

when Larry dropped out of school because he felt Larry showed considerable potential. Larry often talked of returning to high school, and in the late spring took a special qualification test to bypass the high school degree to enter college, but failed. Larry, in contrast to Tom, seemed to maintain his position in the group through his friendly manner, while daring and fighting skill were more predominant with Tom.

John, the third status member, was the most difficult to achieve and maintain rapport with. His family background is similar to Tom's with the exception of spending several months in prison.

Howard, the fourth status member, came from the most favored economic background. Both of his parents worked, one as a truck driver, the other as a practical nurse. His family owned a late model sedan and pick-up besides a farm and over a hundred head of cattle. Howard was the older of two boys, and his parents bought him a new car of his choice in an attempt to keep him in school. He stayed in school only a couple of months into the eleventh grade, dropping out ostensibly to work and help pay for the car. Soon however, he was back with the group, and one certainly suspects if this was not the major motivation for leaving school.

Rocky along with Coon was one of the lowest status members. He lived with his mother and was like Larry in the respect that his parents were separated, and the family had a very meager income. Also like Larry, he was handsome and popular with the girls; however unlike

Larry he neglected the group by dating. There were several instances when Rocky had his mother's old car and was seen with a girl when he was supposed to be with the other group members. This factor especially served to undermine his position in the group.

Coon was the lowest member in status. Both he and Rocky were about a year younger than the other members and both found it necessary to be loud, boastful and brash as an attempt to maintain status in the other members' eyes. Both of Coon's parents worked. His father was a carpenter and his mother, a cook.

Coon was the best snooker and pool player in the group. His ability was such that the owner of the pool hall where the group played offered him fifty dollars a week and a chance to become a professional if Coon would finish school and let the man train him. However, the owner told the observer that Coon would rather be with "that bunch" than do anything else.

Coon's most consistent role in the group seemed to be that of a clown. The other members tolerated this but criticized him for talking too much and too freely.

As a group all members fell within the lower socioeconomic class with the possible exception of Howard. Larry and his mother were on public assistance. Tom and John's parents both held semi-skilled occupations for an annual income of about four thousand. Both of Coon's parents were blue collar workers and total income was approximately five thousand. Rocky's mother worked part time and

received some assistance. Her income was around three thousand. Howard's parents had semiskilled occupations but their combined incomes exceeded six thousand.

Group History

Earliest associations among members began in grade school but the group did not form until junior high. By the eighth grade Howard, Tom, John, Larry, Joe and two or three other boys were associating together. Coon and Rocky were a year younger but were active also. During the eighth and ninth grade as the group grew stronger, school attendance dropped until most of the hard core were out of school. The members also mentioned John and Tom's older brother and older brothers of Larry and Rocky's that they admired and associated with. Larry's brother, Ronnie was killed about this time by police in a nearby city and Rocky's was in prison.

A lengthy interview with the principal of the junior high confirmed the boys' remarks and said the members were almost uncontrollable in school. He said at one point that these boys were smoking and engaging in illegal activities with girls during the noon hour at a nearby house, and police had to be called in to help stop the activities. This was probably the first time the group came to the attention of school and police authorities. From these reports the group seems to have been in existence about three years before observations were begun.

Group II

Group II was in the middle socioeconomic level and the members were age-mates of the individuals in Group I. However, Group II was studied a year later; thus all members were 17 or 18 years old, and all were seniors in high school. Many of the members of the two groups knew each other, and some members of Group II went to the same junior high as Group I. This was the limited contact between the two groups though.

For locating a group in the middle class level, a different set of interaction sites was chosen. This time an observer attended high school football and basketball games, frequented two different pool halls near the college campus and a business district that catered to college students, faculty and generally a clientele with higher income than those of Group I's area. The best initial interaction site proved to be one of the pool halls where members of the group were usually present on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights. Unlike Group I they were rarely in the pool hall other days in the week or in the afternoon. In both pool halls unlike those in Group I's area there were no older men, with the clientele ranging from 13 or 14 year-old boys to college students. In the same area were several nice drug stores, restaurants, and clothing stores that catered to young customers. This was very much a setting where youth were in dominance, and a place where they congregated with the approval of adults.

Over a period of twenty observations, two large clusters became

discernible. Though there was contact between the clusters, they were more or less divided by age, one being composed largely of high school juniors and seniors, the other of eighth, ninth and tenth graders. Within the older cluster, from frequencies of association, a hard core was selected for possible observation. By the end of thirty observations it was apparent this was a group with six solid members and a fringe of five to seven more. From the first not much resistance was encountered from this group. In the fourth observation the observer exchanged casual remarks about the snooker game. Within a couple of weeks he was asked to join in a game. He soon learned the names of Pete, Cecil, Ray, Gene and George. These boys would usually come in together in the evening and play two or three hours of snooker. They would also exchange greetings with other boys their age in the pool hall. Usually they arrived together, played together and left at the same time. Ron, a large chunky boy, often tried to join them in their game, but usually he was rebuffed in his attempt. On the other hand Ted, who did not attend the pool hall too regularly, was always welcome. After five to six weeks of observation, contact had been established with the group members and most of them knew the observer's name and would readily speak to him upon seeing him.

One night the observer attended a local high school football game and noticing the group, sat down directly behind them. During the first part of the game, Pete noticed the observer and asked him to join them. Soon the observer was invited to join the boys in their

snooker games and was invited to go for cokes before they went home in the evening. Then when they mentioned that George was on the high school basketball team and Ted also, the observer mentioned that he would like to see them play sometime. The boys said that he should come to some of the home basketball games. Within two months after the start of observation the observer had achieved strong rapport with all hard core group members.

Pete was one of the first group members identified. He usually came to the pool hall with Ray and Gene. Usually later in the evening George would appear--sometimes with Cecil or Ted. Ron usually came in by himself and remained on the fringes of group activity. The group's range of activities included playing snooker together, going to high school basketball games, playing touch football on Saturday and Sunday afternoons and just being together. None of the boys dated regularly, and when one did he was soon dropped from the group. Such was the case of Ted. In the initial stages he was a frequent group member. But when he began to have dates on Friday and Saturday night he could not participate in group activities and soon was not contacted for Saturday and Sunday afternoon football games.

The highest status position in the group was occupied by Pete. Pete performed well in all the activities of the group, whether this was basketball, football, or shooting snooker. He was a B+ student in high school, but did not participate in a large number of school activities though he was well known to his classmates. Pete was a

friendly boy and rarely exercised negative sanctions toward any of the other members.

The second status position was held by Gene. Gene was Pete's cousin but physically and temperamentally they were quite different. Whereas Pete was spontaneous, sometimes boisterous and open in his interpersonal relations, Gene remained reserved. Gene usually backed Pete's initiatives and urged the other members to follow Pete's suggestions.

Closely tied in third and fourth positions were Cecil and Grover. During the early period of observation Cecil held higher status than Grover, who was at that time dating steadily. However, near the end of the school year, Grover and his girl friend broke up thus enabling him to spend greater time with the group. Also Cecil became interested in a girl and saw his position slip below that of Grover's.

In the fifth and bottom position of the hard core was Ray. Ray was one of the most regular group members and participated in all of the activities; yet his suggestions for things to do and places to go were rarely taken. If they were, they first had to be endorsed and taken over by a higher status member before the group acted on them. Nevertheless, there was not a great deal of social distance between these five boys and few instances of derogation and none of physical punishment were ever recorded by the observer.

The sixth group member who was a considerable distance below Ray was Ron. Ron was excluded from many of the group's activities.

He seemed to be contacted only when no one else was available and another person was needed. He always pestered the group members to call him, but only Pete showed much interest in him.

In addition to these six boys, George and Ted occasionally interacted with the group, but because of other activities such as basketball and girls, they were not regular nor frequent group members; consequently their status within the group was somewhat more difficult to predict with reliable accuracy. They usually fell somewhere in the middle ranges; although the activity the group was engaging in at the time played a larger role in determining the status they held than it did for the regular members.

Because of the flatness of status positions among group members, the observer had greater difficulty in reliably ascertaining status positions for the group. Ron was, of course, easily seen in the bottom position. Pete and Gene were close to the top position. Cecil, Ray and Grover were close in the middle areas. Ron's position stood out because of the great deal of derogation he received. Ray's position became increasingly discernible; as the observer noted that his suggestions were never acted upon until they were endorsed by a higher status member, usually Pete.

Rank correlation between the independent observer and the regular observer are presented in Table II. Unfortunately, in this instance, only five of the six hard core members are present. Owing to this fact, however, ranking was somewhat easier with a correlation of 1.00 being

Table II

Spearman Rank Correlations for Status and
Sociometric Choices Measurements
for Group II

Observed Status with	rho	n	Probability
Independent Observation	1.00	5	$<.01$
Effective Initiation	.928	6	$<.05$
Popularity	.898	6	$<.05$
Fighting	.780	6	$>.05$

Note. -- Source: Appendix B.

achieved between the two measures. Status in this group with its activities largely being leisure time and socially acceptable was strongly affected by the member's popularity standing within the group. Though Pete and Gene were difficult for the observer to rank on the basis of effective initiative and the allied measures of derogation and sanction, analysis of sociometric material shows how popularity can in this instance greatly affect the leadership dimension. Sociometric choices also reaffirmed the considerable social distance between Ron, the bottom position man, and other members of the group. Only one member of the group chose him in any of the three dimensions of the

sociometric instrument. This was Cecil, and the dimension was fighting ability, a relatively unimportant dimension in this group where physical abuse or enforcement of an individual's prerogative was rarely recorded. Such abilities or assets as popularity, having a car, being a good athlete, or having good ideas contributed heavily to the status a member held within this group.

Norms and Common Activities

Central activities of Group II were mainly recreational. Members were very interested in both participant and spectator sports. During the many observations, long conversations were reported where members discussed various high school and college football teams operating in the area. During the football season the group played touch football on Saturday and Sunday afternoons almost every week. With the advent of basketball season group activities shifted to attending the high school basketball games and playing basketball in one of the city's recreational centers. The basketball sessions, like the football sessions, were usually on Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Then on the week-end and Thursday night, the group would usually appear in the pool hall where they would shoot several games of snooker, jump into Pete's, Ray's or Gene's car and drive to one of two or three restaurants in the area. There they would drink a coke or two, spend an hour talking about athletics, girls and cars and would usually be home by midnight. More than anything else the group's

activity seemed centered around just being together and enjoying each other's company.

Several of the group members were also active in organized high school and city athletic programs. Pete played on the high school baseball team and also the American Legion team as did Ray, but during the year they did not play baseball; so they would have more time to be with the group. Gene had been on the high school basketball team his junior year, but this year, his senior year, he declined to play since it required too much of his time. Being a member of the high school basketball team made it difficult for a person to also be a member in good standing with this group. Such was the situation of Ted, George and Wayne who were occasional members when they were not away playing basketball or in training.

The second important and noticeable norm of the group was that concerning academics. All the hard core group members were B+ or better students and had plans to go to college. Only George, a fringe member, had little interest in school, and he was criticized by several group members for his failure to make good grades. During four different observations the observer noted group members criticizing George for making a "D" in English during the first 8-week term. All the group members were taking college preparatory classes, and as a rule the group did not have any activities on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday night; so there would be no distraction from study time. The follow-up study done on this group two years later showed the

persistence of this norm concerning the importance of academics in college. All group members with the exception of Ray were still in college at this time. The group was still functioning as a social group. Only Gene was no longer active since he had gone to a different college from the rest of the group.

The group did not date or attend parties together and usually teased any member who was regularly dating. As mentioned earlier, Ted with his participation in high school basketball and dating eventually dropped from the group. Much the same situation occurred with Cecil in the later stages of the group observation when he lost his status position to Grover when Cecil began to date frequently. Prior to this time Grover had a steady girl friend but when he abandoned her, he spent most of his time with the group. Gene also discontinued dating a steady girl friend; so that he too would not be distracted by this disinterest. By and large the members seemed to be more interested in spending their time shooting snooker, participating in sports and just being together rather than being with girls. Relations with girls were minimized and joking about sexual topics was not frequent. No conversations were recorded of planning or anticipating marriage. For Group II anything but occasional dating went against the norms of the group and hampered participation on the part of the members.

Most of the group members had few conflicts with authorities, including parents, police and school officials. Two fringe members, Ted and George, did have disagreements with their parents on how

many nights a week they should spend out and what time they should get in. George's parents also asked him not to go to the pool hall. However, the fact that the rest of the group was there led him to get his parents to change their mind. With all the other members there were no recorded conflicts with parents or police or school officials; although Pete and Gene had mentioned that their parents did not know all that they did, and that it was best they did not find out.

The only known illegal activity that Group II participated in was obtaining beer illegally. Members of this group and all groups in this study were minors. Possession or buying any alcoholic beverage was illegal. However, like the members of Group I they were aware of sites both within the town and in rural areas where they could purchase beer illegally. It was recorded that the members did drink beer; however, consumption was limited to two or three glasses even though the boys often talked of wanting to get drunk. When they did drink it was not excessively, and they seem to be experimenting rather than being familiar with the activity.

There were two members of the group with standardized nicknames. Both were upper status: Pete had been given the name, "Betty," in junior high, and the group members still used it. Gene, the one group member who attended church regularly and taught a Sunday School class, was often called, fondly, "Preacher" by the other members. Standardization of the nickname was to such an extent that he did not view this as teasing.

It should be noted that the near-by college served as a strong reference for these individuals. They wanted to know what college students did and they all planned to go to college. Their dress was similar to college students' and usually consisted of loafers, wheat jeans, Ivy League shirts and sweaters. Much of this clothing was bought at stores near the college that cater to college students.

In summary, the degree of deviancy of this group with respect to critical norms of society was small. They had apparently never been involved with the police, had fairly good relations with parents, and had done well in school. Drinking beer occasionally was the extent of known misdemeanors. Most of the boys had cars or access to them but did not spend a great deal of time tinkering with them, or anticipating buying a more desired automobile. None of the group members dated very much--this was viewed as a disturbance and hinderance by the members. The group seemed to provide for the members an association of like-minded individuals, whose company each enjoyed and a source of identification and stability in the general adolescent world.

Roles and Personal Characteristics

In Group II, as in any group, the popularity a member enjoys, the position he holds in status hierarchy, and the degree to which he adheres to the norms of the group is a function of several factors. In terms of physical characteristics, Pete, the highest status member and most popular individual, was only average. His height was about

5'11", and he weighed about 150 pounds and had brownish-red hair. On occasion he was called "Betty" by his fellow group members. This nickname started back in junior high school and now appeared as an institutionalized product of the group.

Pete in the group served a role as provider and organizer most of the time. He owned an old gray Ford which served as a major means of transportation for the group. He seemed to perform well in all things the group considered important (snooker, basketball, football, baseball and school work). Thus in terms of the major activities of the group and the norms which apply to these activities, Pete was quite successful.

He was a relatively quiet person but when he talked the members usually followed his lead. He did very little or no dating and seldom mentioned girls in conversation. Pete seemed to maintain his leadership by virtue of his popularity, his dependability, and his ability to come up with good ideas in fun things for the group to engage in. These interesting things, however for this group, generally fall within the latitude of accepted behavior in terms of the larger adult society.

Pete had always lived in this town. His father was a civil service employee. His home was the nicest of all the group members and was a brick structure that was evaluated from \$15,000 to \$20,000. Pete and his family were members of a fundamentalist Protestant church, and his mother and father were both very active in the church. Although Pete usually attended church, it did not hold an important position

in his life. Unlike his cousin, Gene, when asked to take a Sunday School class and teach it, Pete refused. Pete had four siblings: an older brother and sister and a younger brother and sister.

He, until the spring of his senior year, had held a job at a nearby cafeteria for two years. This job provided him money to use in the group's activities. Pete did well in his school work. He made far above the average on the college placement exam, planned to attend college and complete a law degree.

Gene, Pete's cousin, was the second highest status member of the group. He was physically larger than Pete, being about 6' tall and weighing 175 pounds and had dark brown hair that was always neatly combed. Gene was recognized as being the "tough guy" of the group. He had a temper, and it often showed. Otherwise he was a fairly quiet person outside of the group, but while with the members he was much more verbal. Gene also served as a provider of transportation with his 1956 black and white Pontiac and organized activities but not to a degree that Pete did. More often than not it was Gene who pushed Pete's decisions and saw that they were agreed to and carried out.

Gene was not always the most regular group member. He "broke-up" with his girl friend toward the end of the observation period. He had been dating her steadily for about a year. The reason they "broke-up"--he wanted to "run around with the guys." Gene performed well in basketball and football but did poorly in snooker. This was often a point of embarrassment for him; yet members did not tease him about

this inadequacy. He made good grades but not as high as most of the other group members.

Gene went to barber college last summer and worked two hours every day after school and on Saturdays in a shop in town. Of all group members, Gene was most committed to church doctrine and activities. He taught a Sunday School class of 11 year-old boys. At times he was referred to as "Preacher," yet, he, like the other group members, liked to boast of buying beer and talked of getting drunk. When beer was available, Gene did not hesitate to show that he was a good group member by drinking with the other members.

Gene's home was less expensive than Pete's. It was evaluated at less than \$10,000. His father worked as a city employee. Gene had one sibling, a sister in junior high. He, like the other group members, planned to attend the college in the town. Though at the time of the observation Gene had stated that he planned to pursue a bachelors degree in business, in a later follow-up study, it was learned that he had gone to a near-by religious denominational school with the intention of becoming a minister. The old group members felt that this was quite a joke, but Pete insisted that Gene was very serious about this future vocation.

Cecil, along with Grover, was the third highest status member of the group. He was tall and slender and had long brown hair cut in a fashion that was very popular with college students. Cecil's performance in the group's activities was neither good nor bad relative to

that of the other members but was steady and dependable. In the later stages of this study Cecil became a much less dependable group member when he began to date regularly one girl. This brought a drop in his status, and Cecil was consequently not included in the group's activities. Several of the group members made derogatory remarks about Cecil's attachment to the girl.

Cecil's father was a small business man and his mother, a housewife. His home was a brick structure that was estimated at a value of approximately \$12,000. Cecil had two older brothers, one younger brother and a younger sister.

Cecil, like most of the other group members, was a good student and seemed to be more serious than most of the fellows in the group. He planned to study engineering at the college. He also had a part time job, working for the local newspaper on the week-ends and after school.

Grover was the other middle status position member and whose standing shifted with Cecil late in the study. Grover rarely initiated any activity in the group but could be counted upon to participate with enthusiasm. Smaller than Pete, Gene or Cecil, he performed well in basketball but poorly in snooker. Performance in some of these activities often was not nearly so important as being dependable and appearing to be similar to other members. Early in the study Grover was dating a girl regularly but terminated this. This action seemed to have prompted his sudden and regular association with the group. He served as a provider of transportation at times in his 1957 Chevrolet.

Grover's father was a farmer, and later civil service. He lived in a relatively new wood-frame house that was evaluated between \$10,000 and \$12,000.

Grover was a strong student. At the end of the first semester in his senior year in high school he made 5 A's and 1 B. He planned to go to college the next fall, and was interested in business.

Ray was one of the lower status members of the group. About the size of Grover, he was 5'8" and weighed about 140 pounds. Ray was usually the butt of the group's jokes. His performance in football and baseball was good but fair in basketball and variable in snooker. When he did well, he was often labeled "lucky" by the other members. In one interaction session when the group had gone bowling, Ray was performing unusually well. He and Pete were leading the rest of the group members. Finally it became a personal contest between Pete and Ray as to who would obtain the top score. In this situation the observer and the independent observer, who was also present, stated that Ray was bowling a decidedly better game yet began to falter when the rest of the group members began to tease him about being lucky. By the end of the evening Ray's skill had slid until he was making the lowest scores of all the members of the group.

Many times Ray made suggestions that were not acted upon. The other members seemed not to hear his suggestions and went on; yet often Pete or Gene made the same suggestion a few minutes later, and the group soon followed it. Nevertheless, Ray was an outgoing

person who was easy to get to know. He was one of the first contacts made with the group. Ray depended usually upon Pete for transportation and, at times, also Gene, Grover and Cecil. Once in a while he would drive his parents' 1956 blue and white Plymouth. He dated very little or none, but talked of girls he had dated. Ray was not disliked by the other members of the group or left out in their activities. In fact, he along with Pete, was one of the most regular members. He seemed not aware or disturbed by his status relative to the other members.

Ray's home environment in some ways was more permissive than that of the other members. He was allowed to curse and drink beer while at home. Although he had this freedom that the other members did not, his parents did not approve of his drinking elsewhere and insisted that he be in by midnight. Neither he nor his parents attended church. His father was an employee of the near-by college. He had two sisters, one older, one younger and a younger brother. His house, not too far from Gene's, was a white wood frame structure and estimated about \$7,000 to \$9,000.

Ray was a good student and seemed more outwardly concerned with his studies than any other members of the group. Some of the members said that Ray was quite a "grind." They said that he studied rigorously every week night. He had remarked when asked about his studies that he made all A's the first semester of his senior year. He, too, planned to go to college the next fall and like some of the others, study business. He said that he was presently saving money for college

next year and worked week-ends at the college in one of the academic departments. In a follow-up study conducted two years later Ray was the only regular group member who was no longer in college. He still resided in the town and had a job. He failed to make adequate grades to stay in school.

Ron was the sixth and final member of the hard core of the group. Less was known about Ron and his interaction with the group because he was so often excluded from certain activities. Much of this rejection was related to personality characteristics of Ron. He was loud, boisterous and often overbearing toward the other members. The only time any physical sanctions were seen meted out by the members toward other members or any one else for that matter, was toward Ron. He repeatedly irritated other members by asking for rides, loans of money, and criticized the members for leaving him out of the activities.

Ron's father was a small business man and had an eight room brick home evaluated at around \$18,000. Ron did not have a car or access to one; although he did have a driver's license. He had no other brothers or sisters.

Ron was a B+ student at the high school and also planned to attend college in the fall. He did not hold a part-time job and depended upon his parents to finance his education. He planned to major in a general liberal arts and sciences curriculum.

Group History

In terms of group history, some of the group members have known each other since grade school days and others have become acquainted only since junior high. The group as a social entity has only seem to come into being within the last three years. This was the time when most of the boys entered high school.

As far as any publicity, favorable or unfavorable, goes concerning the group and its members, none was noted by the observer. All hard core members were seniors in high school and several were on the honor roll during the study. This was a group that because of the nature of its activities, few people would become aware of them. Nevertheless it had considerable meaning for the boys. Much of their time was spent in interacting with other members. Major activities seemed to be centered around doing enjoyable things together, and occasionally drinking beer seemed to be the only group activity that would bring the group to the attention of the police. This happened so seldom and to such a slight degree, that the situation never occurred.

Group III

Group III, like Group II, was in the middle socioeconomic level. The observer used the same initial site of interaction, the pool hall near the college, to first pinpoint the group. This group was located from a cluster of 15 to 20 boys who ranged in age from 14 to 16. There was some contact between Group III and Groups I and II; however, it was not as great as the contact between Group I and II. After six weeks, and by the 18th report, rapport was established with all

hard core group members of this group.

None of the members had automobiles but several did have small motorcycles that they rode to school and such interaction sites as the pool hall. Like the other two groups, they often used a pool hall as a place to meet and plan later activities. But, like Group II, they never entered the two pool halls where Group I frequented and preferred the less expensive of the two halls near the college. The main activities of the group were: shooting snooker together; attending parties; going to movies and sitting in one of the nearby restaurants and just talking. Observations were also made of this group within their school setting where it was found that the group members tended to interact with each other in this formal setting as they did in the informal situations. When possible they took the same classes together and always sat together during lunch periods and would often meet in the halls between classes. Occasionally girls accompanied the boys in some activities, but none were members.

One of the most striking things about this group was the members' haircuts and the color of the hair. The individual first noted by the observer was the highest status man, Billy, who wore his hair long in a modified "beatle" cut and kept it bleached a dark blond. Similar to Billy was Cotton. Both Pat and Bobby had their hair in "beatle" cuts and bleached blond, yet neither their hair nor their dress was as extreme as that of Billy's. The fifth group member, Leon was the last hard-core member identified. Much of the difficulty in identifying Leon was

that he did not conform to the norm of haircuts of the other group members.

In a typical interaction session most conversation was directed either to Billy or Pat. Billy made most of the suggestions, and they were seldom challenged by other group members. Pat's suggestions, however, were often challenged by Cotton, who was very close in status to Pat. In fact, Pat's successful initiatives seemed closely related to the following he had with Bobby and Leon. Cotton did not have this support. In some instances he would not go along with the group decisions and launch an activity on his own; however, the other two members, Bobby and Leon, would usually follow the initiatives of Billy and Pat, in that order. When there was a conflict between Billy and Pat, Cotton almost always took Billy's side. This was sufficient to swing group opinion in that direction.

Status in this group was certainly not related to physical size alone. Billy and Leon were the two smallest members, both about 5'8"; however, Billy stood at the top and Leon at the bottom on the status hierarchy. Bobby was the largest boy, about 6'3". Pat and Cotton were both about 6' tall.

Through observation it was easiest in this group to ascertain the top status position, however, the two lieutenant positions were very close between Cotton and Pat. There were occasional fights between these two boys; however, each differed in his relation to Bobby and Leon. Pat was usually able through verbal means to persuade Bobby

— and Leon to his viewpoint, whereas Cotton used physical force to achieve the same ends.

Table III
Spearman Rank Correlations for Status and
Sociometric Choices Measurements
for Group III

Observed Status with	rho	n	Probability
Independent Observation	.800	5	>.05
Effective Initiation	.822	5	>.05
Popularity	1.00	5	<.01
Fighting	.900	5	<.05

Note. -- Source: Appendix C.

Table III presents data on the structural characteristics of the group. In this group only two measures, popularity and fighting correlated significantly with status ascertained by the regular observer. Part of this may be accounted for by a smaller n, five in this case while other groups had six. However, this also seems to indicate as did observations that the group was not tightly organized and roles and norms were less stabilized than the other three groups in the study.

In terms of exclusiveness of membership or degree of closure

in system, Group III was fairly open. Not only were there five or six fringe members who participated in the group activities, but also most of the group had other friends that they would occasionally be with rather than the group. From such data it would appear that the group was in an early stage of development or may have been just a less cohesive group.

Norms and Common Activities

Activities of the group centered around athletics and being together. Billy, Cotton and Bobby all played junior high athletics. Leon and Pat had played football during the fall, but were no longer involved in any sort of organized school athletic program. By and large the other fringe members of the group also participated in the school's athletic program. Though this group was not too closed, it was interesting to note that all the fringe members came from the same junior high. There was another junior high in the town and two of the group members, Bobby and Cotton, lived much closer to this school than the one they went to; however, they had applied for transfers to this school that the rest of the group attended and had few friends in the part of town they lived in. Indeed, one of the norms of the group was rejection of students from the other school. Stereotypes had been formed for this out-group and labels such as "sissies" and "rich kids" were given to the student who attended the other junior high. It should be noted, however, that these stereotypes and labels

were not restricted to the use by the group members alone, but were found to be used regularly by many of the students attending this school. Some of the stereotyping in counterpart to these terms were found among students who attended the other school.

All group members with the exception of Leon often caused disturbances in the school. Usually this was for rowdy conduct, but the boys were not adjudged severe discipline problems particularly since their standing in their classes remained high. Though it did not appear a group norm to study a great deal, all of the boys maintained "B" averages.

More serious illegal activities usually occurred in some other context than the school. It usually involved buying and drinking beer. Several times the group was observed with beer in its possession, and Cotton asked the observer to buy beer for him more than once. At least in two instances, more than just the group members were involved and in these situations, the beer-drinking occurred at a party at a girl's house. Certainly it should be noted that the visibility of group activities in the middle and upper class becomes less discernible to the observer. This is because they do have access to individual homes and private clubs where observation becomes much more difficult. Subsequently much deviate behavior appears to go undetected in the middle and especially upper levels of society.

In other illegal activities, once Cotton informed the observer that Pat and Billy with two other boys that were not group members

had rented a room at a near-by motel and planned to have a party there. On occasion the boys would drive cars illegally. Cotton was known to have wrecked two motorcycles speeding within the city limits. At times group members got into fights both with group members and non-members; however, there were no known instances of fights where the entire membership was involved.

The ability to date girls and influence them favorably was important in this group. Though none of the members dated steadily, girls were a topic of conversation and were repeatedly evaluated by the boys. Especially important was to have knowledge of and perhaps access to girls that would bestow sexual favors to the boys. Billy, Pat and Cotton were all popular with girls; however, Leon and Bobby seemed quite shy around girls.

By way of summary it should be noted that the group was not tightly knit; yet there were definite structures and norms. Looseness of the group was reflected in the fact that often other ninth graders at the particular junior high were included in activities with the group, and many of the members also had other friends they spent time with. Activities seemed the consequence of the favorite interaction sites of the group. Members were often in contact with college students. Resultingly the college students served as an important reference group for the members especially in matters of dress and dating. It seemed though that the influence of the college did not extend into academic spheres; consequently, only selective aspects of the college as a

reference group were used by the boys.

Roles and Personal Characteristics

Billy was the highest status member of the group. During the period of observation he was 15 years old. He was about 5'8" tall and had long blond hair and often wore it in a "beatle cut." His father was a mechanic and his mother held a semi-skilled job. Billy's home was located in a relatively new development of middle-class homes. It's estimated value was around \$8,000. A chain link fence enclosed a well-kept yard. Billy was mature physically for his age and was the best athlete in the group.

Billy had a small Japanese motorcycle that he rode to school and to meet the boys at their favorite interaction sites. He was quite proud of it and said that his father taught him to do most of the work on it himself. Billy also made on the average the best grades of all the group members and was president of the student council. He performed well in athletics, and was intensely competitive, both within the group and in generalized settings and was captain of the football team the past year. It was evident that he emphasized athletics and relationships with friends and girls to a greater extent than his schooling. Though Billy did not get into much disciplinary trouble at school or in settings away from the school, he was often one of the most daring members of the group. His ability to avoid trouble was closely related to his verbal skills and the lack of surliness in his treatment of adults. He was

popular with adults, including teachers at the school and often joked good-naturedly with them. He also used this ability to maintain his status within the group and his general prestige at school.

Pat was the second highest status member of the group though the distance between him and Cotton was very close. Pat was about 6' tall but not yet physically well-developed. His father was a fairly successful small business man, and his family income was the highest of the group members. His home was in a more expensive residential district than Billy's and was evaluated in excess of \$13,000.

In his relations with other group members Pat did a lot of joking and teasing even with Billy, though this was usually looked on with approval. Sometimes the group members became irritated when Pat began to disturb an important activity. Pat did not have a motorcycle but did have fairly free access to Leon's. In terms of total effective initiative, he exceeded Cotton, but fell fairly short of Billy. Pat also got into many disputes with Cotton. Pat, unlike the other group members, did hold a part-time job most of the time. He said much of this was at the insistence of his father.

Cotton was the third highest individual in the status hierarchy; however, there was very little difference between his position and Pat's. Cotton was the same size as Pat but had better coordination resulting in him being a better athlete. Still he did not equal Billy in skill, yet he made up for this with concentration and daring. This daring went to the point of recklessness, as seen in the two motorcycle

accidents he had had.

Certainly one reason that Cotton continued to hold a position just inferior to that of Pat was that he often unmercifully teased the lower status members in the group and often hazed Pat. None of the group members with the exception of Billy dared sanction negatively this behavior, but they replied to it by avoiding Cotton on these occasions. Cotton, like Pat and Billy, was a very open, talkative person. Rapport was first well established with him, then Pat and then Billy--a little more difficulty was always encountered with Leon and Bobby.

Both of Cotton's parents were unskilled workers. He had a 21-year old brother who held only part-time employment. Cotton lived in the poorest house of the group, evaluated at about \$7,000; however, he like Bobby lived in the school district that would normally put him in the other junior high in the town. Yet because of his membership in this group and an attachment to the junior high, he requested to be transferred to this school, even though the school in his district was far newer and had more adequate physical facilities for athletics and classes. Cotton said that he enjoyed the reputation of being one of the tough kids from the tough school in town.

Bobby was the fourth highest group member. He was a tall, blond-haired boy about 6'3" and fairly clumsy. He was forward on the basketball team and, like the rest of the group, with the exception of Leon, played on the football team. Bobby had a motorcycle and was often with Leon.

Bobby, like Cotton, lived in the school district near the other junior high in the town, but transferred to this one that had some of the lower socioeconomic people in the district. His home was the nicest of the group and was estimated in excess of \$18,000. Bobby used his motorcycle to get to school and to the favorite interaction sites such as the restaurants and pool halls near the college.

Though Bobby had considerable prestige within the school itself, he was the butt of more jokes than any other group member, even Leon who had a lower status. Cotton, especially, did a lot of teasing, and Bobby was the object of this more than anyone else in the group. It should be noted that even though he received more teasing, relative to effective initiative, he initiated more activities than did Leon. Bobby followed the other members' leads in doing things and this often got him into trouble. He was not as clever as Billy, Pat or Cotton in avoiding detection and this often involved him in problems with authorities.

Leon was the lowest status member of the group. He was the least physically mature. He had several brothers and sisters and his father owned a small farm and business. His house was evaluated at approximately \$18,000. He, like Bobby and Billy, had a small motorcycle that he used for transportation to school and other activities with the group.

Leon rarely ever got into trouble at school, although he was usually with the group. In most instances he was quiet and said very

little. Unlike other members of the group, he participated very little in athletics. In fact, Leon's presence was more evident by his non-participation in events than by what he did; however, he was well liked by Pat and Bobby and was usually not teased or bothered by Cotton. Though Bobby received more derrogation, Leon rarely, if ever, initiated any activities.

Group History

Apparently some of the members had known each other for a number of years yet had only begun to associate together a great deal during the past few months. The year before Pat, Bobby and Leon were at a private school; Cotton went to the town's other junior high while Billy was the only one at the present school. However, Cotton did go to the same church as Bobby, Pat and Leon and said that his parents often talked of sending him to a private school if he could get along with the teachers.

From observations and interviews about group members at school and other points throughout the community, there was no indication or any information about any publicity that the group had received when acting as a group. Cotton had been fined for reckless driving of a motorcycle and after the study was terminated, Leon and Bobby were arrested for illegal possession of alcohol. These events occurred after the group observation was discontinued. By and large the group during the period of observation seemed to be in the early stages of development with activities in many cases closely

corresponding to those available at school.

Group IV

Group IV was in the upper socioeconomic level. For a variety of reasons high income adolescent groups proved hard to locate and develop rapport with. First is the problem of mobility. Since most adolescents in the upper income brackets have access to one or more cars, they are not restricted to one or two near-by sites as boys in the middle and lower income bracket often are. Second, youth in upper class settings have access to private clubs and homes in which to conduct group activities. Such facilities are not as readily available to youth in lower and middle income settings. Access to private clubs and homes has strong methodological implications for observing groups. If the observer is restricted to public sites effective observation is thwarted. Lower class groups often meet in very public and visible surroundings such as pool halls and playgrounds which an observer can readily penetrate. On the other hand, a private club, school or home limits, if it does not completely prevent, access to an external observer.

The third problem in observing high income class groups is that the wide varieties of activities and associations available to these individuals moderates to varying degrees the formation of tight, highly exclusive and secretive groups. This is not to say that such groups do not exist, only that conditions in the upper class setting helps to

retard, prevent or deter such development. As an example, consider the wide range of activities available to the adolescent in the upper class setting. In addition to organized school activities such as band, orchestra, chorus and athletic events, there are special clubs relating to language, speech, science and other fields. Outside of school there is a wide range of church activities, auxiliaries of men's and women's social associations and clubs designed specifically for the youth. Moreover in many cases, the parents can afford to send the children for week-end outings to special camps and on shopping and vacation trips often several hundred miles from home. All such activities tend to further enlarge and widen spheres of influences and friends that impinge upon the individual. As a consequence of such a situation, the probability that the individual will anchor a great deal of his identity and his concerns in a select group of five, six and seven friends is statistically decreased. It would seem then that the sheer frequency of tight and formal associations among youth under these circumstances would be less than youth under more deprived circumstances. Such gross behavioral observations in economically and socially differentiated settings seem to point to a certain degree to such a fact (Bird, 1967).

However, let us consider factors that exist in upper class settings that may be conducive to formation of small informal groups among adolescents. First, adolescents, almost uniformly in this culture, regardless of social class, are in somewhat similar circumstances.

By virtue of their age, lack of training and education and experience, they are not full-fledged and recognized members of adult society. Second, as adolescents, they are in a transition period from childhood, characterized by little responsibility for making major decisions in their lives, to adulthood, where great responsibility in this culture is largely placed upon the individual. Also, with the onset of puberty, adolescents find themselves physically changing and experiencing different sensations and events than they did as children. This is another commonality of all adolescents. Third and somewhat a product of the first two factors, is the fact that many adolescents in this society selectively subscribe to styles of life that are somewhat different from those of adults. This is best documented by trends in music, clothing and automobiles among the youth. Indeed, these and other such themes can be seen as variations of general patterns throughout the culture that are predominantly characteristic of youth as compared to other age groups. Thus, just by virtue of being an adolescent, certain common experiences are insured.

By the very fact that an individual is in a different socioeconomic grouping, he tends to experience a different range of activities than others who are not in his socioeconomic grouping. Experiencing such activities and being in somewhat different interaction sites, are certainly two factors that lead to the development of groups differentiated by socioeconomic class. As a consequence of this and the inability of the research to locate and develop rapport with higher income groups

in the general public settings within the community studied, the research plan was altered to place an observer within one of the settings frequented by individuals in the upper social economic level.

With Group IV the setting where the observer first attempted to pinpoint a group was a private club in the nearby metropolitan area that included a swimming pool and a golf range. Quite rapidly within a period of two weeks, the observer was able to note through frequency of interactions a cluster of four or five boys that would be at the club most of the day, playing golf, swimming or inside watching TV. This observation was begun during the summer months, consequently all group members had a great deal of free time. The observer quickly identified a hard core of four members--Jack, Rod, Craig and Harold. By the third week Rick had appeared and at the end of the first month, a sixth member, Ken, was evident. In this group as with other groups, there were two or three fringe members, but they were distinctly fringe and were not included in many of the group's activities or the intimate discussions.

The typical interaction period for the group consisted of coming out to the golf course early in the morning, playing golf as a group until noon and then playing for an hour or two in the afternoon before going in the swimming pool. The boys would swim from about two until five o'clock during the hottest part of the day, return to the golf course for two hours more and then usually go swimming once more before leaving the club that night. In terms of sheer frequency, Rod,

Harold, Jack and Craig were there the most often. Rick was present only about one-half of the time and Ken usually just appeared on the week-ends as he had a regular job.

Rapport was not difficult to establish with this group since the boys were quite open with most younger adults in the setting. The observer who had a late model sports car attracted the boys' interests with this and often gave them rides to their homes in the evening. The boys were very impressed by the car and the observer, who was in college. They asked many questions concerning college and had older friends and brothers and sisters who were in college. Rapport was achieved to such an extent that the observer was able to visit each boy in his home during the period of observation. Undoubtedly this would not have been possible if it had not been for the fact that the observer was able to gain access to the setting which was restricted to members of the upper social class.

In most group interaction situations, either Rod or Harold had the greatest number of effective initiations. Rod was the better swimmer, but Harold was the better golfer; so in the group's two more important activities, the two were fairly evenly matched. Craig also stood high on the leadership dimension but fell just a notch below Harold or Rod. Near Craig was Ken. Ken, like Harold, was a couple of years older than Rod, Craig or Jack, and this helped him to maintain a higher status position. However, Ken's position was never highly stabilized since he did not have as much interaction within the group

as the other members.

In terms of status a considerable distance below these top four were Rick and Jack. Rick was a year older than Rod, Jack or Craig but younger than Ken or Harold. He was skilled in golfing and swimming and popular with the girls. Yet, the members often stressed that Rick could not be counted upon and was sometimes called a "chicken." The members felt that he would tend to divulge secrets to adults and other persons who were not involved in the group's activities.

Jack was usually the lowest member in the status hierarchy of the group. This could not be attributed to Jack's lack of skill in the activities of the group such as playing golf, swimming or popularity with girls. What seemed more than anything else to place Jack in the bottom status position was his irascibility and quarrelsomeness in his relations with other members of the group, and a tendency to enter into activities the group considered too dangerous or deviate from legal strictures. Jack boasted of getting into scuffles, even knife fights with other boys, of being drunk repeatedly and of having sexual relations with a wide variety of girls. All the other group members occasionally made such boasts, but Jack carried this to a more extreme degree than they did.

Jack's relations with other group members were often colored with friction and ill feelings. Especially Rod and Rick had disagreements with Jack and several times short fights ensued. Usually these resulted in Jack coming out on the losing end and exploding in a violent

fury of profanity and threats. After such an incident, for three or four days there would be considerable social distance between the other members of the group and Jack. He would usually slowly work his way back up only to engage in another similar disagreement and drop back down again.

Table IV summarizes data on the structural characteristics of the group by the series of correlations between observed status and

Table IV
Spearman Rank Correlations for Status and
Sociometric Choices Measurements
for Group IV

Observed Status with	rho	n	Probability
Independent Observation	.885	6	<.05
Effective Initiation	.943	6	<.01
Popularity	.772	6	>.05
Fighting	.913	6	<.05

Note. -- Source: Appendix D.

independent observer's and the three dimensions of the sociometric instrument i. e. , popularity, effective initiative and fighting. In the group popularity with a rho of .772 did not correlate significantly with

status. This correlation seems to reflect the observed division between Rod and Harold, and their preference in both cases for Craig. Here again Craig's role as a mediating and cohesive influence is observable.

Norms and Common Activities

Considering norms and activities of this group it should be noted that all boys attended the junior high in the town that was in the more expensive residential area. Members of Group I and III attended the junior high that had a greater-mixture of socioeconomic classes, while Group II had members, some of which had attended one junior high and some the other. At the time of observation, Rod, Craig and Jack were sophomores. All three were 15, approaching their 16th birthdays. Harold and Ken were seniors in school and both were 17, while Rick was a junior and was approaching his 17th birthday. All boys had access to automobiles, although Rod and Craig rarely drove since they did not have licenses. During the observation period only Harold had a car--a new Corvair. At the end of the period, Rick's parents bought him a new sports-type automobile. None of the group members had motorcycles or showed much interest in them.

All of the boys came from what was called the highest socioeconomic level in the town. Homes were located in the more expensive parts of the town and were predominantly of brick construction in modern ranch style with the exception of Craig's home. It was a

two-story wood and brick structure in a more traditional style. All of the boy's parents had two or more cars. Cars were in the upper price bracket such as Oldsmobiles or Buicks. All the group members' fathers' occupations were either professional or executive with incomes estimated in excess of \$15,000 in every case.

All the members dressed well and always seemed to have spending money. In fact only one incident was noted of a member complaining of needing money. This was Jack. Repeated instances were documented noting the existence of affluence of the group members. In one observation one member remarked that he took his parents to dinner and it cost \$16. During this observation the boys talked of various good restaurants and all of them were fairly exclusive and expensive places. The observer noted that none of the boys seemed disturbed at spending \$16 for three meals. Often the boys would spend \$2.50 or \$3.00 in a couple of hours entertainment at a bowling alley or pool hall. Each boy had special golf shoes that cost about \$20.

Related to the easy availability of many material items were the group members' petty acts of vandalism. In interaction sites such as the swimming pool, the bowling alleys, pool halls, etc., observations were made of members casually destroying small property articles. When questioned about this, the boys would remark that they could easily pay for whatever was torn up.

Small acts of illegality were lightly regarded by the members, especially Rod and Jack. In addition to petty vandalism, sometimes

the boys drove automobiles illegally or were apprehended while speeding or some similar violation. They bragged repeatedly on their parents' ability to get such traffic tickets fixed. Moreover, none of the boys' parents seemed too disturbed when a boy was charged with a traffic violation.

Common to all of the boys was the fact that they made very good grades in school. Various reports from the members and the school interviews indicated the members were "A" students and rarely became involved in discipline problems. Only Jack was the exception to this general group characteristic. He had been involved in repeated disciplinary actions in school. All boys planned to attend college and Harold and Ken were to enter the next year and had completed interviews with college counselors and were deciding between two or three large universities. None of the members expressed a doubt but what they would complete at least four years of college.

Many of the group's sites of interaction were closed to the general public or adolescents. These sites such as members' homes, parties given by girls and private clubs expose the members to a somewhat different social environment than that which other adolescents may experience. However, even in terms of public places, group members exercised considerable discrimination in sites they chose to patronize. Preference peculiar to this group was choice of a pool hall that was considerably more expensive than others in the town. It was noted that Group I spent much of its time in a pool hall in the low rent district of

the town while Groups II and III rarely, if ever, entered this pool hall, and chose as a favorite site another one near the college where college students also often played. However, Group IV rarely entered the pool hall of Groups II and III and never stopped in the part of town that was Group I's domain. One member in particular, Craig was especially prone to negative evaluation of the other pool hall only a hundred feet away. He insisted that a person might get his throat cut there--that it was a place where the rough crowd hung out--where fights were frequent.

Golf was by far the greatest time-consuming activity of the group and considerable importance was placed upon it. All members were good golfers--better than most adult men and took a great joy in defeating adults. Though there were clear differences in the member's golfing ability there was nothing like a positive correlation between status in the group and golfing ability. With respect to golf, Harold, Jack, Craig, Rod and then Rick and Ken would be the order of skill; however, in status ranking, Jack occupied clearly a bottom position while Rod held the leadership position with Harold. Most apparent here is that skill even in the group's most frequent activity is a rather poor, if at all useful, index of status. The key to what determines status is something more than just skill in an important activity.

In addition to golf the boys engaged in other forms of athletics such as diving and swimming. Here they were loud and boisterous and often drew the attention of other people. Usually the boys basked in this recognition and tried to emphasize their distinctness from the rest

of the youth in the setting.

Much of the group's activity in the swimming pool or in the pool halls was done to attract the interest of girls. The boys were interested in girls, and spent a great deal of time evaluating various girls on dimensions such as beauty, sexual availability and so forth. None of them dated regularly. Often all members would attend the same party at a girl's house and usually they kept in very close contact with what particular girl a member might be interested in at a particular time. Rod especially was adept in his dealing with girls--certainly much more so than Harold. Several times group members would caution Jack about his language around or his treatment of girls. Some members, especially Jack, Rod and Rick, boasted of their sexual exploits; although such behavior was never recorded in any observation.

Not a great deal of conflict with authorities was noted in this group. The extent of such conflict seemed to be accounted for mainly by Jack, the lower status member. His conflicts ranged from his father, business establishment owners and school authorities to older high school boys. Such conflicts seemed more a function of Jack's personality and own situation than any norm of the group.

Standardized through the interaction of group members were stereotypes regarding students that had attended the other junior high in the town. Such epithets as "thugs," "greasers," and "hoods" were often used when referring to these students. Indeed the members often stated that they went to great pains to avoid certain other adolescents

in the town.

Roles and Personal Characteristics

Rod was the highest status member of the group and lived in a large spacious home that was evaluated upwards of \$50,000. Rod had both older and younger sisters, but seemed the favorite of the family. His success in school work was less than that of other group members and his parents seemed more concerned about his participation in athletics and social affairs; so he seemed to orient his energies here.

Rod was talented in athletics and entered events with enthusiasm and aggressiveness. Often he monopolized conversations among group members by telling of his successes. His aggressiveness brought him into conflict with some of the group members, especially Jack and Rick. In these instances he almost always predominated; yet he usually deferred to Harold. The issue was not Rod's deference to Harold but the very few times Harold attempted to challenge any of Rod's assertions. Rod and Craig were very close. No conflict was observed between these two during the period of observation.

Rod's aggressiveness and popularity extended to his interactions with the girls also. More than any of the other boys he interacted and talked with them easily, and the boys often teased him about being a lover, which he willingly acknowledged. More than once Harold was in his shadow when the boys were trying to attract and keep the attention of girls.

In his aggressiveness Rod often derided and berated other group members severely, but at times he could turn on a spontaneous and effuse charm that effectively reduced tension. Rod was the most uninhibited and carefree of the members. He was always ready to put an idea into action, but not good at planning or carrying out complicated activities.

Second in status and very close to Rod was Harold. Harold was an only child and his father was considerably older than the fathers of the other members but for Craig's. His home like most of the others was an expensive, in excess of \$20,000, brick ranch style home. Until the fall when Rick got his car, Harold was the only group member with an automobile. He was 17 and a senior in high school, made good grades and planned to go to college. He also was probably the best golfer in the group.

Harold was more reserved and inhibited than the other members of the group. He often acted as a check on some of the boys' exuberance and was more concerned with planning and consequences of action. Partially as a consequence of his age and his standing in school, Harold was eagerly considering which college he intended to enter and was more serious than any of the other members about school. In group activities as with school, Harold was intent and competitive in a way much different from Rod. Whereas Rod performed with a flourish, Harold drilled at his goals methodically and without a great deal of flair. Harold was not as popular with girls as Rod and this often

disturbed him.

Harold seemed to hold his position in the group through his greater age, experience and reliability. He could be counted upon to carry things out and often acted to check the excesses of particularly Rod and Jack; yet Harold was not immune to criticism himself; especially in reference to clothing, Rick and Jack had teased Harold about his lack of taste in the current styles. This usually brought laughter from the group members with the exception of Craig and Ken.

Craig was the third status member of the group, though Ken held a position very near him. He lived in an older two-story wood frame house which was evaluated around \$18,000. Craig had one older brother who was about 30 and was a very successful banker in a near-by city. Craig's father himself was a retired banker. Craig said that his brother's house cost \$80,000 and that he wanted a house like that himself some day.

Though Craig was smaller than Rod or Harold, he ranked very close to them in golf and swimming. He was a good athlete, though compared to the other group members he was probably the least competitive and aggressive. He rarely got into arguments and fights with other members, or for that matter, with non-members either. The one role that Craig performed in the group was arbitrator of disputes and fights. Time after time when friction arose between group members, Craig intervened before a fight occurred and urged the members to get back to whatever activity they were engaged in. He rarely

criticized any of the members; although occasionally he would make critical remarks about Jack or Rick to the observer. Craig was close to both Harold and Rod who were often at odds with each other. Consequently, he did much to block disharmony that did often occur here.

Instances of derogation that were recorded for Craig were mainly directed at Jack. He was especially critical of Jack's fighting, drinking and cursing and often remarked that Jack showed no respect for girls. Craig often verbally chastised Jack. Jack seemed to regard this with humor rather than animosity.

Of all group members Craig was the most reserved around girls. He never boasted of having sexual intercourse with girls and rarely, if ever, dated. Occasionally he would attend parties given by girls but only if other group members were present. It was not that girls did not like Craig. He usually ignored them and they in turn accused him of being shy. His behavior was in strong contrast to Rod's, Jack's and Rick's. Craig was very interested in cars and was especially impressed by the observer's sports car. However, he like the other group members did not prefer the lower price class in cars, even if these cars were fast and powerful. All group members talked in terms of either foreign sports cars or higher priced domestic cars like the Buick Riviera and Chevrolet Corvettes. They also never cared to work on their or their parents' automobiles themselves.

Craig also made good grades in school and placed considerable emphasis on this. He did not seem to have much friction with his

parents and the only known recurrent conflict was over the concern over what time he should be in at night.

Ken was in the middle status of the group, just below Craig. He like Harold was a senior in high school, was 17 years old and was just a little shorter than Harold. He lived in one of the better residential parts of town in a brick ranch style home evaluated at approximately \$20,000.

Ken had a full time job that kept him busy all during the week so that he was with the group only on week-ends. Consequently Ken's position was never as clearly defined in the group as was the other members. He was nearly as good a golfer as Rick or Craig and was a special friend of Harold's. In fact the reason that he was included in many of the group's activities seemed to stem from his special friendship with Harold. Ken never initiated any activities for the group and seemed content to follow along with whatever was going on at the moment. He rarely received derogation and criticism from the other members, and most of his communication was through Harold or Craig.

Ken was better than a B+ student in school and was planning to enter a large state university and study engineering. However, he chose a college different from the ones other members had chosen. As a partial consequence of Ken's infrequent presence in the group and of his interest in other activities such as his job, he did not seem to have a well standardized role and position within the group and seemed more an occasional golf partner.

Some distance below Ken was Rick who was next to bottom in the status hierarchy. Rick, too, lived in an expensive brick home with a two-car garage and a large lawn. His father was a successful self-employed professional, and he had an older sister who had her own car and was in college. Rick was a junior in high school, like the other boys made good grades and was on the wrestling team. One of the most noticeable aspects about Rick was his size compared to the other group members. He was just a couple of inches over 5' tall and weighed about 110 pounds. Though well built and nice-looking he was bothered by his small stature and was occasionally teased by the other members because of his size. Especially in some of the more daring physical activities of the group, Rick was often called "chicken" because he seemed afraid to participate in them.

Though all the boys had good clothes and athletic equipment, Rick always seemed to have the newest, if not the best, and insisted upon bringing this to the attention of the other group members. He frequently talked about himself and bragged about his accomplishments--all of which did little to enhance his standing in the group.

Compared to the other members, Rick also seemed more closely attached to his parents. He usually had to receive permission before he could go out at night and had to go in earlier than the other boys did. This was a source of teasing, and Rick often actively tried to avoid situations where he would have to excuse himself to go home because of his parents' request.

Rick, like Jack, received a great deal of derogation and was the butt of many jokes of the group. Almost every observation contained some criticism of Rick. Yet, when he was bothered by a non-member, the group quickly supported him. In one instance he almost got into a fight with an out-group person and was actively supported by the group. When authorities investigated, the group helped him construct a cover-up story and urged him to finish the fight at a later time. In another instance when Rick and Jack got into a short skirmish, Rick was actively supported by the other group members, and it was declared that he gave Jack what Jack deserved. For three or four days thereafter, the other members teased Jack about the beating he had received from Rick.

Jack was the lowest status group member. He was about 5'8" and just a little shorter and lighter than Craig. He like the other members had an expensive home in one of the better residential districts. His parents had three new cars. His father, like Rick's, was a very successful self-employed professional and Jack almost always seemed to have plenty of spending money, though he did not have an outside job. He was also a good student in school and made mainly A's; however, there many of his similarities with other members ended.

Jack was certainly the most deviate of the members with respect to norms of the group. Part of this seemed to stem from the fact that about a year before Jack associated with another group whose activities and norms seemed considerably different from the group that he was in

now. According to Jack, remarks of the other boys, and remarks from his parents, the group that he formerly spent much of his time with came into a great deal of conflict with adults and norms of the adult world. He was involved in instances of fighting, petty theft, drinking and disorderly conduct. Indeed his father expressed satisfaction to the observer with the fact that Jack no longer associated with that bunch of boys. Jack still retained much of this sort of behavior in his interaction with the other group members. He repeatedly engaged in brief fights with Rod and Rick although he generally left Harold alone and did not seem concerned with Craig.

Jack was the only group member who smoked, and he often boasted about getting drunk and having sexual relations with a wide variety of girls. In fact he often claimed every girl he dated he had sexual relations with, but the boys regarded this as just another of Jack's idle boasts. Jack, more than any other member, had a large number of conflicts with authorities such as parents, police and school officials.

In his relations with the group members Jack always actively participated in the activities of the group and performed quite well. He often exceeded the other member's expectations in his performances with them attributing this to luck. He was short-tempered in a competitive situation and often exploded in a violent display of anger when he failed to achieve his objectives. More than once Jack would scream threats to another group member and then leave but would always

return the following day.

Jack received far more derogation than any other group member with the exception of Rick. In most instances though Rick was not criticized as harshly as Jack. In some areas with respect to the group though, Jack surpassed Rick. He was certainly more ready to participate in any group activity and never failed to be available though he might run counter to his parents' wishes.

Jack remained, during all the period of observation, between the two groups which had radically different norms and somewhat different activities. Indeed to account for his behavior, one would have to consider both of his membership groups, and see that in some situations one would largely determine his behavior, and in another it would be the other group that was the major influence. The other group members were aware that Jack also maintained interaction in a different group and Craig often commented that Jack's trouble was "that bunch of guys he runs around with." Nevertheless, Jack was always included in group activities although members often found it necessary to place severe restrictions upon his behavior.

Group History

Group IV had apparently been in existence two or three years before this study was initiated. Though Harold and Ken were two years older than Rod, Craig and Jack and one older than Rick, all boys had gone to the same junior high. Moreover, attendance at the private club

had helped bring them together.

The group had apparently never been brought to the attention of police or school authorities though at the club it was recognized that they were usually together. Only Jack seemed to have incurred unfavorable publicity and this was in connection with actions with other boys.

Between Group Comparisons

The results have shown that each group had structure, norms and roles; moreover personal characteristics of members have been found to contribute differentially to their group. It is assumed then that all four groups studied met the definition of a group stated earlier in the study and thus were in the same class of phenomena. Each then was representative of the defined system and exhibited characteristics common to each other and thus the system. The data then fulfilled the first and major objective of the project--the study of the functioning of natural groups over time in their own settings.

Secondary but still a major part of the project was studying the groups in socioeconomically differentiated levels. Two types of data were collected to test the null hypotheses that all groups were either from the same or identical populations. One set of data was estimates by group members of family income. The second set was independent evaluation of the dwellings of members. A third collection of information presented in this section was the police records for legal violations for group members. This information provided an independent means

for checking the norms and activities of the group with respect to deviation from laws.

Though in many ways analysis of these data by parametric statistics would have had advantages, non-parametric statistics were used since there was a distinct possibility that the population was not normally distributed and variances within samples were considerable. Inspection of data in Appendixes E, F and G indicate such a conclusion.

Data on estimation of family income were transformed to ranks, divided at the median and analyzed by the extension of the median test

Table V
Extension of the Median Test for
Scores on Estimation of
Family Income

	Group I	Groups II & III	Group IV	Totals
Above Median	0	5	6	11
Below Median	6	6	0	12
Totals	6	11	6	23

Note. -- Source: Appendix E.

^aOverall chi square with two degrees of freedom equals 12.03
<.01. —

(Siegel, 1956). The overall chi square at 12.03 with two degrees of

freedom was significant at less than the .01 level.

Using a technique described in Maxwell (1961) the linear component of the overall chi square was extracted yielding a value of 11.50 with one degree of freedom. The value was significant at less than the .001 level. Table V presents the observed frequencies.

A linear chi-square component of 11.50 represents 95.8 per cent of the total chi square. Thus it was concluded that a strongly linear trend from lowest to highest group exists. Such findings were interpreted as supporting the hypotheses that the groups were from different populations and can be represented by a linear function. See Table VI.

Table VI

Components of Total Chi Square
from the Extension of the
Median Test

Source	Chi Square	df
Linear Component	11.50*	1
Residual	.53	2
Total	12.03	3

Note. -- Source: Appendix E.

* significant at $< .001$.

Data on the independent evaluation of members' homes was analyzed by the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. Table VII presents the ranked data. An H of 17.54 was computed with three degrees of freedom. The probability of attaining this value by chance

Table VII
Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of
Variance of Estimated Value
of Family Dwelling for
All Groups

	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV
Ranks	1	6.5	8	18
	2	6.5	10	19
	3	10	13	20
	4.5	12	15.5	21
	4.5	15.5	15.5	22
	10	15.5		23
Totals	25.0	66.0	62.0	123.0

Note. -- Source: Appendix F.

^aTotal N = 23.

^bH (corrected for ties) = 17.54 < .001 with 3 df.

is less than .001. It was then safely concluded that Groups I, II, III

and IV did not come from the same or identical populations.

From the highly significant chi squares and H on the family incomes and dwellings data, it was concluded that the groups did represent different and distinct socioeconomic levels. The highly significant linear component of chi square led to the conclusion that

Table VIII
Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance
for Total Police Violations
for All Groups

	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV
Ranks	18	5	5	5
	20	5	5	5
	21	5	12.5	5
	22.5	12.5	12.5	5
	22.5	12.5	16.5	12.5
	24	12.5		16.5
Totals	123.0	52.5	51.5	49.0

Note. -- Source: Appendix G.

^aTotal N = 23.

^bH (corrected for ties) = 15.24 < .001 with 3 df.

three socioeconomic levels had been located.

Data from police statistics on all violations were analyzed by the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. An H , corrected for ties was computed, yielding a value of 15.24. With three degrees of freedom the probability of a value as high as this occurring by chance is less than .001. It was stated with a high degree of certainty that not all groups came from the same or identical populations with respect to number of police violations. The data are summarized in Table VIII.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The results of this study concern both findings about small groups, their members, and settings; and an aspect of developing more precise methodologies to use under field conditions. Four small natural groups were located and studied intensively over periods of several months for each group. Members were unaware they were objects of scientific study and observation was conducted in a large variety of each group's interaction sites. All groups came from the same community, had access to many of the same institutions, were near each other in age, but were from three different socioeconomic levels.

In each group data were collected on aspects of group structure, norms and activities of the group, roles and personal characteristics of members and facts about the group's history. To insure the objectivity of the status rankings of the observer, ranking was done by an independent person. To check members' perceptions and compare them with the observer's, sociometric choices for popularity, effective initiation and fighting ability were obtained. The dimension of

socioeconomic level was examined by requesting an estimate of family income from each member and an independent evaluation of each member's dwelling. Police data were collected on the number of violations for each group member. Moreover a great deal of other information such as member evaluations of girls, car preferences, common activities, aspects of roles and so forth was collected and briefly summarized in the result section.

Indeed the sheer bulk of available data, what to concentrate on and how to analyze it are important considerations in a study such as this. One important limitation of the study was that not all the pertinent data available to an observer was recorded. Given data collection techniques available today, this was patently impossible.

Besides problems of data collection a study conducted in the field is limited by problems of control of variables. Here such variables as socioeconomic position, norms, and activities of groups could not be systematically varied as can the intensity or pitch of a tone by a psychologist investigating auditory discrimination. Today social psychology is in the position of not always being certain of what the more critical variables are nor knowing how to reproduce many of the variables under laboratory conditions. It was the intent of this study to search for some of the more critical variables pertinent to the functioning of groups by utilizing existing small groups. This is then at best a compromise, short of the exactness of the laboratory but necessitated by the state of the science of social psychology.

Quite often there are disparities between findings in experimental groups and groups located in the field. Indeed too many times groups in an experimental setting are only togetherness situations embodying something less than the norms and role relations that characterize groups. The methods used in this study seek to avoid such pitfalls while at the same time not alerting subjects in the field that they are under observation.

A second limitation of these findings was inherent in the choice of units of analysis used. The three main units used were individual, small group and setting. One problem that arose was how to delineate the group or more specifically the "hard core." Such delineation must be, in part, arbitrary since membership in a given group did not seem clear-cut with fringe members. In almost every instance a group member would have other friends with which he associated besides the group members. Only when it seemed that the relatively larger part of his time and concerns were invested in a given group; and there were corresponding status positions and roles for him was he considered a hard core member.

Compounding the problem of specifying membership was the fact that the group as a system can and does change over time. In every group there was some change in membership, activities and/or status. Consequently a single point-in-time characterization of a group must include consideration of this variability.

Another aspect of the problem of unit of analysis was whether it

was more parsimonious to assign a given characteristic to qualities of the individual, the group or the setting. For example in all groups almost every boy wanted a car; however most members in Group III were more interested in motorcycles. Group I expressed preferences for powerful but lower-priced Fords and Chevrolets while Group IV wanted higher-priced cars or foreign sports cars. Group II was the least interested in cars but did feel a fairly new one was desirable. Another example was clothing. Members of all groups dressed similar to college students, but there was variation between groups. Especially Group I was dissimilar in this respect.

The most parsimonious course seemed to be to assign such characteristics, of almost all youth, as interest in cars, preferences for styles of clothing, choice of kinds of music to broad, general themes or values or norms. Then on a theme, such as interest in cars, a particular group might develop a variation, and perhaps variations occur on an individual level.

Certainly greater variations on general themes or norms would be encountered if groups were selected from other areas in this culture. Variations could be even greater in cross-cultural samples. Geertz (1959) presents a somewhat similar analysis of variation on a general theme in Indonesian culture.

An important difference between findings in this study and studies using the participant observer technique (Short, 1965) was the resistance to questioning and use of the verbal adaptation of the sociometric

instrument. This was especially true with Group I. Short reports that information about group activities even if delinquent were readily obtainable from members. However in this study considerable secrecy was manifested by group members to outsiders especially police. With Group I the observer even after he was established as a trustworthy person, was unable to get much information by direct question about illegal activities. Such findings seem to indicate that undisguised questionnaires or direct questions may not always elicit truthful or complete answers. Often the responses may be what the subject feels are socially acceptable.

Another difference between these findings and those often reported by researchers concerned with youthful delinquencies was the lack of a discontinuity between many of the general values of society and the values and aspirations of group members (Cohen, 1955). All group members, even those of the most delinquent group, Group I, shared many of the general values of society. They all desired money, cars, good jobs and other elements of success in middle class life. The members of Group I had no discernible personality aberrations nor did they seem to reject all the values of the middle class. It seems their delinquency could better be accounted for by norms that endorsed drinking, fighting or petty theft as masculine behavior. Moreover there were older brothers and friends, who, like them, had engaged in delinquency, and that from members' statements had served as ego references for the group's members. It should also be emphasized

that the other groups also engaged in some delinquent behavior similar to Group I. At any rate, drinking, fighting and driving fast cars are frequently glorified and endorsed in aspects of American society. Perhaps Group I was delinquent only with respect to what set of norms their behavior is compared.

One study (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960) has attempted to formulate a typology of delinquent behaviors. They specifically note three possible types of delinquent gangs: criminal, conflict and retreatist that may exist in delinquent settings. In regard to this typology Short (1965) notes great difficulty in locating gangs that singularly specialize in one of these types. Similar findings have come from this study. The one group that can be considered a delinquent group engaged in a variety of delinquent acts; moreover in the general youth setting other groups were noted and none came to the attention as specializing in one activity. For that matter none of the groups studied, specialized in one activity alone, but engaged in a wide variety.

Certainly the problem of delinquency at this point resists any typology or explanation based on personality disorders alone. Though this sample was small, intensive investigation in these instances indicated some delinquent acts in groups not at all characterized as delinquent. Furthermore members of the group that did have a great number of police violations only spent a very small amount of time in delinquent behavior.

In the results section it was noted that especially in Group I but

also in the other groups, popularity and ascertained leadership did not correlate highly. In Group II and III the highest status position and the most popular person were the same, but the individual in the second or third position was low on the popularity dimension. On the other hand the leader of Group I was not most popular, but instead it was the individual in the second status position. This along with observers' reports support the contention (Hare, 1962; Sherif and Sherif, 1964) that leadership and popularity are often separate dimensions in a group.

Since groups did come from significantly different social levels, it might be asked if this did affect group process. The answer seemed to be a qualified "no." Certainly in terms of the definition of group used in this study, social phenomena corresponding to the definition were located at all levels. In effect Groups I through IV all had norms, roles and structure.

However norms and activities between groups did differ. Group I had more police violations, and more instances of physical abuse between group members and non-members were recorded for this group. Groups I, III and IV were very interested in girls, but the case was much less so with Group II.

One of the largest differences due to socioeconomic class was the opportunities afforded to group members. Group I had to depend almost entirely upon public areas to meet. At the other extreme Group IV rarely congregated at a pool hall or restaurant but preferred private clubs and members' homes. Consequently, the activities of

Group I were much more publicly visible than any of the other groups, and thus more likely to come to the attention of police.

As noted earlier each group had a fairly stabilized preference for types of cars or as in the case of Group III, motorcycles. All members of Group I did drink, usually beer, and considered this an important element of appearing as men. Though the members of Group II drank beer, it was never more than a glass or two and on rare occasions. The members of Group III and IV seemed to have similar attitudes toward drinking, regarding it as forbidden but exciting. Rarely ever were these boys seen with beer in their possession.

Attitudes toward school varied from unanimous contempt especially to teachers and principals by members of Group I to a highly favorable endorsement by members of Group II. Groups III and IV fell between these two poles. In terms of clothing preferences, all groups varied on a general theme of collegiate styles. Group I in most instances wore a cheap variety of clothes that were in current fashion and often the clothes were worn or not too neat. Groups II and III, to the extent members could afford it, dressed very similar to college freshmen while Group IV closely resembled fraternity boys in their dress.

It was not felt that the conclusion could be drawn that groups, in the terms of this study, are absent from any socioeconomic level. It can be concluded that even within a relatively small and homogenous population there exists a great potential for variation among groups.

Certainly socioeconomic level is but one of many factors that contribute to this variation.

One possible theoretical implication of this study concerns methods that alert subjects in either field or laboratory conditions that they are under study. In several instances group members were resistant to outright questions; moreover in each group several weeks passed before the observer had an opportunity to see certain group activity.

A second implication concerns the degree of integration or unity existing within a social unit larger than a small group. Findings here indicate several variations on central themes or patterns are possible, and that somewhat antithetical orientations may exist within the same setting.

At the individual level the importance of the small group as a point of reference for the individual is evident. The small group was not only highly numerous, but it also carried a great deal of meaning for the individual. Indeed norms and roles were rarely enforced for an individual, but were expectations he strived to meet. Deviations from his own group norms seemed very painful for the adolescent.

Deviation with respect to one or another set of norms has important practical implications. Too often treatment of criminal offenders concentrates on the individual, alone, without consideration of a set of norms of a group to which he may be conforming. Findings here indicate that social control must not only include the individual, but also his group and more inclusive social organizations.

Finally the motivational aspect of belonging to a group suggests future research and practical application. Historically man has anchored his identity and developed his ego in the context of some kind of social grouping. This may have been the consanguineous and conjugal family, the clan, the tribe, the race, the work group and so on. He may have had multiple identifications, but the issue is that he did have one or more.

Today as a result of industrialization, urbanization and increased mobility, traditional groupings are dissolving. The same process seems to be occurring in all parts of the world albeit at different speeds. What consequence this has for the individual or society still remains largely an unanswered question. Certainly as old affiliations and institutions disappear, new ones will develop to take their place. But what will be the design of the new orders? What norms will be developed? Will arrangements develop by caprice or can they be planned? If human affairs can be planned what design is best for the species--these and other monumental questions have few if any scientific answers today.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A brief history and current findings and methods in small group research were presented and summarized. Present research was roughly divided into two trends, one of which emphasized field methods and phenomenology; the other emphasized control and experimental manipulation. The first trend was found to be lacking in the ability to go beyond description, while the second produced reservations about the validity of findings and reproduction of variables in the laboratory.

Consequently, a methodology was presented to observe real-life groups to insure validity and with controls and procedures to more fully investigate phenomena. Briefly the methodology consisted of using an observer similar in age and appearance to the subjects and continuing observation over a period of several months. There were six consecutive focuses for observation. They were location of group, rapport, status, norms, roles and history. An independent observer and sociometric ratings supplemented the observer's status rankings. Police records for member violations were obtained. Members' estimates of family income and independent evaluation of dwellings

were gathered. Interviews were also conducted with school officials and others who had contact with the groups.

Subjects consisted of twenty-three adolescent males. All subjects lived in a small city of thirty to fifty thousand people. Nearby was a much larger urban center. Subjects were homogeneous in race and nationality. It was proposed to locate groups in three socioeconomic levels i. e., low, middle and high, and four such groups were located and studied intensively.

Group I was placed in the low socioeconomic level. It had a hard core of six members, all of which had dropped out of school. In this group secrecy and resistance to observation were high, and its members had the greatest number of police violations. The sociometric dimension of fighting correlated most closely with status.

Group II was placed in the middle socioeconomic level. It, too, had a hard core of six members, all of whom were seniors in high school. The central activities of this group consisted of athletics, shooting snooker and just being together. There was very little conflict between positions in the group structure, and the leader was also the most popular person.

Group III was the youngest group studied with all members fifteen-years-old at the time of the observation period. It was also in the middle socioeconomic level. This group was very interested in school athletics, and group activities centered closely around these. This group was judged the least developed and seemed to have a low

degree of cohesiveness.

Group IV was placed in the high socioeconomic level. Like Groups I and II it had a hard core of six members. The membership of this group rarely appeared in public areas and was located by the observer in a private setting. Structure in this group was characterized by competition between two members at the leadership position.

Comparisons among groups indicated differences on the socioeconomic dimension and on number of police violations. The differences were significant at respectable levels. Similarities among groups were noted including the importance of money, clothes, girls and cars. Differences were attributed in most cases to variations on central norms or themes. As an example Group I, III and IV were very interested in girls, but Group I seemed to seek primarily sexual favors with low emphasis on dating or marriage. Contrastingly members of Group II showed little interest in girls and chastised members who dated.

Socioeconomic level was seen as only one of several dimensions effecting variability in the groups. Even within the closely circumscribed setting with the low degree of differentiation in occupation, nationality, race, living conditions, schools and so forth there was considerable variation among the groups.

Methodological implications indicated the feasibility of combining laboratory controls with field validity. However no claim was made for any perfection of methods nor a complete description and explanation

of behavior in groups.

Theoretical considerations were discussed concerning differentiation between leadership and popularity, the degree of integration among social units and the problem of deviation and social control. Possible research was considered in these areas and the feasibility of scientifically planning human organizations. The study took note of the potential that such research could have.

REFERENCES

- Allport, F. H. Social psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.
- Bales, R. F. Interaction process analysis: a method for the study of small groups. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1950.
- Bales, R. F. The equilibrium problem in small groups. In T. Parsons, R. F. Bales, & E. A. Shils (Eds.) Working papers in the theory of action. New York: The Free Press, 1953, pp. 111-161.
- Bales, R. F. How people interact in conferences. Scientific American, 1955, 192 (3), 31-35.
- Bell, W. Urban neighborhoods and individual behavior. In M. Sherif & C. W. Sherif (Eds.) Problems of youth: transition to adulthood in a changing world. Chicago: Aldine, 1965, pp. 235-264.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. The study of social conduct within the framework of adaptation-level theory. In M. Sherif & M. O. Wilson (Eds.) Emerging problems in social psychology. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Book Exchange, 1957, pp. 143-180.
- Bion, W. R. Group dynamics: a review. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1952, 33, 235-247.
- Bion, W. R. Experience in groups. New York: Basic Books, 1961.
- Bird, H. A study of the class distribution of small solid adolescent groups. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1967.
- Bohannon, P. Social anthropology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

- Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. Group dynamics. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
- Cloward, R. A. & Ohlin, L. E. Delinquency and opportunity: a theory of delinquent gangs. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.
- Cohen, A. K. Delinquent boys. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- Cooley, C. Social organization. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.
- Dashiell, J. F. An experimental analysis of some group effects. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1930, 25, 190-199.
- Empey, L. T. & Rabow, J. The Provo experiment in delinquency rehabilitation. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 679-696.
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H. W. & Schacter, S. When prophecy fails. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.) Readings in social psychology. (3rd ed.) New York: Holt, 1958, pp. 156-163.
- Geertz, C. Form and variation in Balinese village structure. American Anthropologist, 1959, 61, pp. 991-1012.
- Hare, P. Handbook of small group research. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Hill, W. F. Hill interaction matrix (HIM). Los Angeles: Youth Studies Center-University of Southern California, 1965.
- Homans, G. The human group. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1950.
- Homans, G. Social behavior: its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1961.
- Hood, W. R. & Sherif, M. Verbal report and judgment of an unstructured stimulus. Journal of Psychology, 54, 121-130.
- Levy, M. The structure of society. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R. & White, R. K. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." Journal of Social Psychology, 1939, 10, 271-299.

- Lowie, R. Social organization. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1948.
- Martin, E. A. & Hill, W. F. Toward a theory of group development: six phases of therapy group development. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1957, 7 (1), 20-30.
- Maxwell, A. E. Analysing Qualitative Data. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1961.
- McGuigan, F. J. The experimenter: a neglected stimulus object. Psychological Bulletin, 1963, 60, 421-428.
- Miller, W. B. Two concepts of authority. American Anthropologist, 1955, 57, 271-289.
- Miller, W. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 24 (3), 5-19.
- Moreno, J. L. Who shall survive? Washington, D. C.: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co., 1934.
- Murdock, G. P. Social structure. New York: Macmillan Co., 1949.
- Murphy, G. In the minds of men. New York: Basic Books, 1953.
- Orne, M. T. & Scheibe, K. E. The contribution of nondeprivation factors in the production of sensory deprivation effects: the psychology of the "panic button." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68 (1), 3-12.
- Pollis, N. Relative stability of reference scales formed under individual, togetherness, and group situations. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1964.
- Polsky, H. W. Cottage six. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1962.
- Polsky, H. W. The structure and functions of adult-youth systems. In M. Sherif & C. W. Sherif (Eds.) Problems of youth: transition to adulthood in a changing world. Chicago: Aldine, 1965, pp. 189-211.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. A natural science of society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.

- Rosenthal, R. & Fode, K. L. Psychology of the scientist: V. three experiments in experimenter bias. Psychological Reports, 1963, 12, 491-511.
- Schneider, D. & Gough, K. Matrilineal kinship. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1962.
- Secord, P. F. & Backman, C. W. Social psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Shaw, C. The jack-roller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.
- Shaw, C. The natural history of a delinquent career. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Sherif, M. A study of some social factors in perception. Archives of Psychology, 1935, 187.
- Sherif, M. The psychology of social norms. New York: Harper and Bros., 1936.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. Groups in harmony and tension. New York: Harper & Row, 1953.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. Reference groups. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. (Eds.) Problems of youth: transition to adulthood in a changing world. Chicago: Aldine, 1965.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R. & Sherif, C. W. Intergroup conflict and cooperation: the Robbers Cave experiment. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Book Exchange, 1961.
- Short, J. Social structure and group process in gang delinquency. In M. Sherif and C. W. Sherif (Eds.) Problems of youth: transition to adulthood in a changing world. Chicago: Aldine, 1965, pp. 155-188.
- Short, J. & Strodbeck, F. L. Group process and gang delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Simmel, G. The web of group affiliations. (trans. by K. H. Wolff) New York: The Free Press, 1955.

- Strodtbeck, F. L. Husband-wife interaction over revealed differences. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 468-473.
- Strodtbeck, F. L. The family as a three-person group. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 22-29.
- Thelen, H. A. Dynamics of groups at work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Thibaut, J. W. & Kelley, H. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Thrasher, F. The gang. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- Thrasher, F. The gang. (abridged with introduction by J. F. Short, Jr.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Whyte, W. F. Street corner society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- Zorbaugh, H. W. The gold coast and the slum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Structural Rankings for Group I

Observed Status		Independent Observation	
Individual	Assigned Rank	Individual	Assigned Rank
Tom	1	Tom	1
Larry	2	Larry	2
John	3	John	4
Howard	4	Howard	3
Rocky	5	Rocky	5
Coon	6	Coon	6

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Popularity		Effective Initiation		Fighting	
Individual	Rank	Individual	Rank	Individual	Rank
Tom	2	Tom	1.5	Tom	1
Larry	1	Larry	1.5	Larry	2
John	3.5	John	3	John	3
Howard	5	Howard	4	Howard	4
Rocky	6	Rocky	5.5	Rocky	5.5
Coon	3.5	Coon	5.5	Coon	5.5

APPENDIX B

Structural Rankings for Group II

Observed Status		Independent Observation	
Individual	Assigned Rank	Individual	Assigned Rank
Pete	1	Pete	1
Gene	2	Gene	2
Cecil	3	Grover	3
Grover	4	Ray	4
Ray	5	Ron	5
Ron	6		

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Popularity		Effective Initiation		Fighting	
Individual	Rank	Individual	Rank	Individual	Rank
Pete	1	Pete	1	Pete	2.5
Gene	3	Gene	3.5	Gene	1
Cecil	2	Cecil	2	Cecil	2.5
Grover	4.5	Grover	3.5	Grover	4.5
Ray	4.5	Ray	5	Ray	6
Ron	6	Ron	6	Ron	4.5

APPENDIX C

Structural Rankings for Group III

Observed Status		Independent Observation	
Individual	Assigned Rank	Individual	Assigned Rank
Billy	1	Billy	1
Pat	2	Pat	3
Cotton	3	Cotton	2
Bobby	4	Bobby	5
Leon	5	Leon	4

APPENDIX C (Continued)

Popularity		Effective Initiation		Fighting	
Individual	Rank	Individual	Rank	Individual	Rank
Billy	1	Billy	1	Billy	1
Pat	2.5	Pat	2	Pat	3
Cotton	4	Cotton	3	Cotton	2
Bobby	2.5	Bobby	4	Bobby	4
Leon	5	Leon	5	Leon	5

APPENDIX D

Structural Rankings for Group IV

Observed Status		Independent Observation	
Individual	Assigned Rank	Individual	Assigned Rank
Rod	1	Rod	2
Harold	2	Harold	1
Craig	3	Craig	4
Ken	4	Ken	3
Rick	5	Rick	5
Jack	6	Jack	6

APPENDIX D (Continued)

Popularity		Effective Initiation		Fighting	
Individual	Rank	Individual	Rank	Individual	Rank
Rod	2	Rod	1	Rod	1.5
Harold	3	Harold	3	Harold	1.5
Craig	1	Craig	2	Craig	4
Ken	4	Ken	4	Ken	3
Rick	6	Rick	5	Rick	5.5
Jack	5	Jack	6	Jack	5.5

APPENDIX E

Members' Estimates of Annual Family Income

Group I		Group II	
Tom	4,000	Pete	8,000
Larry	1,500	Gene	4,800
John	4,000	Cecil	7,000
Howard	6,500	Grover	7,500
Rocky	2,000	Ray	6,000
Coon	3,000	Ron	9,000
Means	3,500		7,050

APPENDIX E (Continued)

Group III		Group IV	
Billy	7,000	Rod	60,000
Pat	10,000	Harold	12,000
Cotton	6,000	Craig	20,000
Bobby	10,000	Ken	10,000
Leon	10,000	Rick	30,000
		Jack	25,000
Means	8,600		26,167

APPENDIX F

Estimated Value of Family Dwelling

Group I		Group II	
Tom	4,000	Pete	18,000
Larry	1,000	Gene	6,000
John	4,000	Cecil	8,000
Howard	8,000	Grover	12,500
Rocky	2,000	Ray	6,000
Coon	3,500	Ron	18,000
Means	3,750	Means	11,417

APPENDIX F (Continued)

Group III		Group IV	
Billy	8,000	Rod	50,000
Pat	13,000	Harold	25,000
Cotton	7,000	Craig	20,000
Bobby	18,000	Ken	19,000
Leon	18,000	Rick	30,000
		Jack	27,000
Means	12,800	Means	28,500

APPENDIX G

Total Recorded Police Violations for Members

Tom	13	Pete	1
Larry	4	Gene	0
John	9	Cecil	1
Howard	12	Grover	1
Rocky	12	Ray	0
Coon	7	Ron	0
Totals	57		3

APPENDIX G (Continued)

Group III		Group IV	
Billy	1	Rod	0
Pat	0	Harold	0
Cotton	1	Craig	0
Bobby	2	Ken	0
Leon	0	Rick	1
		Jack	2
Totals	4		3