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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The study of man has been the basis for psychological study from time immemorial to the present day. The entities inherent in man's being have been studied and scrutinized. It has not been until relatively recent times in the history of social psychology that attention has been turned to what actually happens when man meets man. It was obvious, of course, that men did work and play with other men, but it was not recognized that this interaction was perhaps a more important part of man's being than mere knowledge of his physical or mental capabilities. We must know the resultant product of man's informal interaction with other men if the study of human behavior is to be truly successful.

Statement of Problem

The problem to be studied here is whether subsequent normative and hierarchical relationships will develop between individuals in a collective social situation, assuming basic goals and structure.

Literature

From ancient times until late in the nineteenth century, psychology was a study of individual minds. Hobbes,
Rousseau, and Bentham (13) advanced theories of how individual motivation led into conceptions of the nature of society. However, there was no social psychology worthy of the name until the nineteenth century began to draw to a close.

In actuality, group psychology in the modern sense, had its beginnings through the growth of psychiatry. Much of the basic work was done in the Paris school and in the Nancy school. Here, Charcot defined the Historical Disposition (13, p. 402), and Liebeault defined the nature of suggestibility (13, p. 403). This work provided the basis necessary for the conception of the relationship prevalent between leaders and followers. A few years after, two more works were completed dealing with similar aspects of group relations. One study was done by Sighele (13, p. 405), in which he defined the "criminal crowd." The other study was done by LeBon (Murphy, 1949), when he wrote his monumental studies of crowd psychology. It seems evident, then, that it was the work of the clinic that gave the working conceptions from which were finally derived the theory of the crowd mind. The major importance of theories such as these is that they contradict the classical rationalistic conceptions which underlay the major theories of social conduct.

From these beginnings, the history of modern group psychology can be divided into three basic phases. The first phase occurred at the beginning of the century and was characterized by wide-ranging theoretical speculations based
upon uncontrolled observations. Attempts were made to explain almost all of the many and varied forms of human behavior ranging from courtship to politics and war. Even with this broad area, many of the observers built their theoretical systems on foundations consisting of a small number of explanatory principles.

Most of the theoretical accounts of this period emphasized three supposedly basic processes. These were sympathy, imitation, and suggestion. Various actions of an individual were said to be instances of a certain category of behavior, and the category name was said to be the explanation for the behavior. This type of reasoning said little more than that a person imitated because he imitated. In another illustration, McDougall (10), in his analysis of suggestion, defined suggestion as the adoption of some communicated opinion "in the absence of logically adequate grounds." He contended that the uncritical acceptance of the stated proposition was due to the operation of the instinct of submission.

The second developmental area of group psychology includes another important idea that was prevalent at the turn of the century. Interpretations of particular phenomena were guided by metatheories concerning the nature of men rather than by hypothesis which dealt with precisely defined, somewhat limited variables. Tarde (18) viewed man as being in a semi-hypnotic state in which he would automatically accept suggestions of a dominant model. The social
psychology of the present day has given the individual intellect a much more important position. Thinking and reasoning instigate and steer behavior in addition to providing post hoc excuses for it.

By the time of the First World War, group psychologists had begun to enter the laboratory. They felt that their main objective was dealing with the responses of individuals to stimuli associated with other people. Many of the first experiments done were concerned with the various effects of the presence of others upon a person's activities. Allport (1) expressed his system in response terminology. The accelerated performance by people working side by side was largely due to peripheral phenomena which Allport utilized. He felt that an increased social stimulation, caused by the presence of others engaged in similar activity, was produced.

Mead (11) stressed the role of symbolic activity in social interaction. Although he called himself a "social behaviorist", he insisted that symbolic response processes were essential to distinctively human behavior. He also pointed out that experiences that are shared by the members of a group play a very important part in the thinking of an individual. Because of these common experiences, the individual's verbalizations invoke similar responses in his listeners and in himself. Thus, by holding internal conversation with himself, he is able to anticipate the actions
of others. Such a wide and varied use of this concept makes it not at all surprising that its meaning is far from precise, and little agreement exists as to exactly how it should be defined (14).

The end of the behavioristic dominance over social psychology came with the advent of World War Two. By the late 1940's, phenomenological analysis had become the major premise for group study. This was primarily due to the thinking and studies of the Gestalt-oriented researchers. The emphasis at this time and up to the present was upon the subject's understanding of his situation. How the objective stimulus conditions affect individual cognition, and the effect of these cognitions upon behavior were of major concern at this time. Phenomenological analysis stresses the importance of considering interpretations, beliefs, and understanding. However, all do not necessarily agree in picturing man as frequently acting in a rational manner. Asch (2) insisted that man's intellect cannot be denied. The associationistic interpretation of prestige-suggestion assumes that a fixed object of judgement has experienced only a change in evaluation. Asch (3) argued that giving the subject the name of the author of a statement may actually cause the formation of a context affecting the interpretation of the statement. This theme can be carried one step further in explaining instances of imitation or other prestige effects. The copying actions of a prestigeful
figure or in some way adopting his opinions may be a rational attempt at problem-solving. If a person does not know what response to make in an ambiguous situation, he might do well to copy the actions of someone else who has had a history of success on similar tasks. If this person's behavior had been correct in the past, chances are that his behavior at the present situation will also be correct (9).

As group psychology developed, psychologists were willing to make inferences about internal processes, so long as these inferences are based upon objective observations and employ carefully defined terms. They no longer maintain that every construct must be denotable. As a result, most psychologists seem to treat the situation-person relation in a similar fashion. As Koch (8) pointed out, a person's behavior in a given situation depends upon his thoughts about the situation or the meaning it has for him.

As a part of the background in contemporary group psychology, consideration of two major theoretical approaches is necessary. The first is a system of conceptions introduced by Moreno (12). He proposes three cardinal ideas, each implemented by research and drawn into a meaningful system to be understood and invariably used for the studies of interpersonal relations. The first of these is the concept of sociometry. Sociometric analysis is used to measure social processes. Somewhat reduced, a sociometric procedure consists of the choice by each person or those persons with whom he or
she would like to be placed in relation to a series of criteria (5, 7). The second of Moreno's conceptions is that of spontaneity testing. Here two individuals are placed together and told to begin a conversation. Various parts of their conversation are studied to determine the degree of plasticity of each individual. From this, we come to the third major conception, that of spontaneity training. Moreno sees the individual as a once fluid and flexible being who, with age, has hardened. Spontaneity training has been developed to restore the flexibility that is so necessary in our everyday interactions. The vehicle for this training is the drama. The drama is presented without detailed plot, written lines, or sharply defined roles. Sociometry has spread with great rapidity through American psychology, especially in the area of intergroup and intragroup relations (4, 16, 956).

The second major theoretical approach to be considered was advanced by Festinger (6, p. 271). He is credited for the first systematic argument for cognitive instigation of behavior. In discussing informal social communication arising from "pressures toward uniformity in a group," he advanced two major reasons why a group member would want such uniformity: first, for group locomotion, and second, in order to achieve a social definition of reality.

If a person decided to find the validity of his beliefs, but had no physical means of doing so, he would have to rely
on a social definition of reality. He could feel sure that his belief was correct if it was shared by all or most of the members of the group to which he referred this belief or attitude. As Festinger (6, p. 275) commented, "the difficulty is to define in a non-circular fashion which groups are appropriate reference groups for a particular opinion or attitude." The likelihood of a group serving as a referent for a person is a function of the group's attractiveness or its cohesiveness, and the relevance of the opinion to the group's functioning. Festinger, using these as a basis, advanced a set of interrelated hypotheses. These hypotheses deal with the magnitude of pressures to communicate, the choice of the recipient for the communications, the determinants of opinion change in the communication recipient, and the magnitude of tendencies to reject non-conformers. Pestinger (7) also indicated that an individual possesses a drive by which he can evaluate his own opinions and abilities in this regard.

In this period of very great activity and conflicting theoretical formulations, many began to turn to the great systematic psychologies for their key to specific problems of social psychology. One thing however, that was greatly needed if the earlier empirical studies were to be brought into a unified, systematic form, was a definition of the nature of social responses so formulated as to bring laboratory studies into full alignment with observations made in
the field. Such a definition was carefully developed and advanced by Sherif (17). Sherif at this time had begun to note the influence of the group upon the individual at the level of social perception. The observation gave rise to the idea that the individual learns to perceive as a member of his cultural group must perceive. He also made use of the autokinetic effect (16). This effect is governed by the factors of previous learning and of present attitude. By placing an individual in the company of others, he showed that the individual is progressively molded into the group's way of thinking. In other research, (15, 16) he found that under group conditions of work, the norms and variabilities which had characterized the individual when alone were rapidly forced in a direction determined by others in the group. He stressed the point that groupness was a function of the development of governing norms and a status hierarchy which was accepted by the members of the group in order to fulfill the need or to accomplish the goal for which the group was formed.

Social relations as such are the foundations of behavior. They tend to limit certain types of behavior in one instance, and permit certain types in the other instance. Individuals affiliate themselves with group activities and their behavior is altered as a result. Within the group, we accept certain roles or responsibilities. We assume a position in the group's hierarchical structure.
Definition of Terms

A Group -- A number of individuals in a social situation who arrange themselves in a somewhat stabilized status and role relationship, and who possess a set of values or norms which controls the activities of the members of the group at least in matters of consequence to the group (16).

Statement of Hypothesis

The following hypothesis was investigated: that a number of individuals collectively as a social unit will become a group through the development of somewhat stabilized status and role relationships, and the establishment of a normative system which controls the activities of the members of the group at least in matters of consequence to the group.
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CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects consisted of sixteen boys between the ages of eleven years and fourteen years of age. These boys were members of a local Boy Scout troop that was meeting in a residential area of Dallas, Texas. The Troop had not met for some time at the time that this study began. It was in the process of reorganizing, and presented an opportunity for studying the methods that were utilized during this reorganization. Some of the boys had been members of the previous troop, however, most were new to the program. The newness of the participants combined with the basic scouting program lent itself well to the study of group development at this age level.

The boys at no time knew that they were the objects of study. Very few adults had knowledge of the study, and those were informed out of necessity in order to initiate the study void of extra problems. The author assumed the character of an untrained, uninformed assistant scoutmaster who knew nothing about the scouting program. He was in no way represented as an authority figure. The subjects were not made aware of the method or nature of the study. This was successfully maintained throughout.
It was known that the majority of these boys came from homes of the middle lower, upper lower, or lower middle class. Most of them attended the same school or saw each other frequently. Many of them entered the troop along with a friend, or because many of their friends were already members. There was a mixture of White American, and Latin American boys in the troop. Except for a few isolated instances, the racial difference seemed to have little affect upon the general picture or outcome of the study.

The boys were homogenous in that they all were within the same age range, and came to the troop in order to derive something from it. What they wanted to derive, and what they finally did derive constitute the basis for heterogeneity of this sample. The boys evidenced little internal organization upon entering into the troop situation, and if the hypothesis is correct will develop the proper organization to handle their needs as time progresses and the situations permit.

Apparatus

The apparatus used was of two main types. The first type consisted of specially designed test and retest procedures to measure the development of status and role relationships. The second type involved personal recorded observations of the development of the troop with regard to the evolution, through time, and a normative system of behavior which tended to govern the members of the troop in
matters of importance to the troop. The observations are factually recorded rather than subjectively estimated, and interpreted logically to show the emergence of norms within the troop as it developed from a collective interaction situation along the continuum of groupness.

For the test/retest procedures, two devices were used. The first device was used in order to obtain a sociometric analysis. It consisted of a three by five, white index card, on which was obtained choice status and rejection information as well as background information (see Appendix I). The choice status information was obtained in both social and skill criterion areas. Rejection information was obtained only in the social area. The background information consisted of such other pertinent data as age, time in the troop, rank and position, and school attended.

The sociometric analysis was used to show the changes in relationships between the boys from the time that they first came together in a collective situation. They chose rather indiscriminately between and within the troop's subdivisions. Once they had achieved a degree of groupness, their choosing was shown to be more discriminate, and hence their status hierarchy was more sharply defined. At this point the leaders had emerged and had been recognized, and the rejects had been relegated to their position in the ranking. This analysis also yielded information concerning
the morale of the unit, and the realistic nature of their choosing as they became a group.

The second testing device used was the *How Well We Know Each Other* scale (see Appendix II). It was designed for two main purposes. This scale served to provide information on the acquaintance volume of each person in the troop, and also for a cross-check on the previously explained sociometric analysis. The scale indicated the volume of friends that each person had and showed how many of the total membership were known to other members. If the unit is to become a group, it is assumed that the acquaintance volume for the troop will increase over time. The members of the group must know each other in order to discriminate adequately and establish a hierarchy of status. The sociometric cross-check simply provided additional detailed information to substantiate that which was already collected.

The other extensive method of study used besides the sociometric analysis was the recorded observations. The strict procedures employed in performing these observations were outlined by Sherif (1). Excerpts of this procedure and the methods involved are included herein (see Appendix V). The observational method was used because it provided the opportunity to gather factual information concerning the processes inherent in group formation that are difficult to obtain in a strict testing situation. It was realized that there are many boundaries that an adult cannot cross in a
child's world no matter how skilled he is in testing. The same is true in collecting observational data but not to the same degree. The method of observation by an individual who is perceived as representing little authority or knowledge allows a much deeper penetration into the depths of interpersonal relations as they develop than do other methods of assessment. The observations are recorded without the knowledge of the subjects. Fact is separated from inference, and interpreted only in the light of the totality of information written and observed. This method was utilized to study and assess the development of a normative system of behavior as the unit became a group. The actions, the comments, the interaction between the members were felt to yield some of the most valuable information about group development. Such information was recorded and presented (see Appendix III). Observations were further exemplified with other illustrations as well as was possible (see Appendix IV).

Procedure

The procedure consisted of the administration of the sociometric cards, the How Well We Know Each Other scale, and continuous recorded behavioral observations. The tests were administered at the beginning and at the completion of the eight month study. Observational information was maintained on a regular basis throughout. The tests were designed to provide information about the ways in which a given number of boys become a group over a period of time. The
tests therefore were administered without warning and with
the explanation that the information would be used to better
the troop through knowledge of how the members felt.

The sociometric test and the *How Well We Know Each*
*Other* scale were administered simultaneously at the earliest
possible meeting of the troop. This early testing was neces-
sary in order to accurately measure the level of groupness,
if any, of the boys. The results of this testing gave the
basis from which a change toward group structure could be
seen when compared with the retest results. Near the end of
the eight month period of study, the second battery of tests
was administered.

Both sets of tests were then correlated across and
between the resultant scores. The intra-correlations were
used to infer relationships between the various areas of
group development at the early as well as the later stages
of group development. The inter-correlations were used pri-
marily to show the change in the relationship between the
boys as a function of their continued interaction, and hence
the amount of group development. This information substan-
tiated by the observational data, and the observational data
conversely substantiated by the correlation information,
served as a basis from which the degree of group development
could be inferred.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Description of Data

The data were gathered and analyzed according to the procedures outlined in Chapter II. The results tend to support the hypothesis of group development through interaction, formation of a normative system of values and the establishment of a status hierarchy. Diagrams and charts are provided to illustrate this developmental pattern. Continuous observational reports (See Appendix III, Fig. 1, 2, 3) sustain the statistical findings as well as add additional pertinent information. The photographs which are included (see Appendix IV, Fig. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) again testify to the pattern of growth maintained by this unit in its approach to a state of groupness. Although the degree of groupness was low at the point that this analysis was made, there are definite indications that it will increase with time. Additional data collected subsequent to the post test session, but which are not included here because time did not permit proper analysis, substantiate this prediction of group growth. In addition, the stabilization of supervisory leadership, as well as the growth of the group membership, point in a similar direction.
Inspection and careful analysis of the accompanying charts and tables will show the developmental sequence of this troop. Appendix VII, Fig. 1, shows the total choices given and total choices received during the pre-test session as compared with Appendix VIII, Fig. 1, which gives the same information concerning the post-test session. When compared, it is evident that, not only are more choices given and received by the recognized leaders of the group, but also there is effective discrimination against those whom the group deems as undesirable. The variation of feelings is not as pronounced in the more mature group, and this is indicated by the adequate discrimination between the top and bottom of the social ladder.

The choice status of this group is broken down further in Appendices IX, Fig. 1 and 2; X, Fig. 1 and 2; and XI, Fig. 1 and 2. The correlation between the skill choices given in the pre-test, and the choices given in the post-test is .11. The correlation between the social choices given in the pre-test and those in the post-test session is .26. Correlations between skill and social choices received in both the pre- and post-test sessions is .55, and .07 respectively. The low level of the correlations indicated a change. The respective charts showed that this change was represented by an increase of choices given and received between the testing sessions. Also shown in the graphs (see Appendix X, Fig. 1 and 2 and XI, Fig. 1 and 2) is the rejections given at
each test session. The correlation between the rejections given was .54, and between rejections received was .52. A slight change in rejection discrimination is apparent, and would be expected as a social unit becomes a group. A presentation of the differences in total rejections received on the pre- and post-test sessions is presented in Appendix XII, Fig. 7, and XIII, Fig. 8. Rejects for the pre-test comprised 28.5 per cent of the total responses given during this session. The rejections given during the post-test session constitute about 44.6 per cent of the total responses or an increase of 16.1 per cent in the second session. This would be indicative of group development through the establishment of a normative system and status hierarchy which prescribes for certain types of activities for members, and realistically discriminates against those who do not conform and are therefore in disfavor with the group.

As the rejection discrimination increases, it would also be expected that the mutual choices made by the members would increase also. Mutual choice data were compiled by choice status and rejection criteria. It was expected that as a group matures the choices and the rejections would be realistically seen by all or most of the membership. Appendix XIV, Fig. 9 and 10, shows the mutual choices between members in both test sessions. Appendix XV, Fig. 11 and 12, shows the mutual rejections for the same period. The findings tend to support the expectations. The mutual choices
in the pre-test session comprise 42 per cent of the total choices, whereas in the post-test session, the mutual choices had increased by 13 per cent to 55 per cent of the total choices. On the other hand, in the pre-test session there were no mutual rejections made whatsoever. In the post-testing sessions the discrimination between members in the form of rejections had increased to 37.9 per cent of the total rejection choices, and to 30 per cent of the total choices given.

An additional area of inquiry in determining groupness is the degree to which members of the group are not chosen by the other members. They are isolated, yet not rejected. This was also an important indicator that the group was sorting out those of best regard from those of least regard in some systematic way. Appendices XVI, Fig.11, and XVII, Fig. 12, show the results pertaining to isolation of members on both the social and the skill criteria obtained during the pre-test. There was only 6.3 per cent isolation. This increased, and during the post-test session there was shown to be 25 per cent social isolation, and 31.2 per cent skill isolation. Table I presents this data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Choices Received</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Choices Received</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Choices Received</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejections Received</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Choices Received</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Rejections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolates - skill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolates - social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the other basic considerations in showing group development is the evolution of a status hierarchy based on both the social and skill choice criteria. Additional data were obtained on the hierarchy formation with this troop. The status shift from low to high tends to support the original hypothesis concerning stable hierarchy formation of a maturing group. The charts of these hierarchies are presented in Appendices XVIII, Fig. 13; XIX, Fig. 14; and Appendices XX, Fig. 15; and XXI, Fig. 16. The comparative statistics are presented in Table II.
**TABLE II**

**CHOICE HIERARCHIES ON SOCIAL AND SKILL CRITERION DURING PRE AND POST TEST SESSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp%</td>
<td>Act%</td>
<td>Exp%</td>
<td>Act%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper 25</td>
<td>30-65</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>30-65</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Upper,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 per cent</td>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lower,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 per cent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp%</td>
<td>30-65</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>30-65</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp%</td>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Expected
**Actual

In addition to the other signs of groupness, the acquaintance level of the group as a whole gives evidences concerning the interaction between members. It was expected that as the group matures its members will know more of the other members than at an earlier stage of development. The expectations are also fulfilled. Appendices XXII, Fig. 17 and XXIII, Fig. 18, show the relationship between the acquaintance levels before and after a state of groupness was achieved. Table III also summarizes these findings.
TABLE III

AVERAGE MEMBER ACQUAINTANCE LEVEL FOR PRE AND POST TESTING SESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Session</th>
<th>Know</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. No.*</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Test Session</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Test Session</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average Number

Discussion

This study in its entirety lends support to the theories of Sherif (2, 3) concerning the spontaneous emergence of a group system due to the interaction of its group members. Support is also apparent to the studies of Bonney (1) regarding the sociometric indicators of groupness. This study, however, was limited by the fact that the troop met only one time each week, and therefore could only be observed during this time. The data collected in the form of test items and observations do reflect what was occurring within the troop situation. They cannot, however, account for the variable activity occurring outside the troop meeting and hence affecting the interaction of the members during the regular meetings. This was realized at the outset, and the data were interpreted accordingly. Special care was taken to exact the actual meanings behind the overt interactions of
the boys. There are many boundaries beyond which an adult observer cannot move. For this reason, every effort was taken to eliminate as many of the possible blockages to the collection of valid data as was possible. This was accomplished through the use and maintenance of inconspicuousness and lack of authority on the part of the experimenter. As a result, many observations were recorded concerning relationships present between the boys. This would not have been possible if the boys had been concerned with being revealed openly.

As the troop was being organized, it experienced a number of changes in the quality of adult leadership. This was one reason that the results were not as exact as they might have been. The strength of the theory, however, is seen in that it is supported regardless of this problem, even though to a lesser degree than would have been expected under ideal conditions.

The results, even though they are in support of the basic hypothesis, do not represent a finality of group development. Only a degree of groupness had been attained at the point of the post-test session. The results, however, do suggest a trend and an eventual movement toward a higher level of groupness. As the interaction between the members increase, and the status and role relationships become more sharply defined with reference to the group's value system, this movement toward higher level groupness will take place.
The basic elements inherent are time and interaction. Under most situations, a high degree of groupness is not attained within a short time period. Time must elapse during which the members are allowed to interact and form stable relationships. This troop, during the brief time that this study was performed evidenced some interaction and relationship formation. The process is, of course, not complete. As the members interact with each other, and begin to set goals, and attempt to accomplish them, the degree of groupness will increase markedly.

The knowledge of the functional relationships which will become apparent in a small group situation provides much insight into the patterns of human behavior in everyday life. The understanding of such concepts as pride, prejudice, values, leadership, and what actually happens when man meets man, will be the end results of continued studies in areas such as this. To understand why a person is as he is, and why his relationships with others are what they are, the why and how of interaction theory must be studied and investigated in the realms of the small informal group.

Conclusion

As seen from the data, this troop of boys has made some marked changes in their overall organization. They have become more discriminating between those of high status, and between those of low status within the basic realms of social
and skill criterion. Norms for behavior have begun to emerge, and those who did not conform to the basic system were isolated from the rest of the membership. This social situation, containing a somewhat stabilized status hierarchy, and possessing norms which control the actions of the members of the group, supports the original hypothesis that over a period of time, if people are brought together in a social situation for a common purpose to which all are to some degree committed, a status hierarchy, and a normative system will emerge, and hence this social unit will have attained a degree of groupiness.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

This study tested the hypothesis that a number of individuals collectively as a social unit will become a group through the development of somewhat stabilized status and role relationships, and the establishment of a normative system which controls the activities of the members of the group at least in matters of consequence to the group. Sixteen boys between the ages of eleven years and fourteen years of age who were members of a local Boy Scout troop that was being organized, served as subjects for this study. They were at no time aware that this study was being made, or that they were the subjects involved therein. All test information was gathered under the guise of general information needed about the desires of the membership. All observational data was recorded without the knowledge of the troop members.

The boys were subjected to sociometric analysis at both pre and post testing sessions spread approximately six to eight months apart. Continuous observations were made and recorded concerning their interaction with each other during this period of time. At the end of the testing sessions, the sociometric data were compared with the information gained by observational technique.
The results of the sociometric and observational procedures tend to support the original hypothesis of group information and give added credence to the theories proposed and tested by Sherif (2, 3), and by Bonney (1), with regard to degrees of groupness and interaction. Many problems were apparent in the analysis of the data. The changing quality of the adult leadership, and the non-measurable interaction which undoubtedly occurred outside the troop meetings were two of the major ones. Even with these external problems, the basic theory still found support as indicated by the comparative data which is presented. A degree of groupness was still formulated out of what was at first a collective interaction situation consisting of individuals who were doing things for individual reasons. As indicated, the degree of groupness measured between the pre and post test sessions is not to be considered as a finality of development. It is rather indicative of a trend which, if maintained, will function to provide a basis for higher level grouping.

The results as presented, indicate that interaction between individuals in a social situation, who have come together for a common purpose, or who have something to gain by membership will tend to influence them at least within the group situation. This type of basic understanding concerning the interaction between individuals provides wide latitude for the understanding of small group activities in a wide variety of situations.
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APPENDIX I

SOCIOMETRIC DATA CARD USED DURING BOTH
PRE TEST AND POST TEST SESSIONS

1. Last Name, First Name, Middle Initial. Age (yr. & Mo.).
   Rank. Telephone.

2. Address.

3. Dallas, Texas.

4. How many brothers and sisters do you have?

5. What school do you attend? What grade are you in?

6. List the name or names of the person or persons who you
   would most like to have as a tent-mate.

7. List the name or names of the person or persons who you
   would most like to have work with you on a project in
   the troop.

8. List the name or names of the person or persons who you
   would most not like to have as a tent-mate.

9. Today's date.
APPENDIX II - FIG. 1

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

TROOP NUMBER

HOW WELL WE KNOW EACH OTHER

Directions (part 1): Print 3, 2, 1 or 0 opposite each name to show - 3 means know very well; 2 means know fairly well; 1 means know slightly; 0 means know not at all. You are not limited to one person for each number.

Directions (part 2): Show who the person or persons are who you would like to have help you set up your campsite when on a campout by putting 3 for first choice; 2 for second choice; 1 for third choice; 0 if unable to make a choice: X if you would not like to have this person help you set up your campsite.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>PART 1</th>
<th>PART 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***NOTE: IN THE FIRST SPACE AFTER YOUR OWN NAME INDICATE HOW LONG YOU HAVE BEEN IN THE TROOP.**
The committee of the Troop met tonight to discuss the problem of leadership in the organization. Very little of my significance evolved from this meeting. Those who were present at this meeting included: Mr. MacElverne, assistant district commissioner for this area, a middle aged man with good intentions and a lot of "tales to tell"; Pastor Dick Atkinson, institutional representative and religious leader of the local Methodist Church that sponsored the troop. He is extremely interested in the well-being of this troop; Jesse Hernandez, an interested scouter of good scouting background who was to take over this ailing troop but decided against it at least as Scoutmaster. He agreed to give assistance to any degree that he could; J. D. Vincent, an interested party with a boy in the troop but without any time to devote to actual troop leadership other than on the committee work because of his job; Tommy Thomson, a retired Army Sergeant with two boys scouting age. An interested individual but unable to give any direct assistance to the troop other than on the committee because of his job schedule.
With a little assistance from the author, the body agreed that the most important thing to accomplish at the present time was to resume troop meetings for the benefit of the boys involved. It was agreed to hold a troop meeting next week and to invite some prospective scoutmasters that were suggested. At this time it was hoped that one of them would agree to help take over the troop.

Special thanks should be extended by the author to the Reverend Dick Atkinson for his help and encouragement as well as interest in this group study.
The boys gathered at the scout hut at about 7:30. The troop had not been meeting for about a month. About 16 boys showed up; a bunch of the old boys and some new boys. A number of boys had received cards in the mail telling them of the organization of the troop. The first order of business was to get the scout hut into some semblance of order. It had been under some repair. The boys were to get into two patrols. The boys were allowed to choose the patrol that they would like to be in for tonight's work. The majority of the boys chose to be in one patrol while four particular boys chose to be in the other patrol. We had a patrol of four boys and a patrol of 12 boys. The four boys in the patrol were: Sailor, who was Fred Z.; Bruno, who was Gary W.; Bruno, who was Fred W.; and Shorty, who was Arthur M.. These fellows were in one bunch and the rest of the boys were in the other patrol. One thing that was evident among the Latin-American boys was a very close tie or perhaps a cohesiveness of sorts. They all chose to be together in one patrol except for Fred Z. and Arthur M.. It was noted that the four man patrol worked very little together on the project of cleaning up the scout hut. Most of these boys worked individually on a project or integrated partly in with another patrol. Very little working together occurred with these people. On the other hand, the other patrol, especially the Mexican or Latin-American fellows, worked together quite well and got the job done. It was noted that they tended to work with members of their own patrol in accomplishing their tasks. About fifteen minutes after the meeting had actually gotten started, two late-comers arrived at the scout hut. These fellows were new scouts and this was their first time at a scout meeting. They were told to join in and help wherever they could without being assigned to a particular patrol. They seemed to have a little trouble at first getting in with the other patrols, but as the evening progressed they seemed to be accepted for the most part into the bunch. They were not assigned a particular patrol but seemed to work into the project well. As mentioned before the Mexican boys seemed to be very cohesive and stay and work together quite well; better than any other one sub unit observed. The boys in general seemed to be aware of my presence. They would turn to my direction when they were about to do something almost as if to get my permission or to see if I would say anything about it. They seemed to be aware of my walking around and observing their actions. I entered into little or no conversation with
any of the boys. I attempted to stay as much in the "shadows" as possible without arousing suspicion, and without asking any questions at all of the boys. I moved from this aspect. I think that it is reasonable to assume that in the coming weeks with this same approach that my presence will become of less importance to them. The game period came about and the individuals did play a game. They split up into teams and the object of the game was for each team to guide its members through a maze of chairs within a given time period. Very little cohesion within the teams was evident at first. But as each team began adding scores to their respective side, the members of each team began to "pull" for their own team and the cohesion of the teams in this manner began to increase. Much cheering and coaching appeared as the game progressed and finally climaxed. As the evening progressed, Hood began to emerge as some sort of a leader-type. Not so in any other way other than in a sort of physical way. The boys hesitated to do that which he told them not to do. He seemed to be able to push the other boys around and arrange them as he pleased without them giving him too much static. One incident that was noted concerned Blackey and a couple of other boys. Blackey was sitting next to Joey H. and they seemed to be shoving and pushing each other around and then Joey called Blackey some sort of a name that was racially uncomplementary due to the fact that Blackey was a Mexican. I believe that although Blackey did not put up a fight, being somewhat smaller than Joey, that they exchanged words. Then two other boys, Sailor and Bruno, coming to the defense of Joe, said to Blackey that he ought to "keep his mouth shut", indicating perhaps a dislike, a racial problem to be studied further in somewhat greater detail later on. A dislike of this nature of a new boy such as Blackey is more than likely a carryover from the classroom. These boys all do go to the same school and because of this, perhaps the above cited incident can be explained.

Next week it is planned that an acquaintance scale be administered to the boys. This week information cards were gathered and this information will be analyzed. The week following, the Peer Nomination Inventory will be administered and this should give me some information to work with in establishing the group organization. All of this will be backed observationally. My observational findings will be backed with my collected sociometric finding and Peer Nomination Inventory findings, and vice versa. Information was also gathered tonight concerning advisors' ratings of the boys with special regard to the top and bottom of the status hierarchy within the troop. The Institutional representative consented to rate the boys that he was familiar with. This included mainly the boys that were members of the "old guard" that had been in the troop before and had returned. It seems fairly complete rating with a little character sketch of each as he is perceived by
the rater. This will be compared to the sociometric data from the cards that were collected on which the boys were to choose a social activity partner, such as who they would like to have as a tentmate, and a skill involving activity partner, such as who they would like to have work with them on a project in the troop. Also a negative rating was obtained in which they listed the person or persons that they would most not like to have as a tentmate. Sociometric analysis will be set up immediately on these and further studies made.
APPENDIX IV

ILLUSTRATIVE PICTURES

Picture #1
An Attempt at Patrol Organization

Picture #2
Patrol Pride—"It's My Patrol"

Picture #3
Lack of Norms—No Reason To Learn
These new boys must know these
knots in order to attain Membership.

Picture #4
An early attempt at an emotional experience
Picture #5
A Later Picture Showing the contrast between Patrol Organizations and Wearing of the Uniforms

Picture #6
Attentive to the Scoutmaster by Patrols

Picture #7
A Presentation to the Boy Leaders of the Troop

Picture #8
Presentation of Awards to the Younger Boys made by the Older Boy Leaders. A Step Toward Cohesion.
APPENDIX V

EXCERPTS FROM THE INSTRUCTIONS TO OBSERVERS OF GROUPS BY SHEHIF AND SHEHIF (64)

1. A group must be singled out for intensive study through your own observations of repeated associations of the same set of boys.

2. Observation is the method for gaining information about a group or its members. The only direct questioning permissible in this phase is of individuals unrelated to the site of observation or boys observed.

3. Observation should include special alertness to any information that comes your way without asking for it directly.

4. Establish an initial base of operations in the area selected for study.

5. Observe the interactions among boys primarily between the ages of 13 to 18 years.

6. To help remember the individuals you see, it may be helpful to assign nicknames or tags that seem to characterize their appearance to you.

7. Do not approach group members or others who know them with direct questions about them or their activities.

8. At this stage, if individuals approach you, you should not only respond but carefully record the entire incident.
9. Your appearance in the particular locale should be from the very start as natural and self-evident as possible.

10. Once a recurrent pattern of interaction is spotted in one place, it should be followed to other locations and activities.

11. Write down what you actually observe. If you have impressions, comments, or evaluations, write them also, but specify that you are making an inference or a judgement.

12. Your role is not that of a leader, and not of a participant observer, as far as the group members are concerned. As far as they are concerned, your role is not that of an observer for a scientific study. Try first to have the group members take your presence in their vicinity as harmless. Suspicion they may manifest toward you or resistance to establishing rapport may in fact be proportional to their solidarity, and may, therefore, indicate how closely knit the group is.
1. The primary precaution to heed in all observation is to insure that at no time individuals being observed and others related to them become aware that they are being studied.

2. The observer should not take notes in the range of vision of the individuals being observed.

3. All observations should be written down or dictated on tape as soon as possible after the observation period is completed. Write fully and as completely as possible.

4. Adults in the area must be advised not to tell others of the study.

5. Observer must not in any way appear as an authority figure in the group. He should put himself in a "trainee" position.

6. Observer should not be in competition with the adults in charge of the group activities.

7. A pretext should be developed by the observer for being in the area that the group being studied is occupying. It should be as truthful and as natural as possible to avoid being trapped by contradictions later.
8. Your actions should in no way suggest that you are an investigator.

9. The observer's aim should be to develop a relationship with group members such that he is regarded by them as harmless, as well-wishing, as helpful on occasion, but not as a member of the group.

10. Never initiate activities for the group unless such activities are deliberately planned in the study for a particular phase.

11. Always avoid showing like, dislike, or favoritism.

12. Group members do not expect nonmembers to follow group customs, but they will not reveal those that might be unacceptable if you pass value judgements on members' behavior.
Fig. 2--Total Sociometric Choices Given and Received During Pre Test Session.
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Fig. 1 — Scouts Skill

Fig. 4 — Sociometric Choices Given and Received on the Skill and Social Criteria for the Pre Test Session.
Fig. 1 -- Scouts' Skill

Fig. 5 -- Sociometric Choices Given and Received on the Skill and Social Criteria for the Post Test Session.
Fig. 1  Scouts Pre Test

Fig. 2  Scouts Post Test

Fig. 6--Sociometric Rejections Given and Received for the Pre and Post Test Sessions.
Fig. 7—Total Sociometric Rejections Received During the Pre Test Session.
Fig. 8—Total Sociometric Rejections Received During the Post Test Session
Fig. 9—Mutual Choices Received During the Pre and Post Test Sessions.
Fig. 1 — Scouts — Pre Test

Fig. 10 — Mutual Rejections Received During the Pre and Post Test Sessions.
Fig. 11—Isolates on Skill Criterion for Pre and Post Test Sessions.
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Fig. 12--Isolates on Social Criterion for Pre and Post Test Sessions.
Fig. 13. Choice Status Hierarchy Pre-Testing Session.
Fig. 14--Choice Status Hierarchy Pre Testing Session Social Criterion.
Fig. 15--Choice Status Hierarchy Post Testing Session Skill Criteria.
Fig. 16—Choice Status Hierarchy Post Testing Session
Social Criteria.
APPENDIX XXII

Fig. 17--Acquaintance Level for Pre and Post Test Sessions, Positive.
Fig. 18—Acquaintance Level for Pre and Post Test Sessions, Negative.
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