

~~2-121~~

MAY 10 1963

124

ABSTRACT

GROUP PRACTICES AND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE A CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS

By

Richard Shields Hurst

This thesis attempts to examine distributive justice as a social phenomenon collectively constructed by social actors while interacting with one another. This view differs from the traditional distributive justice literature in that the central focus here is on group processes rather than the additive outcome of individuals' independent thinking (i.e., reactions, consequences, reciprocity, etc.). Virtually all of the theoretical and experimental work done concerning distributive justice has made the assumption that individuals carry with them a stock of ready-made cognitions (either local or referential) about how socially valued rewards are or ought to be distributed. This assumption has somehow led to an observational shift of the observers' attention to focusing primarily on the outcome of distributive justice behavior, instead of how outcomes are achieved by individuals. In this way, inferences about individuals' cognitions are made from observing only the resolutions to reward allocation problems.

To avoid the problem of making conjectural inferences about distributive justice based on indirect observation, this thesis offers an experimental method for creating a more

empirically grounded theoretical base. This proposed method hinges on the idea that the distributive justice phenomenon consists of, and is produced by, members' talk, utterances, gestures and whatever else is involved in a conversation. However, most of the analysis here is devoted to members' talk.

Accordingly, a conversational analysis was used to make sense out of the collected data. Tape recordings of conversations about a particular distributive justice problem were analyzed and used to demonstrate that the manner in which groups go about and collectively achieve conclusions about distributive justice problems is crucial for an understanding of the distributive justice phenomenon. Using the conversational data base also provided a much broader analysis than what could have been obtained by using a conventional survey or experimental design.

The results of the experimental design used in this study show that group decisions about distributive justice do not follow a type of stimulus-response pattern. Rather, decisions about distributive justice are collectively constructed, in an orchestrated fashion, by the use of certain group practices. In addition, these decisions were both situational and circumstantial, or more specifically, the results reflected the experimental context in which group decisions were made. Nonetheless, the findings clearly show the socially constructed nature of the distributive justice phenomenon.

These major findings strongly suggest that the group practices found in this study are practices common to other phenomena as well. Other various decision-making groups may in fact use the same group practices as the ones described in this study. In this regard, the thrust of this thesis emphasizes group practices and the usability of conversational data as a basic resource for doing sociology. It is not that the distributive justice phenomenon is any less central to the analysis, but that more work needs to be done before any conclusive statements could be made.

GROUP PRACTICES AND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE:
A CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS

By

Richard Shields Hurst

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1977

TO MY WIFE CAROL

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to my major professor and friend, Dr. Bo Anderson who made the completion of this thesis possible. His patience, encouragement, and intellectual guidance provided me with a solid basis for doing sociological work. I would also like to extend my sincere appreciation to my committee members, Drs. Peter K. Manning and Albert B. Robillard for their help in editing, commenting, and guidance.

A special acknowledgment goes to my wife Carol for her total dedication and support in seeing this project through. I deeply appreciate her many hours of arduous work spent typing and proofreading this thesis. In addition, I would like to thank my parents Helen and Clyde, Ben and Mary Schoenbachler, John and Joviannia Bianco, Thomas and Donna Fishburn, Cliff and Diana Garoupa, Chris Vanderpool, Dugan Weber and Bob Fischer for their moral support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Distributive Justice Theory: A Brief Overview	3
Rethinking the Distributive Justice Problem	5
II. METHOD AND DESIGN I	8
Characteristics of the Participants	8
Recruitment Procedures	8
Experimental Setting	9
The Task	9
Experimental Procedures	12
Debriefing the Participants	16
Comments on Design I	17
III. METHOD AND DESIGN II	20
The Task Revised	20
Experimental Procedures Revised	21
Comments on Design II	25
IV. EVALUATION OF PROCEDURES	27
The Difficulty of the Task	27
The Amount of Interaction	29
V. SOME RESULTS	34
Interpretation	35
Surmising	39
Self-Reference	42
Other-Reference	44
Summing-Up	45
Consistency Work	47
Ordering of the Practices	49
VI: GENERAL GROUNDS AND DESCRIPTIVE ACCOUNTS	53
Grounds for Scholarship Allocation	56
General Grounds and Group Practices	60
Contrived Setting	64
VIII: CONCLUSIONS	67

Part	Page
APPENDICES	72
Appendix A: Characteristic Matrix	72
Appendix B: Scholarship Applications	73
Appendix C: Preliminary Interview Guide	77
Appendix D: Final Decision Interview Guide	79
Appendix E: Post-Experimental Interview Guide	81
Appendix F: Revised Scholarship Application Form	83
Appendix G: Information List	84
Appendix H: Transcripts of Experiment 4	87
LIST OF REFERENCES	114

PART I: INTRODUCTION

In a study of an eastern utilities company, Homans (1953) observed an extremely interesting phenomenon which he described as a "status problem" among clerical workers in a certain company. The Homans study concerned two groups of female clerical workers, cash posters and ledger clerks, in one division of a utilities company. The cash posting job consisted of pulling customer cards and posting the necessary billing entries. The job was both repetitive and monotonous, and required little thought. In sharp contrast, ledger clerks were required to work with customers on problem-solving tasks such as address changes, account information, and billing information. In addition, ledger clerks were required by their supervisors to assist cash posters, at the end of each day, in order to keep the posting up to date.

Ledger clerks were typically much older and had more experience and seniority than the cash posters. Their job was nonrepetitive, and responsible. For this reason, being a ledger clerk involved a promotion from cash poster to ledger clerk. In comparison to cash posters, ledger clerks were then considered to be of higher status because their job involved more responsibility, more thought, and experience in cash posting. In this sense, the ledger clerks were required to do not one, but two jobs. Yet the pay for the ledger clerks and the cash posters was exactly the same, even though ledger

clerks had greater inputs than the cash posters. Hence, the pay scale did not reflect a quantitative or qualitative difference between the inputs of cash posters and ledger clerks.

Homans observed that both cash posters and ledger clerks felt that the amount of pay was very good in comparison to what other companies would pay for the same job type. However, from interviews with ledger clerks, Homans quotes one ledger clerk's complaint which was a typical complaint of all the ledger clerks:

I like the work. There's only one thing I don't like about it. Everybody talks around here as if cash posting was the only job that counted. They take us off stations (ledgers) to work on cash, and they think that the stations can just take care of themselves. The work piles up and you get behind. Of course we've got to get the cash out, but I think the station work is just as important. And it's much more responsible. Cash posting, most of it, is just mechanical, but station work is a responsible job. You have to deal with the customers and with the stores, and if you don't do something right, someone is going to suffer. Of course that's true of cash posting, too, but there are a lot more things that a station clerk has to do. It's a more responsible job, and yet the station clerks get just the same pay as the cash posters. It seems that they ought to get just a few dollars more to show that the job is more important.

Homans (1961) later concluded that what he had observed was a problem of status incongruence where profits (rewards minus costs) were not in line with investments, or more simply, a problem of distributive justice. Although this problem had been voiced by the ledger clerks to both management and their own independent union, nothing was ever done about the inequitable discrepancies between inputs and outcomes. However,

workers eventually voted to join the CIO, which Homans suggests was due to the independent union's inability to resolve the inequity. If wage differentials had been set up according to job evaluation, then it would have been possible to minimize the dissatisfaction of the ledger clerks.

Distributive Justice Theory: A Brief Review

The Homans study of clerical workers gave birth to a wide variety of theoretical notions and experimental possibilities concerning distributive justice. Generally, the distributive justice literature can be organized into three rather different theoretical orientations; cognitive dissonance notions, exchange notions, and status value notions. Each of these orientations have been further elaborated by various theorists; cognitive dissonance theory (as it relates to distributive justice) has been elaborated by such theorists as Patchen (1961), Adams (1963), and Lawler and O'Gara (1967), exchange formulations have been elaborated by Homans (1961), Leventhal et. al. (1969; 1972), Lane and Messe (1972) and Weick (1966), and finally, status value theory has been elaborated by Zelditch and Anderson (1966), Israel (1960), and Burger et. al. (1972).

The result of these three different orientations has been the creation of a vast amount of experimental research by social psychologists in an attempt to ground the theoretical notions with empirical data. For example, there has been experimental work on the reactions to inequitable situations (see Cook, 1973; Leventhal and Bergman, 1969; Schmitt and Marwell, 1972), responses to overpayment and underpayment (see Weick, 1964; Lane

and Messe, 1971; 72; Lawler and O'Gara, 1967), reward allocation and conflict (see Leventhal et. al., 1969; 1972; McCranie and Kimberly, 1973), and the effects of hourly and piece-rate payments (see Adams, 1963; Andrews, 1967; Lawler, 1968; Adams and Rosenbaum, 1962). In general, however, all the aforementioned experimental research have in common (1) contrived conditions, which are perceived to be by the experimenter, states of injustice, and (2) observation of the anticipated outcomes. Since the conditions are contrived in these experiments, there is always a problem of the effect of the experimenter (see Anderson and Shelley, 1970; Goodman and Friedman, 1967; Weiner, 1970). Also, since observation has been restricted to observing only the outcomes, there are measurement problems concerning dependent variables (see Leventhal, Wiess and Long, 1969; Leventhal and Lane, 1970). But, more importantly, what has emerged from the theoretical and experimental literature are the questions "Where does distributive justice theory now stand?" and "What new directions will the experimental research lead us?"

We can find excellent reviews of the distributive justice literature by such authors as Walster et. al. (1973, and Pritchard (1969), but these reviews merely state what the theoretical orientations are, what experimental research has been done, and what are some of the possible directions experimentalists could take. But the distributive justice problem is a much deeper one. All distributive justice notions assume that individuals have either cognitions, or perceptions, or expectations of how

rewards should be allocated. Yet, this idea that subjects may have relevant thoughts pertaining to the distributive justice process, while participating in such experiments, has never been investigated. Accordingly, all experimental work on distributive justice has been done by indirect observation, in that the focus is on the outcome of experiments and not on what individuals say and do while participating in these experiments. Somehow both distributive justice theorists and experimentalists alike have lost sight of the phenomenon of which they attempt to explain. Between the contriving of experimental conditions and the final outcome, the distributive justice phenomenon has occurred, yet there has been no direct observation. Consequently, the theory of distributive justice is left with an unexplained void.

Rethinking the Distributive Justice Problem

Returning once again to the Homans study concerning clerical workers, it is clear that what was once an extremely interesting phenomenon has now become lost in the theoretical and experimental works. It is like reading a novel and anticipating what the outcome of the story will be, the interest comes not from knowing the final outcome, but from how the final outcome is worked out. It would have been of little interest if Homans had reported only that ledger clerks, who had more inputs than cash posters, abandoned their own independent union in favor of joining the CIO. The "facts" of the clerical workers situation did not furnish Homans with complete resources for

understanding the distributive justice phenomenon. It is rather from the conversations with the clerical workers which made it possible for Homans to observe the distributive justice phenomenon. Clerical workers, engaged in talk, have displayed their everyday work-world to Homans. They have produced the distributive justice phenomenon by describing, with talk, their experiences and activities. They have done so not by sophisticated analysis and technical jargon, but by use of practical, common-sensical reasoning.

It is the purpose of this paper to treat distributive justice as a social phenomenon produced by members' everyday talk and understood by the members through practical reasoning. Unlike previous distributive justice literature this study offers no hypotheses. What hypotheses could be offered of a phenomenon which has never been directly observed? Secondly, this study is not concerned with predicting the outcome of the distributive justice phenomenon, but with how members work out the outcome. If distributive justice theory is concerned with the way in which socially valued rewards are allocated to members of a social system, then what is needed is a way of observing the phenomenon in its entirety, a way of observing the distributive justice phenomenon as a social phenomenon. Although this idea has its roots in phenomenology and ethnomethodology, it is not the concern of this study to elaborate principles of phenomenology or ethnomethodology. Again, the sole concern of this study is with the distributive justice phenomenon.

In the next section of this paper an experimental method for directly observing the distributive justice phenomenon is offered. Groups of individuals were given a distributive justice task which was extremely problematic. Accomplishment of this task could only be achieved by group consensus, and consensus requires discussion. It was felt that by making the task extremely problematic it would invoke the distributive justice phenomenon to occur, while at the same time making it possible for the researcher to observe the phenomenon directly. However, it is not being suggested here that this method is the only method for directly observing the phenomenon. It is hoped that this method will suggest other possibilities for observing the distributive justice phenomenon.

PART II: METHOD AND DESIGN I

Characteristics of the Participants

Participants in this study were recruited from undergraduate courses in social psychology and social research methods at Michigan State University. The majority of the students in the two courses were in either their junior or senior year in college. In addition, the majority of the students were not sociology majors. Students enrolled in the two courses were from various academic interests (i.e., education, psychology, criminal justice, etc.). In all there were 21 participants, 13 males and 8 females. The ages of the students ranged from 20 to 22. Although no additional background information was asked of participants, it was observed that all participants were white.

Recruitment Procedures

Students enrolled in the social psychology and social research methods course were asked during classes if they would like to participate in a study concerning decision-making. The students were told that if they decide to volunteer for the study, it would involve approximately one hour of their time and that they would be paid \$2.50 for their participation. Next, the researcher selected groups of either three males or three females (reasons to be discussed later) from the list of individuals who had volunteered to participate in the study.

A group of three individuals were then instructed to meet in the sociology laboratory at a specified time, at which point they were completely briefed as to what the study was about. The researcher strongly emphasized that participants would not be asked to do a non-sensical task or be deceived in any way. These procedures were repeated until all groups of three had been used in the study. One particular group was comprised of two females and one male. The reasons for this will be discussed later in this paper.

Experimental Setting

The sociology laboratory, where subjects were asked to meet, consisted of two rooms, an observation room and a subject room. The observation room and the subject room were separated by a wall length one-way mirror. Placed in the subject room was one table, three chairs, and a portable chalk board. Placed on top of the table were a set of pencils, a ruler, an ashtray, and a box of paper clips. Directly above the table, on the wall, was a concealed microphone wired to a tape recorder in the observation room. The researcher's intention was to make the subject room resemble, as close as was possible, a natural environment (the classroom) for the participants.

The Task

The methodological concern of this study was to create a situation which invoked the distributive justice phenomenon

to occur. Accordingly, it had to be a situation of which the researcher could observe. Typically distributive justice experiments are ones in which participants are given a distributive task which is only observable in terms of the outcome of the experiment. This, however, ignores all participants' thoughts and perceptions about "the way in which socially valued rewards are allocated to members of a social system". What was needed for this current study was a situation in which participants "talked about" while "doing" distributive justice. Borrowing a few strategic notions from the experimental research done by ethnomethodologists, it was felt that the best way to elicit verbal responses from participants about the distributive justice phenomenon was to devise a situation in which the distributive justice process was extremely problematic, a situation in which individuals' common-sensical notions of "fair", "just" or "balance" was of paramount concern. Finally, a situation was needed which aroused the utmost interactions between individuals, so as to observe how individuals' common-sensical knowledge of the distributive justice phenomenon is organized.

The task for the participants in this study was to make a group decision of how financial scholarships should be allocated. The participants were each given a folder containing three completed financial scholarship applications and were asked to examine the profile of each applicant. Each participant had the same three applications as did the others. The

profile of the three applicants contained information on five variable characteristics; (1) College Major, (2) Parents Financial Statement, (3) College Grade Point Average, (4) Employment Information, and (5) Scholastic Aptitude Test Score. All characteristics for each applicant were made problematic (See Appendix A). For example, an applicant with a high college grade point average was given a high scholastic aptitude test score as well. On the other hand, the same applicant did not have a job like the others did, and had all of his or her educational expenses paid for by his or her parents. Making the applications problematic in this way means, of course, that all applications were fictitious.

Each application contained certain information which could be used as criteria for evaluating each applicant. Participants were asked to examine closely the profile of each applicant then discuss among themselves as to which applicant should be considered a first choice, a second choice, or a third choice when being considered for a financial scholarship. Participants were then instructed to try and reach a final decision, as a group, after they had given the matter much thought and discussion. If all three members could not agree upon the final decision of how the applicants were to be ranked, the group was instructed to discuss as to where exactly the disagreement lies.

After the group had finished the task, whether they had reached a unanimous decision or not, the group was asked how

they went about ranking the applicants and why they felt that their final decision upon how the applicants ought to be ranked was the most appropriate.

Experimental Procedures

The participants met in groups of three in the laboratory at a specified time, at which point they were to be completely briefed as to what the study was about. Once in the laboratory, participants were given a tour of the lab by the researcher. The researcher informed them that the one-way mirror and the tape recorder would be used for the study. If there were any objections to the use of either the one-way mirror or the tape recorder, the researcher would tell them, tactfully, that it was necessary for the study to use the equipment, but if they objected, they did not have to participate.

The groups were either all male or all female, and in one particular group, two females and one male. Each participant was given a folder containing three completed financial scholarship applications (See Appendix B) and were asked to take a seat at the table. If the group was all male, then the applications contained all male applicants. If the group was all female, then they were given applications containing female applicants. The mixed group was given applications containing male applicants. After they had been seated at the table, the researcher attempted to develop as much of a relaxed environment as possible. The following statement was told to the group:

Hello, I am glad to see that you could all make it here today, we really appreciate your time in this study. You are probably wondering what exactly is this study all about? Well, as you know, various types of financial scholarships are awarded to students each year at Michigan State University and other midwestern state universities. Probably yourself, a friend, or someone you know of, have applied for some financial scholarship at one time or another. Yet, how the scholarship committee's decisions are made as to who should receive scholarships and who should not receive scholarships, is unclear to most applicants, and even persons who sit on committees that give out scholarships are sometimes unclear about what criteria ought to be used.

This statement was not read word-for-word to the group, nor was the statement memorized then told to the group word-for-word. Instead, the statement's content was memorized by the researcher and then told to the group in such a way that the statement was simply an instance of typical language use.

In the same manner that the opening statement was given, the participants were then given the following instructions:

The Michigan Scholarship Association (MSA) each year awards scholarships to students who attend Michigan State University. In the past, the members of the scholarship committee alone have simply reviewed all of the applications and then selected those applicants who the committee felt should be awarded a financial scholarship. Recently, however, there has been some concern among both members of the committee and students as to exactly which criteria the committee ought to use as bases for determining which applicants should receive scholarships.

To help resolve this problem the committee has decided to ask groups of students which criteria are most important when evaluating an individual's application. With the aid of student input it is hoped that the committee can construct better guidelines as to how decisions are to be made when evaluating applications. This would also mean of course, that persons who do not receive a scholarship can be given specific reasons for not being granted a financial scholarship.

The folder placed before you contains three quite typical applications which the MSA has randomly selected from the files. Only the persons' names have been changed, so as to insure confidentiality. Each application contains certain information that can be used as criteria for evaluating each applicant. Please examine the applications closely, then discuss among yourselves as to which applicant should be considered a first choice, a second choice, or a third choice when being considered for a scholarship award. After you have given the matter much thought and discussion, try to reach a joint decision as a group. If you feel that additional criteria should be used for evaluating applicants, please make suggestions. When you have made a final decision of how the applicants are to be ranked, please try to be prepared to specify which criteria you feel were the most influential in determining how the applicants were to be ranked. Although we would like for you to discuss the matter until you all agree on how the applicants should be ranked, you may find it difficult for all of you to agree upon the same rank order. If this is the case, please discuss the matter until you are sure about on which points you disagree.

Next the researcher asked the participants if there were any questions they had concerning the study or the task. After all questions, if any, were answered, the researcher told the participants that, because he did not want to influence their decision, he would leave the room and check back periodically to see if any difficulties had been encountered. The experimenter would then leave the experiment room and enter the observation room, at which point he would then begin recording, on a tape recorder, participants' interaction.

After the group members had discussed the applicants for a short while, the researcher attempted to find a natural point in which to interrupt the group's discussion. The researcher would interrupt the group and then administer a preliminary

group interview (See Appendix C). The reason for the preliminary interview was twofold; (1) it enabled the researcher to record any ready-made solutions to the task the group members offered, if any, and (2) the interview also allowed the researcher to observe any decision changes that might occur during the course of the discussion.

The group was then instructed to continue their discussion and try to reach a final decision of how the scholarships ought to be allocated. They were also told that if they could not all agree upon the final decision, then they were to discuss among themselves as to where exactly the disagreement lay. Additionally, it was strongly emphasized that if additional information was needed to please make suggestions. The researcher then left the room and returned to the observation room.

After the participants had discussed the applications and had reached a final decision, the researcher would then enter the room and ask the group for a final decision of how the applicants were to be ranked. If it was apparent that the group had not reached a unanimous decision, then the researcher would enter the room when the group had finished discussing where the differences lay. Next, the researcher administered a final decision interview (See Appendix D). This interview was used by the researcher as a probe for eliciting from the group their reasons as to why they had ranked the applicants as they did.

After the researcher had finished administering the final decision interview, the group members were taken, one at a time, to the observation room. The researcher then administered a post-experimental interview to each member (See Appendix E). In this interview each member was separated from the other group members. The other group members could not hear or see the individual that was being interviewed. In this sense, it was felt that the researcher would be able to find any differences that were not expressed in the group's discussion that the individual might have with the group's decision. It also enabled the researcher to find out whether there was any member or members of the group that were felt to be influential in making the group's final decision.

Debriefing the Participants

After the researcher had finished interviewing each member separately, participants were asked to assemble as a group once again in the subject room. The researcher then informed the group that the applicants were fictitious and that there was no such organization as the Michigan Scholarship Association. The researcher then reminded the group that they were promised that they would not have to do a non-sensical task. The following statement was given, in the same manner as the introduction and instructions, to the group:

Although the applicants and the scholarship organization were fictitious, this study was truly interested in how scholarships are allocated. There is much confusion about how scholarships ought to be

allocated and it is hoped that this study, with the help of your contributions, will bring a clearer understanding of how scholarships are, or ought to be, allocated. So, you see, the task in this study was real, only the information was fictitious. This was done because, first of all, scholarship organizations protect the privacy right of every applicant and will not release such information about any applicant to the public. Secondly, because this information is not available, the applicants and the organization were made up because it is necessary, for the study, for people to take the task seriously. Your seriousness was not only much appreciated, but also much needed. Without your serious contributions this study would be meaningless. I really appreciate your help with this study. If you would like to see the results of this study, I will be glad to show them to you when the study is completed. Are there any questions or complaints?

After the researcher responded to the participant's questions or complaints, if any, the researcher then paid the participants for participating in the study.

Comments on Design I

There are two issues in this study which must be discussed: (1) the use of white applicants only, either all-male or all-female, and (2) the ethical implications of making the participants believe the scholarship organization and the applicants were not fictitious.

The reason for using all white applicants in this study was to prevent any compensatory behavior. For example, it is quite possible that participants would feel that black applicants, because of white oppression or exploitation, should be ranked above white applicants without any discussion. On the other hand, it was not possible to make all the applicants black because it was quite possible that white participants may

feel that blacks should not be given scholarships or that blacks are over-represented in receiving scholarships. In either case, it was possible that there would be no discussion of how, other things being equal, scholarships should be allocated.

For the same aforementioned reasons, the use of all-male applicants for all-male groups and all-female applicants for all-female groups was for preventing any compensatory behavior toward women. For example, it is quite possible that participants would feel women, because of sexism or whatever, should be ranked above males without any discussion. However, one particular group, two females and one male, was given all-male applicants. Some difficulties did arise in regard to the compensatory behavior problem, but yet this does not preclude that compensatory behavior is a pervasive problem. This issue will be discussed more fully in the next section of this paper.

Although both variables, sex and race, are extremely important for an understanding of distributive justice, the inclusion of these two aspects goes beyond the scope of this study. The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of how, other things being equal, individuals common-sensical knowledge of the distributive justice phenomenon is organized. If an understanding of the distributive justice phenomenon is achieved from this study, then a follow-up study with the inclusion of sex and race variables is much in order.

The second issue of this study is the use of deception. In almost any experimental situation a researcher will try to make the experimental conditions isomorphic to real situations. Yet the conditions must be devised by the researcher because the probability of observing the phenomenon under real conditions, in a controlled environment, is remote. This means that the creation of conditions in every case will involve a certain amount of deception. The ethical implications of deception are only at issue when there is the possibility of doing harm to either a participant or to the reputation of the discipline. It is felt that this study showed neither, however, the ethicality in this study still is a matter of public judgement.

PART III: METHOD AND DESIGN II

After three groups were run using Design I, it became apparent that there were a few shortcomings that Design I could not overcome. The intention of Design I was to invoke the participants to discuss their perceptions and thoughts of how the applicants were to be ranked, and indeed in this sense the results were successful. However, the participants spent virtually all of their time discussing the applicants as if the information about the applicants was self-evident. What was gained by using Design I was a discussion of which pieces of information about the applicants were important. Yet there was no discussion of the reasons why certain pieces of information were more relevant than other pieces. It seemed as though how they used the information was agreed to be a taken-for granted matter. What was needed was a change in the design which would allow the participants to discuss more fully how the applicant information was to be used, and why certain pieces of information were thought to be more important than others.

The Task Revised

The task for Design II is still concerned with the allocation of financial scholarships. Also the completion of the task for the participants is the same, the decision as to

which applicant should be considered a first choice, a second choice, or a third choice when being considered for a scholarship award. But, for this design participants were each given a folder containing three applications with only the applicants' background information (i.e., sex, race, address, and age). The remaining part of the application (See Appendix F) was left blank. Obviously participants could not rank the applicants given only background information. So participants were allowed to select, one at a time, a piece of information from the list of available information (See Appendix G) placed in each folder. In order to receive a piece of information from the researcher, the group had to first have at least two members who agreed upon the request, and secondly, the group had to state clearly why they needed that particular piece of information.

After the group had used three pieces of information they were to make a joint decision of how the applicants were to be ranked. After the group had reached a decision, the researcher furnished the group with the remaining pieces of unused information, one at a time, and asked the group if the additional information would change their decision of how the applicants were to be ranked.

Experimental Procedures Revised

Like Design I, participants were asked to meet at the laboratory at a specified time. Once the group had assembled at the laboratory, they were given a tour of the observation

room and were informed that a tape recorder would be used, but not the one-way mirrors. Next the researcher proceeded with the group to the subject room and asked the participants to take a seat at the table. The researcher then gave the following introduction and instructions:

Hello, I am glad to see that you could all make it here today. You are probably wondering what this study is about. Well, as you know various types of financial scholarships are awarded to students each year at Michigan State University and other midwestern state universities. Probably yourself, a friend, or someone you know of have applied for some financial scholarship at one time or another. Yet, how the scholarship committee's decisions are made as to who should receive scholarships and who should not receive scholarships, is unclear to most applicants, and even persons who sit on committees that give out scholarships are sometimes unclear about what criteria ought to be used.

The Michigan Scholarship Association (MSA) each year awards scholarships to students who attend Michigan State University. In the past, the members of the scholarship committee alone have simply reviewed all of the applications and then selected those applicants who the committee felt should be awarded a financial scholarship. Recently, however, there has been some concern among both members of the committee and students as to exactly which criteria the committee ought to use as bases for determining which applicants should receive scholarships.

To help resolve this problem the committee has decided to ask groups of students which criteria are most important when evaluating an individual's application. With the aid of student input it is hoped that the committee can construct better guidelines as to how decisions are to be made when evaluating applications. This would also mean of course, that persons who do not receive a scholarship can be given specific reasons for not being granted a financial scholarship.

The MSA has randomly selected three quite typical applications from the files. Placed before each of you is a folder containing copies of those three applications. Only the persons names have been changed

to insure confidentiality. Each application contains the sex, ethnicity, address, and age of the applicant. This is the only information that you are provided with at first. Your task is to examine the information closely, then discuss among yourselves as to which applicant should be a first choice, a second choice, or a third choice when being considered for a scholarship award.

More than likely, you will need more information than you are given in order to arrive at a ranking of the three applicants. Please open the folder placed before you and take out the sheet of paper titled "Applicant Information List". This sheet contains an alphabetically arranged list of seven categories of information typically used as criteria for evaluating applicants. You may select, one at a time, a piece of information from this list of available information. Each request for information must be agreed upon by at least two members of the group. Additionally, before I can give you the information you request, you must state clearly to me the reasons why you need that particular piece of information. After you have done this I will give you the information you have requested for all three applicants. You must make as good a use of the information you have received as you can before requesting further information. You may record the information I give you on the blank lines of the applications.

After you have used three pieces of information, I will ask you for a decision on how the applicants are to be ranked. This means that you may wish to select the three pieces of information which are the most relevant when ranking the three applicants. Give the matter much thought and discussion, then try to reach a joint decision as a group. Although we would like for you to discuss the matter until you all agree on how the applicants are to be ranked, you may find it difficult for all of you to agree upon the same rank order. If this is the case, please discuss the matter until you are sure about which points you disagree.

Next the researcher asked the participants if there were any questions they had concerning the study or the task. After all, if any, questions were answered, the researcher then instructed the group to begin the task. Throughout the group's discussion

of the three applicants, the researcher refrained from offering any suggestions or conclusions. The sole task of the researcher was to argue with every reason the group offered for requesting more information. The key role of the researcher was to make the group's discussion as problematic as was possible. When the researcher sensed that the group's reasons for requesting the additional information were exhausted, the researcher then provided the group with the requested information.

After the group had used three pieces of information, the researcher asked the group to make a final decision on how the applicants ought to be ranked. The researcher then asked the group how they had arrived at their final decision. At this point it is impossible for the researcher to anticipate the participants' responses. For this reason, a structured or semi-structured interview would be of little use. Instead the researcher probed every response until the participants felt they had stated how they had arrived at their final decision to the best of their ability.

In the final phase of the experiment, the researcher furnished the group with the remaining pieces of unused information, one at a time, and asked the group if the additional information would have changed their decision on how the applicants ought to be ranked. If the group decided to change its decision, the researcher then asked the group how the decision was to be changed and why. If the group's decision had remained the same, the researcher was to ask the group why the

particular piece of information did not change their decision. In either situation, probing was essential.

After the group had been furnished with all the available information, the researcher asked the group to make a final decision. Additionally, participants were told that if they felt that additional criteria should be used for evaluating the applicants, to please make suggestions. Finally, the researcher asked the group how they had arrived at their final decision, why it was the best decision that could have been made, while probing every response.

Comments On Design II

The major difference between Design I and Design II was the way in which the applicant information was allocated to the group. This basic change made it necessary to make several other adjustments in the experimental design. First of all, the researcher had to shift from a detached observer role to a neutral participant observer role. Usually the presence of a researcher limits the amount of group interaction. But, in this design the researcher does quite the opposite. The researcher entered the group's discussion at two points; when the group had made a decision of how the applicants ought to be ranked and when the group had requested additional information. Upon each entry the researcher asked such questions as; How did you arrive at that decision? Why did you feel that piece of information was important? Does that make sense to you? Why? Are you sure? How sure? Do you really want

that piece of information? Why not some other piece? This line of questioning not only made the participants' task more problematic, it also increased the amount of group discussion. Keep in mind that, although the researcher may have some bearing on the final decision, this design is not particularly interested in what the final decision will be, but how the group develops a final decision.

The most visible difference between Design I and Design II was the absence of all interviewing guides used in Design II. There were three reasons why the interviews were not used. First of all, the researcher in Design II was physically present throughout the group's discussion and could ask questions when the occasion arose. Secondly, in virtually all of the final decision and post-experimental interviews the participants repeated what they had already discussed beforehand. This, of course, was of little value because the group's discussion was being recorded on tape. Thirdly, there was very little difference between the group interviews and the individual interviews. What little difference there was was felt to be beyond the scope of this study. The focus of this study was on group behavior, not individual behavior.

PART IV: EVALUATION OF PROCEDURES

Since both method designs were intended for reporting descriptive observations, the results are more qualitative in nature rather than quantitative. Therefore, no tables, graphs, or statistics will be presented here. Additionally, no elaborate coding schemes were used which would allow for any type of qualitative measurement. Instead, a description will be presented here of how well Design I and Design II accomplish their aims - conversation about distributive justice. This will require a discussion of the difficulty of the task given to members, and the group interaction it promoted.

The Difficulty of the Task

It was assumed that by making the distributive justice task highly problematic for the participants that they would work collectively, through conversation, to achieve a decision. This assumption proved to be correct. Also, participants displayed a good deal of concern or discomfort by gestures, utterances, and voice intonations. Yet, in a descriptive sense, the difficulty was more like the discomfort exhibited by participants was more like the discomfort normally experienced by persons faced with a problem in math. The discomfort was not of an emotional nature, take for example the following passages taken from transcripts of the experiments:

(Experiment #4)

Researcher: Did you find it difficult to rank the three?
 Larry: Not difficult, I thought it was interesting because . . .
 Steve: Interesting!
 Larry: Because, you know, obviously if three of us can come to a, you know, some unanimous decision on how things, certain situations and certain aspects of personality, you know . . .
 Steve: That was something!

(Experiment #5)

Researcher: Overall, did you find it difficult or easy to rank the applicants?
 Stan: Difficult or easy? It was difficult.
 Researcher: What do you feel the main difficulty was in ranking them?
 Stan: Not enough information.

(Experiment #6)

Debbie: So, what we could do is either pick background or employment first, and then, we have three choices.
 Linda: It's so difficult, I think.
 Researcher: You don't have to decide on a second and third choice until after you decide on a first choice.
 Linda: That's the problem.
 Carol: How about grade point?
 Debbie: As first?
 Carol: I guess.
 Debbie: Which would be indicating to the committee that that's what we think is the most important.
 Carol: Well, I don't think that, but . . .
 Debbie: Yeah, but that's what the whole point of it is.
 Linda: You have to settle on what you are comfortable with.
 Carol: Uh-huh.
 (Pause)
 Linda: Tough decision to make.

The use of these examples is not intended to emphasize a large degree of difficulty or discomfort experienced by the subjects, but rather, they are illustrative of statements made by all participants concerning the difficulty of the distributive justice task.

The Amount of Interaction

Although there was no observational schedule maintained (such as in a Bales type analysis), group interaction was sustained throughout each experiment. There was, however, a good deal of pausing. For example, long pauses in the group's interaction were observed when participants were reviewing the information given by the researcher in the first phase of the experiment, or when they had reached a group decision. Also, not all group members were interacting with one another all the time. Sometimes two members would often be interacting with each other while the third member listened. In rare instances, one member would occasionally enter the group's discussion, offer a few ideas, then would seemingly stand aloof from the group's discussion. But, this sort of quasi-participation role was never taken up by one particular member for the entire duration of the experiment.

It should be mentioned that the group's pausing practices may indeed be important to the group for reaching a consensus decision. Schegloff and Sachs (1974) suggest that there is a turn-taking machinery in groups in which a member's utterance may have special markings for broaching new material. This can be viewed as an attempt to close discussion on one particular topic in favor of another. However, the analysis of group interaction in this paper does not deal with pausing practices, they are mentioned because they require further investigation at another time.

In respect to the amount of group interacting then, all experiments were extremely successful. More importantly, virtually all of the group's discussions pertained to the distributive justice problem. All discussions, in some way or another, were relevant to the problem at hand. Often times participants would use humor in the conversation, not to escape the problem at hand, but to either emphasize or elaborate a point. Take for example the following quote from the transcript:

(Experiment #4)

Steve: Yeah, and with Mark - I'd give him that money and say "Hey! Good work, take it easy!"
 Mark: He's killing himself!
 Steve: That restricted diet means no beer.
 Mark & Larry: Ha, ha, ha

What is important is that the humor in this particular episode is still content-specific. The humor does not go beyond the problem at hand, rather it pertains to the distributive justice problem.

In sum, the participants did find the task to be problematic, and accordingly, engaged in lengthy conversations about the distributive justice problem. In this sense the experiments were successful. Both Design I and Design II had achieved their aims. Yet, there are differences between the two designs which need discussion.

The major drawback of Design I was that participants were discussing the distributive justice task without specifically mentioning which of the criteria were being used, or how they

were, or should be used. What was taken-for-granted meanings between group members was unclear to the observer. Participants discussed the distributive justice problem as if the meaning of each piece of information provided was self-evident. Take for example the following quotes from the transcripts of the experiments:

(Experiment #1)

Hank: Yeah, and this pre-med is more of a college status worker. He makes it by book learning. He doesn't have to labor.
 Tracey: Uh-huh.
 Hank: So it is a different background.
 Tracey: Ok, well it seems, well I don't want to rush into a decision, you know really quick.
 Hank: Well, I'm not coming to any conclusions. I'm just pointing out what I'm seeing.

(Experiment #3)

Stan: And they are all employed.
 Chris: They all have pretty good GPA's.
 Stan: We don't have a whole lot of differences, do we?
 John: Yeah, except majors.

What Tracey understands and what Hank is seeing in the first example is extremely unclear to the observer. In the second example, neither Stan, Chris, nor John are discussing how the criteria GPA, employment, and major are, or should be used. In addition, the detached observation role did not allow for further probing. What was needed was for participants to express some of their unstated understandings. This was to some extent achieved in Design II.

By no means is it implied that Design I was abandoned in favor of Design II, but rather Design II grew out of Design I to complement it. What was not achieved in Design I, was achieved in Design II, and vice-versa. Keep in mind that in Design I very little control was exercised by the observer. For that reason, Design I provided observations of how individuals, without interference, discuss distributive justice problems. Thus, this is the reason for including both Design I and Design II.

Another problem of Design I was the usefulness of the preliminary, final decision, and post-experimental interviews. Many of the questions which may have been helpful emerged from what the group members were saying at a particular time and occasion. There was really no way of anticipating what members would say or what questions should be asked. Preconceived interviews were of little help, even if they were in semi-structured or unstructured form. The questions needed to be asked when the occasion arose, not before or after. With the inclusion of the researcher as a neutral member of the group, the preliminary and final decision interviews were not necessary.

Like Design I, participants under Design II discussed the distributive justice problem in a typical, taken-for-granted, common-sensical way. However, unlike Design I, the group discussed not only which information should be used, but why. The researcher's questioning made the group focus on which criteria

should or should not be used when allocating scholarships, and why. In this way, the researcher was allowed to observe distributive justice problems in a much clearer light. The researcher could investigate individuals' perceptions, cognitions, normative expectations, or whatever, about how rewards are, or ought to be, allocated to members of a social system. For the first time the practical accomplishment of a distributive justice decision was directly observed in its entirety. Properties of distributive justice were unveiled by the group, by use of talk, in a sequential manner which allowed observation by the researcher. Again, the only major difference in the results between Design I and Design II is that in Design I participants discussed the distributive justice criteria generally, whereas in Design II participants discussed the distributive justice criteria both generally and specifically.

PART V: SOME RESULTS

The plan of this study was to observe directly the distributive justice process more or less in its entirety and to report, in a sequential manner, the unfolding of events by which the group decides how scholarships ought to be allocated. The term direct observation, as it is used in this study, is understood to mean that an observer makes a descriptive account of each developing stage of the phenomenon in progress. All group interaction is viewed as an on-going process inseparable from the phenomenon itself, that is, the phenomenon is produced by the group members' interacting with one another, it is socially constructed. By "direct" it is meant in totality, observing the phenomenon from its inception through its accomplishment. The concern is not with the adequacy, substance, or implications of the outcomes of the phenomenon, but with the group's construction of the phenomenon. For the reasons mentioned above, all observations of group interaction which contributes to the construction of the distributive justice phenomenon will be reported here.

Participants were given a distributive justice task and were asked to make a decision, by consensus, on how the scholarships ought to be allocated. In reviewing the transcripts of the experiments, it is possible to discern, in a preliminary

way, six mechanisms or practices used by the groups to achieve a consensus decision. By "consensus practices" it is meant, the various ways in which members' descriptive accounts of the actual situation accomplishes a consensus among members. These consensus practices have no serial ordering and can be used simultaneously. They can be invoked at any particular occasion and time by any particular member without disturbing the orderliness of the group. The six practices that will be discussed here are; (1) interpretation, (2) surmising, (3) self-reference, (4) other-reference, (5) summing-up, and (6) consistency work.

It is quite likely that there are other group practices involved in achieving consensus which will not be mentioned here. Also, it should be pointed out that these group practices may not only occur in group decision-making involving distributive justice problems, but to group decision-making in general. Application of these practices notions to other types of decision-making groups suggest many possibilities for understanding how groups achieve consensus.

Interpretation

Interpretation is a practice in which individuals take an item and place it into a context so that it acquires meaning for the group. This practice is bound both temporally and spatially, in that the meaning of the item is acquired insofar as the stipulated conditions of the situation will permit.

The term item is used here to mean a potential piece of information, in that an item becomes information through interpretation. Participants were given items which, as a group, they had to interpret for themselves. In order to reach a consensus about how and in what way the item was to be used, there needed to be a common understanding between group members about the meaning of an item. For example, the grade point average of one particular applicant was 3.5. The following quote from the transcripts demonstrates how an item becomes information through interpretation:

Scott: Well, you know, maybe we'll have to go with their grade points, see how hard they have been working or how, you know, what it means to them. If we see a guy who's got a 3.5, we see that he can cut it here, it might be more to our advantage to give it to him to finish.

In this example we can see that the item 3.5 has been interpreted by Scott as an indicator that the applicant can "cut it." We also can see that the grade points in general are items being interpreted to mean "how hard they have been working." Interpretation of items, such as in this last example, became information which could be used collectively by the group in an effort to accomplish the distributive justice task. Interpreting of items by group members was observed throughout the experiments, however, it seemed that placing an item into a meaningful state or context was a natural starting point. For example, after the participants of each group had initially reviewed the provided items (information list or applicant

characteristics, depending on design), discussion was initiated in the following way:

(Experiment #1)

Tracey: We don't know what this SAT is for.
Hank: 432 is lousy.

(Experiment #5)

Julie: What is this financial statement?
Sue: What your parents do.
Scott: Yeah, what they do.

(Experiment #4)

Steve: Fairview Street, what kind of street is Fairview?
Larry: What kind of street is Roden?

Until enough groups are run it cannot be conclusive that all discussions begin in this manner. But, more importantly, interpretation was a practice used often by each member of the group at various occasions and times. Yet, if the item was to become information for the group's use, it not only had to be interpreted, it had to have a shared meaning which could be agreed upon by all members of the group. Sometimes this agreement was unstated between group members. More often this agreement was achieved by the group through collective interpretation. Take for example:

(Experiment #4)	Sequence of Collective Interpretation
Mark: I've always been kind of biased against GPA's.	The item GPA is suggestively interpreted by Mark.
Larry: Yeah	Larry agrees with interpretation
Steve: Yeah	Steve agrees with interpretation
Mark: You can't evaluate a person's intelligence by 3.5 or 2.8.	Mark continues interpretation of GPA item.

Larry: Yeah, or even by a test too. Everybody bitches about a professor's test, how it really isn't a true measurement of what you really think you know. It would be hard to assess that, you know, through an oral interpretation, because there's no time.

Larry agrees with the additional interpretation then continues to interpret the item.

Here we see that Larry and Steve's agreement with Mark's interpretation of GPA allows Mark to continue the interpretation. Larry agrees with the additional interpretation and feels free to take up the interpretation practice. There seems to be some sort of signaling going on in which members indicate to one another that they accept the interpretations or that they agree on them. This suggests that an interpretation practice may presuppose that other lower "level" practices are resorted to when a suggested interpretation becomes accepted. Notice if you will the sort-of "Yeahing" practice used by Larry and Steve which is instrumental for Mark to continue the interpretation of GPA. There are, of course, unspoken signals between members such as nodding, gestures, and voice intonation which may be used to indicate when a suggested interpretation has become accepted. These observations were not recorded and will therefore not be discussed further. However, the following is an example which raises another question, "In how many ways do members signal to one another when a suggested interpretation has become accepted?"

(Experiment #3)

John: I don't think the SAT's tell you anything, personally. If one person had 900, I mean 800, and the other person had 120, you might consider that.

(Later in the same experiment)

Chris: Well then SAT's, we aren't going for SAT's are we? So, that leaves the bottom third of the page.

This example shows, not only that an interpretation practice can be invoked by any of the members at any time, but also that a shared interpretation of an item can be achieved in an unspoken way.

There is also a sub-type of interpretation practice in which members acquire meaning by combining two or more items. Take for example the following:

(Experiment #4)

Steve: Because even then if his grade point [item] wasn't all that great, we would know a little bit more about his financial background [item]
 Larry: Right! And if he's . . .
 Steve: Determination and . . .
 Larry: Right, and if he's putting forth an effort to make some money toward an education.
 Mark: Working [item] and going to school
 Larry: Right.

Again, we can see a collective interpretation effort, but instead interpretation is being done by combining the items and interpreting them simultaneously.

Surmising

Surmising is a practice in which the group makes extensions from the evidence to build a, more or less, complete "story."

In this practice the group adds new dimensions to the information by extrapolation, or by combining items in a speculative way. Surmising differs from interpretation in that the members do more than simply place an item in context or combine items, they introduce new, speculative items. Take for instance the following example from experiment #1:

Tracey:	Well, you said a pre-med is better than . . .
Hank:	I'm not saying that it's better, I'm just saying that as far as I can see, well, what does a pre-med stand for? Is it like the things going into a doctor [conjecture]. Well, then you get into accounting, that's a little bit [conjecture?], well, I don't think that, you know, this here is a matter of life and death [conjecture].
Tracey:	Communications, that's a pretty broad field [interpretation].
Hank:	That's pretty hard [interpretation].

Where "conjecture" is bracketed in the example indicates that the statement is a surmising practice which introduces new, speculative items. There is very little evidence given to those members that would suggest any conclusions that could be made about the applicants. There is no evidence which is conclusive that the pre-med applicant has intentions of becoming a doctor in the future, much less that he will become involved in matters of life and death. Nor is there conclusive evidence which would suggest that the accounting major has intentions of becoming a CPA, or that the communication major would eventually become a counselor (these last two conjectures were made later in the conversation).

It was also observed that group members would create "fictional characters" which seemingly aided their surmising. The

fictional character was presented as a "he", "she", "they", or the like. They seemed to be the "story characters" in surmising. Take for example the following:

(Experiment #4)

Mark: And we can leave the grade point, the GPA out of that, cause that would just kind of mess everything up.

Larry: True, if you have like an insight of what they're taking, you can say, well, uh, this person's [fictional] taking computer processing or something, maybe [he's] looking ahead in the future [surmising], maybe [he's] logically thinking this money would apply to a field later in life that would be moving [surmising], or not necessarily moving [surmising], but [he] would find work in, you know, rather than take a job in nuclear fission, aviation or soforth like that [surmising]. [He] might not, [he] would have to go years and years ahead of time [surmising]. So, college major, I think, I would like to see.

Mark: Does that go for the rest of us? [Pause]

Larry: Ok, GPA, that is bias.

Mark: Ok, let's throw that out.

In this example Larry's surmising is in reference to Mark's statement about GPA. Larry's creation of "he" seems to give lifelike features to the surmising. However, Larry's surmising is introducing new, speculative items in a further attempt to interpret the item college major. In this sense, surmising and interpretation are being accomplished simultaneously. Additionally, the "he" gets more and more surmised attributes. Although only one member is building the fictional character, the fictional character can be collectively surmised by the group (to be shown later in this section).

Self-Reference

Self-reference is a practice in which individuals give authority to their statements by relating to others their own personal experiences. In the process of making sense out of the items individuals will attempt to ground empirically, by reference to personal experience, the authority of their statements. Strangely enough, these statements usually go unchallenged by other members of the group. In an academic sense, typically it is thought that personal experiences are unacceptable, in most cases, as a method of giving credence to a statement. Often times self-reference practices in such situations do quite the opposite. They may in fact discredit a statement. However, participants in this study found self-reference practices to be both acceptable and appropriate. For example:

(Experiment #5)

Scott: Well, I'm just starting to think. It may not be all that important. It's, well, if a guy is making good money, he's working for the capitol or something, four or five dollars an hour.
 Sue: But, (I'm) making four dollars an hour now. (I) applied for financial aid because (I) want to quit my job.
 Julie: You couldn't . . .
 Scott: You're working at the capitol?
 Sue: (I'm) working at a clothing store.
 Scott: Yeah

(Experiment #2)

Elaine: And if you look at Susan, she is working 40 hours a week. (I) was working 30 hours a week. That was a lot of work.
 Susan: Yeah, (I) work twenty hours a week.
 Elaine: That's a lot of strain, specially if you throw medicine on top of it. That's a lot of studying.

Looking at the above examples it is quite clear that an individual's use of the self-reference practice goes unchallenged by the other group members. In experiment #5 Sue relates to the group the current wages she is earning in her job, then follows this statement with an intention as to why she had applied for financial aid. Susan's relating of a personal experience (earning four dollars an hour) gives authority to her statement about applying for financial aid and quitting her job, which may be also seen as a conjecture about the intentions of the applicants. Nevertheless, her personal experience is not called into question by the others.

In much the same way, in experiment #2 Elaine gives authority to her statement about the item that the applicant Susan works forty hours a week, by telling the group she once worked 30 hours a week, and that that was a lot of work. Instead of challenging Elaine's personal experiences, Susan agrees with Elaine and then states that she works twenty hours a week. But, what does Susan agree with? As it has been mentioned before, interpretive practices are used by members throughout the experiments. In this example interpretive practices and self-reference practices are being used simultaneously. There is an attempt by the members to interpret what the item forty hours a week means by use of self-reference practices.

Other-Reference

Out of all the practices mentioned in this section, other-reference practices are probably the least understood. Other-reference practices are practices in which individuals give authority to their statement by referring to the experiences of others. But other, as observed in the experiments, should not be confused with the traditional symbolic-interaction concept of "generalized other." In other-reference practices the other may be specific, like "my father" or "my husband", or they may be general, like "some people I know" or "some teachers I have had." Take for example the following excerpts from the transcripts:

(Experiment #1)

Tracey: Well, I know people in education and they
are . . .
Chuck: A counselor?
Tracey: Yeah, I guess, I don't know.

(Experiment #4)

Mark: I've got a roommate who's been accepted
to a medical school. That costs a lot of
money.
Larry: It sure does.
Steve: All that time, internship, three years.

Other-reference practices, as in the previous examples, do not require any profound understanding. They are simply statements which refer to the experiences of a specific person that a group member knows of, or to the experiences of a group of persons that a group member knows of. Yet, it is quite clear that the rest of the group has no tacit knowledge of this other

person, or persons, to which the speaker is referring. The other-reference practices, much like self-reference practices, usually go unchallenged by other group members.

Summing-Up

Summing-up practices are those practices in which individuals attempt to summarize the group's ongoing discussion of the items. While in the process of making information out of the items by interpreting, self-reference, other-reference, and surmising, it becomes necessary for the group, at certain points, to construct a descriptive account of what has been said. This practice accomplishes a consensus among members as to what relevant points of the discussion are important. For example:

(Experiment #5)

Scott: He wants 500, ok, all we have to do is rank these guys. So, let's . . .
 Julie: Ok, the ones with the most need.
 Scott: Right!
 Sue: Well, financially I would say Daniel.
 Scott: Ok, we'll just say that Keith is not in the running for top prize. Ok, Daniel, 30 hours a week and only 65 a week. Now, 30, he's not making much at all, barely over two dollars, poor Daniel, he's got it rough, he's got, he works, course he doesn't work a lot of hours, but 30 hours, yeah, still, yeah, that's as many . . .
 Julie: If he works 40, it's full time.

(Experiment #7)

Don: I really think we've got to have the financial statement.
 Mark: Well, if we get the financial statement, we'll have to have the family background, that's two.
 Don: Yeah

Mark: Then we just have to have, like either the grade point average or the SAT.
 Don: Yeah, we have to make up our minds which one is the better, Ok, so far we're in agreement then? Family background, parent's financial statement, and either the GPA or the SAT, right?
 Mark: Yeah

Another interesting point about summing-up practices is who is doing the summarizing. Studies concerning group decision-making have long contended that influence and persuasion is an important feature of group decision-making. Usually this idea is followed up with notions of self-esteem, uniform prescriptions, evaluations of status characteristics, etc. (see for example, Zetterberg, 1957). Nonetheless, group decision-making cannot be accomplished without talk. It was observed in all experiments that those individuals who discussed the most, frequently engaged in summing-up practices. Often times the summing-up was used by these individuals to make conclusions about how the group should evaluate the applicants.

(Experiment #2)

Elaine: So, if Donna just needs the money for partying, she can go out and get herself a job, as far as I'm concerned.
 Sue: And I think with Diane, she's working 22 hours a week.
 Elaine: Yeah, she's making an attempt, she's trying.
 Sue: You figure she's making \$2.30 an hour, she's making \$50 a week.
 Elaine: Yeah, well, the minimum is probably 50 a week. You got to remember she is paying her rent.
 Sue: Yeah, that's what it says, rent and everything else.
 Michele: She has to have a car to get to work with.
 Elaine: She can take a bus, I mean, if you really get down to it.

Consistency Work

Once the group had reached a decision about either the criteria or the ranking, the group would then use all other practices in a way that was consistent with their decision. This is particularly noticeable in Design II in which participants were given additional items and asked whether or not the new items would change their minds. In all the experiments using Design II, participants made the additional items sensible, by use of the various practices mentioned previously, in such a way that it was consistent with their previously committed decision. This is what is meant by a consistency work practice. Formally speaking, consistency work practices are practices in which group members attempt to maintain their achievement of consensus by treating all new items as if they were consistent with their decision. In some cases, previously discussed items were made consistent with the decision that later followed. Like the other practices mentioned, consistency work is often times a collective effort. Here is a clear example of consistency work practices:

(Experiment #4)

Solid Line - Consistency Work

Dotted Line = Group Practice

Practice Used for
Consistency Work

Researcher: (Gives participants
GPA item)

Steve: That just reinforces
what I've said, makes
it even clearer.

Summing-up and interpretation.

Mark:	<u>Yeah, communications</u>	Signaling agreement
	<u>and . . .</u>	
Larry:	<u>Ok, I would still re-</u>	[1] Interpretation by
	<u>main with our decision</u>	Combining
	<u>because of, you know,</u>	[2] Interpretation
	<u>I am glad that we did</u>	[3] Summing-Up
	<u>arrive at Keith being</u>	[4] Interpretation
	<u>number two, [1] be-</u>	[5] Interpretation by
	<u>cause he is pulling a,</u>	Combining
	<u>you know, 3.29 in ac-</u>	[6] Surmising and Com-
	<u>counting and [2] that</u>	binning
	<u>does give credit to</u>	
	<u>him, and [3] we've al-</u>	
	<u>ready said that maybe</u>	
	<u>the 3.42, [4] that's a</u>	
	<u>good grade point ave-</u>	
	<u>rage, and [5] the 2.68</u>	
	<u>for the pre-med, [6] he</u>	
	<u>could've just ran into</u>	
	<u>some difficult questions</u>	
	<u>that term and he plans</u>	
	<u>on bringing it up to a</u>	
	<u>3.2, you know, next term.</u>	
Steve:	<u>Yeah, one bad term!</u>	Signaling Agreement and
		Surmising
Larry:	<u>It's very possible,</u>	
	<u>so . . .</u>	Unclear
Mark:	<u>Difficult questions in</u>	Surmising
	<u>pre-med.</u>	
Larry:	<u>Yeah.</u>	Signaling Agreement
Researcher:	<u>It would still remain</u>	
	<u>the same decision?</u>	
Larry:	<u>Yeah.</u>	
Steve:	<u>Yeah, I wouldn't change</u>	
	<u>it.</u>	
Larry:	<u>No (agreeing with Steve)</u>	
Researcher:	<u>Everything seems to be</u>	
	<u>consistent?</u>	
All:	<u>Yeah.</u>	
Researcher:	<u>(Gives participants SAT</u>	
	<u>item)</u>	
Larry:	<u>Kind of reinforces our</u>	Interpretation
	<u>decision on Mark, our</u>	
	<u>decision on Mark still,</u>	
	<u>because it does show</u>	
	<u>that he does have a 520,</u>	
	<u>and that is . . .</u>	
Steve:	<u>Respectable!</u>	Interpretation

Larry:	<u>Yeah, very respectable, and it maybe reinforces our statement that, you know, the 2.68 is just running into a bad term. It's just possible to bring it up to a higher average.</u>	Signaling Agreement Both Summing-Up and Surmising by Combining
Mark:	<u>He has potential to bring it up.</u>	Surmising
Steve:	<u>Yeah.</u>	Signaling Agreement
Larry:	<u>Yeah, definitely, and...</u>	Signaling Agreement

Ordering of the Practices

It is quite obvious that in an example given for a certain practice, there is also an example, or examples, of the other practices mentioned. There is no ordering of the practices which would suggest any uniformity as to when and where the practices were appropriate, or by whom. There seemed to be no serial use of the practices, nor did it seem inappropriate for members to use several practices at once. Take for example the following excerpt from the transcripts of experiment #4 as outlined on the following page.

(Experiment #4)

- (1) Larry: (a) Maybe ther's seven kids and (b) the father has, you know, has debts for being in the hospital twenty years.
- (2) Steve: He has a factory job.
- (3) Larry: Right.
- (4) Mark: Alright, well (a) sometimes the applicants just don't work and (b) they depend on their parents for . . .
- (5) Larry: That's right, (a) that's why...
- (6) Mark: (a) But, then again there's, well, (b) I can see applicant's employment information, that could, pro or con, that could influence.
- (7) Larry: Shows that
- (8) Mark: The amount of income
- (9) Larry: Right
- (10) Mark: Whether (a) he works hard to deserve that scholarship, or (b) trying hard to get financial backing.
- (11) Larry: Or if (a) he's consistent. (b) How many years he worked at certain jobs and (c) reasons stated why by employers, like if (d) he just worked for the summer.

Practices Description

- (1) Surmising practice used combining speculative items a & b
- (2) Surmising practice which introduces a new speculative item. Also, statement signals agreement by story character "he" which is in reference to "father"
- (3) Signals collective agreement.
- (4) Signals collective agreement. Surmising practice used to introduce new speculative items by combining a & b
- (5) Signals agreement and attempts (a) consistency work
- (6) Signals that collective agreement has not been achieved. Interpretation practice used (b) in an attempt to put employment item into a meaningful state.
- (7) Interpretation attempt.
- (8) Interpretation completion, collective effort.
- (9) Signals awareness of collective agreement. Also, indicates to others that elaboration is permissible.
- (10) Introduction of story character "he" and surmising by combining a & b
- (11) Picks up story character and adds new attributes (a) and suggests new items b & c. Surmising practice used (d) with the aid of the fictional character.

- (12) Steve: Or fired
- (13) Larry: Yeah, if he was fired, if (a) he consistently puts down "I dislike the job", or so forth, meaning he had, (b) he can't hack it, (c) he can't just stick with something long enough without them, you know, if they award him money, (d) he's gonna be inconsistent in putting out for school too.
- (14) Mark: He (a) probably won't pay it back either.
- (15) Larry: Right, or he (a) would have to be forced to do it. (b) That's why applicant's employment information would be valuable. (c) Family background would probably be important too, but, you know, (d) that would be independent from the financial statement. (e) information on how many children, (f) where they are now, (g) maybe a few of them are in school too.
- (16) Steve: Yeah.
- (17) Larry: They, sometimes some families, you know, (a) they'll have three or four, you know, guys that will, or daughter, or brothers that (b) will go through the same major.
- (18) Steve: (a) I've got a brother who's starting next year and (b) it will cost him 2500 a year just for commuting, but, (c) my parents combined is 29,500 or something.
- (12) Offers new item "fired" by surmising. Also, indicates the collective nature of adding attributes to "he".
- (13) Signals agreement and picks up story character "he" and adds attribute (a). Surmising practice is used combining (b), (c) and (d).
- (14) Maintains story character "he" by surmising (a).
- (15) Signals agreement and maintains the group's story character "he" by surmising (a). Summing-up practice used in (b). Introduction of new item (c) is combined with new item (d) for interpretation. Interpretation practice is used in (e) & (f) by combining items. Surmising practice is used in (g).
- (16) Signals awareness of collective agreement. Indicates that elaboration is permissible.
- (17) Introduce new speculative items (a) & (b) by surmising.
- (18) Other-reference practice (a) used and interpretation of the combined, new items (b) & (c).

- (19) Larry: Uh-huh
 (20) Steve: That's a bitch!
- (21) Larry: It is.
 (22) Steve: So, (a) I work, you know, full year round, (b) take out loans and everything, so, I can see that.
- (23) Larry: Yeah, except me, (a) I'm personally involved. I've been turned down twice for scholarship grants in Michigan.
 (24) Steve: Yeah, I never applied for scholarship grant.
- (25) Larry: Because, (a) most of the time you get in there, you file for it, it's the truth, the minority gets it, you know, (b) I don't know how it goes, what criteria they use, but, (c) most of the people I know sure as hell don't get any of the money from Michigan. (d) So, there's something they got to be doing wrong.
- (26) Mark: Should we ask for the applicant's employment information?
 (27) Steve: Yeah.
 (28) Larry: That's a good idea.
- (19) Signals agreement with interpretation.
 (20) Surmising practice used to show agreement
 (21) Signals awareness of shared agreement
 (22) Introduction of new items (a) & (b) by making use of self-reference practice.
 (23) Signals agreement and awareness that the agreement is shared by self-referencing (a).
 (24) Signals awareness of consensus agreement by self-referencing.
 (25) Continuation collective work by surmising (a), interpreting (b), other-referencing (c), and surmising (d).
 (26) Suggestion that a consensus has been achieved.
 (27) Signals that the suggestion is correct.
 (28) Also signals that the suggestion is correct.

PART VI: GENERAL GROUNDS AND DESCRIPTIVE ACCOUNTS

We shall now set aside the analysis of general group practices and return to the distributive justice phenomenon. What seems to be the primary concern here is that there is a vast gap between the transcripts and traditional distributive justice concepts. Distributive justice terminology such as cognitive dissonance, balance, normative expectations, equity, status characteristics relevance and the like, can only be applied to the transcripts at a high level of abstraction. In order to make the distributive justice phenomenon understandable by using the traditional concepts, the concepts must be superimposed to correspond with the transcripts. But, at this high level of abstraction, essential features of the phenomenon would be overlooked. For example, exchange formulations state that in order to determine if an individual deserves an outcome, one compares the input/outcome ratios of two or more persons in the same reward-allocation system (See Adams, 1963, 1965). Determining whether an outcome is equitable follows the definitional formula:

$$\frac{\text{Input A}}{\text{Outcome A}} = \frac{\text{Input B}}{\text{Outcome B}}$$

Applying this formula to the transcripts we take this to mean that an equitable decision of how the applicants should be ranked exists when the input/outcome ratios of all the

applicants are equal. This may be expressed in the following way:

$$\frac{\text{Input of First Choice}}{\text{Ranked First}} = \frac{\text{Input of Second Choice}}{\text{Ranked Second}} = \frac{\text{Input of Third Choice}}{\text{Ranked Third}}$$

Extending this formula to the transcripts we may analyze the following exerpts accordingly:

(Experiment #7)

Don: Ok, so, Daniel, Mark, and Keith?
 Mark: Well, [pause] yeah, I guess that Mark seemed to be more deserving of getting the scholarship money [outcome], if he was worthy of, you know.
 Don: Yeah, he doesn't have the GPA that Keith does [comparison of inputs]. But then you look at Keith's.
 Mark: Yeah, I would just say put Keith third [outcome] because it doesn't look like to me that he needs to be given any scholarships [input?].
 Don: No, because he's the only child in a family that earns 23 thousand [input?]. That's pretty good set up for him. Ok, so that sounds reasonable to me, Daniel, Mark, Keith.
 Mark: I know that's what I'd say.
 Roger: Yeah, now why are we? Just because? Ha, ha, ha.
 Don: I don't think it takes much to justify it.
 Mark: It doesn't take much to justify Daniel being first [outcome] or second [outcome]. It's just that Mark's family situation [input?] and the amount of money [input].
 Don: Didn't compare to.
 Mark: Needs it more, like Keith doesn't look like to me like he should be somebody crying.
 Don: Yeah, he doesn't look like he needs anything. So, our reasons why Daniel should be first [outcome], for one thing he's got the highest GPA [input], and for another thing he's totally independent from his parents, trying to make it on his own [input], with loans and stuff like that. Ok, then that's good enough for Daniel being first [outcome]. Then for Mark being second [outcome]. Although he has a lower GPA than does Keith does [comparison of inputs], he definitely shows a higher need for money than Keith does [input?], and Keith looks, like he's got everything pretty well set [comparison input?]. Ok, does that look alright?

By presenting the data in this fashion, exchange formulations, or any of the other distributive justice formulations, completely ignore the lengthy group discussion that preceded their decision. One can go through the transcripts without very much difficulty and label the various inputs, status characteristics, balance notions, normative expectations, or the like. But the example above also shows that "inputs" were once "items" which have now become information for the group through interpretation. The interesting feature about the transcripts is that the group does not apply a scheme for ranking the applicants, they construct one. Schutz (1971) points out that ad hoc groups (such as in this study) have no shared system of ready-made typifications or relevances and are therefore always involved in a process of building typifications and relevances.

When attempting to make sense out of the transcripts, there emerges a problem of reflexivity between the participants' interpretive procedures for making the distributive justice phenomenon understandable and the researcher's interpretive procedures for making the distributive justice phenomenon understandable. The researcher has the difficult task of understanding the distributive justice phenomenon as it has come to be understood by the group members. The participants, by use of talk, are "doing" distributive justice in a way that is both observable and reportable. They are ranking the applicants in a way they deem just. But, if the researcher

were to select those statements from the transcripts which were felt to be the most sociologically relevant (such as "inputs"), it would not be possible to understand the distributive justice phenomenon as it is understood by the members.

Grounds for Scholarship Allocation

After reviewing the transcripts and tapes several times it was possible to organize six types of statements in which the participants were giving grounds for allocating scholarships. By "grounds" it is meant that there are normative ways of allocating scholarships in everyday life. The following excerpts illustrate the participants' giving grounds for allocating scholarships:

Ground A

(Experiment #4)

Mark: Ok, the idea of getting a financial scholarship is for support. Obviously, if they do apply, they don't have enough money.

(Experiment #6)

Carol: Give me your arguments again, why do you think financial statement is more important than grade point?

Linda: Well, I think they're equally important, but, I think a person who needs it the most ought to have it.

Ground B

(Experiment #1)

Hank: Yeah, but then I looked down here and he's totally independent from his parents.

Tracey: Yeah

(Experiment #2)

Sue: Ok, who's independent and who's not independent?
 Elaine: Susan is . . .
 Michelle: She's working.
 Elaine: Susan is independent, Diane is a little bit independent, and Donna is totally dependent.

Ground C(Experiment #4)

Mark: Whether he works hard to deserve that scholarship, or trying hard to get financial backing.

(Experiment #1)

Tracey: Yes, it is a hard subject and he will need a lot of time to study. Therefore, if he has to spend it working, it's going to be a real problem for him.
 Hank: So I think he's pretty up to par. Well, I guess he could be better.

Ground D(Experiment #4)

Mark: Ok, the college major will tell us what kind of business these people are planning to do. What are they working towards?

(Experiment #5)

Julie: Well, it's a hell of an idea to put the guy through and not get anything back out of it.
 Sue: Yeah!

Ground E(Experiment #4)

Steve: Yeah, but it may be hard for the (blind) kid to support himself.
 Mark: All the additional expenses. He has to have someone bus him around. Ever seen one of those vans? they come by, pick up the people.

(Experiment #6)

Carol: Yeah, but it's funny, they get you in a bind because, like health statement, maybe she can't work more than, ha, ha, ha.
 Linda: Ha, ha, ha.
 Carol: You don't know those things.
 Debbie: Yeah, and we ruled that out. We don't know if she's a diabetic, or if she's confined to a wheelchair.

Ground F

(Experiment #4)

Mark: You can't evaluate a person's intelligence by a 3.5 or 2.8.

(Experiment #7)

Roger: I think it should be second behind some score or indication of intelligence. I don't know if you want to go with SAT, or the grade point average.

Keep in mind that these statements, when taken out of context, may appear to make no sense at all. However, within the context of the group's conversation the statements can be organized in the following way:

Ground A: Scholarships are given to those individuals who demonstrate a financial need.

Ground B: Scholarships are given to those individuals who exhibit independence.

Ground C: Scholarships are given to those individuals who show effort.

Ground D: Scholarships are given to those individuals who will be useful to society in the future.

Ground E: Scholarships are given to individuals who are handicapped in some way.

Ground F: Scholarships are given to those individuals who are intellectually competent.

In selecting the previous examples, an attempt was made to select those examples which were typical of the statement made by the group members, in reference to the grounds for allocating scholarships. Similar statements which exemplify the grounds for allocating scholarships were observed repeatedly throughout the experiments. However, there appeared to be no noticeable order or sequence to the statements concerning the grounds for allocating scholarships. One member may broach a ground for allocating scholarships at any time and for no apparent reason. For example:

(Experiment #7)

Roger: I don't think you're going to find much difference between college grade point average and SAT.

Don: Ok.

Mark: What else would you include? I don't follow you.

Don: Well, I was thinking maybe applicants' employment information might be a good indication of how the student will pay for the next couple of years as a student.

Mark: I really don't think that's that important. I didn't think family background is that important.

Don: No, I didn't either.

In this example, the group was involved with discussing ground F when Don broached ground A for reasons unknown. Yet the group did not find this to be disturbing, it seemed to be perfectly acceptable to broach a ground, or drop one, for allocating scholarships at any time. Also, once a ground was broached by one of the members, that ground could be dropped or reintroduced by any one of the members at any particular time or occasion.

General Grounds and Group Practices

The first clue that the group practices and the grounds for allocating scholarships were somehow linked together came about in experiment four when participants were asked if they would change their decision because of new additional information they had received. The following dialogue occurred:

Researcher: Would you change your mind now? Would
you say . . .
Larry: Well, . . .
Steve: Only in this case.
Larry: Well, we can't say that, because we could
always say "only in this case." I think
we're still right in asking for family
background information, cause we did make
assumptions.
Steve: I'll put it this way, I consider this an
exception to the rule.

In this particular episode the group is making use of the consistency work practice. But, while the group is attempting to make the new information consistent with their previously committed decision, Steve makes use of what Garfinkel (1967) terms "et cetera", "unless", and "let it pass" practices to demonstrate the rationality of the group's decision. This seems to suggest that the group's final decision of what are the most important grounds for allocating scholarships is not universal. The group's decision will hold only when "other things being equal". We can now say that the quasi-law feature of the group's final decision suggests that the grounds for allocating scholarships are "general grounds". Given different conditions at a different time and occasion, the group's decision may not be applicable. Moreover, aware that the final decision is not

strictly universal, the group still arrives at a decision which they feel is objective and rational. Take, for example, the discussion that concluded experiment four:

- Larry: Well, obviously you've got to make assumptions cause that way it gives you a basis for making conclusions.
- Mark: Yeah, a lot of guess-work, and with all three of us working together open-mindedly, we've come to conclusions that, by making assumptions, then working it over, talking it over, you know. I would like to stress open-mindedness.
- Larry: Yeah, and we initially agreed with the three pieces of information, and we stuck with it. And with the assumption or the statement that every one of these additional information is definitely needed too, and that it's possible we've seem to change our, you know, our decision back and forth with the supplemental criteria. So, it is valuable to have all.
- Steve: It might make a nice, I think there's a point where you should really have piles of stuff, which you really should have, which I feel are the first three, cause I really see a change when we got all of it, from the first three. But, the rest of it is real nice supplemental.
- Larry: Yeah, as an overview of what we did, like you say, we were very objective! And we came to a decision after seeing the rest of the stuff. Our basic assumptions were objective, and was important.

Knowing that group's final decision will not hold true for every case, the group still manages to yield a ranking of the three most important criteria to be considered when allocating scholarships. Obviously there are, or could be, applicants who apply for scholarships who conform to grounds A, B, C, D, E, F, A & B, A & C, A & D, A & E, A & F, B & C, etc. In order to arrive at a final decision of which the group can all agree upon,

group members give descriptive accounts of the general grounds for allocating scholarships which satisfies the group that their work is "in the right track". These descriptive accounts satisfy group members that they are pursuing a course which will eventually lead to a rational, objective decision. For example:

(Experiment \$3)

Mark: Financial statement or . . .
 Larry: Well, parents financial statement, that's, I've always been pretty pissed since the beginning of how they always do that. It should not be based on what you should receive, except, you know, obviously some people do have a lot of money, I mean, you can actually say "what bracket are you in?" But, when they start assessing it all the way down, and most your, what you need is based on what they earn, even if your, aside from if your living at home, you know, most guys do get away.
 Steve: Even if your family does make 35 thou.
 Larry: Yeah.
 Steve: Then again it might not mean . . .
 Larry: Maybe there's seven kids and the father has, you know, has debts for being in the hospital twenty years.
 Steve: He has a factory job.
 Larry: Right!

In this example Larry is offering the descriptive account that when using financial statement, "what you need is based on what they earn, even if your, aside from your living away from home, you know, most guys do get away." Steve adds the account "Even if your family does make 35 thou." Larry agrees with Steve's statement and adds the account "seven kids" and "the father has, you know, debts for being in the hospital twenty years." Steve then adds the consideration that "he has a factory job." But, in every case, all accounts are made available

to the group by making use of consensus achievement practices. Considerations of the various general grounds for allocating scholarships are made by interpreting, surmising, self-reference, other-reference, and consistency work.

Looking once again at the previous example, the considerations for grounds and the group consensus achievement practices are used simultaneously in the following way:

<u>Descriptive Account</u>	<u>Consensus Achievement Practice</u>
I've always been pretty pissed since the beginning of how they always do that	Self-Reference
It should not be based on what you should receive	Interpretation
Obviously some people do have a lot of money	Surmising
But, when they start assessing it all the way down	Other-Reference (Unspecified Authority)
What you need is based on what they earn	Surmising
Aside from if your living away from home	Surmising
most guys do get away	Surmising
Even if your family does make 35 thou	Surmising
Maybe there's seven kids and the father has, you know, has debts for being in the hospital twenty years.	Surmising
He has a factory job	Surmising (Fictional Character)

In sum, the participants were giving descriptive accounts of what the general grounds for allocating scholarships are. In order to reach a consensus about the grounds for allocating scholarships, the group socially and collectively gave descriptive accounts by making use of surmising, interpretive, self-reference, other-reference, summing-up, and consistency work practices. Therefore, which general grounds for allocating scholarships were to be used when evaluating the applicants, was the net result of the accounts and consensus achievement practices used by the group members. The general nature of the grounds for allocating scholarships allows the group unlimited possible combinations of practices for giving accounts. There is no uniformity or predictability as to which particular practice will be invoked by the group members at any particular time or occasion. The final decision of how the scholarships ought to be allocated is contingent on the setting, its circumstances, its characteristics, its particular situation.

The Contrived Setting

There is much evidence to support this last notion that the final decision of how scholarships ought to be allocated is contingent upon circumstantial possibilities in which there are endless ways of making the information sensible. In each of the experiments, the group made statements about the general grounds for allocating scholarships that corresponded to the use of the information provided for by the researcher. The participants' general grounds for allocating scholarships did not correspond

to any other category of information other than the ones provided by the researcher. The following chart explicates this point.

<u>Information Topic</u>	<u>General Ground Applicable</u>
Parents Financial Statement	Ground A & B
SAT Scores	Ground F
Overall College	Ground C & F
Family Background	Ground A & B
Student's Employment	Ground B & C
College Major	Ground D
Health Statement	Ground E

More than likely the participants are aware of other general grounds for allocating scholarships, such as allocating scholarships to minorities, women, or athletes. Yet, these general grounds were never elaborated. First of all, the variables race and sex were made constant in this study in an attempt to avoid preferential decisions, therefore, race and sex were not circumstantial elements of the setting. Secondly, athletic ability information was not included in the information list, thus making athletic ability an irrelevant circumstance of the setting.

Although participants were repeatedly encouraged to suggest additional information that ought to be considered when allocating scholarships, no additional information categories were offered. On the other hand, participants were also told that the MSA evaluated applicants according to the same information topics

they were provided with, and that their purpose was to aid the MSA. The task, as it was presented to the group members, was to make suggestions to the MSA about the information given. What is essentially being said to the participants is, given these information topics, how would you go about allocating scholarships.

Also, once the group had agreed upon the first information topic they wanted and were given that piece of information, the focus of the discussion moved away from scholarship allocation in general, and toward the specific circumstances of the applicants. In this sense, the researcher is implying to the group, given these conditions stipulated in this particular piece of information, how would you go about evaluating the applicants? In sum, the objectivity of the members' decision of how scholarships should be allocated is not independent from the setting, its circumstances, its characteristics, its particular situation. Furthermore, how scholarships should be allocated is consequential to the group's elaboration of the materials in the setting, by making use of the various group practices.

As a final remark on the contrived setting, it must also be pointed out that in every experiment the researcher stressed the importance of the group reaching a consensus. In Design II participants could not receive a piece of information until there was a majority agreement. In this way, the contrived stipulated conditions of the setting is not independent from the group's consensus achievement practices.

PART VII: CONCLUSIONS

It was proposed in the Introduction of this paper that it was possible to directly observe the distributive justice phenomenon in its entirety. This, however, did not fully happen. The participants' general grounds for allocating scholarships reflected the experimental setting, its circumstances, its characteristics, and its particular situation. For this reason, the distributive justice phenomenon cannot be considered to be independent from the researcher's contrived stipulated conditions of the setting. This finding is important in that it calls into question all previous experimental designs concerning distributive justice. It is quite possible that the results found in previous distributive justice experiments merely reflect the researcher's intentions.

Although it was not possible to directly observe the distributive justice phenomenon in its "pure" form, it was possible to observe how a group of individuals go about resolving a distributive justice problem. The group practices mentioned in this study partially fills a tremendous gap in the distributive justice literature. We now have some understanding of the socially constructed nature of the distributive justice phenomenon.

The transcript from Experiment 4 (see Appendix H) has been included to give the reader an opportunity to observe a group's

use of the practices from the time they were given a distributive justice task, to the accomplishment of that task. Since it is impossible to include the tape recording of Experiment 4, much of the transcript loses its authenticity. Nonetheless, the transcript still provides an understanding of how a group goes about, by the use of certain practices, socially constructing the distributive justice phenomenon.

There is also another reason for including the transcript of Experiment 4. The transcript was included to show the richness of conversational data. Persons doing sociology rely upon individuals' talk as a major resource for their inquiries. Elicitation instruments such as questionnaires or interviews are used to collect individuals' responses or answers. Yet there is always the problem among social scientists of "cleaning up" a respondent's talk or responses. Typically the solution to this problem has been to either use fixed-alternative response categories or some type of elaborate coding scheme. On the other hand, mere utterances observed in this study proved to be crucial for demonstrating how consensus was ultimately achieved by a group. Hence, conversational analysis can be a fruitful alternative way of doing sociology.

It is not being suggested here that conversational analysis is anything new to social science. Quite the contrary, there is a vast amount of literature concerning conversational analysis in both sociology and anthropology. This traditional literature has been developed under the auspices of either

"ethnomethodology" or "social linguistics." A discussion of the major works in either of these two areas has purposefully been omitted because it is very unclear as to how these works are important for sociology. For example, two ethnomethodologists, Garfinkel and Sacks (1970; 1972) have written extremely convincing papers on the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. But, in turn, how collected conversational data has been used by ethnomethodologists and social linguists affords sociology very little insight about social phenomena. Admittedly, conversation is a social phenomenon itself. But, how much can we learn about social relations by limiting investigations to such conversational practices as turn-taking (see Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974) sequencing in conversational openings (see Schegloff, 1968), and opening up closings? (see Schegloff and Sacks, 1974). The net result of these efforts has been a sort-of biology of natural language which ignores completely that conversations between speakers and hearers have intent and purpose. Such activities as turn taking, sequencing in conversational openings, and opening up closings provided no help in making sense out of the conversational data collected in this study. For these reasons, conversational analysis has been traditionally used for atheoretical purposes.

This is not to say that the findings from previous studies using conversational are totally unimportant. Contributions such as Schegloff's (1972) notion of locational formulation (in which the formulation of place serves as a marker for

orienting conversation) is a valuable concept for understanding the context-sensitivity of any phenomenon. The problem is that if one continues to investigate only the mechanisms in conversation, conversation itself becomes the only phenomenon under scrutiny. It is suggested here that conversational data can, and has been, used for investigating various social phenomena. One can only imagine what Homans' (1953) original formulations would have been had he not recorded the conversations he had with the cash posters.

As a final remark, the distributive justice phenomenon has only partially surfaced in this study. The problematic concern of scholarship allocation is more than likely different than the allocation of other types of rewards (i.e., job promotions, wage distribution, honors, etc.). Scholarship allocation may in fact summon what Goffman (1974) terms a "frame" which governs individuals organization of the object of their activity. In other words, the principles which governs a group's behavior while concerned with a task of scholarship allocation may be quite different in a different frame, such as job promotions. And this, of course, is a theoretical problem of intent and purpose. Variants of the design used in this study are presently being constructed to give a much broader understanding of the frame used for allocating scholarships. Certainly one can conclude from the experiments that grounds given by the group for allocating scholarships tended to favor need considerations. At the same time, they also

considered merit as well. How this compromise between need considerations and merit considerations is achieved is a question which may lead to a better understanding of the distributive justice phenomenon.

APPENDIX A: CHARACTERISTIC MATRIX

CHARACTERISTIC MATRIX

	Major Status	Overall College GPA	SAT Score	Employment and No. of Hours	Parents Occupational Status	Total Family Income	Parent's Contribution
Applicant #1 Mark or Donna	Pre-Med	2.68	520	Employed Half Time	Father-Auto Wash Manager Mother-Bank Teller	\$16,548	All Tuition and Books
	HIGH	LOW	MED	MED	LOW	MED	MED
Applicant #2 Daniel or Diane	Communications	3.42	435	Employed 3/4 Time	Tool and Dye Machinist (Father only)	\$ 9,678	None
	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MED	LOW	LOW
Applicant #3 Keith or Susan	Accounting	3.29	670	Employed 1/5 time	College Instructor (Father only)	\$23,000	All Educational Expenses
	MED	MED	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH

APPENDIX B: SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATIONS

MICHIGAN SCHOLARSHIP GRANT APPLICATION

lsav-102

PF: 3420

Applicant's Full Name _____

Local Address _____

Local Phone No. _____ Student ID No. _____

Sex _____ Age _____ Major _____

Marital Status (1) single____ (2) married____ (3)divorced/
separated _____

Ethnicity (1) white____ (2) black____ (3) chicano____ (4)other____

Overall College Grade Point Average _____

Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) Score _____

Are you presently employed? _____

If yes, how many hours do you spend at your job per week? _____

Statement of Parents Financial Situation

Father's Occupation _____

Position _____ Father's Annual Income _____

Mother's Occupation _____

Position _____ Mother's Annual Income _____

Family Total Annual Income _____

How much do your parents contribute toward your college educa-
tion? _____

College Advisor _____

Applicant's Signature _____

PF: 3420

Applicant's Signature

PF: 3240

Applicant's Signature

APPENDIX C: PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Excuse me, I'm sorry to interrupt your discussion, but I would like to ask you a few questions at this point. First of all, do you find it easy or difficult to rank order the applicants?

The experimenter then records the responses as:

- a. If easy, why? _____

Describe how you went about ranking the applicants. _____

Which characteristic of the applicants made it easiest for you to decide? _____

Why do you consider this particular characteristic to be more important than the other characteristics? _____

Why are the other characteristics less important? _____

- b. If difficult, why? _____

What seems to be the main difficulty in ranking the applicants? _____

Why do you consider it (the difficulty) important? _____

Is there any way of resolving this difficulty? _____

How so? _____

- c. *Information suggestions _____

Do you feel that you need more information on the applicants? _____

What information would you suggest? _____

Why is this (information offered) important? _____

*NOTE - If subjects request more information about the three applicants, experimenter will (1) explain that the information provided by the applications is the only information the MSA requests of the applicants; (2) ask subjects to make suggestions; and then (3) record those suggestions.

2. Secondly, do you feel at this point that all three of three of the applicants should be considered for receiving a scholarship? If not, which applicant (or applicants) do you feel should/or should not be considered for receiving a scholarship, and why.
- a. Applicant(s) to be considered: _____
 Reason: _____
 Why do you feel that all the applicants should be considered? _____
- b. Applicant(s) not to be considered: _____
 Reason: _____
 Why don't you feel that applicant(s) should not be considered for receiving a scholarship? _____
 Why do you feel that (subjects answer to previous question) is important? _____
 Why do you feel that the other(s) applicants should be considered? _____
3. Lastly, if you were to make a decision presently, how would you rank the applicants as to which applicant should be considered a first choice, a second choice, or a third choice?
- a. First choice: _____
 Why? _____
 Was this an easy or difficult choice? _____
- b. Second choice: _____
 Why? _____
 Was this an easy or difficult choice? _____
- c. Third choice: _____
 Why? _____
 Was this an easy or difficult choice? _____

APPENDIX D: FINAL DECISION INTERVIEW GUIDE

FINAL DECISION INTERVIEW GUIDE

After the subjects have discussed the applications for (Approximately) 15 minutes more, the experimenter will then enter the experiment room and ask subjects for a final decision. The following script will be used:

1. Excuse me, I would now like to obtain your final decision on how the applicants should be ranked. First, though, do you all agree upon how the applicants should be ranked?

-
- a. If agree, how should the applicants be ranked? _____
 First choice: _____
 Reason (Probe) _____
 Why do you consider this particular applicant to be a first choice? _____
 Why do you consider this (subject's reasons) to be important? _____
 - b. Second choice: _____
 Reason (Probe) _____
 Why do you consider this particular applicant to be a second choice? _____
 How does the applicant differ from your first and third choice? _____
 Why are those differences important? _____
 - c. Third choice: _____
 Reason (Probe) _____
 Why do you consider this applicant to be a last choice? _____
 How does the applicant differ from your first and second choice? _____
 Why are those differences important? _____
 - d. If disagree, where does the disagreement lie? _____
 Why do you consider the disagreement important? _____
 Is there any way to resolve the disagreement? _____
 How? _____

2. Overall, did you find that your final decision of how the applicants should be ranked was easy or difficult? _____

a. If easy, explain why _____

Explain how you went about ranking the applicants _____

Is there one characteristic which you felt aided your decision more than the other characteristics? _____

Why did you feel that it (characteristic offered) was important? _____

b. If difficult, explain why _____

What was your major difficulty in ranking the applicants? _____

Why do you feel that (subject's explanation) is important? _____

Is there any way to reduce the amount of difficulty? _____

c. Additional criteria suggestions _____

Do you feel that additional criteria should be used in the applications? _____

What are they? _____

Why do you feel that they (additional criteria offered) should be included? _____

In the final phase of the experiment the experimenter will interview each subject separately with the following interview guide. Subjects are told that the results will be kept confidential and anonymous.

APPENDIX E: POST-EXPERIMENTAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

POST-EXPERIMENTAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Did you find that it was difficult or easy to select a first choice from the three applicants? _____
 - a. Probe: Why was it easy? _____

Is there one characteristic which makes this applicant more desirable than the others? _____

Why so? _____

How quickly did you decide upon this applicant as a first choice? _____

Was there ever any second thoughts? _____
 - b. Probe: Why was it difficult? _____

Why do you consider this (difficulty) important? _____

Is there any way to reduce this difficulty? _____

2. Did you find it difficult or easy to differentiate between your first choice and your second choice? _____
 - a. Probe: Why was it easy? _____

Is there one characteristic which differentiates your first choice from your second choice more than any other characteristic? _____

Why do you feel that (characteristic) is important? _____

 - b. Probe: Why was it difficult? _____

How would you change your second choice in order to make it a first choice? _____

How would you change your first choice to make it a second choice? _____
3. Did you find it difficult or easy to differentiate between your second and your third choice? _____
 - a. If easy, why? _____

Is there one characteristic which differentiates your second choice from your third choice? _____

Why do you feel that (characteristic) is important? _____

- b. How would you change your third choice in order to make it a second choice? _____
- How would you change your second choice in order to make it your third choice? _____
4. Did you find it difficult or easy to differentiate between your first and your third choice? _____
- What was the major difference between your first choice and your second choice? _____
- Do you consider this to be a large difference? _____
- Why? _____
- How would you change your third choice in order to make it a first choice? _____
5. When your group had reached a final decision on how the applicants were to be ranked, did you disagree or agree with the group's decision? _____
- Why did you agree with the group? _____
- Did you feel that you had a part in the final decision? _____
- _____
- Did you find the other members of your group to be reasonable? _____
- Why? _____
- Why not? _____
6. Was there one particular member of the group you felt influenced your decision? _____
- Which member(s)? _____
- How were you influenced? _____
7. After the preliminary vote on the ranking of the applicants: (If the group's decision had changed)
- Were you aware that the group had changed its decision? _____
- _____
- (Probe) Why do you think the group changed its decision? _____
- _____
- Did you agree or disagree with the change? _____

APPENDIX F: REVISED SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION FORM

MICHIGAN SCHOLARSHIP GRANT APPLICATION

1sav-102

PF: 3240

Applicant's Full Name _____ (Male or Female)

Local Address _____

Local Phone No. _____

Sex _____ Age _____

Marital Status

(1) single X (2) married _____ (3) divorced or separated _____

Ethnicity

(1) white _____ (2) black _____ (3) chicano _____ (4) other _____

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

APPENDIX G: INFORMATION LIST

INFORMATION LIST*
(Alphabetically Arranged)

Applicant's Employment Information (current)

College Grade Point Average

College Major

Family Background Information

Health Statement

Parents' Financial Statement (includes parents' contributions)

Scholastic Aptitude Test Score (SAT)

*This list is to be given to the participants

INFORMATION LIST*

Applicant #1: Mark or Donna
 Applicant #2: Daniel or Diane
 Applicant #3: Keith or Susan

APPLICANT'S EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

Applicant #1: Works 20 hours per week at a local sport shop
 Weekly Pay \$44 Monthly Pay \$176
 Applicant #2: Works 30 hours per week as a deliveryman
 (male) or sales clerk (female)
 Weekly Pay \$65 Monthly Pay \$260
 Applicant #3: Works 8 hours per week for a handicap
 association
 Weekly Pay \$24 Monthly Pay \$ 96

COLLEGE GRADE POINT AVERAGE (OVERALL)

Applicant #1: 2.68
 Applicant #2: 3.42
 Applicant #3: 3.29

COLLEGE MAJOR

Applicant #1: Pre-Med
 Applicant #2: Communication
 Applicant #3: Accounting

FAMILY BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant #1: 3 brothers and 2 sisters, one brother and one
 sister are in college.
 Father is a manager of an auto wash
 Mother is employed as a bank teller
 Applicant #2: 2 sisters, neither one in college - both married
 Father is employed as a tool & dye machinist
 Mother is a housewife

Applicant #3: No brothers or sisters
Father is a community college teacher
Mother is a housewife

HEALTH STATEMENT

Applicant #1: Treated for ulcers January 1975-restricted diet
Applicant #2: General health good
Applicant #3: General health good - loss of vision in both eyes - infant disease

PARENTS' FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Applicant #1: Family's total annual income is \$16,548.
Family pays for tuition and books only.
Applicant #2: Family's total annual income is \$9,678.
Family contributes no financial support.
Student has used loans to pay for educational expenses.
Applicant #3: Family's total annual income is \$23,000.
Student lives with parents (living costs).
Parents pay for all educational expenses except books and miscellaneous expenses.

SAT SCORES (800 POSSIBLE)

Applicant #1: 520
Applicant #2: 435
Applicant #3: 670

*This information list is to be held by the researcher only

APPENDIX H: EXPERIMENT 4 TRANSCRIPT

EXPERIMENT 4 TRANSCRIPT

L = Larry
S = Steve
M = Mark

E; (Subject Instructions)

S; Fairview Street, what kind of street is Fairview?

L; What kind of street is Roden?

M; Well, all in Lansing, they're all white, they're all single, all white, all about the same age, all male, obviously there is not enough information here. (Pause) Ok, the idea for giving a scholarship is to supply financial support and obviously if they do apply, they claim they don't have enough money.

S; Yep.

M; So.

L; Well.

M; Financial statement or?

L; Well, parents financial statement, that's, I've always been pretty pissed since the beginning of how they always do that, it should not be based on what you should receive except, you know, obviously some people do have a lot of money, I mean, you can actually say "what bracket are you in?" but, when they start assessing, you know, it all the way down, and most your, what you need is based on what they earn, even if your, you know, aside from if your living away from home, you know, cause most guys do get away.

S; Even if your family does make 35 thou.

L; Yeah.

S; Then again it might not mean.

L; Maybe there's seven kids and the father has, you know, has debt from the hospital that he was in for, you know, twenty years.

S; He has a factory job.

L; Right!

M; Ok, well sometimes the applicants just don't work, and they depend on their parents for.

L; That's right, that's why.

M; But, then again there's, ok, well I can see applicant's employment information either way pro or con that could influence.

L; Shows that.

M; The amount of income.

L; Right.

M; Whether he works hard to deserve that scholarship or trying hard to get financial backing.

L; Or if he's consistent, how many years he worked at certain jobs and reasons stated why by employers, like if he just worked for the summer.

S; Or fired.

- L; Yeah, or if he was fired, if he consistently puts down "I dislike the job' or so forth, meaning he had, he can't hack it, he can't just stick with something long enough without them, you know, if they award him money, then he's gonna be inconsistent in putting out for school, too.
- M; He probably won't pay it back either.
- L; Right, or he would have to be forced to do it, so that's why applicant's employment information would be valuable. Family background information would probably be important too, but, you know, that would be independent from the financial statement just information on how many children, where are they now, maybe a few of them are in school, too.
- S; Yeah.
- L; Maybe sometimes some families, you know, they'll have three or four, you know, guys that will or daughter or brothers that will go through the same major.
- S; I've got a brother who's starting next year and it will cost him 2,500 a year just for commuting, but, my parents combined is 29,500, or something.
- L; Uh-huh.
- S; That's a bitch!
- L; Sure is.
- S; So, I work, you know, full year round, take out loans and everything, so, yeah, I can see that.
- L; Yeah, except me, I'm personally involved. I've been turned down twice for, you know, scholarship grants in Michigan.
- S; Yeah, I never applied for scholarship grant.
- L; Because, most of the time you get in there, you file for it, it's the truth, the minority gets it, you know, I don't know how it goes kike you're saying what criteria they use, but, most of the people I know sure as hell don't get any of the money from Michigan, you know, there's something they got to be doing wrong.
- M; Should we ask for the applicant's employment information?
- S; Yeah.
- L; That's a good idea.
- E; That's a first choice piece of information?
- S; Uh-Huh.
- E; That's above all the rest?
- L; Um, let's weigh it again (Pause).
- M; College grade point average.
- L; Yeah, grade point average and applicant's employment information seem to be the most valid to me at the moment.
- S; Major might, like an accounting and chemistry on this campus are the lowest overall departmental gpa's, and his grade point wasn't all that fantastic but relative to his major, it's really good.
- L; So, you can really be discriminate on majors that's why I kind a ruled it out, because like you said, like chemistry or somebody working in mathmatics majors or stuff like that, could have a lower gpa rather than the college of

social science where these sociology majors are just, you know, and the psychology majors are maybe pulling a 3.5, you know, compared to a 2 point or 2.8, you know, to a chemistry or something, that may be biased in getting that.

M; I've always been kind of biased against gpa's.

L; Yeah.

S; Yeah.

M' You can't evaluate a person's intelligence by 3.5 or 2.8.

L; Yeah, or even by a test too. Everybody bitches about a professor's test, how it really isn't a true measurement of what you really think you know. It would be hard to assess that, you know, through an oral interpretation, because there's no time available.

M; And a class of a hundred and fifty kids.

S&L&M; (Talk at once).

L; They couldn't agree with you on what you say

S; Of course not on a TV screen, yeah, then applicant's employment information is.

L; Ok.

S; Because even then if his grade point wasn't all that great, we would know a little bit more about his financial background.

L; Right! and if he's.

S; Termination and things like that.

L; Right, and if he's putting forth an effort to make some money towards an education.

M' Working and going to school.

L; Right, sounds like a winner.

E; So, you would like applicant's employment information?

Let me tell you what's involved in applicant's employment information. It tells, basically, what type of organization the individual works for, how many hours a week does he work, and the amount of pay he gets for that.

L; So, it's only the present job he's working at now, it's not?

E; That's correct, it is not a history.

M; It doesn't say how long he's had that particular job?

E; No, it does not have that information.

L; Well, that kind of rules out what we've tried to base it on.

S; No history.

L; Yeah.

E; Do you think that's important?

S; Yeah, history.

L; Yeah, cause we've stated, you know, that if a person is consistent in keeping jobs, you know, or finding jobs relating, in what type of jobs he's had, is it related to his field? Then that means he has a greater interest to be associated with those people. So, you know, he can apply that to his field rather than getting some, you know, I know it's sometimes you get jobs just to get money, you know, that's obvious. It's not always easy to find a job in what you're interested in.

S; But it shows effort.
 L; Yeah, it would show us.
 S; And that can make up for whatever might not seem to be there with gpa, relative to a major.
 L; Right.
 M; He's trying to put himself through school, he definitely works hard at his job.
 E; The current information won't give you that? That knowledge?
 M; The one here?
 E; The one I have available for you.
 L; Yeah, It would probably tell us, like you said, at the moment, we could find out if his job presently is related to his major and, or if it isn't, and then, um, like you said it doesn't give any record of how long you.
 S; He could be working for 30 to 60 hours. Still want to take a look at that?
 L; Yeah.
 S; Still want to look at that?
 M; Yeah.
 S; Ok.
 E; Is that out of all the available information?
 S; Uh-Huh.
 E; Now, you have lines. I would like for you to take a pencil and write down the information I give you.
 M; Which one's first?
 E; I'm going to give you information for all of them, all applicants.
 E; Experimentor gives information on applicant's employment information (see Appendix G). Now, given that piece of information, try and discuss how you would rank the applicants as to a first choice, second choice, or third choice. You have two available pieces of information left from your information list.
 S; Now, can I ask you a question?
 E; Sure.
 S; Is this grant fixed or variable? the amount.
 E; It's a fixed grant.
 L; Just an annual amount?
 S; It's a certain set amount, it doesn't vary?
 E; It's a certain set amount granted annually.
 S; This guy here works almost full time. He's pulling in 260 a month. I'm just wondering (Pause), how much of that grant would he need? It could be staggered. Stiner, he would need the grant more. His living might be more of a difference to make up.
 M; Ok, we can look at Keith, I don't know what his major is or why he's doing that, It could be for beer money (Pause), it could be dedication towards.
 S; Yeah.
 L; That's right.
 S; It's not exactly discernable.
 L; I think we should request for more information. It's hard to.
 S; Do we have to rank them anyway?

E: Do you think there is enough information at this time that you could rank them?

L: I personally couldn't.

S: No.

M: I couldn't truthfully rank them this way.

E: Given the information you have at this point, how would you.

M: How would you?

E: How would you rank them? If this was the only information you had.

M: You would have to make a bunch of assumptions, they may or may not be true.

S: That could be his major. He may not need it all that much, because he not doing too bad, compared to everybody else, the guy in the middle, Mark, he might need it the most to make up.

L: And you figure, if Keith is doing 8 hours per week, for dedication and he's only making 24 hours per week you can do that in two afternoons or three afternoons, you would think he would get another job, you know, like one that does 15 hours.

S: Yeah.

L: 15 additional hours, you know, and he would still, you know, be doing the same amount of work as the other would, so it might.

M: You don't know what the major is or.

L: Yeah.

M: Or his credit load.

L: Yeah, yeah, like you say, he could be doing 22 credits a semester trying to get through. So, that would be a bias on our part to say that he's only working that 8 hours.

S: Deliveryman, could be a marketing major.

L: Sure, for Coor's beer, I don't know about in Michigan.

L&S&M: Ha, ha.

L: Yeah, so I think I would like some more information.

E: Which piece of information do you think would be next?

L: It's hard to, cause I did rule out college major, cause I felt that the grade point average would be a little more valid, but, then we said like the gpa is bias. But, then again, if we look at college major, that might be biased also, and family background I stated was important. It's between those three (pause), for me anyway.

S: This SAT score is jive!

L: Unless maybe.

S: He could be sick that morning and blow the exam and still be smarter than anybody.

M: Yeah.

L: Unless Keith, you know, like if you look at the health statement. Maybe Keith too is a handicap person, you know, that would explain, you know, that he's only working 8 hours because of that. He can't tax himself, but yet he's dedicating himself for others.

M: That information wouldn't help us.

L; That's true, that's true.
 M; This guy working in the sports shop, could be a jock.
 L; That's true, that's true, and he could be supplemented under the table and so forth.
 M; Yeah, I know exactly what you mean, credit cards.
 L; Ok, so, we've ruled out health statement, huh? Ok, how about college major?
 M; I think college major could give us.
 L; That's true, that's true.
 S; Grade point is out of it completely.
 M; Ok, the college major will tell us what kind of business these people are planning to do, what are they working towards?
 L; Ok.
 M; And we can leave the grade point, the gpa out of that, cause that would just kind of mess everything up.
 L; True, if you have like an insight of what they're taking, you can say, well, a, this person's taking computer processing or something, maybe he's looking ahead in the future, maybe he's logically thinking this money would apply to a field later in life that would be moving, or not necessarily moving, but he would find work in, you know, rather than taking a job in, you know, nuclear fission, you know, aviation or so forth like that, you know, he might not, he would have to go, you know, years and years and years ahead of time. So, college major, I think, I would like to see.
 M; Let's go through the rest of this. Ok, GPA that is bias.
 L; Ok, let's throw that out.
 S; SAT score, forget that.
 M; Sat, we can be done with that.
 L; I've never liked the SAT!
 M&S; Ha, ha, (joke)
 M; Family background information.
 S; I was wondering there, which one.
 M; That may also be used.
 S; Eventually.
 L; Would that state how many, obviously how many other brothers and sisters in the family?
 E; Family background?
 L; Whether the father is dead or alive? Or the mother, That's what I thought was valuable if the mother is supporting children, you know, through welfare and so forth, ADC or.
 E; These are information available on the family background; number of brothers, number of sisters, and whether or not the brothers and sisters are in college or elementary school.
 L; And if any of them are deceased, cause like he could be getting money through the government for his father.
 E; It doesn't state that here.
 S; No parents. Marital status.
 E; It also tells the marital status of the brothers and sisters, and it will give the marital status of the parents, and it gives you information on what the father's occupation is and what the mother's occupation is.

- S; Are those the financial statements?
- E; Financial statement? Financial statement is the statement of the family's total income, and the family's contribution toward the applicant's education (pause).
- L; It says nothing of any, I guess it wouldn't, outstanding debts or loans the parents have towards, mortgage on the home, so forth and like that.
- S; It doesn't talk about the.
- E; It doesn't talk about the parent's loan situation. But, it does the student's, the applicants.
- M; That's the parents financial statement?
- E; Right.
- L; (Pause) I've often thought the parents financial statement is bias. Because if the father, if the parents are making a sum of 29 thousand, 29,000 or even 25,000, you know, that is a fair size amount of money per year, but it does rule out the other children that are at home, you've got to kind of look at that, I think, um, because, you know, the parents are making a lot of money and there might be only two children. Then again, I think a few more of the others are more important than that, like the college major and family background information are probably more, you know, a lot more helpful to us in our decision. Although if we don't know what the parents make, then we're kind of in the dark about that.
- M; The idea of family income maybe derived from the family background. If he's a janitor, we can assume a certain amount of money.
- L; Oh, it states what employment, in the family background, the father has?
- M; Father's occupation.
- L; Ok, then that.
- M; Then the number children, so we.
- L; Ok, that's true, that's true, employment in, ok, I agree on family background.
- M; College major?
- L; College major I'd like as second, and family background third.
- M; Working from this information here, I would say college major, that gives us an insight as to what they plan to do, how they plan to use their time, whether Keith needs that much time.
- L; Uh-huh.
- M; For his academic work.
- L; I agree, because if we take the family background information first, then we might develop some, you know, bias or great exception before we see what major he is in. So.
- M; I say college major.
- L; Me too.
- E; So, college major? What was the fear about biasness of family income?
- L; Family income? you mean the parents' financial statement?

- E; Why should you care if it's bias or not? Committees do make decisions on bias.
- L; That's true.
- S; I mean, you know, the kind of bias, that I suspect, may not be, you know, a lot of people who deserve it, who's parents might make 30, 32, 35 or something, a lot of times they can't afford it either, I mean, according to the government, and to their scale, they may be well off, but, in real terms, that's not always so. So, to be up there in the top 30%, but that still doesn't mean you're eating cake every day.
- L; That's true.
- E; You think college major is more important than that piece of information?
- S; Well, it shows direction, seeing the job.
- L; To the individual, and not, separate it from all that statistical stuff, such as the aptitude test I mentioned, statement something like that. We would like to find out what practical aspects of the individuals that are concerned with getting money.
- S; He can make a GPA with effort.
- E; So, you would like that above all the other information? Are you sure about that information? That's what you all agree upon?
- S; College major.
- M; Yeah.
- L; Yeah.
- E; Experimentor gives information on college major (see Appendix G).
- M; I've got a roommate who's been accepted to a medical school. That costs a lot of money.
- L; It sure does.
- S; All that time, internship, three years.
- M; He doesn't seem to be disillusioned so far, he seems to be persistent. I don't know how long he's had that major, probably he had that major all the way along, it shows that he's got.
- L; Are you speaking of Mark?
- M; Of Mark Stiner.
- L; Ok, so, he's what now, a sophomore, you said, twenty years old, pre-med, do you have to declare pre-med? Because I know, like, you can work towards the B.S. and concern your studies with mostly physiology, biology, basic stuff, you know?
- S; Yeah, I think you do.
- L; You have to declare?
- S; Uh-huh.
- L; I always thought that you didn't declare a major.
- S; You would still be in the college of natural science?
- L; Yeah, Ok.
- S; Com's always remind me of writing composition classes in high school. Everybody took them.
- M; You mean communications?

S; Yeah.

M; Communications, what does that relate to?

L; Personnel, personnel management. You could be working for public relations, he could even be working as a salesman for a coproration, you know, he could be working for broadcasting, going into radio, TV education or even non-formal education, and so forth like that.

S; My father had a bunch of that stuff, cause he was into a personnel agreement with management, the place where he works, so, he took a whole bunch of that. Specially for a deliveryman, had to explain the bill, it's up this week!

L; Either that, or maybe it's a requirement for politics.

S & L; ha, ha, ha.

E; Do you have enough information to rank the applicants at this point?

L; Oh, I don't believe so.

S; Accounting's no cake either.

M; It requires a fair amount of time and concentration, for the work and stuff.

S; I've got somebody who might be leading in the race, but I don't know how you can defend it.

L; Well, let us know.

S; Right now, Mark would seem to be the one who's right.

M; He seems to putting a lot of effort towards that, I don't know how well, he's doing in school, he's taking 20 hours out of his week to work in a sport's shop making 176 dollars.

L; Then you can also read other things into it. We know nothing of their level in school. Sure there 20 years old and 21 years old.

S; That could be a freshman.

L; Yeah, one could be working at a shop for two years and decide to go back to school. You could have made 7 to 8 thousand a year, and then driving around having a sailboat, and so forth, and decided to get rid of it, keep that money and bank it, and ask for additional funds. So, you can't really say that. And if you did know, if you would say that, like Mark, 20, he would be a sophomore, the others 21, a junior, you would say "Well, them being juniors they have worked longer than he has and they'll be out sooner. So, maybe the requirement for the funds will be even more so.

M; We really can't.

L. Yeah.

S; I would like to see one more piece of information. I wouldn't want to rush a decision, that could be the family business he drives for.

L; That's true, that's true. The sports shop also.

S; Yeah.

L; It could be his old man's sport shop too, so, background information seems.

E; Well, you requested college major, did that help?

L; It did, yes.

S; Yeah.
E; Where did that help.
M; It gave us direction, whether they really want a position, they're really shooting for something.
E; How do you know whether they're shooting for something given the information that you have?
L; You don't.
M; Well, ok, like pre-med, he has some direction, he wants a good job with that.
S; I know pre-med majors and they have a lot of work, specially in those beginning chem classes.
L; Sure they do.
S; It can really be a bitch!
L/ Sure it can.
S; And, the work he does, and putting in twenty hours a week. Like I put in twenty hours a week, 20-22, and that could be, that can make you break out in a mental sweat.
L; Right.
S; So that would make.
L; And also, Keith, accounting, my wife's in accounting and that's a hard curriculum. Those courses are very, I think very hard.
S; It takes a lot of concentration.
L; You have to be very dilligent and, you know, an awful lot of concentration, you can get pissed off so easy, like accounting, you just take a straight curriculum, I mean, it's all set up for you, take this, this, and this before you get that, you know, so, he would obviously have to work pretty hard too, and maybe, we like don't know but, he's got 8 hours per week, but maybe he is taking a full load in accounting, and he doesn't.
S; Takes up all his time.
L; Yeah, and he's having difficulty, has to work, he needs assistance or aid (pause). I still find it hard to make a decision.
M; I couldn't continue without more.
L; No.
E; But, the major seemed to help you?
S; Yeah.
L; Oh, yeah, you kind of get things straightened in your head a little, what preconceptions you would like to look at first and then offer some alternatives and so forth.
E; How would you rank them presently?
L; Presently?
E; Given the college major now.
S; Just off the top of the head?
E; Yeah, tentatively.
S; Mark one, Keith two, Dan three. But, make the two and three close.
M; It's a toss up for number one between Mark and Keith. Dan will have to be number three.
L; Yeah, I agree.
E; How did you go about that, how do you base that ranking?
M; Well, ok, the amount of work that goes into that particular major, un, pre-med, ok, my roommate's just accepted

into med school, ok, I'm familiar with all of the stuff he has to go through, I have a couple of friends who are in accounting, and possibly that's all he can spare, 8 hours, he's working and maybe just to stay alive and maybe he's not making enough money.

L; Communication major is like pretty open. Obviously you have to concentrate, you know, on communications, courses and stuff, but you have just about the same amount of work you would have in psych or sociology major.

S; That could make them just as, that could tend to diminish the differentiation, cause I know a woman friend of mine who is a communications major, she wants to work in a bank so she's taking all these econ courses and accounting and everything so she wants to have like a public relations, or a, have a means to people, or personnel management in a bank. So, I've seen instances like back home where someone will pick up a degree like that but it'll be an open-ended degree, but an open-ended degree because then they'll be able to weigh what is most relevant to them. You can shoot for a B.A., and you can work through a pre-med or accounting curriculum, and that's hip. Then you can take an open-end major, and bend it, you know, to make it fit you're particular need, and with accounting majors, they don't list what you're options are. So, that's why I would still put him three, but, it wouldn't be that, it would be close, a close third.

M; Third cause, I would put him third because I can see the difference in both. He needs the money more than the other one does.

L; Dan too.

M; That's true, Dan, Ok, then Mark and Keith, they seem to be working hard towards their major, and it employs a lot of time for their academic studies. They would not have enough, Mark here is 20 hours a week, I wonder how he does it?

E; Well, you have one piece of information left on the list.

M; Family background information, cause you got to find out, if, well, I would like to see how much, additional information or additional help his family is giving, like this Mark, whether he's working this twenty hours to keep his head above water, whether he has to do that or he doesn't have to.

E; There are two types of information, one is family background, one is parents financial statement.

M; I think family background would be the most.

S; Number of people.

M; Members of the family, the occupation of the parents and status of the family.

S; Cause if they're living where they say they are, just from knowing that area, doesn't seem like they would be rolling in dollar bills.

L; (Pause) I would like to also request family background information.

- E; You're final choice of information, is this agreed upon?
- M; I feel by choosing that, it would give us the last piece of information we need to come to a conclusion a truthful, unbiased.
- E; Then there is no need for the health statement of the applicants?
- M; No.
- E; College grade point average, overall GPA?
- M; No.
- L; No.
- E; Scholastic test?
- L; No.
- M; That's the one I definitely do not want!
- L&S; Yeah.
- E; How about parents financial statement?
- M; Parents financial statement would not give us the information, telling us about the.
- E; Parents financial statement also tells how much the parents are contributing toward the applicant's education.
- M; Yeah, but we don't know what he's doing as an occupation.
- L; That's true, that's true, and if you did give us that and they said, "They don't contribute anything at all," that's fine, but, family background, like he said before, it would tell us personally what the father is doing. I think we can estimate in our head, what we think the income he would be receiving and then it would state how many children there is, we can logically say "Well, you know, apply it to yourself and say, how much does my father give me when we had this many children, or how much did my friend get, the amount of children they have in their family. I mean it's only logical how much your parents can give, you know, cause most people do have expenses, they have, bills to pay, you know, health or other kids in school, they have to pay for clothing.
- L; Like they send out in high school a flier, "Everybody apply for a BEOG", basic educational opportunity grant. Now you say to the people who turned them in, you know on that nice little computer printout, "congratulations, you've been turned down"
- L; Rejected!
- S; Yeah, and I would rather look at the man who's applied, you know, like the family's position, cause like I've said, that kid's parents could be making a ton of bucks, and I think the number of people they had knowing how much it takes to raise people and get around, things like that, seems to be more important to me than how much money he's making. Because that can change with the wind.
- L; And like if one of the, the guy's here, their parents, there's like, maybe he's, in the family and just him and another brother, him and another sister and if the parents are making 30 thousand a year or something, then we know, they can afford to back him in some way. If they're not, then, well obviously their not if he's asking for it, or maybe just needs additional funds. But they should be

giving him, you know, some, and we could make an indication of, we could say "Well, at least they should be giving him at least a couple hundred dollars a year, if they're making, you know, if they're making, you know, if they're making 30 thousand a year and only two kids in the family. They could give up a thousand a year, you know, just about that, if we find out there's 4 or 5 kids in the family, and they're making 22,000, their combined income, then we know that's going to be hard, and if they do give something, that's fine. But, he still should be supplemented.

S; Cause the law of a state, like Illinois, they apply tough standards, like they say "They consider education to be your parents most important, significant investment, you in their life, you know, it's supposed to rank above feeding you, and they, and one crackpot letter that Hewitt sent out would say "It would not be inconceivable to expect your parents to sell their second car or take out a second mortgage or something, and it's hard enough to work off a mortgage, as it is, you know. So, for me the family situation is more important.

E; Now, do you feel confident in ranking the three on those three pieces of information? This is your last piece of information.

M; With the information there is, exposed to.

L; Yeah, I don't if we're confident, if confident is the right word.

Tape ends, experimenter gives subjects information on family background of applicants, leaves the room. Subjects were then left to make a final decision of how the applicants should be ranked.

PART II

L; Community colleges are usually funded by the state as well as local. So, I don't know, what do you two think?

S; Tool and dye machinist.

L; Yeah, but then again.

S; Might make a little more.

L; Yeah, and the deal is, if he's a tool and dye machinist, maybe he's been working in the shop, maybe for 15 years.

S; Yeah, he's.

L; And he's just been able, you know, to get into this tool and dye program.

S; Outside the fact that he might have gotten married last week, or something.

- L; Right, right.
- S; And my knowledge of tool and dye makers.
- M; Potentially has making, is a, making money as.
- S; Like my uncle, he went out, moved out of Chicago, moved out of Cicero and moved into a 50,000 dollar house.
- L; I don't know, you still see that no brothers and sisters, College professor, then you see here though, you can rule out the two sisters here, so it's like both of them are equal on that. Nobody's living at home except them, or nobody, you know, is getting aid except these two, the two older sisters are out, and their both, I would say tool and dye machinist and college instructor, maybe they're making just about the same.
- M; It's close to equivalence.
- L; Yeah, then you have to go back to the major.
- S; I think it comes under a cultural preference, maybe.
- L; And this guy's working 30 hours a week, he's able to work this 30 hours a week for some reason, and he's making 260 bucks a month. Well, if he's living at home and making 260 bucks a month, well, you know, maybe he has a car.
- S; That com major, I mean, he doesn't look like he probably lives at home, aw, that's another assumption, but, ok, that notwithstanding, he might not, it doesn't look like he's doing too bad, he's a deliveryman.
- L; For a local business. So, obviously he is living, well, not obviously, but were assuming, he probably does live at home. It's a local business, and he's only making 260 a month.
- S; Keith might be living at home too.
- L; That's not true either though, he could be living at the dorms and just supplemented through government loans.
- S; Yeah, true, so, they're just about equal, family-wise, income wise.
- L; I know I shouldn't ask this, obviously number one is outstanding. He's going to ask us for reasons, you know, for these two, because your talking no brothers, no sisters, and college instructor. Here we're making bias against college instructors.
- S; Yeah.
- L; As opposed to a machinist.
- S; And if we choose Keith, he'll ask us, "well then, that's your advice to the upward achiever," right! Because an accountant, if he became a CPA, he would be a professional, right? And the com, you can't assume, he might keep on being a deliveryman, he might just want, I don't have.
- L; Maybe he works for a local businessman, maybe there is public relations in that business, maybe that business if funding some of his education.
- S; Like I have another relative who started out as a roof man, for Freitas, and he worked his way up through the ranks.
- L; Shoot, I know a district manager making 30 bills a year.

- S; Right, that's the truth, those guys make some money. I know a CPA who can jump in a bank.
- L; Yeah, I had a friend who drove a truck route for Strohs, and he's making close to 18 thousand a year. Jes, he's only 24 years old, you know, if you want to do that the rest of your life, that's fine. I know that Stroh's is going to be around here for an awful long time!
- S&M; Ha, ha.
- M; Specially around here!
- S; That's strange I got those stock boy hands of those grocery stores.
- L; I don't know, do you want to make a decision?
- S; I'd like to, but i.
- M; Ok, me, I'm looking at, for Dan is, he's putting a lot of time into working, we don't know how much the parents are supplementing for his education, now, if for some reason, he could be living in a dorm and everything, and he's got lots of money, to buy a pound of Columbian or something.
- L; Really!
- M; Fuck-off money. You don't know if he's putting that money to work.
- L; And we have stated before that, accounting is a hard curriculum.
- S; It's nice to be civic minded and work for a handicap association.
- L; It is.
- S; It doesn't have all that much relationship with accounting, unless he keeps their books. We could sit here all day, now, and make a lot of assumptions.
- L; Yeah, that's true.
- M; Maybe he's not keeping the books, he's helping out with handicap. He probably wheels them around and stuff.
- L; Yeah, on campus, he could be even doing it.
- S; Yeah, that's true.
- L; And (pause) it's a bitch!
- M; On that assumption, I would put Keith number 2 and Dan number 3.
- L; Ok, there's another assumption you can make, if his father is working at a community college. That means that he's living in East Lansing. So, we're assuming that he goes to Michigan State right? Ok, so, if his father works at a community college, then it's either got to be LCC or someplace else. So, that means he's living away from home, he's going to need the money all the more than a person, this guy we assume, maybe he lives here.
- M; We know from the addresses they do not live in a dorm.
- L; Right, in Lansing, in East Lansing. He could live very well in an apartment. So, yeah, I would agree with you, number 2, Keith (pause) you agree?
- S; (pause) All it takes is two to vote me down. I was just wondering because it's my white middle class bias, but, accounting seems like a tougher challenge to me than communications. But, then what I said before, qualifying that

- by how it relative it affects the major. So, those two are.
- E; I gather that your decision is not a consensus?
- S; Well, it could very well be.
- M; Number 1, we agreed on that.
- S; Yeah, that was Mark.
- E; Number 1? You arrived at a decision?
- S; He's probably left out in the doorway, the doorstep, in a flaming snow storm, wrapped in a blanket.
- L&M; Ha, ha.
- E; Second choice?
- S; Ah, Keith.
- M; It's unanimous for Keith and Dan after that.
- E; No reservations?
- S; No reservations.
- L; We've talked about 2 and 3 for, we arrive at number 1.
- S; As soon as you left the room.
- M; As soon as the door closed.
- L; 2 and 3 in the last 15 minutes.
- E; How did you arrive at that decision?
- S; Ha, ha.
- L; Didn't I tell ya? That's why we talked about it so much, so we could have quite a few reservations as to why we came to this decision.
- E; Not particularly why, but how?
- L; Each of us work on the why, each of us go independently and then you can assess.
- M; Ok, what I looked at was, Ok, we know they're all living off campus, taken for granted they go to MSU. I looked at Dan, he's making quite a bit of money, and working on his own. I don't know what he's using that money for, but, I feel his parents are in a position to help him out. And for Keith, he's not making that much money, doing some things for handicap people, it's consideration showing his time. Accounting takes a great deal of time. See what, what we've see as being identical is the family background.
- L; Because you know the two older sisgers are married, so, we just excluded them, their independent, they have their own husbands, their own income. That evens them up as far as brothers and sisters because Keith has none. Then we said the father, college instructor of a community college, pay scale we assume would be a little bit lower than a university. And father is a tool and dye machinist, does make pretty good money, most places do pay a sizeable amount for people into programs for tool and dye electricians, you know, stuff like that, and both the mothers work, so, we said that too they're on that same scale. So, I guess the only thing that made our decision was Keith being in accounting a more rigorous, more demanding curriculum, and that he is giving more time, I mean his, you know, you know. He's civic minded for the handicap and this other guy is making 30 hours, you know, per week for 260 a month, you know, and the communications major, just no way.

- E; I'm curious at this point, you selected as your first choice, from the available information, the student's employment, and you really haven't talked about how that affected your final decision.
- S; Ok, well Mark was obvious, I mean, like I said, now, unless he's selling dope at that car wash, he ain't gonna make a whole lot.
- L; Yeah, his ol' man isn't.
- S; Yeah, and bank tellers not exactly.
- L; No, that's a bad job.
- S; That doesn't put you in the top 10.
- L; No, you're talking 4, or 5, or 6,000 a year with benefits.
- S; And he's, you know, two kids in primary school and one guy in high school, and those are the years you start changing clothes, you got a lot of expenses jus for being raised.
- L; Yeah.
- S; Plus books and stuff.
- L; And the two other girls.
- S; And two other girls in college, now they may have full rides for something, but still, you've still got the three boys. And he's, you know, pre-med, and he's working his rear end off, that.
- M; Shows ambition.
- L; Un-huh, Twenty hours a week.
- S; Second and third, were tough.
- E; Did you find applicant's working just as important as before you chose that piece of information?
- L; You mean now?
- S; His working? Yeah.
- L; Yeah.
- E; Just as important?
- S; It distinguished them even more than the other two, I mean, in view of the family situation.
- M; It was essential information for Keith and Dan in number 2 and 3.
- L; Yeah, it made our decision, yeah.
- S; Because as far as family and income are concerned, their just about even. Community college instructor and a tool and dye machinist, they're probably making about the same.
- L; And plus we stated that Daniel, his residence is Lansing as opposed to Keith's who's residence is East Lansing, and he's delivering for a local business, and it's Lansing, maybe he's living at home, you know,
- M; Who's this?
- L; Daniel, it says Lansing, so we figure maybe his parents live in Lansing. His father is working at a local, you know, factory as a tool and dye machinist. So, maybe he's living at home, and this other guy is living in East Lansing, so, we figure maybe he has an apartment off-campus, his father being a community college instructor, it would either have to be LCC or some other county, so, that means that he's living away from home or he's, you know, he's commuting to school. So, he would need additional funds for that.

- S; And in respect to the fact that.
- E; For commuting from Lansing to East Lansing?
- L; Yeah, Ok, if his father did teach at LCC, then it would rule out what I have said. But, we don't know if he teaches there, if he teaches at another community college, well then, it's probably in another county, so, he would have to come here to live.
- E; Do you feel confident?
- S; Well with me, the clincher on two and three, in my mind, seeing the family backgrounds, were just about the same. It was the major for me. It's just that to me accounting is a more obvious challenge, than com, he's making nice money. Com could be just a fuck-off major just like a lot of people consider education to be. Then it could be something really challenging but, we don't really have any proof of that, but, he is concerned about things other than just school and stuff like that by working for that. That can be messy work. You can be emptying bed pans. So, accounting from my personal experience seems to be something that requires a little more dedication, a little more determination because he can, he can intervatig at times, so, seems that that was the same in this case, the major, the second one that we considered, the second most important.
- E; Do you feel satisfied with your decision?
- S; Yeah.
- L; Yeah, as far as the information we've been given or allowed, cause we have stated that, I would say the other stuff would be very helpful, you know, it would like, maybe, rule out a little more the bias that we had. Then we could, you know, if we got the college grade point, the other tests, you know, we said they're not as important as what we've picked but it would show, maybe, a little more light on the situation.
- E; So you have selected college major.
- L; We selected applicant employment information first.
- L&S; College major second.
- L; Family background third.
- E; And you have arrived at this ranking of Mark, Keith and Daniel given this information?
- L; Right.
- S; Uh-huh.
- E; And you feel satisfied with that decision, given that information?
- L; Given this information.
- M; I feel we're all satisfied with that decision.
- L; Yeah, we've all been objective in this I believe.
- E; (Experimenter gives information on GPA) Given that information, does that change.
- S; That just reinforces what I've said. Makes it even clearer.
- M; Yeah, communication and.
- L; Ok, I would still remain with our decision because of, you know, I am glad that we did arrive at Keith being number two because he is pulling a, you know, 3.29 in accounting and

that does give credit to him. And we've already said that maybe the 3.42, that's really a good grade point average, and the 2.68 for the pre-med he could've just ran into some difficult questions in that term and he plans on bringing it up to a 3.2, you know, next term.

S; Yeah, one bad term.

L; It's very possible, so.

M; Difficult questions in pre-med.

L; Yeah.

M; And I didn't expect a 4.0.

S; Yeah.

E; It would still remain the same decision?

L; Yeah.

S; Yeah, I wouldn't change it.

L; No.

E; Everything seems to be consistent?

L&S&M; Yeah.

E; (Experimentor gives information on the SAT) Given that available piece of information, would that change your decision? Or maybe your reasoning?

L; Kind of reinforces our decision on Mark, our decision on Mark still, because it does show that he does have a 520, and that is.

S; Respectable.

L; Yeah, very respectable, and it maybe reinforces our statement that, you know, the 2.68 is just running into a bad term. It's just possible to bring it up to a higher average.

M; He has the potential to bring it up.

S; Yeah.

L; Yeah, definitely, and.

S; Keith might have a little excess capacity.

L; Yeah, Keith with a 670, obviously he is doing very well in school and the money would be helpful towards accounting. He's pulling 3.29 with a, you know, SAT of 670, then he is being consistent and in his studies.

S; Dan is one reason why I might throw out that, might not really care too much about looking at the SAT. He has a 3.42, and pulling a 435. Now he could be working above.

E; What's his name.

M&S; Com.

S; Irrespective of curriculum, 3.42, he could be working above himself, which means in the test may have lost some, because you don't know the day he was tested. So, but, seeing the curriculum he's in, I might doubt his choice, he might be cruising it. So, maybe getting a college degree to be getting a college degree, so, I would make him kind of leary, which is, you know, it reinforces basically what I've decided, but, that one case there might, sort of shadow the other one's validity.

E; So the SAT had a.

S; It made no difference.

M; The factor SAT doesn't illustrate anything.

S; It was consistent with the other things too.
E; Let's take parents financial statement. (Experimenter gives information on the applicants' parents financial situation)
S; That was a surprise.
E; Pardon me?
S; That was a surprise. I thought Dan's old man would make more than this, like I told them, I had an uncle who was a tool and dye maker and he, he's not buying fish at the market.
L; I had stated that a community college instructor was only making 14-16 thousand a year, so that.
S; There we could use a little additional background.
E; Pardon me?
M; There is a good example of additional background.
S; Right.
L; Yeah, it is.
S; Yeah, the age might have helped me, because if the father works at a community college, his age might have played a factor.
L; With this information I would change my decision.
S; Yeah.
M; I think so too.
E; How would you change that decision?
L; I'd make three to two.
S; I'd make Dan number two.
E; How would you?
L; Just change Keith and Daniel. Daniel is two and Keith is three.
M; Dan's family is working hard to keep their head above water.
E; Mark is still first choice?
S; Yeah.
L; Yeah, he's gotta be, you know.
S; Cause med school is.
L; Two kids in primary school, one in high school and two sisters in college, and you know, 16, you know, 48, that's.
S; All tuition and books.
L; It's still, yeah.
E; Mark has outstanding loans, so that doesn't make a difference, right?
L; No, I would keep Mark as.
S; Mark's got years ahead of him and his parents might be paying tuition and books now, but, you know.
L; And they're working their buns off, you know they are.
S; That's still a lot of money.
L; Yeah, cause the parents got to look for themselves as far as enjoyment, food, vacations and stuff for the other children. Mark, I would say, stays the same.
E; You didn't consider that information to be crucial.
L; Before hand?
E; Would you change your mind now, would you say.

L; Well.
 S; Only in this case.
 L; Well, we can't say that because we could always say "only in this case all the time". I think we're still right in asking for family background information, cause we did make assumptions.
 S; I'll put it this way, I consider this an exception to the rule.
 S; A rule I generally, from my experience.
 E; How do you feel with the first three pieces of information? Would you stick with it?
 L; I would say next time the test is run, four additional pieces of information would have been.
 S; Yeah, ha, ha.
 M; Yeah, four pieces of information, the parents financial statement, the family background, major, and the.
 L; Right.
 M; Work.
 S; I still go with major.
 L; I would have kept them in the same order, and put family, or, parents financial statement fourth, out of the three we picked.
 E; Is that.
 L; Ok, I'm saying that we did have objective assumptions towards all of these, and the only ones we're really off on were the two, and it did make it, yeah.
 S; Cause I've seen people screwed on that for no reason.
 E; This would change your.
 L; Yeah.
 E; Still, you wouldn't include that in your first three?
 L; No.
 S; No.
 E; So, in other words, it's important for the student, what type of job is he working at and how much he makes?
 M; If he's making enough.
 E; And, ok, that's supposed to be an indicator of his effort.
 L; Uh-huh.
 S; Relative to his effort in school.
 ; Yeah, because if we ruled out family background information, then, instead, took the plan, parents financial statement, then we wouldn't have known that, you know, if the two sisters were married. He didn't have any brothers and sisters. We weighed those and we tried, we thought we could make more valid assumptions out of getting the family background.
 E; Does parents statement, this statement, parents financial statement, would not be included in the first three? Are you saying that this is just a rare case?
 L; No, you can't say that cause it could be.
 S; Yeah, first three, made a decision for me rather clearly, and I would still go with those first three, because I consider them the most important, even though financial statement did make a difference in this case.
 L; Sure did.
 S; I'd still go with the first three, cause I consider them

- more important, because.
- E; But, you changed your ranking.
- S; Right.
- L; Yeah.
- S; Right, but I would still base it on the first three, more important indicator, because what I'm interested in is what the individual, the applicant is doing, and like with Mark's case, seems to me he's really doing a job.
- E; The only thing I don't understand, if they are the three most important.
- L; Then you're contradicting yourself.
- E/ Why did you change your decision?
- S; Exception to the rule.
- E; So you considered that.
- S; It's a good piece of additional information to have, as an auxiliary, you know, as a back-up, or you might say that's wrong, but I still consider that a surprise, an exception to the rule.
- L; Before we stated that the parents financial statement to us, in past experience, we found that it can be biased and we kinda like, we thought we would take an alternative, and look at the family background information and see if we could ourselves decipher, you know, we figure maybe that's the position a panel should use as their criteria. They should look at the family background and then logically try to assume what the parents make and where it should go and stuff, rather than just saying "just give us how much they make and forget about family."
- S; Cause that's jive, I mean how much does your family income tell about you?
- L; I'd say those two contradict, and with both of them together, they supply each other with an explanation.
- M; If we didn't know the family background, you know.
- L; Yeah.
- M; Like for the college, we didn't even know he was a college instructor.
- L; Yeah.
- M; 23,000 what? How many kids were in his family?
- L; Yeah, that would invalidate, you know, if we could have taken the parents financial statement, in place of the family background, then we would have the same problem. If you would say "ok, we'll give you the family background now, then we would say "oh", it would change our decision the same way we changed it this way, it would be irreversible, we would change our decision back and forth, given each of those two pieces of information in different order.
- S; Like one time it would be Daniel then Mark.
- L; Right! Just the opposite.
- E; (Experimenter gives subjects the health statement)
- S; Which means he does his accounting work by braille, or its read to him.
- E; This is tied in with his work he does with the handicap.
- S; Oh!
- L; So, here we go again!
- S; Here we go again.

L; Change our decision again.
 S; With Mark, that money, I really want to give it to him then, because I really don't want him working.
 M; He's got an ulcer, it's been a strain on him, he's been worrying a lot, he's been working hard.
 E; What I'm going to do is leave and let you make a final decision, given all the available information.
 L; Ok.
 E; This is your first ranking, and your change was here.
 S; Now make a final.
 E; Yes, given all the information. I'll be back in a few minutes.
 S; I'd keep it the way it was before. I'd just go back to Mark, Keith, then Dan.
 M; He's doing good for being a blind student.
 S; Right.
 M; Family income.
 L; Exceptional for a blind student.
 S; Yeah, and with Mark, I'd give him that money and say "hey, good work, take it easy."
 M; He's killing himself!
 S; I hope that restricted diet doesn't mean no beer.
 M&L; Ha, ha.
 L; That would be terrible, sit ther, you know, loose, oh wow, you can get pretty loose on those columbies (pause).
 S; He couldn't drive a delivery truck either.
 M; How can he sell something in a sports shop.
 S; Ha, ha.
 L; I'd like to know if we had Mark as first then we give, we change back to Keith second, are they both receiving the same amount of money?
 S; No, it's just a preference.
 L; It's just a preference of who's going to get this amount?
 S; You could ask him that.
 L; Yeah.
 S; Which ever way it is.
 L; I doubt if it is different.
 S; I'd still.
 L; Amounts of money, if he's, Mark's first choice, you know, second choice, or if it's just the same amount of money, it's just that they need two applicants for that amount of money, you know?
 M; I don't really know if it says how much the people are giving, 1,000 dollars?
 L; Right, so we're going to leave Mark as first, then change back Keith second.
 S; Keith two.
 M; Keith, yeah.
 S; A strong number two.
 L; Yeah, but then, don't let that hamper you, yeah, sure he's blind! But, look it, the ol' man's still making 23 thousand bucks a year.
 S; Yeah, but it may be hard for the kid to support himself.

M; All the additional expenses, because he has to have someone bus him around. Ever seen one of these vans, they come by, pick up the people.

S; Special transportation costs and.

L; I know! But still!

M; Special care, you have to have someone.

S; You need an attendant when he's at home.

L; Yeah, but his father could give him 7,000 a year and still be doing good, you know?

(pause)

L; Take 7,000 from that, that would still make it 16,000 a year.

S; But according, blindness, well blindness is a really.

L; Well, I just want to make sure that, you know, right away we're not letting.

S; We're not just.

L; Yeah, we're not just feeling sorry for him.

M; Yeah, I understand that.

L; Because the 23,000, you know.

S; Accounting is one thing, being blind on top of that.

L; That's true.

(Pause)

S; So I'll leave it. Dan's, well, tough luck.

L&M; Ha, ha.

(Pause)

(Experimenter enters)

L; But then we figure maybe his father, the blind guy, maybe his father has been supplementing all these costs for surgery for his eyes and all that stuff for years.

S; Oh, yeah.

L; So that could take up an awful lot of room.

E; How does the ranking follow now:

S; Back to the way it was before.

L; Well we tried not to put it back there just because.

S; Yeah, out of sympathy.

L; And we tried not say "Jes, he's blind", that's because you still got to look at the ol' man's making 23,000 a year. But, then we said maybe, you know, he's supplemented, you know, eye surgery and treatments and stuff maybe, if he has been paying all along for special courses for him, to get him, you know, initially, you know, familiar with Braille, you know?

M; Accustomed to college life.

L; Sure!

S; Transportation on campus.

L; Sure!

M; And.

L; Paying for someone to help him on campus.

M; Someone to watch over him.

E; So, you've changed back to your original.

L; Uh-huh.

E; How satisfied do you feel with that decision?

L; More satisfied, because now we have all this information in front of us that, that's here, that we wanted in the first

- place, you know, we feel the information, the rest of it, has given us a little better outlook, you know?
- E; Is there any additional information you think should be on these applications? That should be used as criteria?
- S; The information, I think, these columns are good enough, but, they should be more complete.
- L; I was thinking in addition.
- S; I would like to see employment history as well.
- L; Ok, yeah, that's good one.
- L; And also, I thought it would be valuable to have, in some respect, have on file, an oral, an objective, you know, oral interview of what each of these students plan on doing in the next 5 to 6 years, you know?
- M; For a boy.
- L; Yeah.
- M; And sit down.
- L; Yeah'
- M; Discuss his future plans.
- L; Yeah, what they feel they would like to do.
- M; His past, what he's been doing, discuss the whole situation.
- E; Personal interviews?
- L; Yeah, and how he feels about his father making this much money, and then where he knows where it's going, and then like this one, his family, like Mark would say I know my father can't be supplementing this way, with as many children at home, I understand this, and that's why I'm working 20 hours a week.
- E; When you look at your final ranking, is there anything you can select out that changed the three so you could put them in that order, any main criteria you used?
- S; Ranking criteria?
- E; What ranking criteria do you think you used the most?
- L; Um-student's employment.
- E; Is that.
- L; It's hard to say when you've had two turn arounds, after we were exposed to the health and we were exposed to the parents financial statements. That turned our decision back and forth both ways.
- M; It changed.
- L; And without those, I'm sure we would have made.
- S; Which verifies our use of the first three.
- L; Yeah, right.
- S; So, without those first three, we might of come up with a three way tie for first place.
- E; Was it just out of chance they came up that way? Or do you feel that if you had stuck to your original three that you would have been.
- L; Yeah, we weren't exposed to the other ones.
- S; I remember the first time we were all pretty confident with the rankings?
- L; Yeah.
- E; You seem pretty confident in this one also.

- S; Yeah, then we head back, which shows the amount of information we had. You could give us information that Keith is going to buy a car and Dan's going to rape somebody, and that could switch us back the other way.
- L; No, I think.
- M; With the information we have.
- E; You feel pretty confident at this point?
- M; It illustrates, it's a good example of illustrating, you know, with certain stages of exposure to information more you know about a person, the more valid conclusion you can make.
- L; Uh-huh, right!
- M; Whether he needs the money or not.
- E; What does more information provide? What would you be looking for? What would you request?
- M; Ok, all this information that we've got showed us his ability to work, are they, how determined are they to get through school? Are they putting this money to good use, putting towards a college education. Are the parents, the family status back home, what's going on there, is he desperate or in dire need of this money? Or can he wait?
- E; Did you find it difficult to rank the three?
- L; Not difficult I thought it was interesting because.
- S; Interesting.
- L; Because, you know, we were all obviously if three of us can come to a, you know, some unanimous decision on how things, certain situations and certain aspects of personality, you know, person's.
- S; That was something!
- M; The thing that was interesting is that we were all open-minded about it.
- L; Right.
- M; We were not pulling, you know, "Well, I'm not giving him anything."
- S; Ha, ha.
- L; Well, obviously you've got to make assumptions cause that way it gives you a basis for making conclusions.
- M; Yeah, a lot of guess-work, and with all three of us working together open-mindedly, we've come to conclusions that, by making assumptions, then working it over, talking it over, you know, I would like to stress open-mindedness.
- L; Yeah, and we initially agreed with the three pieces of information and we stuck with it, and with the assumption or the statement that every one of these additional information is definitely needed too, and that it's possible that we've seen to change our, you know, our decision back and forth with the supplemental criteria. So, it is valuable to have all.

- S; It might make a nice, I think there's a point where you should really have piles of stuff, which you really should have, which I feel are the first three. Cause I really saw a change, when we got all of it, from the first three but, the rest of it is real nice supplemental.
- L; Yeah, as an overview of what we did, like you say, we were very objective! And we came to a decision after seeing the rest of the stuff. Our basic assumptions were objective and was important.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adams, J. Stacy, "Inequity in Social Exchange," in L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 2, Academic Press, New York, 1965, pp. 267-299.
- Adams, J. Stacy, "Toward an Understanding of Inequity." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, Vol. 67, No. 5, pp. 422-436.
- Adams, J. Stacy, and W. E. Rosenbaum, "The Relationship of Worker Productivity to Cognitive Dissonance About Wage Inequity." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, pp. 161-164.
- Anderson, Bo and Robert Shelly, "Reactions to Inequity, II: A Replication of The Adams Experiment and a Theoretical Reformulation." Acta Sociologica, 1970, 13, No. 1.
- Andrews, I. R., "Wage Inequity and Job Performance: An Experimental Study." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, pp. 39-45.
- Berger, et. al., "Structural Aspects of Distributive Justice: A Status Value Formulation." Sociological Theories in Progress, Edited by Joseph Berger, Bo Anderson and Morris Zelditch, Jr., Vol. 2, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1972.
- Cook, Karen, "The Equitable Redistribution of Rewards: A Reaction to Inequity?" Paper presented at the West Coast Conference on Small Groups, May 3, 1973, Scottsdale, Arizona, NSF, GS-32128.
- Garfinkel, Harold, Studies in Ethnomethodology, Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Garfinkel, Harold and Harvey Sacks, "On Formal Structures of Practical Actions" in J. C. McKinney and Edward Tiryakian (eds.) Theoretical Sociology: Perspectives and Developments, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970, pp. 338-366.
- Goodman, P. and A. Friedman, "Wage Inequity, Self-Qualifications, and Productivity." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1967, 2.

- Goffman, Irving, Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience, Harper and Row, 1974.
- Homans, G. C., "Status Among Clerical Workers." Human Organizations, 1953, 12, pp. 5-10.
- Homans, G. C., Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.
- Israel, J., "The Effect of Positive and Negative Self-Evaluation on the Attractiveness of a Goal." Human Relations, 1960, 13, pp. 33-47.
- Lane, I. and L. Messe, "Equity and the Distribution of Rewards." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 1-17.
- Lane, I. and L. Messe, "Distribution of Insufficient, Sufficient, and Oversufficient Rewards: A Clarification of Equity Theory." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 228-233.
- Lawler, E., "Equity Theory as a Predictor of Productivity and Work Quality." Psychological Bulletin, 1968, Vol. 70, No. 6, pp. 596-610.
- Lawler, E. and P. O'Gara, "Effects of Inequity Produced by Underpayment on Work Output, Work Quality, and Attitudes Toward the Work." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, Vol. 51, No. 5, pp. 403-410.
- Leventhal, et. al., "Equity, Reciprocity, and Reallocating Rewards in the Dyad." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 300-305.
- Leventhal, et. al., "Inequity and Interpersonal Conflict: Reward Allocation and Secrecy About Reward as Methods of Preventing Conflict." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 88-102.
- Leventhal and J. Bergman, "Self-Depriving Behavior as a Response to Unprofitable Inequity." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, pp. 153-171.
- Leventhal and D. Lane, "Sex, Age, and Equity Behavior." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 312-316.
- McCranie, E. and J. Kimberly, "Rank Inconsistency, Conflicting Expectations and Injustice." Sociometry, 1973, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 152-176.

- Patchen, M., "A Conceptual Framework and Some Empirical Data Regarding Comparisons of Social Rewards." Sociometry, 1961, 2, pp. 136-157.
- Pritchard, R. D., "Equity Theory: A Review and Critique." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1969, 4, pp. 176-211.
- Sacks, Harvey, "An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology," in David Sudnow, Studies in Social Interaction, Free Press, 1972, pp. 32-63.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking in Conversation." Language, Vol. 50, No. 4, 1974.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, "Sequencing in Conversational Openings." American Anthropology, Vol. 70, 1968, pp. 1075-95.
- Schegloff, Emanuel and Harvey Sacks, "Opening Up Closings." in Roy Turner (ed.), Ethnomethodology, Penguin Education, 1974, pp. 233-264.
- Schmitt, D. and G. Marwell, "Withdrawal and Reward Reallocation as Responses to Inequity." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1972, 8, pp. 207-221.
- Walster, E. and G. Walster and Berscheid, "New Directions in Equity Research." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 151-176.
- Weick, K. E., "The Concept of Equity in the Perception of Pay." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1966, 11, pp. 414-439.
- Weick, K. E., "Reduction of Cognitive Dissonance Through Task Enhancement and Effort Expenditure." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, pp. 533-539.
- Weiner, Y., "The Effects of 'Task' - and 'Ego-Oriented' Performance on Two Kinds of Overcompensations Inequity." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1970, 5, pp. 191-208.
- Zelditch, Morris Jr. and Bo Anderson, "On the Balance of a Set of Ranks." Sociological Theories in Progress, Edited by Joseph Berger, Bo Anderson and Morris Zelditch, Jr., Vol. 1, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1972.
- Zetterberg, Hans, "Compliant Actions." Acta Sociologica, Vol. 2, 1957.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293103859835