

THE RELATIONSHIP OF A HIGH  
PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION TO SUCCESS  
IN INFLUENCE PROCESSES

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
PAUL THOMAS MANKA  
1970

007515



MR 172 2100

1

1

---

.

## ABSTRACT

### THE RELATIONSHIP OF A HIGH PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION TO SUCCESS IN INFLUENCE PROCESSES

By

Paul Thomas Manka

Research during the last twenty years suggests in general that persons occupying positions of high status in small groups participate more frequently in group interaction which consequently results in their influencing the group's behavior.

This thesis tests the hypotheses derived from this literature by means of a different experimental method. The thesis is based on research involving seven experimental three-man discussion groups comprised of male college freshmen. Status is operationalized through the concept of "performance expectation." A "performance expectation" refers to a group member's mental state in which he feels that he will perform more proficiently or more poorly than the other group members on a given task. The concept "performance expectation" was operationalized in this thesis by giving each group member a score on his

ability to successfully cope with the group task. The experimental design controls for any unequal propensities of individual members to participate so that the only factor which could affect participation would be the "performance expectation." The design also minimizes and detects any suspicion that might arise from any member regarding his or any other member's task score.

The primary unit used is the "influence process" which is any attempt to resolve genuine disagreement between two or more members of the group. The data has been coded in accordance with the Berger-Conner system (a modification of the Bales Interaction Process Analysis). Such coding helps us discern the patterns of interaction among members with different status rankings during the "influence process."

The hypotheses tested state that higher score persons are more active in initiating and receiving certain types of acts and are more successful in having their ideas prevail than the lower score members. The quantitative analysis (Berger-Conner coding system) of the "influence process" fails to support the hypotheses. However, in the content analyses, the higher score members did have their ideas accepted more frequently than the lower score members. But even in this type of analysis, the expected difference of "influence process" success between the two higher score men did not materialize.

Although the hypotheses tested were based on total group discussions, the experimental method of the thesis focused on the "influence process" which is a much smaller segment of total group behavior. The findings demonstrate that hypotheses based on an analysis of the total group interaction do not seem to hold up in the "influence process." However, no clear conclusion can be made until the total group interaction of these experimental groups are analyzed.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF A HIGH PERFORMANCE  
EXPECTATION TO SUCCESS IN  
INFLUENCE PROCESSES

By

Paul Thomas Manka

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1970

G - 65693

1-27-71

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author of this thesis would first like to thank Dr. Thomas L. Conner for serving as chairman of this master's project. Besides serving as the author's committee chairman, Dr. Conner has allowed his experimental data to be analyzed. He has been most helpful and understanding in every phase of this project and has most certainly proven his kindness to the author.

The author would also like to thank his wife, Carol. During the entire project, she has been a source of encouragement as well as being a most willing and competent critic.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	1
EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN . . . . .	19
TEST OF HYPOTHESES AND THE INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS . . . . .	24
CONCLUSION . . . . .	30
Appendix A: Coding Rules . . . . .	34
Appendix B: Verbal Transcripts . . . . .	42
Appendix C: Experimental Instructions . . . . .	159
Appendix D: The Case of George Edwards . . . . .	170
Appendix E: The Presentation of Formulas Used in Tables 10-23 . . . . .	176
Appendix F: Tables . . . . .	179
FOOTNOTES . . . . .	201
LITERATURE CITED . . . . .	204

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Person to person acts in XG-1 . . . . .	179
2. Person to person acts in XG-3 . . . . .	180
3. Person to person acts in XG-4 . . . . .	181
4. Person to person acts in XG-5 . . . . .	182
5. Person to person acts in XG-6 . . . . .	183
6. Person to person acts in XG-7 . . . . .	184
7. Person to person acts in XG-8 . . . . .	185
8. Aggregate matrix of acts for groups XG-(1-7) .	186
9. Aggregate matrix of acts for groups XG (1-7) expressed as a percentage of the total acts .	187
10. Rates of support in XG-1 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts . . .	188
11. Rates of support in XG-3 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts . . .	188
12. Rates of support in XG-4 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts . . .	189
13. Rates of support in XG-5 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts . . .	189
14. Rates of support in XG-6 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts . . .	190
15. Rates of support in XG-7 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts . . .	190
16. Rates of support in XG-8 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts . . .	191

Table	Page
17. Rates of support in XG-1 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form) . . . . .	191
18. Rates of support in XG-3 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form) . . . . .	192
19. Rates of support in XG-4 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form) . . . . .	192
20. Rates of support in XG-5 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form) . . . . .	193
21. Rates of support in XG-6 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form) . . . . .	193
22. Rates of support in XG-7 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form) . . . . .	194
23. Rates of support in XG-8 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form) . . . . .	194
24. Expected rankings for each group member on the initiation and reception of specific types of acts according to the score of the participant . . . . .	195
25. The combined rankings of subjects for all groups according to subject's score and type of act . . . . .	196
26. The frequency of successful "influence processes" according to activity level of initiating acts . . . . .	197
27. Relationship of rate of participation to power position . . . . .	197
28. Comparison of rankings in total support intake according to group score and rate of participation . . . . .	198

29. The expected rankings in the flow of  
communications and support among the  
members of the power hierarchy . . . . . 199

30. Frequency of success in "influence  
processes" according to score . . . . . 200

31. The trend of successes in "influence  
processes" over time . . . . . 200

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In previously unstructured social groups, it has been found that over time some members come to control a larger portion of the interaction within the group.<sup>1</sup>

In an article which has since stimulated much small group research, Bales reports that in groups containing three to ten persons a crucial factor at work was the fact that only one person can speak at a time thus giving the activities of the group a "single focus."<sup>2</sup> Through the application of his "Interaction Process Analysis" coding system to a number of experimental small groups, Bales found that:

. . . if the participants in a small group are ranked by the total number of acts they initiate they will also tend to be ranked:

- (1) by the number of acts they receive
- (2) by the number of acts they address to specific other individuals, and
- (3) by the number of acts they address to the group as a whole.<sup>3</sup>

Bales' article presents us with an organized method for studying and collecting data regarding interpersonal patterns of behavior within the small group. Particularly, through this quantitative method we are enabled to code and note the frequency of particular types of acts as they are initiated and received by specific members of the group.

It has since been found that inequalities in participation tended to be stable over a series of meetings. When group members are asked to rank one another at the completion of a discussion session according to best ideas, amount of influence and the amount of "liking" received by a person from the other persons, such measures are found to be highly correlated with one another and with the interaction rates of the participants.<sup>4</sup> It seems that the above measures indicate that persons possessing such attributes are accorded a certain status by the group and have interaction rates quite different from those of the other members.

Such a phenomenon has been dubbed "status generalization" which occurs when: ". . . prior status differentiation among group members leads to patterns of influence which clearly parallel the status structure, even when such differentiation has no apparent relevance to the task confronting the group."<sup>5</sup>

In this experiment, we shall manipulate the "status generalization process" through the use of "performance expectations." A "performance expectation" is:

. . . a general belief or anticipation about the quality of future performance outputs. Performance expectations are ordinarily in one-to-one relation to beliefs about task ability. Those high in ability will be expected to perform well, and vice versa.<sup>6</sup>

Before continuing our review of the literature, it would perhaps be best to clearly state and define the crucial concepts in this thesis.

This thesis involves the study of the "status generalization" process in selected segments of interaction of experimental groups called "influence processes." An "influence process" is initiated by an "influence attempt" which is any ". . . negative reaction directed at x or any reaction directed at someone other than x"<sup>7</sup> after x had initiated a performance output. During the "influence process": ". . . Either the performer must decide that the negative reactor (or reactors) is correct or the negative reactor must be convinced to change his mind."<sup>8</sup>

The major concepts and coding system of this paper were developed by Joseph Berger and Thomas Conner in "Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups." Like Bales, their basic unit of coding is the act which is "usually a simple verbal sentence but could be a gesture, a look, or some other form of nonverbal communication."<sup>9</sup> They modified the Bales "Interaction Process Analysis" coding system by condensing its twelve categories into four: "performance outputs," "action opportunities," "positive reactions" and "negative reactions." A "performance output" contains Bales' categories four to six and is

. . . an act which is an attempt to solve or partially solve a task related problem. It may be the suggestion of a course of action, a decision, or a solution: the statement of an idea, fact, observation, generalization, or assertion; or a statement in a chain of reasoning, an hypothesis, or logical assertion.<sup>10</sup>

An "action opportunity" subsumes Bales' categories seven to nine and is ". . . any act which communicates a request for activity."<sup>11</sup> "Positive reaction" corresponds to Bales' categories one to three while negative reactions correspond to categories ten to twelve. "A reaction is any act which communicates the evaluation of a performance output . . ." with "positive reactions" indicating agreement or acceptance of an act while "negative reactions" demonstrate any disagreement with another person's "performance output."<sup>12</sup>

In studying the "status generalization" process in the "influence process" one modification has been made. We are interested, indeed, in studying "the patterns of influence existing among group members paralleling the status structure" but only when the differentiation has relevance to the current task confronting the group. This modification of the "status generalization" process has been made so that the experiment could delineate more clearly some factors affecting a person's ability to influence others in group interaction.

Basic conditions used in the experiment to facilitate the desired "status generalization" were: (1) the

group has a collective task to accomplish; (2) each of the members has an experimentally created ability ("performance expectation") to accomplish the task; and (3) the members are motivated to be substantially concerned regarding the successful completion of the group task.<sup>13</sup>

Bobbie Norfleet had discovered several years prior to the Heinicke and Bales article that during discussions one member would direct his remarks toward the member which he felt was the most productive and that with the passing of time the members discerned ". . . more clearly between the productivity of others and the popularity or attractiveness of others."<sup>14</sup>

Slater conducted an experiment based on the findings of Bales, Heinicke and Bales and Norfleet wherein he found that with the passage of time there evolves within the experimental discussion group a role specialization among the members. He suggested that high participation is related to highly rated task ability by the other members and in high status consensus groups, there is a division of labor with a "best-liked man" and a "task specialist."<sup>15</sup>

Adopting Slater's concepts to our experimental design, Hypothesis I states that it is expected that in a high status consensus group the "task specialist" will initiate more activity in the "performance output" area and the "negative reactions" while receiving the most

"positive reactions," "action opportunities" and "negative reactions" whereas the "best-liked man" will initiate more positive reactions and action opportunities while receiving more performance outputs.<sup>16</sup>

This hypothesis is drawn from Slater's findings and assumes that the person receiving the highest score in our "performance expectation" manipulation will be considered the "task specialist" by the other members while the person with the medium score will be the "best-liked man."<sup>17</sup>

Taking a different approach in studying the process of influence in small groups, Riecken designed an experiment which had the group solve a series of problems. In the first several problems there was in fact no correct or best answer. While observing the interaction within the group in their problem solving attempts, the experimenter noted both the most active and least active interactors. The group was then posed with a problem which indeed did have an "elegant solution," i.e. one best answer. In some of the groups, the most frequent interactors were given the best answer via a hint on their instruction sheet while in others the least active members were given the solution. The members receiving the hint were instructed that they alone have the best answer to the problem and that they ought to persuade the others to accept it.

The results were:

. . . The top man is more often able to get the elegant solution accepted by his fellows than is the bottom man, even though the latter is, by design, equally well equipped with information and suggestions. When the top man has the insight needed to solve the problem elegantly, the group accepts this solution more than two thirds of the time; when the bottom man has the same information, the elegant solution is rejected in more than two thirds of the groups. This result does not achieve the conventional level of significance (by Fisher's exact test,  $p = .08$ ), but it is consistent with Bales' earlier findings. It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that it is probably not the superiority of the top man's information, suggestions, or opinions as much that lead him to be seen as having contributed most to the solution. Rather, his influentiality seems to be the result of his status as the most frequent talker in the group or of some personal attribute associated with this status.<sup>18</sup>

From Riecken's experiment, we can formulate Hypothesis II which states that the more a person participates in a group discussion, the greater the amount of influence effected by him. The hypothesis suggests that the more a person participated in a discussion the frequency with which the group accepts his ideas will increase.<sup>19</sup>

Theodore Mills devised a method to measure the relative power positions of persons in small groups in order to study its relationships to different forms of coalitions in small groups. This method uses the Bales "Interaction Process Analysis" as a coding instrument and measures both "the relative number of contributions made by a person" and "the relative frequency of support" others give to the person.<sup>20</sup> According to this system a high rate of participation coupled with high support intake would constitute a relatively strong power position

within the group whereas low participation coupled with a low rate of support would constitute a relatively weak position.<sup>21</sup>

The relationship of Mills' formula to the study of coalitions in small groups is not of importance in this thesis but rather what matters is that his formulas give us another way of measuring the relative rates of contributions among members of different "performance expectations" in the groups and the rate at which members give support to members of differing "performance expectations."

Assuming that the "performance expectations" of this thesis creates a status hierarchy in the small experimental groups, Hypothesis III states that the person who received the highest score is expected to occupy the highest power position in the group while the person who received the lowest score is expected to occupy the lowest power position in the group.

Encouraged by Mills' research, Herman and Theresa Turk applied his power formulation to a hospital setting containing twenty eight three-person nursing teams. Such groups included a registered nurse who had work authority over the nursing students. The nursing students were equal in status (work authority) for half of the teams and were of unequal status for the other half. We are only interested in the experimental condition where all the members of the team are of different statuses. Their findings provide a basis for Hypothesis IV.

Hypothesis IV states ". . . both the volume of communication and the rate of positive socio-emotional support between any pair of members is a function of the combined power of the pair, with the higher-powered member communicating more to the other and supporting him more."<sup>22</sup>

Outside the realm of strictly experimental discussion groups, it has been found that status flowing from larger social-cultural norms can have a significant effect on which person's ideas or influence are accepted within the small group.

Strodtbeck, after studying the decision making process and the amount of influence exerted within the husband-wife dyad, found that it significantly reflects ". . . power elements in the larger social and cultural organization and amount of participation in the small group situation."<sup>23</sup> In another experiment, Strodtbeck et al. found that in a situation involving mock juries ". . . evidence that the status differences of the larger community become manifest in the deliberation, then it may be expected that similar generalization of status will be found in other interactional contexts where hierarchical considerations are more prominent."<sup>24</sup> More specifically he finds that people of higher socio-economic status were chosen more often as jury foremen than expected by their proportion in the group. Participation is greater for males than females in all occupations with proprietors and

clerical workers contributing more than their share while skilled and unskilled laborers contributed less.<sup>25</sup>

Other evidence has been gathered regarding the effect of status upon participation in informal social groups. Whyte, in Street Corner Society, discovered that status ordering within the gang played a significant role in the lower status members' bowling scores when in competition with the leaders of the group. In such situations their scores were poorer than the scores they were capable of in other situations. Whyte attributed this to the subtle pressures applied to any member by the other members in the gang thus affecting his ability to successfully challenge the leaders in the match. In a study of school adolescent groups, Harvey found that a member's performance on a dart game could be predicted successfully beforehand by the other gang members on the basis of his status in the gang.<sup>26</sup> Torrance pointed out that within bomber crews the opinions and suggestions of the high status member (the pilot) tended to be accepted more readily than those of the low status member (the bombardier) even in non-task decisions or problems.<sup>27</sup>

Status is a concept which has many meanings in sociological literature. It should be repeated at this point that the concept "performance expectation" is the operationalization of status in this paper. Admittedly, by limiting the concept of status to the area of expertise

in small group problem solving we are limiting the generality of our findings. This limitation may be justified, however, by the argument that when we allow status to be more generally defined it is very difficult to understand just what is happening within group interaction. For example, one might reasonably ask just how to interpret Strodtbeck's mock jury findings which have been cited. In that experiment it was not clear whether a person's influence was merely a product of his social standing in the community or was rather based on a complex interaction of socio-economic standing, verbal fluency, community standing and manner of dress.

James C. Moore designed an experiment which closely resembles the experimental design of the experiment used in this thesis. He tested the relationship of "performance expectations" to actual behavior in a group situation. By constructing a "standardized task" and a "standardized experimental situation," Moore hoped to understand more about the effect of status upon group interaction.

The required design of the experiment should thus be quite clear at this point. It is necessary that we (1) employ two experimental subjects who, with respect to each other, possess only the information that they are associated with differentiated states of a single general status characteristic (white-negro, male-female, college student-high school student, etc.); (2) motivate these subjects toward making "correct" choices on an ambiguous task requiring independent choices; and (3) control their interaction in such a manner that they perceive continuous disagreement between themselves with respect to their choices.<sup>28</sup>

All of the subjects were chosen from a homogeneous population of junior college women. Each subject was informed that her partner had come from a group which was commonly considered of either higher or lower status than the subject's group membership. The low status group was a local high school in a poor section of town and the high status group was the Stanford college population.<sup>29</sup> The relevance condition employed in the experiment refers to the degree to which a member has been informed of the status of her partner. An "implicit relevance condition" consists of merely informing the subject of the other subject's status without any comment by the experimenter whereas in the "explicit relevance condition" the subject is informed of the other's status by the experimenter who mentions explicitly that the other subject's status group usually does much better or poorer on the task than the subject's status group.<sup>30</sup>

It was hypothesized that when faced with continual disagreement ". . . the Explicit Relevance-High Status subjects will show a significantly greater number of S (self) resolutions than the Explicit-Relevance-Low Status subjects."<sup>31</sup> The second hypothesis states that ". . . there will be substantial differences between the High Status subjects and the Low Status subjects in the Implicit Relevance conditions, with High Status subjects showing the greater number of S resolutions."<sup>32</sup> The last

hypothesis states ". . . there will be no significant differences between the relevance conditions when status is held constant."<sup>33</sup> A self resolution consists of accepting one's own decision in spite of perceived disagreement from the other subject.<sup>34</sup> All of the hypotheses were validated by the experiment.

Another of the paper's aims, besides studying the effect of "performance expectations" on the interaction of members within the group, is to study in detail the relationship of success in the influence process to a member's "performance expectation."

Bales first discussed the idea of "influence attempts" and "influence processes" in Interaction Process Analysis. He points out that during the discussion any failure on the part of a person to follow the ideas or suggestions of another participant causes a new process to go into action which he entitles the "problem solving" sequence of behavior.<sup>35</sup> Such a process is considered an attempt to restore the integrity of the communication process as illustrated in the following example.

#### Bales' Problem Solving Sequence

\*Initial Acts (7-9\*)--Medial Acts (4-6)--Terminal Acts (10-12, 1-3)

\*The numbers refer to the categories of the Bales coding system.<sup>36</sup>

The observer can distinguish an "initial act" which signals at least to him (the observer) and often to

the other participants that the impairment is present. Such an act is sometimes primarily expressive (such as a startled look or bewildered expression on the face of one of the participants) but often is an act which is apparently meant by the actor to signal a difficulty or need, such as a question, a disagreement, a request for repetition, or the like. If the signal is noted by another participant, the next act is often a kind of attempted answer to the problem indicated by the signal. This attempted answer we shall call a "medial act." Again, the "medial act" may be primarily expressive, but often is an instrumental act which has a problem-solving relevance to the problem signaled by the initial act; examples of such instrumental acts would be an answer to a question or the giving of a requested repetition. Following the "medial act," the first participant usually gives a signal as to whether the attempted answer of the other has or has not solved the problem signaled by the initial act and this permits the other to determine whether the process is again integrally shared.<sup>37</sup>

The "influence process" which we study in our experiment is the type of process described by Bales except for one point. In the "influence process" the breakdown of communication results from a disagreement over a point. The "influence process" like Bales' problem solving sequence then continues until communication is again "integrally shared." Communication is re-established in the "influence process" when one of the members has won his point. The process is of relevance to this paper because we want to study the relationship of "performance expectations" to success in the "influence processes." It is assumed that a person's success in winning "influence processes" is a significant indicator of a high status on task ability (see page 3).

Often during the "influence process," the member who initiates the "negative reaction" to the "performance output" will try to have the group accept his own "performance output" which is presented along with the "negative reaction" to the original "performance output."

After an "influence attempt" has been made, an "influence process" may result in several possible outcomes. The first possibility is that the member whose "performance output" is objected to may accept the "negative reaction." For example, the low score man might say, "Let's do A." The high score man says, "No, I don't think so." The low score man says, "Yeah, you're right." A second possibility occurs when the initiator of the "performance output" objected to disagrees with the "negative reaction." In such a case, the person initiating the "influence attempt" or the person initiating the "performance output" wins. For example, the high score man says, "Let's do A." The medium score man says, "No, I don't think that is a good idea." The high score man says, "Well, why not?" The medium score man says, "I think that B would be better." The high score man says, "No, you are wrong." The discussion ends with the high score man winning the "influence process." A third possibility is the case wherein the group accepts the original "performance output" and rejects the "influence attempt." For example, the high

score man says, "We should do A." The low score man says, "We should do B." The medium score man says, "I think we should do A."

We have enough evidence to suggest that "performance expectations" will not only affect the rates of interaction within the experimental groups but also will play a vital role in whose ideas will receive acceptance by the group. This notion is formalized in Hypothesis V which states that the success of a person in the "influence process" is positively and directly related to his "performance expectation." The higher his "performance expectation" the more successful will he be in having others accept his ideas.

It is quite possible to influence other members' opinions without disagreeing. For example, people will very often agree to a person's idea(s) initially without discussion. Undeniably, in such a situation the person is exerting his influence in the group. However, we focused solely on cases where a person has to overcome opposition in winning acceptance of his ideas because success in this endeavor, we believe, is indicative of the status which he holds in the group, i.e. if he has a high score, he should have less of a problem convincing others than if he had a low score.

Heinicke and Bales reinforce this point when they state that in high status groups:

. . . There is little need for a lot of overt expression of agreement--only a few statements made by the "right" people need to be agreed to. . . . When the status problem is settled, we may suppose, less time has to be spent in discussion which is essentially a thinly disguised attempt to change generalized status positions.<sup>38</sup>

Because of the ambiguity of the problem, it is quite possible for a low score member to challenge a high score member particularly if the low member is not swayed by the high "performance expectation" established for the other and/or the low "performance expectation" established for himself. By studying such crisis situations where the low score members challenge the high score or at least where there is disagreement between two members with differing "performance expectations," we can determine if such a status manipulation will truly affect the interaction rate among the members and the acceptance or rejection of members' ideas on the basis of their test scores.

The second major problem involved in the study of successful "influence processes" is the difficulty involved in determining when an idea has been accepted by the group. If the other members indicate positive responses to a person's ideas, the fact of acceptance is obvious. What about the case where there is no further discussion and no positive responses are noted by all the group members? In such cases, we have assumed for coding purposes that when discussion ends that member whose ideas still remain has won the "influence process." It is true that a silent

person may still disagree with another person's performance output. But how do we measure such disagreement if no outward manifestation of it exists? Our methods are not adapted for such inter-cranial processes. Furthermore, it seems that if a person remains silent while still disagreeing, it is usually because he can no longer successfully challenge the idea or he has lost all inclination. The acceptance of the idea at the end of the "influence process" indicates some measure of the person's influence in the group.

In summary, we have undertaken a study of the effect of status upon group interaction and its relationship to the ability of a person to successfully influence other persons. Our experiments involve experimental discussion groups which are carefully controlled and limited in scope so that any influence of status on behavior is easily discernible.

## EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The subjects of the experiment consisted of males recruited from the freshmen "American Thought and Language" courses which are required courses for all majors at Michigan State University. By selecting students from such courses, we hoped to recruit as broad a spectrum of college majors as possible. Freshmen were recruited because the experimental design required subjects who were not familiar with this type of experiment. The students were informed that they would be paid for their participation in research. As a first step the students were contacted and told that they would have to answer a preliminary questionnaire which tests a person's "Social Insight and Prediction Ability" (see Appendix C: Experimental Instructions). Purportedly, "Social Insight and Prediction Ability" measures an individual's capability to have insight into difficult social situations and to predict successfully the outcome of such situations. They were informed that the questionnaire measured the relationship of their personality to the "Social Insight and Prediction Ability."

Actually, "Social Insight and Prediction Ability" is fictitious. It was part of the experimental design to

create a set of "performance expectations" regarding the member's task ability.

In fact only one question out of the entire questionnaire was used in the selection of subjects for the discussion groups. This question had been pretested successfully on a group of freshmen students at Michigan State University. The question contained two descriptions of behavior in discussion groups. One description (A) portrayed a person who likes to take the lead in discussions and is otherwise very active whereas the other description (B) characterized the type of person who is withdrawn and inactive in discussions. Each subject was presented with six responses which ranged from the statement that "I am most like A" to the middle choices of "I am somewhat more like A than B" and "I am somewhat more like B than A" to the last choice which states "I am most like B." In selecting subjects for our experiment we wanted people who answered the two middle choices. Out of such choices we tried to use subjects who chose the response "I am somewhat more like A than B." Most of the subjects used in the experiment had responded "I am somewhat more like A than B," while the remaining subjects chose the other middle response. Each group, however, was comprised of subjects who had made the same choice on this question.

Upon arrival at the experimental laboratory, the participants were met by an experimenter and led into a soundproofed room containing two television cameras and three microphones. The electronic equipment was pointed out to them, and in the course of phase II of the instructions (see Appendix C) the members were enlightened as to the reason for recording the discussion on video tape.

"Performance expectations" were established by informing each member of his score and ranking as well as notifying every member of the scores of the other two participants. In order to minimize suspicion criteria were presented which related the subject's scores to a ranking in terms of average scores in college populations. The three scores: high, medium and low were randomly assigned to the group members.

Deception was necessary because we desired to test the influence of perceived task ability ("performance expectation") on a person's participation in a group as well as an ability to successfully persuade others. The variable was purposely vague and incapable of outside verification, i.e. we claimed that it is not related to intelligence. The instructions were carefully prepared to convince each subject of the validity of his scores (see Appendix C).

In order to promote possible conflicts of opinion and the subsequent initiation of "influence attempts" and

"influence processes," the problem posed to the group was as ambiguous as possible so that each could feel that his idea was indeed worthwhile. This was accomplished through presenting a case history of a boy named George whose case is before a juvenile court. The basic alternatives of action confronting the authorities are either rehabilitation through a youth center or rehabilitation through reform school (see Appendix D). The case presents many extenuating circumstances which complicate the group's decision and promote a situation for an optimum conflict of opinions. The group was instructed to discuss the issues in the case and to try to achieve consensus on the course of action to be followed in the thirty minutes which had been allotted for discussion.

During the instructions, another test measuring "Social Insight and Prediction Ability" was administered to the group (see Appendix C). The experimenter collected their tests and left the room for about five minutes while he purportedly corrected them. The scores were arranged so that they corresponded exactly with the previous scores. The second test's purpose was to convince the subjects of the validity of their previous scores on "Social Insight and Prediction Ability." When the experimenter returned each subject was given another slip of paper noting his score as well as those of the other members. We assume that the person receiving the two highest scores would

form a high "performance expectation"; a person receiving the two medium scores would form a medium "performance expectation"; and a person receiving the two lowest scores would have a low "performance expectation."

After the group discussion, each subject was individually interviewed so as to detect any suspicion regarding the validity of the scores or any failure on the part of the person to believe his scores. Following the interview, each subject was given a true explanation of the experiment. In one of the groups, one member was suspicious of the experiment and subsequently the group he participated in was eliminated from the sample.

The video tapes of the remaining seven groups were scanned for the occurrences of "influence attempts" and "influence processes." After a sequence of behavior had been identified as an "influence process," a verbal transcript was made from the video tape and was coded in accordance with our coding rules (see Appendix A and B).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

## TEST OF HYPOTHESES AND THE INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

The first hypothesis was tested by ranking levels of participation (Basic Initiating Rank) for all categories of acts both in receiving and initiating. Tables 1-8 are simply a tabulation of the coded acts from the "influence processes." The format of the table follows that suggested by Bales in his article, "Channels of Communication in Small Groups." Each cell of the matrix provides the number of acts occurring between two members of the group. The initiator of the act is designated by the row heading while the receiver of the act is designated by the column heading. The row total designates the number of acts a person has initiated and the column total designates the number of acts a person has received. The abbreviations "H," "M," and "L" mean high, medium, and low scores respectively. They are used throughout all of the tables to indicate test scores of the participants. By observing the rates of participation for the different types of acts, we can determine whether significant differences in behavior exist among the group members. By observing the rates of participation of members of different "performance expectations," we can study the relationship of "performance expectations" to actual behavior.

Table 25 presents the number of times that each member of a particular status was the highest, the second highest and the lowest initiator or receiver for the four basic categories of acts. The fit between the data in Table 25 and the posited rankings was not very good. The "task specialist" highest frequency on his predicted rankings in seven groups was only four in four out of eight types of acts ( $P.O._I, -R_I, A.O._R, -R_R$ ). In the case of the "best-liked man" the highest frequency achieved out of seven groups on his expected rankings was four on only two of the eight basic types of acts ( $A.O._R, -R_I$ ). Whereas the low score man who was expected to have the lowest ranking for all eight types of acts, had the lowest rankings: once for two types of acts ( $A.O._R, -R_I$ ); twice for five types of acts ( $P.O._I, A.O._I, +R_I, -R_I, P.O._R$ ); and only four times on the ( $+R_R$ ) type of act.

Testing Hypothesis I with the aggregate data in Table 8, one finds that out of twenty-four expected rankings, only nine rankings conform to the hypothesis. Of the nine rankings which conformed to the expected rankings, the high score man accounted for three expected rankings and the medium score man had two expected rankings. The "task specialist" and the "best-liked man" had each other's ranking on ( $A.O._I, +R_I$ ) while the lowest status man had the "task specialist's" rank on ( $-R_R, P.O._R$ ). The low status man also had the "best-liked man's" ranking on the

(A.O.<sub>I</sub>,+R<sub>I</sub>) type of acts. Besides this one finds that the rankings in Table 8 are separated in several types of acts by only a few acts. One must therefore conclude that there was not a very high level of role specialization occurring in these groups during the "influence attempts" and "influence processes."

Hypothesis II was tested by counting the number of times members of different statuses had their ideas accepted during the "influence processes." The data was gathered through content analyses of the "influence process." A member was considered to have successfully influenced the group if his ideas prevailed at the end of each "influence process." In the content analysis of each "influence process" only the main disagreements were noted and coded. This procedure eliminates any need for any check of the coder's reliability. As a further check, the beginning and end of each "influence process" is noted in Appendix A. This allows the reader to read the "influence process" for himself and decide if the writer was correct in his determination of success for particular members in each "influence process." The successes in each "influence process" is reported in Table 31. Basically, a member was considered to be successful in an "influence process" if his ideas prevailed at the end of the process or if his negative reaction to a person's performance output was sustained. In cases where a person could have the group

Rate  
data  
activity  
signifi-  
cance  
part  
of t  
only  
is,  
acc  
one  
one  
one  
one  
one  
one  
one  
one

successfully ignore another person's negative reaction to his idea or have another person's performance output dropped, that person was considered successful.

Table 26 indicates that the most active member irrespective of "performance expectation" won twice as many "influence processes" as the other two members. The data supports Hypothesis II.

The activity of the participants does not conform very well to what had been expected by Hypothesis III. Since we had assumed that "performance expectations" and the power position of a person are directly related, we would expect activity to decrease with lower "performance expectations." According to Table 27, the highest score member is the most active participant only two times, whereas the medium score man is the most active four times out of seven groups, and the low score man is the least active participant only two out of seven times. In Table 28, the high score member has the highest support intake only once out of the two times he was the most active participant. The high score member had the highest rate of total support intake only two times for all levels of participation whereas the medium ranked member held the highest "Rate of Total Support Intake" four times over all activity levels. The only pattern which seems to fit the data is that of the low status man. He had the lowest "Rate of Total Support Intake" six times. It seems that

2  
 3  
 4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525  
 526

the expected power ordering based on "performance expectations" did not materialize.

Before proceeding, a point should be made regarding Mills' formulas. The rates calculated from such formulas may range from +100 to -100 (see Appendix E). The positive number denotes a surplus of positive reactions over negative reactions received for all performance outputs and action opportunities he initiated and vice versa.<sup>39</sup> The rates are only relative and they help to point out trends in Tables 1-8 which otherwise would be hard to discern. Since the Mills' formulas are expressed in a rate and the groups very often do not have more than one hundred total acts, one should be cautioned not to overinterpret the rates. They have been used in this paper primarily to highlight the trends present in the tables. Table 29 presents the data which tests Hypothesis IV. In the rankings of the total volume of communication between persons, we found that in terms of the hypothesis the participants had acted as though the low score man had a medium score and the medium score man had a low score.

In the calculation of the regular rates of support the rate of support of L-M was much higher than anticipated while the rate of support of M-H was lower than anticipated. In the modified rates of support, we found that the L-H was much higher than expected while the M-H and the H-L were ranked lower than expected. It seems that the power

22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50

hierarchy expected in this case did not materialize with the high score and medium score men being weak on several indicators of power whereas the low status man seemed to demonstrate more power than expected.

Table 30 presents the information valuable for interpreting Hypothesis V. We can readily see that both the high and medium score persons were successful in the "influence process" two and a half times more frequently than the low status member. However, only in XG-1 and XG-7 was the high status man obviously in a strong power position whereas in XG-3, XG-4, XG-5, XG-6, and XG-8 the medium score man was more successful than the high score man. One concludes that an obvious difference in ability to influence the group exists between the low score man and the others. However, there was not any significant difference between the high score and medium score men.

Table 31 delineates the trend of the successes in the "influence processes" over time. There is no pattern evident in any group where a low score man after winning an initial "influence process" becomes increasingly successful on the latter attempts.

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

## CONCLUSION

In testing the five hypotheses presented two quantitative measures were employed (Berger-Conner coding system, Mills' formulas) and a qualitative measure (content analysis). The combined measures indicated that only Hypothesis II was valid in this experiment. It seems that our hope that the manipulation of "performance expectations" regarding task ability would create real differences in the rate of interaction. Unfortunately, this did not occur.

Several possibilities could account for these results: (1) it is possible that the "performance expectation" manipulations on the dimension of task ability were not effective or (2) the conditions of this experiment did not meet or violated the original experimental conditions of the hypotheses taken from the literature. Regarding these possibilities it seems that the second possibility is more likely than the first one.

This position is taken because: (1) every attempt was made to make the manipulation of "performance expectation" on task ability as strong as possible; (2) attempts were made to detect immediately after the experiment any failure of "Social Insight and Prediction Ability" to

convince any member of its validity; and (3) only a portion of the total group behavior had been coded whereas many of the hypotheses used were based on the total number of acts in a group discussion.

"Influence attempts" and "influence processes" are by definition a conflict among members of different "performance expectations." Usually, it is the case that the lower score member is disputing a point with a higher score member. By focusing on such processes we are biasing the chance of the hypotheses' verification insofar as it gives an inordinate amount of participation to the lower score member. Even if the lower score member consistently lost the arguments with the higher score members, his increased interaction would violate the anticipated results of the hypotheses. In fact, we found that in the seven groups: the high score man initiated 676 acts, the medium score man initiated 525 acts, and the low score man initiated 570 acts while the high score man received a total of 540 acts, the medium score man received 377 acts, and the low score man received 430 acts. Interaction was therefore focused between the high score and low score men. This phenomena can be accounted for by analyzing in greater detail the operation of the Berger-Conner coding system and the way it operates within the "influence processes." All positive and negative reactions initiated and received during the "influence process" are counted.

The system is not capable of accounting for the worthwhileness of an idea. One might therefore suggest that it is possible for the low score man to merely state an obvious fact or a trivial opinion, and yet if any other members nod their heads it will be scored as a positive reaction from the higher score man to a lower score man. If this happens often enough, the rate of positive reactions between the high score man and the low score man will not give an accurate picture of the actual exchange of opinions or ideas, and will invalidate the hypotheses presented.

It was precisely the above situation which prompted the author to also employ content analysis. This method is particularly suitable when employed as it has been in the experiment because it separated the trivial points that may have been won by different group members during the "influence process" from the major ideas or points that were accepted by the group after initial opposition had been raised. As we have seen through the results of such a method, a significantly greater number of "influence processes" were won by the higher score members.

The smallness of the sample was due to the intensiveness of the analysis, i.e. the type of analysis performed in this experiment was very time consuming. The author suggests that the data of this experiment be related to the coded data for the total group discussions so

that one could ascertain whether the hypotheses tested in the experiment are verified in a broader context. If they are not verified one could then reasonably suspect that our "performance expectation" manipulation had failed.

If the hypotheses did hold up in this broader context, the author would then suggest that further research be done so that we could determine whether such generalization about group interaction and status are valid for all phases of group behavior, viz. "influence processes." It is quite possible that the above hypotheses being based on the total group discussion gloss over unique processes in the group such as "influence processes."

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### CODING RULES

The following rules and concepts were used to code the experimental data. Conceptually, the coding system was developed and presented by Joseph Berger and Thomas Conner in their paper, "Performance Expectation and Behavior in Small Groups."

Their system studies only task related interaction in discussion groups. Unlike the Bales' system which studies both "task behavior" and "social-emotional" (see Berger and Conner, "Performance Expectation and Behavior in Small Groups" unpublished draft) any social or emotional acts without task relevance are excluded. Therefore, it is not their intention to deal with behavior aimed at increasing morale or commitment to the task, smoothing tension, or establishing friendship.

This system is a modification of the twelve basic coding categories developed and used by Bales. Like Bales' system the basic unit of coding is the act.

An act is usually a simple verbal sentence but could be a gesture, a look, or some other form of nonverbal communication. More strictly, an act is the smallest unit of social behavior that can be classified within our system. Any behavior that is not an instance of one of our concepts is, of course, ignored.<sup>40</sup>

Berger and Conner adapted Bales' twelve categories into a system of four categories.

The first is the performance output. The definition of performance output subsumes Bales' categories four to six.

A performance output is an act which is an attempt to solve or partially solve a task related problem. It may be the suggestion of a course of action, a decision, or a solution: the statement of an idea, fact, observation, generalization, or assertion; or a statement in a chain of reasoning, an hypothesis, or logical assertion.<sup>41</sup>

#### Examples of Performance Outputs from transcripts

"I think she kind of kept the peace in the family."

"But, I don't blame it all on the wife."

"It was mostly the father's fault about that."

Action opportunities contain the categories seven to nine of the Bales system. An action opportunity is:

an act which communicates a request for activity. It is usually a question but may also be a glance, a stare, or a gesture with the hand or finger.<sup>42</sup>

#### Examples of Action Opportunities from transcripts

"Do you think that they should give him the money for the store, right out?"

"But would the judge be justified in giving in saying well, I think that he has the initiative in him?"

Positive reactions correspond to categories one to three while negative reactions correspond to categories ten to twelve of the Bales system.

A reaction is any act which communicates the evaluation of a performance output, such as agreeing with a suggestion, concurring with a fact, or disputing an idea. It is frequently a verbal act but may often be a frown, a grimace or a nod.<sup>43</sup>

A positive reaction contains reactions which indicate agreement or acceptance of an act of another person. A negative reaction contains any disagreement with another person's performance output.

For an act to be categorized as a reaction:

- (1) the act must be easily identifiable.
- (2) the act designated a reaction must carry a positive or negative evaluation regarding the act it responds to.
- (3) the reaction must be directed at a specific act.

Some examples of typical positive reactions are: "Yeah," "Hh-mm," "Uh-huh" and the nodding of the head while several negative reactions would be: "No," "I don't think so . . .," "Well . . .," "Yeah, but . . ." and the shaking of the head.

The following rules serve as guidelines for the coding process.

- (1) An act has to be clear and unambiguous. It must be capable of being evaluated or reacted to by another person. All incomplete or ambiguous remarks were not coded as acts.

It is important to note that some persons were interrupted in the midst of a performance output. In such cases, if the person completed the act after the interruption it was coded.

(2) In the process of transcribing the group discussions, the rules of grammar and punctuation were applied to the dialog whenever possible. Nevertheless, the general rule for coding performance outputs is that the simple declarative sentence is considered one act. In the cases of compound and complex sentences, clauses were considered as acts only if they expressed a thought completely independent from the main clause of the sentence.

Example: "Because all women usually don't like to bring something like that up (first act), because don't forget, she's got that maternal instinct for the home first (second act)."

(3) The coder acts as if he were an actual silent member of the group--all interpretation and attributions of meaning are from that perspective.

(4) The most immediate context (i.e. most recent act and subsequent act) is the most relevant one for scoring; one relies essentially on "surface meanings."

(5) Complex sentences are broken down if possible into smaller units which are then classified according to what particular kind of act it is.

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Ex

Example: The sentence, "I think we should do A, B, and C." would be divided into three units as follows:

"I think we should do A."  
 "I think we should do B."  
 "I think we should do C."

However, "etc." or any like phrases are not scored. Any "performance output" which is just a rephrasing or repeating of a previous "performance output" when initiated by the same person is not scored.

Sentences linking ideas by the word "or" are scored as a single act.

Example: "We have to do A or B." is considered a single act.

(6) Any behavior that was not task relevant was ignored. This means that basically only verbal acts were coded. Gestures were only counted as acts in the reaction categories and only then were the most obvious and easily discernible coded.

Example: "Nodding the head" is considered a positive reaction; "shaking the head" is considered a negative reaction.

(7) Whenever possible a specific target was assigned to every act. Generally, if a person was looking directly at another, it was assumed that he was directing that particular act at him. A person may be designated a target of an act in cases where no eye contact between the

initiator and receiver exists because the content of the act is obviously directed at a particular member.

If a person looks down while initiating acts, they are presumed to be addressed to the whole group. Likewise, if a person looks back and forth between the other members of the group, the act is coded as being directed to the group.

(8) Continuous nodding (or shaking) of the head during a series of "performance outputs" is scored as a single reaction for every "performance output." So, if A initiated five "performance outputs" and B nods continuously, score five reactions by B.

(9) In many groups, certain phrases were used by the speakers that were not codable because they were outside the scope of the theory or they were substitutes for pauses.

Examples of such phrases outside the scope of the theory are: "Wait a minute" and "Now, listen." Such phrases imply asking for an action opportunity which can not be coded in our system.

Examples of phrases that are pauses: "You know," "Ah" and "Uh." Such phrases have no content but they do allow a person a moment to think before continuing his conversation.

(10) The phrase "you know" posed some interesting problems.

It was scored as an "action opportunity" if a reaction followed.

Example: "He would really hate it there, you know."

"You know" was ignored if it was used primarily as a hesitation gesture.

Example: "I think he probably, you know, well . . . I guess he should be allowed to go to school."

It was ignored if it was used primarily to communicate "are you listening?" or "do you understand?"

Example: "I used to work in a youth center. It was really bad, you know. The guys hated the social worker and stayed away, you know, if they could."

(11) A useful shorthand has been developed to expedite the coding process. The abbreviation for the following terms are:

P.O. = performance output	XG = experimental group
A.O. = action opportunity	O = group as whole
+R = positive reaction	H = high score man
-R = negative reaction	M = medium score man
	L = low score man

The syntax within which the above abbreviations are used is:

INITIATOR (TYPE OF ACT) RECEIVER

Examples: H(+R)L means that the high score man initiated a positive reaction to the low score man. L(A.O.)O means that the low score man has addressed an action opportunity to the whole group.

stag

ing

anti

fire

die

that

acts

been

trial

stag

fire

hol

stad

'reg

Anti

teac

igno

(12) In reading the transcripts one encounters stage directions regarding eye contact, i.e. who is looking at who (or what). These directions remain in effect until negated by new directions, i.e. if on page one the direction is given that H looks at L, and on page three the new direction is given that H looks at M. This means that all acts initiated by H are directed at L whereas all acts initiated by H after the new directions are coded as being received by M.

(13) In the stage directions, the phrase "looks at briefly" means that a person has interrupted a previous stage direction for several seconds to perform a new direction and then returns to the original direction.

(14) Conditions for a successful "influence process" include:

(a) Cases where a participant successfully persuades the others to accept his "performance output" or "negative reaction" in spite of resistance from the other member(s).

(b) Cases where a person received a "negative reaction" to his "performance output" and successfully ignores the "negative reaction."

## APPENDIX B

### VERBAL TRANSCRIPTS

This appendix contains the verbal transcripts of the "influence processes" which have been coded in accordance with the coding rules in Appendix A. Several abbreviations are used within the format of the transcripts. The first important abbreviation is XG which means experimental group. Each of the seven experimental groups used in the study are denoted by XG-1, XG-3, XG-4, XG-5, XG-6, XG-7, and XG-8. XG-2 was deleted from the sample because of a failure in the experimental manipulation. Each "influence process" is noted by an alphabetical letter. The earliest "influence process" in a group discussion is noted by the alphabetical symbol A. The following "influence processes" use the remaining alphabetical symbols in their normal order.

In several sections of the transcripts, the expected "influence process" is missing. This can be accounted for by the fact that these sections were thought to contain "influence processes" but upon analysis of the transcript the process was in reality not there. Therefore, since the acts of these sequences had been already

coded and used in compilation of the tables, they were retained. A perceptive reader will note that the discussion immediately preceding and immediately following an "influence process" is included in the transcripts. This was done in order to allow the reader to understand the context of the discussion in which the "influence process" had occurred.

The beginning and end of each "influence process" is noted in the transcripts with the outcomes of each process recorded in Table 31. A reader is thus allowed to independently verify the accuracy of my content analyses. Finally, an example of a coded "influence process" is found in XG-6A.

XG-1A

Footage 56-78

L (L looks down, M looks down, H looks at L) (Process I begins) "It's not though like George--is very into the idea of having fun (L looks at H) just whenever he feels like it. (L looks down) Like, ah, rolling drunks, ah, whatever they were doing."

H (L looks at H, H looks down) "I think it was more to get some money."

L "Yeah, I don't"

H (H looks at M) "To get spending money . . ."

L (continues. L looks at M) "So much for money as for a gag. (H looks to L then back to M. Everyone is talking at the same time and about (M looks at H) five or six words are covered up. H looks at L, L looks at H) "Yeah, he probably (M looks down) never had a lot of money but--(L looks down) but I don't know is that was the big reason, you know . . ."

H (H looks down--interrupts) "I think so."

L (L looks at H) (continues) "Yeah, you think that was the reason"

H "Yeah, (L looks down) one of the main reasons . . ."

M (M looks at H) "His father wasn't working, you know."

H "Because he moved from a middle class environment to a lower class (M looks down) and he had a little bit of trouble. Well, he had two reasons to get into the

gang. One (H looks at M, M looks at H briefly) for the companionship because he didn't get that at home . . ."

M "That's right."

H (continues) "And the other was, was, ah, getting his kicks as you say. (H looks at L and points at him) And to make a little (H looks down) extra cash."

L (L looks at H) "Yeah, but a lot of it is, is for (H looks at L) most of I think for his (M looks at H) companionship."

H (H nods) "Yeah, companionship." Process I ends

L (H looks at L) "Right along he would have been needing money . . ."

H (M looks down, H looks away) "So we still have to find something . . ."

L (L looks down, M shifts in seat, H looks at L) It's hard to say, he's been in this way (L looks at H) of life for seven (M looks at L) years--the slum, you know. It could be, he might not (M looks down) like the idea of doing school--college (L shakes head, H looks down) is not so much fun . . ."

H (L looks down, M looks at H) "Well, you know, according to the information we had, he was doing (H looks at L) good in school . . ."

L (interrupts--L looks at H) "Yeah."

H (continues--L looks down) "He had the brains and the ability."

L (interrupts) "Yeah, he had it. I don't . . . I don't know."

H (H looks down) "It didn't say that he had sluffed off."

L (H looks at L--interrupts) "No."

H (continues) "When he went into the slums."

L (L looks at M, M looks down, H looks at M) "He continued to do it."

H (H looks at L) "Yeah, he continued to do good work in school. (L looks at H) Maybe he could do better work in school . . ."

L (nods his head) "Yeah, yeah. And get back into it."

H (H looks at L and nods) "Yeah, I think so."

L "Yeah, I think he would also but . . ."

XG-1B

Footage 110-133

(Process II begins)

H (H looks down, M looks down, L looks at H) "But I don't blame it all on the wife."

L (L sighs) "A lot--a lot of (H looks at L) the later tensions."

H (H looks down) "The later, yeah, but it's (M looks at H) because of--of the father and the wife."

L (interrupts--L nods) "Yeah, right." (M looks down)

Process II ends)

- H (L looks down) "The guy evidently had a--he was--  
wasn't too stupid. (H looks at L and shakes head) He  
could have gotten a much better job."
- L (H looks at M, L shakes head) "Yeah, I don't under-  
stand it."
- M (M mumbles something. M looks at H briefly)
- H "And he was probably the one that started in with the  
wife about she was making more money than him."
- M (M looks at H, L looks at M) "I think she kinda kept  
the peace in the family." (M looks down)
- H (H looks at L, L looks down) "Because all women  
usually don't like to bring something like that up,  
because don't forget, she's got (H looks down) that  
maternal instinct for the home first. (H looks at L)  
She probably didn't even really want to go to work  
until (H looks at M) it was so bad that (H looks at  
L) she had to."
- M "Hm-mmm" (M nods head and looks at H briefly)
- H (H looks away) "It was mostly the father's (H looks  
down) fault about that."
- M (Process III begins) (H looks at M) "But George  
should (M looks at H) be sent to the youth program  
(M looks down briefly) until he spends his time help-  
ing. (L looks at M) It looks like he is a leader."
- H (mumbles a few words) "Hm-mmm" (H nods head)

- L (H looks to L, M looks at L, L looks down) "Yeah, you wouldn't--I don't know--you know, he would not be in a position of leadership (L looks at H and M) right away if he went into that youth club."
- H (H looks at M and nods head, M looks at H, L looks at H) "He'd get to it."
- M (H looks at L, M looks at L) "Yeah, but he wouldn't . . ."
- H (more strongly) "He'd get to it."
- L (continues) "Yeah, but he wouldn't be (L shakes head) right away, (H looks down) so when he's moving from a (M looks down) position where (H nods) he's a leader, he's a king. This Ellis Chiefs to a position where he's, (H mumbles something, M looks at H) ah, king of starting over, you know. (H looks at L then at M) He'd work his way up, (L nods head) he would be a leader. (H looks at L) Definitely he (M looks down) is, but he (L shakes head) wouldn't be right away."
- H (H shakes head looks at L then M) "I don't think that would bother (L shakes head) him though."
- M (H looks at M, M looks at H) "I think he would sorta strive to (L looks down) you know . . ."
- H (H nods and looks at L briefly) "Yeah, give him motivation (pause) and ambition. (pause--L is silent, Process III ends, H looks at L briefly then looks down) Well, shall we get onto the eliminations."

- H (Process IV begins, H looks at M while smiling, L looks at H) "Three months probation." (M mumbles something and looks at H)
- L (H looks at L, M looks away from H and L) "Yeah, that's just a legal aspect but he shouldn't (L shakes head)--no--no--sentence or anything like that, no bond . . ."
- H (L looks at H, H looks at L) "No bond but he still (H looks at M) should just be put on (M looks at H briefly) probation (L says "Yeah") to give him a (H looks at L then looks down) warning."
- L (L nods his head) "Yeah."
- H (H looks at M smiling, L looks down) "So, ah, three months is a good time." (L laughs, Process IV ends)

XG-1D

Footage 169-189

- L (Process V begins, L looks at H, M looks at L) "Maybe he should get a job." "Working, you know."
- M (L looks at M, M looks at H, H looks down) "Yes, you know, like digging a . . ."
- L (L looks at H, M looks down) "Well, he can, you know . . ."
- H (interrupts) "Well, let us, let the youth center take care of that problem. (L nods and says "Yeah") I'm (L looks down) sure they know what to do there. (L

looks at H, M looks down, H shifts on seat) Because they have the (H looks at L) facilities and a (H looks down) place to give him a job."

L (L looks at H and shakes head, M looks at L briefly)  
"He'll probably will want one, you know . . ."

H (H looks at L, M looks at H) "To get a little extra spending (M looks down) money."

L "Yeah."

H (H looks away) "Yeah, yeah, let's see." Process V ends

L (M looks at L and H, H looks at L) "That's a logical problem to get a job, you know."

H (H looks away) "When did I, yeah, I got a job (H looks at L) when I was 14."

L (L looks at H, M looks down and smiles) "Yeah, I did too." (then H and L laugh loudly together and a few words are said that are covered up by the laughter)

M (Process VI begins, L looks off) "Well, like he could be a paperboy."

H (M looks down and smiles, H looks at M while laughing)  
"Naw, naw, I never wanted to be a paperboy." (M looks at H)

L (L looks at H, H looks at L) "He could do something in a camp or something like that, you know."

H (M looks at H and laughs, H looks down) "That's menial labor. (H's laughing at this time, Process VI ends)

I was a shit (L looks away) picker. (H continues to laugh) I worked for a veterinarian in the kennel, (M looks at H) you know, I was the star shit picker." (H is still laughing, less so now but kind of smiling (L looks at H) "A shit picker--not enough money in that. (There is a long pause where nothing is said. H is writing something) Well, that's about it."

XG-1E

Footage 275-285

H (H looks down writing, M looks down, L looks at H)  
 "One year would be the crucial part. One year is when all (L looks down) the efforts of the family counseling have to (M nods) be brought. Where (L looks at H) the youth center really has to be brought in. (H looks at M briefly) The first year would tell whether it's going (H looks at L briefly) to work or not."

L (L looks down) "Yeah."

M (M looks at H) "He needs respect for himself. (H looks at M briefly, M looks down) He just doesn't . . ."

H "Right."

L (Process VII begins) "So maybe his probation should (L looks at H) be a year then."

H "Well, the kid's probation would have to be a year"

- L "That (M looks at L) extra shouldn't matter, you know.  
(L looks at M) It either will work or (L looks at H)  
it won't work. So if it works the probation could be  
the (L shrugs shoulders) rest of his life, you know.  
It wouldn't matter."
- H (H looks down, M looks at H) "Yeah, but the idea that  
just--that (H looks at M while nodding) a fourteen  
year old kid--(L says "Yeah." H looks at L and nods)  
a year of probation is a long time."
- L "Oh yeah, I can see it that way."
- H "Because that means even if he does a something--he  
could (H shakes head)--circumstantial evidence."
- L (L nods head and looks away) "Right. Oh, yeah."
- H (continues) "That he gets screwed (H shakes head)  
royally then if he's still on probation."
- L (L looks at H and nods) "Ok then, we give him a short  
probation."
- H (H looks down and nods) "Three months probation is  
(H looks at M, L looks down) about a standard pro-  
bation."
- M (H looks at M, M looks at H, H looks down) "Three  
months it is. (H looks down) All he is going to have  
to do (M looks down) is three months." Process VII  
ends

XG-3A

Footage 389-435

- M (Looking at table) "It seems like we got just about two decisions to make right off the bat. (H looks at M) The first one is do you really rehabilitate him, you know--(M then looks at H) through the state reformatory school or do you it at home? (M looks at H. M looks at table) (Process I begins) It seems to me that if you send him to the school--the reformatory--it might be doing him more harm than good." (H looks at M. M looks at H)
- H "That's right. I agree."
- L (Looking at table) "I can see that but the thing is that--that like in the youth center--I don't see how (L shakes head while saying this. L looks at group) in the present environment that we somehow can improve it all."
- M "Well." (While looking at L) . . .
- H (Looking at L) "Have you ever been to a youth center?"
- L (Looking at H and M) "Well, like what--like?"
- H "In a boys' club or something like that?"
- L (Looking at H) "Yeah, yeah." (While nodding his head. L looking back and forth between M and H) "But do you think that the typical like fifteen year old gang leader will be improved by going to something like that?"

- M (Nodding his head. While looking at L--) "It's been proven that . . ."
- L (Looking at M) "He'd probably hate it."
- M (Looking at L) . . . "a nineteen year old can."
- L (Looking at M) "Yeah, well, Ok." (Attempt I ends)
- H (Looking at L) "I think so. I don't know. We had these boys' clubs where I came from, you know, and we had a lot of kids like this around and they were always kind of cutting around like that or hanging around the pool hall and stuff . . ."
- M (Looking at H interrupts) "The main thing is (M looks at L) that have either of you been to a reformatory . . ."
- H (Looks at L) "Well, we got them in playing basketball and stuff like that and pretty soon they stopped hanging around the pool hall and started playing basketball and stuff like that all the time, you know, all the time." (L looks at table. M and H are looking at L)
- L "Yeah, I can see that but I don't know--it just seems like, you know--(L starts shaking his head) with his father trying to discourage him from working and towards college (L looks up at H and M) and everything (L looks at table again) I don't know--it's just (M and H are looking at L) that the family situation is really so poor." (M looks at table. H is still looking at L)

M "Well, it's easier to send him to the reformatory. (H looks at M) Because then you know all you have to worry about is George."

L "Yeah, then you're totally divorcing him from his family and his environment. (H and M are looking at L. L looks at M) But whether (L looks down at table) or not that would be any help--" (H looks at L, L looks at H. M looks at H)

H "Don't you think though if say his home life was re-established--his parents became happy--say the parents again became the money winner--and the wife would respect him again and he would feel like she respected him and that the home would become happy again and he got placed in a youth center where he got interested in other things besides being a gang leader and do you think that as his studies improved that maybe his father would see that he could still get a good job--you know, maybe even if he didn't get to go to college, he might, you know, just try the course."

L (Looking at table) "Yeah. I don't know. I just sort of get the impression that he's really (L then looks at M) an intelligent (L then looks back at table) boy though and that something that would be--that would give him a good shaking up could give him a better motivation to change himself and, you know, like if he just thinks that he can always get off and you know

because he's intelligent they will give him a second chance and everything. I don't know--maybe just a short term would really, really shake him up." (L is looking at H. M is looking at H. H is looking at L)

H "Do you know anything about reform school?"

L "Yeah. Well, I mean it seems like that he's pretty hardened type and I don't think he would be corrupted too much by that--I mean he's certainly just as corrupt inside as the reform school." (M looking at table. H then looks at table)

H "Did you see where this was though--Cook County?" (H, L and M sort of nod their heads and say "Yeah." M looks at H. H looks at M. L is looking at H)

M (to H) "Where are you guys from?"

H "I'm from Pontiac." (H then looks at L)

M (to H) "I'm from Cook County." (looks at L)

L (garbled)

H (to L) "Are you? Did you go to Rochester High . . ."

L "Yeah."

M "I went to Avondale."

L "Oh, really? No kidding?"

M (Looking at table) "Um (then looks at H) I come from Chicago. (Looks down at the table again) It's a good town. (L is looking at M. H is looking at M. M still looking at table) And there are a lot of cases like this and a lot of times what happens is (M

looking at H. L looking at M) is, you know, kids just get influenced. (M looking at L) It's just--I suppose it happens anywhere. (M looks down at table) And this is what I think happened with George. (M looks up at H. H is looking at L. M looks at H) I mean he just left home. (M looks at L. H is looking at M) You know, he just wanted to get out of the place. (M looking at L--shaking his head) So the first thing--the first people he meets, you know, are the wrong type." (L looking back and forth between H and M)

L "And he does have leadership abilities. (L nods his head) And he's intelligent. He wants to lead."

M (Nods his head) "Yeah."

L "And he's just leading . . ." (M looks up at L)

M "I mean it's easier to go find a gang than . . ."

L "Wrong kind of existence."

M (Looking at L) (H is looking at L. L is looking at both) . . ."it is to go find a youth center and find the kids that you want to hang around with." (L is nodding during M's statement)

L "That's really true."

M (Looking down at table) "The thing is that if you send him to a state reform school (H is looking at M and L is looking at M), you know, I have a feeling that, just like a prison, you know, he will be with the hardened type." (M then looks at H)

H "And he's not the . . ."

M (Looking back at L) "And he's not the hardened type. Rolling drunks does not take a--a helluva lot of guts. So I imagine that this kid would go to the reform school (H and L are looking at M) if he was only there for a short term. I think it would probably do him a little bit more harm than good than if he stayed back. (H looks at L--then looks back at M again) Plus, if he stayed here, that would force the court to help the family situation so that you would be helping not only George but (H looks at L. M looks at L) the family." (M looks down at table. H is looking at L)

H "I agree. Why expose him to more crime?" (Five or six words garbled) (M looking at table. L looks at H. H looking at L)

L "I was just sort of like--like--exploring the other half. I really agree with you, but, you know, there really are a number of alternatives." (H looks at L)

H "Yeah." "I can see that . . . (Then looks at M. M looks at H)

M (Shaking his head) "I've never been in a state reform --you know--so I don't know what it's like. (M then looks at L) But I've heard." (H looks at L) (Everyone talks at once--sentences are garbled)

H "I don't know. I could see other alternatives, as, you know . . ."

L (Looks at H) "It's hard to tell how much--how much--will reform him and how much will just make him bitter. (M is looking down at the table. H is looking at L and L is looking at H) He's in a very poor situation now and we certainly do not want to make him more bitter than he already is." (M looking at table nods his head)

M "That's true."

XG-3B

Footage 443-503

(H is looking at L. M is looking at table. L is looking down)

L (Process II begins) "I think, you know, if he is an intelligent and alert boy that--that--just some counseling would really help, too." (During the last line M looks up at L briefly then looks back at the table again.) "You know, get--get the--family together with the counselor to just have, like, a discussion. You know, get things out in the open. It seems like there was like a pretty great lack of communications, you know--they mentioned that he said to his father that he was interested in going on to college and his father just sort of discouraged it and certainly George is not going to bring up the topic anymore. It just seems like there's--there could be quite a lack of

communication and exchange between the members of the family." (During the speech by L just made L is looking between M and H while he is talking. H looks at L and shifts his eyes to M at times. M looks at the table for most of the speech, looking at L only once or twice for a brief time.)

M "I think it depends on . . ."

H (interrupting and looking at L) "Yeah, that can also cause more resentment though." (M is shifting in his seat)--"if it was brought out in the open." (M looks at H. H is looking at L and L is looking at H)

M "You mean the college prep? If he took the college prep against his father's wishes?" (H is looking at M)

H "No, if--ah--they brought it out in the open in a discussion by a counselor." (M then looks at the table)

M "Yeah, it's true." (H is looking at M. L is looking at H) "Of course--uh--. . ."

L "Well, uh, his mother's already filed for a divorce." (H looks at L. M looks at L) "Right?"

M "Yeah." (M looks at H) "His father's moody and apathetic . . ." (L is looking at table)

L (interrupting) "Yeah. Uh-huh."

M (continuing) . . . "I mean, uh, so you've got two situations and his mom constantly, uh, harps on the fact that she's wearing the pants in the family now." (L

is looking at the table. H is looking at M and M is looking at H) "She seems to get her big thrills out of that."

- H (Looking at M) "Don't you think that the situation would change, though, if, uh, I think she feels that" (M is still looking at H during this conversation) "he, you know, the husband, let her down, you know, when he got his hand mangled so that he couldn't earn the money anymore and she had to go out and now she's enjoying it." (L is now looking at H) "I think if, uh, you know, he got the grocery store like he wanted and he did make a success out of it, you know, he would feel, you know, like here he feels like he lost his masculinity or something, you know--he can't be the breadwinner. If he got, you know, to be the breadwinner again, (M is now looking at the table. L is looking at the table) I think he'd feel like more protective over George and his wife, you know, and his wife. You know, he can tell when somebody feels like they're boss. (L garbled words) . . . and they kind of follow him around. I think the wife, you know, she might keep her job, you know, but he'd still be making more and she would kind of follow underneath him and regain the respect that she lost for him."
- M "Yeah. He does seem pretty resigned to his past." (M then looks up at H) "I think that any case that he's

lost some respect for himself as well as the family losing respect for him." (H looks at M)

H "I think, uh, George may have lost respect for him, too, and that's why . . ."

M (Looking at H, interrupts) "Oh, undoubtedly." (M looks back and forth between H and L) "So, well, I think, uh, you're pretty convinced that the state reform would be . . ."

H (interrupting) "Yeah."

M ". . . uh, not a wise idea." (M then looks at the table) "Then you've got the question of what do you do first about the divorce; second, about his father." (M then looks up at H) "And third, about George." (H is now looking at table)

H "Ok. First, about the divorce. I notice there that they both are--the parents--that they still love each other but they just felt that the other has lost respect for them. So if I were the judge, I would deny the divorce request for the time being. Give, you know--sort of give--the father the store and see how it worked out from there." (L is looking at H during this part of the speech. M looks up at H)

M "Ah, hmmm." (Nodding his head)

H (continuing) "Because I--I--think that, uh, you know they like--they--feel like they say they do--they--they still love each other--but they just lost respect

because the other one's--uh--not making any money."  
 (L is looking at H during this speech. M is still looking at table) "and the other one is--the other one feels superior where as before the other one felt superior and he must feel that their situations are reversed and the other one's no good any more." (M still looking at table, begins to nod head, and then looks up)

M "Yeah. I agree. I think that, uh, if the family situation is solved, the divorce problem would be solved. And, you know, like inherent--(H then looks at L. M is looking at the table and L is looking at M) (Process II ends)

L "Well, uh, the mother must be quite a strange person to--to get like that. I mean, it was an unavoidable accident and, uh, you know, there just must be something about the two that just--a lack of compatability in some ways. I--uh--uh--just can't quite grasp the ways, you know, because of a unavoidable accident that the wife would have such sentiments, you know." (M is looking at the table throughout the time L is speaking. L is looking at H and H is looking at L)

H "Ok, but people generally like to feel superior and, uh, well before she depended upon her husband and he felt superior but then he lost it and, uh, well, he supposedly lost his masculinity because he couldn't be

the breadwinner and she had to take over so then she felt superior, you know--everybody really wants to be the boss--you know--most people--and, uh, she felt that she was the leader now." (During H's speech M looked up from the table at H twice and then looked back at the table)

M "I have a feeling--(H and L look at M)--she just--her mothering instincts took over when he lost his job because, you know, like how many--I forgot--there--was George the only one in the family? I think there were more, weren't they?" (M is looking directly at H at this time)

H "They only have George."

M (Looking at table) "Just George, then? Well, I didn't mention anything else." (H is looking at M. M is looking at the table. L is looking at table) "But, it would seem to me, that she would, uh, you know, once that the father lost his job, the mother went out to get a job, that her--she felt--you know--like, she was--she was--a--bringing up her child without the help of the father." (M looks at H) "Or Charles. So, in other words, she would be taking or assuming the role of bringing up her child and, uh, you know, caring for the family and so forth. I think she's taken herself from a feminine to a masculine role." (M looks down at table) "And I think that's where you--"

ah--get your problem because, you know--" (M then looks up at L. H is looking down at table. L is looking at M) "she assumes a role that's entirely--uh--different from what she's been brought--probably been brought--up to expect." (L begins to speak. M looks at the table. H looks at L)

L "Well, what are we going to do about the father? He's obviously really lost a lot of confidence in himself." (L is looking down at the table. M is looking at his table. H is looking at L) "and he really needs something to really change his life." (L looks at H. M looks at H)

H "Yeah. I don't think he's going to be happy or really be a success in anything else unless he gets, you know, his own shop. He wants to be his own boss." (L is looking at H)

L "Yeah, yeah. He really does." (While nodding his head)

M "Plus it said that he did--the shop--the tailor shop--had success because (M is looking back and forth between L and H. L and H are looking at M) of his drive and his initiative." (L looks at M and repeats the word "initiative" at the same time M says it)

L "And now he just has no drive or initiative and" (M and H are looking at L and L looks back and forth between them) "he's even influencing his own son

because he doesn't want his son to work to college--to go to college. You know, he's just lost faith in--in --humanity itself." (M is now looking at table)

"Really, he just thinks that it--like--it--is--uh--a bad thing." (H is looking at L. M is still looking at table. L is looking at H)

H "Yeah. He's not going to make it unless he gets an education or he's a full, able-bodied man."

M "I think he's capable, though." (H looks at M) "of retaining his old self respect and initiative, if you give him a chance to work at it. He may be slow but, uh, like I--he said, once you give him something to work on." (Here H shifts in his seat. L is looking at M. M is looking at table)

L (Looking up at M and H) "So really it would be worthwhile to think like they said loans available if he got a loan to buy his own shop." (H is looking at L. M is looking at the table) "--or store or grocery store or whatever he mentioned--that there would really be a big change." (M is now looking at L. H is looking at L)

H "If he got the loan, then George could also work there (M is looking at H. L is looking at H) . . ."

L (interrupting) "Yeah . . ."

H (continues) "part time to get his own spending money . . ."

- L "And then gain respect for his father because his father would be the boss." (H is looking at L)
- H "Yeah." (nodding his head) (M is still looking at table. M nods his head a bit)
- L "That would really be a good situation." (L looks at M)

XG-3C

Footage 552-592

- (M is looking at table. H is looking at table. L is looking at M)
- M "I--I have a feeling that--that, uh, he wouldn't revert back to his norm--his old behavior if he were given a chance to grow up in another way." (H nods his head)
- H "Yeah. Grow up . . ."
- L "Yeah."
- M "It seems it worked itself out just by, uh, first, solving the problem with his father, (M looks up at H) I guess." (H shifts in his seat)
- H "I guess (one or two garbled words) everything worked out all right."
- M (looks down at table) "Yeah. I guess that's the way it goes." (H then looks at L. M then looks at L)
- "Yeah. (Process II begins) We're going to have to get his dad--ah--some money (H is looking at M. L is

looking at M) and get a--so his dad can get a store so George can work under him. Have him move away from the area eventually--get George to go to the youth center and . . ."

H (looks at M) "And deny the wife the . . ." (M then looks at L. H looks at L)

L "But what if--uh--. . ."

M ". . . the wife the divorce." (looks at H, nodding his head) (H looks at M) (M and H then look back at L)

L "Ok. We get--uh--we get his dad a grocery store or something. What if George still has a lack of respect for his father and says he doesn't want to work there?" (H looks at M briefly. Then looks back at L)

H "I think he will." (M looks at H) "I think he wants to respect his father."

L "It's still a response--is still a great possibility, you know." (M looks at L)

M "Yeah, it is possible." (H looks at M. M looks at L. L looks at table) "But the chances are that he wouldn't, but if--if he found that he didn't have respect for his father, he probably would have--being the leader that he is--he might have--the respect from the people under him, working with that youth center, and I think, you know, once you have respect for yourself or people have respect for you, you find it easy

to have respect for others. (M and H are looking at L now) Especially in the case of George where he is intelligent enough that--uh--to realize what's coming off. But I--uh--think that there's a less chance of that happening according to what was said than anything else." (L looks up at H and M)

L "But, still, we can sit down and discuss it and sort of run his life, but still he has to make the decisions and it's hard to tell whether or not he'll accept the, you know, fall right into our little pattern that we have set for him. Maybe we really don't know how much he's been corrupted by the gang." (L is shaking his head during this last sentence) "You know, he's been living there for a while--maybe--(M and H look at each other. H says something but it's garbled--about four words)--maybe he'll think the youth center is really, really square."

H (briefly looking at M then back at L) "I know--I think--well, he hasn't been there that long." (Everyone starts to talk and about a sentence is garbled) "Uh, I don't know--almost everybody . . ." (M looks at H. L looks at H. H looks at L and M)

M (interrupts) "Hmmm."

H ". . . from the time they're in sixth grade to the ninth grade, you run around being a vandal and stuff. That's almost natural." (M is looking at H. H is looking at L)

- L "He's been living there since like the fourth grade--  
the third grade . . ."
- M (interrupts--a few garbled words. M and H are looking  
at L)
- L ". . .--he's been there a lot. You know, he isn't  
. . ."
- H "Still though--he's still--his teachers there still  
said, that he shows, you know, ability in class." (L  
and H look at M)
- M "It was just when the--relationship between the mother  
and the father finally were reaching a peak that his--  
that he really did break away."
- H (few garbled words during last part of M's speech)
- M "I think if you establish the rela--a good relation-  
ship between mother and father, the respect for the  
family, especially the father who has definite initia-  
tive and drive, would be restored." (M is looking at  
L. H is looking at M) "Considering also that he's  
got his store with a mangled hand and he's working  
with it, with you know, an impairment. I think George  
would naturally assume some respect for his father  
considering that his father has made some adjustments.  
I mean, you can--" (H looks at the table briefly. M  
is still looking at L. L is looking at the table)--  
there's no way that you can respect or very little way  
you can respect a person who is moody and apathetic  
and resigned to his past . . ."

L "Yeah." (Process III ends)

M (continues) "but a person who takes on initiatives of having his own job--being his own boss--and earning money for the family, I think . . ."

H (looking at L. L looks at table) "I think, uh, George, if he gets there in the store, too, he's going to see more of how other people are. Here, when he's in the slum (M is looking at H) and that all that he sees is his pals, you know--everybody's getting in trouble. He figures, like, the whole world is against him. He gets out there with his father, you know, and he can have a small grocery store like that. I mean, you get regular customers--people come in, you know, and they--and you finally get to know them, and, uh, George is going to meet all these other people and see that everybody's not against you. That people are for you . . ."

L (looking down at table) "That's true, but . . ."

H (continuing) ". . . and that he's going to see that, you know, how different people made it and stuff like that. Make new friends real easy." (L looks at M. H looks at M)

M (M looks down at table briefly then looks back at H) "And another thing, too, kids in freshmen high school --probably by the time this is all settled (M then looks up at H) he's going to be, you know, a

sophomore going on to junior (M and H then look at L) . . ."

H "Yeah."

M (continuing) "there are going to be definite relationships (M looks at L. M then looks back at H) between the kids that he's working with. I mean, uh, he was working with a gang of guys--I mean, undoubtedly he probably, if he goes back to school and is really desirous, that he's going to probably associate with girls also--(M looks at L then back at H) that will lead him away from this rolling drunks. You just don't go and roll a drunk on a date." (M looks at L)

L (chuckles) "Yeah."

XG-3D

Footage 592-end

(M is looking down. H is looking away from everyone. L is looking down)

M (M looks at H. H looks at M. L looks down) "I guess nothing--not--nothing else could go wrong, could it? I mean, like (M shakes his head. M is looking at H) we couldn't foresee anything going wrong besides possibly his losing respect or not retaining respect for his father."

H (L looks at H. M looks at H. H looks at M) "Or he just--I don't know--maybe that the only other thing

could be with that is--ah--that was just a way of life that he liked and he liked going out and getting kicks like that. In that case then, you know, you have a criminal mind--really--a distorted mind. You would have to--to substitute (a few words are garbled) . . ."

L (interrupting. L looks at H. M looks at L. H looks at L) "We really don't know how much he has adjusted to that--you know--like--you know--in gangs (L shakes his head--M looks down) you're influenced by kids and yet you have to follow what is cool and what isn't cool and like he might--may think that it's really a bad thing to--you know--if he has no respect for his dad as it is, he may really be against the idea of working for his dad."

M (M looks at L. L and H look at M) "But look at the size of the gang. (M looks at H. H nods) There were only three people caught including George . . ."

L (interrupting) (M and H look at L) "That's right. It was caught but that doesn't say how many (shakes head) were in it."

M (continuing--H and L look at M. M looks at L) "No, but the--that--normally if you have a gang in a slum like that I would imagine that the gang would kind (M looks at H briefly) of hang around and they are not going to be doing their studies er anything probably so I would assume that the gang would be fairly small

so George has got control over just a few people and you (H looks off from M) would--if it were a large gang I might suspect something like that but with a smaller gang I think it's a--sort of like a bond between members of--a--the group. They're just--ah--you know--no longer interested--interested in anything else but rolling drunks or whatever they were (H looks at M) doing."

"All right. They said Cook County. There's a lot of difference between some of the areas in Cook County . . ."

L "Hmmm."

M (continuing) "I would imagine, though, that this guy might be . . ."

L (interrupting) "would support"

M (continuing) ". . . in the third district of Cook County." (Everyone talks at once and a few words are garbled)

L "That's for sure. (M looks at H. L looks down. H looks at M) Yes."

M (continuing) (L looks at M) "Yes. There's slum areas mostly around Chicago, you know . . ."

H (nods his head) "Yeah"

M (continuing) ". . . and the heart of Chicago."

L (M and H look at L. L looks down) "Well--well--based on what we know about him (H looks down) we really,

you know, (M and H periodically look down while L talks) we don't have that full of an insight into him and really the only way to truly solve the problem would be to talk to him."

M "Yeah, that's true."

L (continuing) "And to the family and everything. (L continues to look down) I mean we're just getting--ah --ah--excerpts from a report from these four (H shifts in his seat) different sources and we really don't know for sure but based on what we have I say that a combination . . ." (everyone again talks and garbles a few words)

H (L and M look at H) "I say that the best possibility though for rehabilitating would be giving his father the money (L looks down) and--and denying the divorce."

L "Right."

M (M shifts in his seat. L and H look at M. M looks at H) "Well, as far as we're concerned--as far as we've seen that's the best possibility and I think if we had the opportunity to talk to George or maybe to listen to what he had to (L looks down) say . . ." (M looks briefly at L--a few words are garbled)

L "Then you could really judge, but . . ."

H "Ok now (word is garbled) briefly."

L "Yeah, based on what we have."

M "Yeah."

Discussion turns to summarization

XG-4

Footage 12-198

M (H and M look down at table. L looks at M) "They had a normal family before his father mangled his hand. (M looks up periodically at H. H. looks up at M periodically) I mean, according to this, you know, they were, you know, a well adjusted family--stuff like this, you know. I mean, the man was a breadearner--stuff like that which is pretty important for a man's ego and stuff. Then all their trouble has taken place after his father mangled his hand and couldn't do any of his occupation. So--maybe to, you know--maybe the source of all the trouble is that right there you know. I think if we could get him back interested in something and--ah--back working, you know, in something that he enjoys like that and he thinks that he really can succeed in it, so I guess you know maybe that would be the start of the salvation of their problems."

H (H looks down at table. M looks alternately at notes and H. L looks away from M and H) (Process I begins) "Yeah, but still there's a hang-up about the wife. Even if he's re-inspired to that--ah--there's no guarantee (H looks at M) that the family could return to any state like it was. And still it doesn't bear an awful lot of relevancy to George (?)--George. Because it definitely would be a good project--pick him up--to

get high on him. But--uh--it can't have much relevancy to George . . ."

L (L looks at H. H and M look at L) "Well, it does because it all started . . ."

H (interrupts. L looks at H) "It started there but returning it I don't think it'll recover anything."

L (M looks down at table. H looks at L. L looks at H) "Well, you gotta tie it in with something else. I mean the Ellis Chiefs wasn't no--wasn't (M looks at L) any good influence on him. That was the only (M looks down periodically. H nods) cohesive group he know of. The only place where he might say he found security and he couldn't find it at home any more and he used--he's studious and everything and now if he wasn't--then if you got him interested in the youth group (L looks down briefly) and made the family a cohesive group (M shifts in seat) again--try to rehabilitate things and bring the father back to reality, it would have a very positive effect on him." (H looks down and shakes his head. M and H talk and a few words are garbled)

M (M looks at table. L looks at M. H looks at M) "Well, uh, I just think that--that, you know, that's not all, (M looks at H briefly. H nods. L looks down periodically while looking at M) of course, you know, that's not all you can do. You're going to have

to work with George I think, but--too--he was (L shifts in seat) concerned about--ah--George must have been concerned about taking a college prep course because he discussed it with his father but because his father was --um--say--ah--down and out at the time, you know, he didn't--his father couldn't see where it was going to get any better and, you know, advised his son not--not to take it so he could get a job but if his father had motivation (M looks at H briefly), you know, somewhere to motivate--his advice to George would have been different, you know. I think it would have anyways, you know . . ."

H (L looks away. H nods head. H looks at M) "Yeah, it would have been different. (M continues looking down) It would--might have been--you know--it might have had a different effect on George. (H looks down) The big thing is getting George ready (H looks at M) enough. You put him in jail (H looks at L)--naturally, it's not going to get any better at all."

M (M looks down and shakes head. L looks at H) "He's just going to get worse." (Process I ends)

H (H looks at L. L looks at H. M looks down) "It's going to get worse and you can't just take 'em though and like they said (Process II begins)--you can't put somebody who's been hardened like that for years into a youth group like that. It's (H looks down)--he's got a . . ."

- L (L looks at H. H looks down) "Well, how has he been hardened?" (End of Process II)
- H "Maybe just a--maybe just a trial--trial--of the court case while this is (M looks at H. H looks at L and periodically looks down) happening will create a little psychological change in him (M looks down) . . ."
- M (M looks down) "Yeah, that . . ."
- H (L looks at H H looks at M) " . . . so that he'll be willing if they tell him this is the only way that you are going to stay out of jail, (M looks at H) you know, that will give him a little incentive to try but the primary thing is to get him back through school . . ."
- M (interrupting) "Yeah."
- H (continuing) ". . . so that he can himself feel useful and then--uh--in society without having--having to steal or anything."
- M (M looks down at table. H looks at M. L looks away from M and H) "Yeah, well, like the judge said, he's got to have other security other than the gang . . ."
- H (interrupting) "Hm--mm." (and looks at L while nodding his head)
- M (continuing) " . . . you know, and like--uh--I get Cook County--they must be talking about Chicago. (H looks at M) Really, I mean he's an overall--there are seven (L nods head)--he's fourteen now so--ah--so--ah--

and he was relatively secure and had a good family until he was seven so he'll probably still remember (M looks at H briefly), you know, and stuff like that, you know. And he's intelligent enough to see--you know he isn't going anywhere and he is concerned or else he wouldn't have even thought about school--you know--taking the kind of courses he's taking and stuff, you know."

H (Process III begins) (L looks at H. M looks at L briefly. H looks at L) "He must be around fourteen by now or by (H looks at M. M looks at L) the time his case comes up because he quit school at fourteen."

L (M looks down. H looks at L) "Well, the reason--you've got to (M looks at L. L looks at H) look at the reason he quit school.

H (H nods head, interrupts and says) "Hm--mm."

L "It's because there was no future there."

H (M looks down. H shakes head. L looks down.) "No. No future . . ." (Process III ends)

L (M looks down. H looks at L. L looks at H) " . . . and if he has to be able to see--while if he's frightened somebody says well--uh--you're good at it so stick with it and you'll get somewhere instead of saying (M looks at L) it's like the throw of the dice--(H looks down and shakes head) it's not--(M looks down) if, you know, let the person know (H looks at L and nods head)

that he has somewhere to go then he'll get--he can get there. You've just gotta--you know, he's (L looks down) looking for security and some meaning and he isn't finding it in school (L looks at H) because it's a dead end street (H looks down and nods head) and he's going to be like his father (H looks at L) when he gets out of it--if he takes college prep courses and he's not really interested in it anyway and he's not interested in taking up some manual (M shifts in seat) thing like bookkeeping so he's--ah--stifled right there."

H (Process IV begins) (M looks down. H looks at L. L looks at H) "I really think the first thing that should be done is get him into college--a high school equivalency type thing so he can go in--so he can get right in. (H periodically looks down) There must be some college in that area where--ah--he can work and put himself through. (H looks at M briefly)

M "Yeah."

H (continuing. looks at L) "Where the attrition is not that high."

M (M looks at his hand and cigarette. H looks down. L looks at H) "Yeah, but you can't just--you can't do that to him before they give him--ah--you've got to give him an incentive to do this--you just can't put him in the thing--(M looks at H. L looks down)--you've

got to want to do it. (H looks at M) He's got to want to go into it."

H (M looks at H. H looks towards M. L looks down)  
 "Well, half of it is that--uh--that--but--(M looks down and shifts in seat) that will partly come by him getting a chance--(L looks at H)--you know--telling him like this is a chance. (H looks down periodically while looking at M) If he is intelligent, like the teachers imagine and everything else and he's alert like they also said, he'll probably see that he's going nowhere now. (L looks down) True, there has to be the social background again brought back so we have some feeling of surrounding (M looks at H then looks down) so he can--uh--adjust to situations a little easier because--(H looks at M)--uh--college is fairly traumatic . . ."

M (M looks down. L looks at M. H looks at M) "Well, he could . . ."

H (L looks at H) ". . . and going back to school (M looks at H briefly) after a period of time is going to be very hard."

M (M looks down. L looks at M. H looks at M) "He isn't even going to be starting that, though--he still has to go through high school . . ."

H (interrupting) "Yeah." (Process IV ends)

- M " . . . you know--and you're talking about--um--a different--um--(L looks down) . . ."
- H "I know, I mean . . ."
- M (continuing) ". . . they have--they--he's got two choices here--either put him back with his family or back to the same (M looks at H) you know thing. You're not talking about putting him into like a foster home or different environment or something like that."
- H (Process V begins) (H looks down. L looks at H. M looks at L briefly then looks down) "That's a hang-up. The family won't give him any security (M periodically looks at H) because I don't think the family can be put back together."
- M (H looks at L. M looks down. H looks down) "Well . . ."
- H "It sounds like it's just reached, you know, a very bad point."
- L (H looks at L. L looks at H. M looks at L and shifts in his seat then looks down) "Well, it can. The father's gotta be able to get a job doing something . . ."
- H (interrupting) "Hm--mm." (Process V ends)
- L (continuing) ". . . and it's--he's undoubtedly gotta earn a little more money than his wife."
- H (M looks down. H looks at L. L looks at H) "He had a very successful tailor shop--even though he managed

to mangle his hand (M shifts in seat), he could still probably get a job at a tailor shop--maybe not his own, but he could help manage it or something." (M looks at L and tries to say something but it is garbled)

L (H looks at L. L looks at H. M looks at L) "He must have some skill."

H (H looks at L. L looks at H. M looks down scratching his head) "Yeah, he's gotta have a skill--it's just that he has to be . . ."

M (looking down) "There'll probably be a hang up there, too."

H "Yeah."

M (while looking down. H and L look at M) "Because a lot of tailors use their hands and stuff like that any way and even if he could, (M looks at group) you know, that means he would be working under someone else, you know, and I don't think he'd particularly dig it, really."

H (H looks at M. M looks at H. L looks at H) "Well, it mentioned that he said . . ."

M "He said a grocery store, you know, and it said that the judge has set up people before, you know, (M looks at notes) got bank loans for them and stuff like that, you know."

H (M and L look at H) "Where's that? (H looks at his notes) It also said he was only happy like when he

was talking about, you know, of his past tailoring  
 . . ."

L (L looks at H. H and M look at L) "Well, that was  
 the only thing that . . ."

M (starts to speak--few words garbled because all are  
 talking at the same time)

H (Process VI begins) (M looks at H. H looks at M.  
 L looks at H) "Well, given the enthusiasm right there  
 to give him a chance, you know, because--uh--if he can  
 get into one--maybe he can, you know, work his way up  
 a bit. (M looks down) Not just up I mean--not actually  
 work but he could like--uh--(M looks at H somewhat  
 puzzled and starts to speak--H continues) manage--like  
 I said before and have the people work under him be-  
 cause he will have the skills and he can tell them,  
 you know, what to do and he knows their problems be-  
 cause he's done it."

M (M looks at notes. H looks at M. L looks down) "Yeah,  
 but the thing is, you know, too, they said though that  
 the only job he could (M shakes his head) get when he  
 mangled his hand was a parking lot attendant (H nods  
 head and repeats "parking lot attendant") and--ah--he  
 could, you know, I mean--uh--regardless of whether he  
 owned his own shop or something like that he just  
 can't (M shakes head and looks at H)--uh--people won't  
 hire you just to manage. (M looks at notes and shifts

in his seat. L looks at M) I mean he have to be able to do something. He'd have to be able to show people what he mended and give them examples of stuff like that you know. So I really don't think that he can go back to tailoring because of (few words are garbled)

H (H looks at M. L and M look down) "I think he can use the hand. I think he can show people and . . ."

L (L looks at H. H looks at L. M looks down) "Well, uh, you've got to consider how many places are looking for somebody who used to be good at tailoring. There's not too many. (L shakes head) Now the grocery store would be--seem to be a little more on his level because he's not the type of (M looks at L)--uh--you know, he's a working type of a person. That is, he's good at running his own business. (M looks down) Because, you know, he worked himself up and he was very successful at this. Now, if you're going to start rehabilitating him--I mean (M looks at L) first, we assume that it's not going to be any good to send George (H nods) away and then we assume that we've got to get the family back (H nods) together and the big thing there is his father. He's--the grocery store seemed to me to be about the best idea."

M (M looks at group. H looks at L. L looks at M) "I think so, too, if you express an interest in it--(H looks at M) you know--maybe not--not giving him a loan

and a grocery store, you know, and let him go like that, you know, but he'd have to do something--he'd have to work in one first or something."

H (H looks down. M looks at H. L looks away from H and M) "You don't know much about the father, though. But there are many stores and places (H looks at M) like that that are looking for a man through the want ads (L looks at H) you know--people that they want who have experience and stuff like that."

M (interrupting) "Yeah, but that . . ."

H (continuing) "and with a court recommendation (M looks down. M interrupts saying "I think he's got . . ." H continues) and take the grocery store . . ."

M (M looks down. H looks at M and nods head. L looks down) "But he's got the ability to--uh--you know, manage in one thing--you know--I mean he's got a certain amount of intelligence, you know (H looks down) I think he could learn how to do something else if he's just given the initiative and given the chance. And a person (M shakes head. H looks at M)--a person in the city--you know--um--it's not--it's not like us (M shakes head) you know, I mean they just, you know, they don't have any chances (L looks at M. H nods head)--and the (M looks down) chances and stuff, you know, but if they had the chances they could get him --they could get him a job. I'm sure the judge could

get him a job in something interesting--and since he  
 --a grocery store (L looks down) and then from there,  
 you know, work on to the loan and once--and once the  
 father was working and, you know, (M looks at H briefly)  
 in some--uh--some amount--if he had some amount of  
 happiness (M looks at H briefly) or whatever, you know,  
 satisfaction or something like that, you know, and I  
 (M looks at H) think the mother would be--would be  
 willing to forego the divorcing, you know, for awhile  
 anyways, you know, just to try it out . . ."

H "Perfectly." (Process VI ends)

M ". . . but she did care--she said she would have gotten  
 it before (L looks at M. H nods head) if it wasn't  
 for the children (M looks at H. H looks at M and nods)  
 so she must care about the children."

H (L looks at H. H looks at M. M looks at H) "And  
 maybe then this little experience, you know, just  
 pushing . . ."

M (nods his head) "Yeah."

H ". . . will make it possible."

L (L looks at H and M. H looks at L. M looks at H and  
 L) "What about--what about her big gripe, you know?  
 When he comes home, he's always irritable and--uh--  
 his father seems to be sort of (H nods. L looks down)  
 paranoid (L looks down) because he's lost his security  
 (L looks at H) and, you know, he's very down at the

bottom. (M looks at L) If you give him some security, something he can work at, he undoubtedly show a great improvement. (M shifts in seat. H and M both say "Yeah" nodding their heads) And this guy would move over to his wife."

H (H looks at M. L looks at H. M looks down) "Yeah. That's--you can't work directly with the wife. You have to work indirectly at (L nods) her."

M (M looks down, H looks at M, L looks at M) "Yeah. That's where their problem started you know. (L looks down) I mean, her problem--her problem, you know, is that she says she doesn't like to be home because of the father yells at her, you know and hassles her, but they didn't have that problem before, you know, so . . ."

H (M looks down. H looks at M. L looks down) "We create an interest and then maybe he won't have to hassle her."

M (M looks down. H looks at M. L looks at M) "Yeah, I don't think he will. I think--ah--you give him a job where he would, you know, a parking lot doesn't (H shakes head) a parking lot doesn't require an awful high intelligence (M shakes head) or not any thinking or anything like that, you know. Give him something that he can be thinking at, you know, and when he would come home from work you know, he would

--he'd still be thinking about it, (M looks at H briefly) you know, and he'd still be trying to think about something to do, you know. Maybe--well, how can you improve a parking lot, you know? Maybe you could think about how to improve a grocery store. (H nods his head. L looks down) So give him a chance and let and--I think the wife would be willing to give the marriage a chance, you know, and let it go and once George sees his father regaining his security and his mother willing to help, you know, and everything like that, you know, there's a little bit more."

H (H looks at M. M looks at H. L looks down.) "Plus his own incentive a little bit. (M says "Yeah.") Maybe you can give him a little bit more of new (M shifts in seat) security again to get him going (L looks at M) through the school that he has to go to." (M nods head and says "Uh-huh." H looks at L. L looks at H. M looks at L)

L "All right, so we gotta get the family back together and the main thing there is to get the father on the feet (L nods head and says "Hm-mm") so that takes care of George's background . . ."

L (L looks at H. H looks at L. M looks at L) "How about this youth group and everything? Would it be advisable to get George into those things then?"

- H (M looks down. H looks at L. L looks at H) "Not right away, I don't think. Maybe after he's gone to some form of school for awhile."
- L (questioningly) "Go away?"
- H "No. (M looks down. H shakes head and looks at L. L looks at H) I mean he has to live at home and go to school for awhile and--ah--meet some other people first and--ah--get back into conversing (L looks down) and--ah--going around with other people than the Chiefs. He has to begin to socialize with others in a different type of environment."
- L (Process VII begins) "Well, does that mean" (M looks down. H looks at L. L looks at H) "The youth group like the YMCA or something--ah--that might be the best level because, you know, over there, you know, nobody cares where you came from--you know--in a basketball game."
- H (H looks at L. M looks down. L looks at H) "No, that's true. That should come just after he starts (M looks up at H briefly) going back to school for he's--he isn't just thrown into an environment where he, you know, should go without, you know, having the school there first. (H looks at M briefly) Just so he meets a few other people (M looks up at H briefly), you know. You know, like instead of his being thrown in with them so that . . ."

- L (interrupting. L looks down) "Well . . ."
- H (continuing. H looks at L) ". . . just barely begin to handle the other people then--then he should be put (M looks at H briefly) with the others."
- L (M looks at L) "Well, I think he could handle people. I--I don't think it's a question of whether you're throwing him (L looks at H) anywhere, you know, maybe --ah--go the YMCA once a week or something. That's not a horribly tremendous step. It's a . . ."
- M (M looks down. H looks at M. L looks at M) "It says that he was the leader of that gang now, you know, and so--ah--the rest of the people in that game--ah--gang--look up to him (L looks at H) as a leader, you know. He's got leadership qualities and so I think it (L looks down) have an adverse effect if you told him that he would have to start going to this youth center, (M looks up at H briefly. H nods head and says "Hm--mm") you know, and he couldn't go to this youth center and become the leader, (M looks up at H briefly) you know . . ."
- H (interrupting) "He could easy . . ."
- M (continuing. H looks at M. M looks at H. L looks down) ". . . I mean he could become it, but, you know, not go into it as, you know, and--ah--you (M looks away from H and L) just have to kind of suggest it to him, you know, (M looks at H. H nods head. L shifts

in seat) and wait until he kind of comes around to it himself, (M looks down) you know."

H (nods his head) "Mmm Hmm" (Process VII ends)

M (M looks down. L looks down) "Maybe kind of build him up by--ah--he knows--ah--(H looks at M) undoubtedly he knows he's (L looks up at M) intelligent, you know, but, you know, show him that he can do something with his intelligence and (L looks at M periodically) maybe show him that he can help somebody else, you know, because undoubtedly in that neighborhood (L looks up at M and H) there's probably people worse off than he is, (H nods his head. M looks up at H briefly) you know, so (M looks down shaking his head) the thing is it's just building up his confidence and his father's confidence and--ah . . ."

H (M looks at H. H looks at M. L looks at H) "And the first step in building up his own is building up his father's."

M (nods his head) "Right."

H (M looks down. H looks at M) "Because his father let's say has all the initiative (M looks up at H and says "Yeah") so by trying that his father can do something (M looks down) . . ."

M "Right."

H (continuing. M looks at H. H looks at M. L looks at H) ". . . it seems like, you know, when his father was doing something he sounds like he kind of . . ."

M (interrupting) "Yeah, yeah."

H ". . . admired him a little bit," (H looks at M. M looks down. L looks at H) "for going on and trying. Not really admired him but (M looks at H and says "Yeah") but, you know, looked up and said--and (M looks down periodically) said he's a success--he's what he wants to be and he's doing good at it so if he can get back and do something that he likes, you know, George probably feel that he can do the same a bit (L looks down. M says "Yeah") because, you know, they must have been--must have been quite close for awhile so that, you know, give him the security and --um--feeling that he can do something."

M (M looks down. H looks at M. L looks down) "Well, uh, I don't know what to say so we--ah--just--just go by steps. The first thing to do then would be to--to --ah--get the father interested in some kind of (H nods) . . ."

H (M looks down. H looks at M) "Occupation."

L (M looks down. H looks at L. L looks at H) "And George in school in a good pre--ah--pre-college course." (H nods)

XG-5A

Footage 460-495

- H (M looks at H. H looks at L. L looks at H) "I don't know. Do you guys think (H looks at M) that he (the judge) should try to arrange a loan (H looks at L) for the father to get a job. I don't . . ."
- M (H looks at M, L looks at M) "Well, his father doesn't. They said he was (M shifts in seat) a parking lot attendant or something. (H says "Yeah") if he doesn't change that position, his family is going to be gone because the mother--has applied for the divorce already."
- H (H nods) "Uh-huh"
- L "Yeah."
- M (Process I begins) (H looks down) "And if he could --ah--(L looks down) the father said he was (M looks down) confident he could--ah--(M looks at H periodically) run the small grocery store like his (H looks at M briefly) tailor business and--ah--(H looks at M) he probably does have (L looks at M) bookkeeping ability and that (H nods)--(H looks down periodically) that if there was a need somewhere for a store like that, that he could run it."
- L "Yeah. But he . . ."
- H (Nodding his head. H looks at L interrupting. L looks at H) "I think he would be responsible enough."

- L (H looks at L, M looks at L) "Yeah, but he does sound kind of apathetic because, ah, like the (H looks down, L looks at M and H) father, you know, tells George not to take the college prep courses (H nods) and everything."
- H "Yeah."
- L "Like he's instilling in George his (H looks at L) attitude of apathy, you know. Like no initiative, don't try to get ahead, just be satisfied (L looks at M and H) with what you know you have, like stay in the clerical courses and you will be a bookkeeper. You know you can do that. But--ah--maybe if they gave the father the money or a program where he could earn the money or, er, even just a (H nods) regular job--(H looks down) Maybe not the money for a store. But (H looks at L) if they gave him a regular good job for a handicapped person, you know, build up (M looks down periodically while looking at L) respect for himself, he wouldn't be so apathetic and, ah, (H looks down briefly) respect is the main thing. If he has respect for himself then his wife will have respect for him. But if his wife doesn't have any respect for himself, if he sees himself as being worthless and not being able to hold down a job, his wife isn't surely going to and that's going to (H looks down) dissolve the marriage (L looks at H) which in turn will--will

--ah--lead back to George's problem. Do you think that they should give him the (L looks at M, H looks at L) money for the store, right out?"

M (M looks at L) "Well, his tailor business he built up on his own too (Pause)."

L "Yeah."

M "And so he has a potential to, (H looks at M) he knows what, has to . . ."

L (interrupts. H looks at L) "But remember he had a different attitude back then. He had a, you know, wife and a child and, ah, initiative and now he's kind of on the borderline."

H (H looks at L, L looks at H) "But I think his initiative will come back. (M looks at H) Because he feels kind of rotten (M looks down) in the position that he's in right now."

L (nods head) "Yeah, that's true, so if you give him the money he might feel that this is my one and only chance. (Process I ends) (L looks at M and H, M looks at L) "But would the judge be justified in giving in saying well, I think that he has the initiative in him. I mean, ideally you know the judge should say, give him all the money he wants, let's see if he can do it but practically they don't always do that. They want to, they have to have something more, ah, they go--the more concrete they can (L shifts in seat)

go on. (L looks at M) I mean give him a job or something like that."

M (H looks at M) "I don't think you can just give him the money, I think there would have to be counseling involved."

L "Oh, yeah."

M (M looks at L and looks down periodically--continues) "Like with the Family Services and he could show the father (H looks down) even if he didn't have the initiative, ah, the primary drive that he had when he first built up the tailor business. They could show him that how it would bring his (H looks at M briefly) family back together if he . . ."

L "Uh--huh."

M ". . . brought new (L nods) business up, and that this would have to go along with it, the loan, (H looks at M briefly) not just . . ."

L (L nods head and looks at M, M looks down) "Yeah, they just couldn't give him the money."

XG-5B

H (M looks down, H looks down) "What about that--the wife and (L looks at H) the job, (H looks at L) you know, if the marriage counselor was going to talk to them, you know, and try to get them back together, (H looks down) what do you think he's going to tell her about her job? Do you think that, you know--he's

going to tell her, (L looks down) that maybe she should quit it or--or she shouldn't--ah-mm, like come home and talk to the father and tell him how much she enjoys it and all that."

M (H looks at M briefly) "I think that would have something to do with--ah--George's schooling because if the father did get the loan (H looks at M, L looks at M, M looks at H briefly) and had his business started, he'd--ah--George is a freshman in high school. (H nods) Now he wouldn't be able to build it up fast enough to pay for George's (M looks at H briefly) education (H nods) but if the mother keeps (H looks down) the job that would be extra (M looks periodically at H) income to that and--ah--that way, (H looks at M briefly) George could take the college prep courses (H looks at M) and if he didn't get the scholarship he would still have a chance to go to--ah--college. (H nods) And his--ah--alertness and intelligence would--he's definitely got some sort of motivation behind him to--(H looks down) to go up and not just (H nods)

H "Hm-mm"

M ". . . come out as a bookkeeper."

L (L looks at M, M looks at L) "But if, ah, are you saying (H looks at L) that there would be a chance for him to go to college if his mother kept the job . . .?"

- M (continues) "And the father (H looks at M) gets the loan, beside if he doesn't get the scholarship." (L nods)
- H (H looks at L, L looks at H, M looks at H) "I have the feeling too that if his father got the loan and started the business that his attitude towards the education would change. I thought that he would probably encourage the kid then to, ah, take the college prep."
- L (nodding his head) "Yeah, ah, (H looks down and shifts in seat, L looks at M and H, M looks at L) with the mother, with her job, it says right in the the thing that, (H looks at L) ah, she likes her job because it gives her a chance to get out of the house and away from the family. (H nods) Maybe if (H looks down) she quit her job, well, there's two things that could happen. (H looks at L) She could come home and (H periodically looks down) she could readjust to home life and, and really, they don't have any younger children which might be hard or she can, ah, she can hate home life and, ah, you know, and wish that she was just working again. Maybe work would be a good emotional release for her."
- H (H looks down, L looks at H, M looks at H) "Probably one of her problems or reasons that she liked to get out--was because of the (H looks at L) slum they lived

in too. Moving from the (H looks down) suburban area to the slum, (L says ah-humm,) is quite a bit a (M looks down) change."

L "Yeah, that's true."

M "Well it was getting (L looks at M) away from the fighting that she did with her husband." (M looks at L, H looks at M, L nods)

H (nods) "Yeah, that too."

M "And if he's out working (H looks down, M looks down periodically) and he's, they're not going to be able to fight." (L nods)

L "You think that the wife should give up her job?"

H (L looks at H, M looks at H) "I don't think she should give up her job. No, I think, I think the (H looks at L, M looks down) family is going to need that support for awhile anyway." (L nods)

L (L looks at M) "If she readjusts her (M looks at L briefly) attitudes, ah, (L shakes head and looks at H) the job won't matter (H nods) because, ah, (L looks at M and H) she--she won't have any kids at home to take care of."

H (L looks at H, M looks at L and H) "I thought it said that they had some more children."

L "Did it?"

H (M looks at H) "Yeah, it said that she got away from the children when she left home. It didn't say just George."

- L (L looks down and shakes head) "Oh, I don't . . ."
- M (interrupts, H looks at M, L looks at M and shifts in seat, M looks at H and periodically looks down) "It said she kept, she didn't apply for the divorce because of the children . . ."
- H "Yeah, the children." (and nods)
- M ". . . but I took from that that now that George had reached the point where he was a freshman which is old enough to, she wouldn't have to stay together for the younger children. (H looks down) Like he was maybe the youngest child."
- H "Yeah, that might be . . ." (H looks down and shifts in his seat, a few words are mumbled.)
- L (M looks at L) "Yeah, I got that impression too."
- H (M looks down) "Well, then do you think that--that maybe, (M looks at H) ah, we should have the a marriage (H looks at L) counselor talk to the mother and the father both?"
- L (L looks at H, M looks at L) "And she should keep the job. (H looks down) With counseling she should be able to do it if she can. There's a lot of ifs in here here."
- H "Yeah."
- L (continues) ". . . with counseling (H looks down) and if they really try (L looks at M) there shouldn't be any reason for her to really quit the job."

XG-6A

Footage 154-165

L (Process I begins) (L looks down, H looks down, M  
 L(A.O.)O  
 looks down) "What about these places for the handi-  
 capped? (Then mumbles a few words about George's  
 father under his breath. (L looks up at H with eyes  
 only. H looks at L)  
 M(-R)L M(P.O.)L  
 M "No. That--that would (L looks at M) really lose his  
 respect."  
 L(P.O.)M  
 L (L looks down) "You know, they could train him for a  
 job."  
 M(+R)L M(P.O.)L  
 M "Yeah then the old lady would really go batty. (M  
 M(P.O.)L  
 looks at L and H briefly then looks down) She'd really  
 want to leave him then."  
 (H(-R)L  
 H (L looks at H, H looks down) "Yea, but then--you--  
 H(P.O.)L  
 you--can't get too much bread in one of those places."  
 M(+R)H  
 M "Yeah."

H (P.O.)L  
 H "It's like for--all that's really wrong with him is  
 that he's with his hand." (H looks at M, M looks at  
 H briefly then looks down)

M(+R)H  
 M (H looks at L) "Yeah, his hand. (L looks down) He  
 M(P.O.)L  
 could run a grocery store. Like they said--he could  
 run a grocery store . . ."

H(P.O.)L  
 H (L looks at H) "He could probably just (H laughs)  
 about do anything but be a tailor." (H looks at M)

L(+R)H  
 L (Very quietly) "Hm-Hm" (Process I ends)

M(P.O.)O  
 M (L looks down) "When you get down to it that's about

M(A.O.)O  
 it, isn't it?:

H(+R)M H(P.O.)M  
 H "Yeah--Yeah or you know, anything (H looks down) to do  
 with extreme use of your hand."

XG-6B

Footage 177-182

L (Process II begins) (L shifts in seat looking down, H  
 looks at L, M looks down) "She's looking for an easier  
 life too."

M "I think she'll come back."

H (L looks down, H looks at M, M looks down, H interrupts)

"I don't think she's"

M "I don't think she's going to . . ."

H "Looking for an easier life. I think she's looking for a more of a respectful life. I wouldn't want to"

M "Yeah, I don't think she either . . ."

H "I wouldn't want to support a guy or, you know, just have him sitting around--coming home, saying--I think that's what shot it--when . . ." (Everyone talks at the same time, somewhat excitedly and the conversation is not discernible--about one sentence of the conversation is blocked out.)

L (Interrupting, L looks at H, H looks at L) "He had the job as a parking attendant."

M (L looks at M, H looks at M, M looks at L) "She lost her respect for him, though, because she was making more money. (L is nodding his head and saying "Yeah" during this part of M's speech. H says "Yeah, well . . .") He resented the fact that (L looks down) she was making more money." (Process II ends)

XG-6C

Footage 261-265

H (Process III begins) (L looks down, H looks at M, M looks down) "I think, ah, that, you know, we could always work George into a half-way house (H looks down briefly) but (pause--L looks up at H briefly) because you know."

M (H looks at M, M looks down) "That would be the last resort."

H (H looks down) "Yeah, I think that's like putting him in a small gang that's all in one house."

M (M looks down) "I think right now the marriage could be solved." (Process III ends)

XG-7A

Footage 422-431

H (Process I begins) (H looks down, M looks down, L looks at H) "You know what--instead of starting his own store, maybe--ah--he could get a job working at one and eventually become a partner in it."

M (M looks back and forth at H and L, L looks at M) "No. I think that would--that wouldn't quite be enough to get back his--self--own self respect and--ah . . ."

H (H looks down, L looks at H) "Yeah." (Everyone talks at once and all the words are garbled together for about a sentence)

L "He has to get his self respect . . ."

H (Interrupts, M looks at H) "But starting your own store--another grocery store--that . . ."

L (M looks down--interrupting) "It's tough. But, ah . . ."

H (H looks at L) ". . . there are no grocery stores around."

M (H looks at M, M looks at H briefly, L looks at M and smiles) "Let us just pretend this is back when this happened."

H (L looks at H smiling) "Oh, yeah. This is back then. No supermarkets around." (Process I ends)

- M (H looks at L, M looks at H and L) "I think even if he worked do--you know--(L looks down) just as a regular employee I think he would still consider himself below what he would be before." (H and L say "Yeah" and H looks at M, L looks at M and "Hm-mm")
- H (H looks at M, M looks at H and nods) "Because he had his own job then."
- L (M looks at L, L looks at H and nods) "Yeah, that's the basis of his working for himself."
- H (H looks down and shifts in his seat, M looks down) "Ok."
- L (L looks down) "That's the word--respect comes in."

XG-7B

Footage 433-446

- L (L looks down, M looks down, H looks down) "So you got to set him--providing a means to (L looks at H) get back to where he was before. (M looks up briefly at L, L looks at M, M looks at L) That right there would probably remove most of the pushing for a divorce."
- M (M looks at L) "To refuse the divorce?"
- L (L looks at M, M looks down and begins writing--interrupting) "Delay the divorce, at least for a period (M looks up briefly at L) long enough to give the father a chance to recover (L looks at H) some of his . . ."

- H (Process II begins) (H looks at M and L) "They might separate though. (Pause) Is there any way you can keep them from separation?"
- M (L looks at M, M looks at H and L) "You just have to have a mutual agreement, I think."
- H (L looks at H, M looks at H, H looks down) "Like she'd go visit her mother? (Pause) (L laughs, M laughs and looks down) See, that's what might happen if they don't give them the divorce (L says "Yeah," H looks at M), she just might leave."
- L "Take off."
- M (M looks at H) "Well, I think . . ."
- L (H nods head and looks off during L's speech, L looks at H, M looks at L--interrupting) "If it was made clear to her that the . . ."
- H "Yeah, ok."
- L (Continuing) "If the reason it was being refused at that (H says "Yeah") time was so that they could give the father a chance." (L looks at M. Everyone talks and a few words are garbled. L continues) . . . it might slow her down."
- M (M looks at H and L, H nods head during the speech, L looks at M and nods head during M's speech) "This would be a matter between the counselor, the father and the mother all together."

L (L looks at M, M looks down, H looks off) "Yeah. Hm-mm." (Process II ends) (H nods his head) So they'd also have (M looks at L) the judge give a recommendation to some local financial institution (L looks at H) to try to arrange some type of financial aid to the father. Perhaps that would . . ."

XG-7C

Footage 446-600

H (H looks at M, M looks at H and L, L looks at H) "He is still in high school, right?" (M and L nod their heads and say "Yes")

M (M looks at H) "He's taking a commercial course. A business course."

H (L looks down) "And that was what he was taking until he got into this gang. Well, he still is." (M says something that is garbled)

L (M looks at L) "He's taking it and his teachers (L looks at H) think that he should go on to college prep."

H "Ok, so, well, um (H looks at L, then M, M looks down then looks at H) you think, uh, he should take the (gesture)."

L (M looks at L, H looks at L, L looks down) "At the moment I'm not sure because he's not motivated for it but if (H looks down, L looks at H) you know, reverse his motivation--if you can change his . . ."

H (Interrupts--H looks at L, M looks at H) "But I don't mean--do you think he should even after he changed--um --right now he doesn't feel any respect for the parents."

L "Right."

H "just wants to get out of there . . ."

L "Hm-hm."

H "but he still does have that potential."

L (L looks at H, M looks down) "True."

H (L shifts in seat, H looks at L) "You can't lose that."

L (L looks at H) "No."

M (L looks at M, M looks at H, H looks at M) "Yeah, but, uh, the kid doesn't want to go to college--I mean --(M looks at L) you're not gonna be able to force him."

L (L looks at H) "That's true."

M (M looks at H) "These courses on him."

H (H looks at M, M looks at H, L looks at H) "Ok. But look the preparatory (H looks at L) it was just a test wasn't it? It wasn't courses?"

L (M looks at L) "Uh."

H (H looks at M) "Wasn't it just a . . ."

M (M looks at H) "No it was . . ."

L (H looks at L, M looks at L, L looks at H) "There-- the--the one taking (M shifts in seat) college prep course . . ."

M (Interrupting) (H looks at L and M, L looks at M)  
 "Courses and . . ."

L (L looks at H) "courses and . . ."

H (H looks down) "I thought it was just a . . ."

L (H looks at L) "an aptitude test so he . . ."

M (few words garbled) (H looks at M) ". . . aptitude test."

L (H looks at L) "that he can try for scholarships."

H (H looks down, L looks down) "Ok--so--Ok, he won't be (M looks down) motivated to taking that yet."

L (L looks at H) "If you can--if you can manage somehow . . ."

H (Interrupts) "But, still . . ."

L "to change them"

H "Yeah, but still there isn't enough. The only way to (L looks at H) change it is--if a--you know (H looks at L briefly, M looks at H), they get the parents back together."

L (Process III begins) (H looks at L, L looks down)  
 "Yeah, if you can (M looks briefly at L then looks down) reconcile the parents, it would improve the home-life more for him."

H (L looks at H) "Well, that's going to take quite a while if he's a senior in high school."

M (H looks at M, M looks at H and L) "I say just let him go through with his commercial courses--business

(L looks at M) courses that he's taking . . ." (Everyone talks, three or four words are garbled)

H ". . . go to college later."

M (L looks at H) "Yeah, go to preparatory school or something like that."

H (H looks at M, M looks at H, L looks at H) "Ok, but look--he won't get those scholarships, though."

L "Yeah. That's what we're worried . . ." (M looks down)

H "And he is capable of doing it. (H looks at L, M looks at H) He is capable of getting those scholarships (L shifts in seat) and if he finds out that his parents--well (H shifts in seat), his (H looks at M and L) father is going to (M looks down) get a loan and or--eventually if he does get the loan, he can start his own (M looks at H) store and his mother will start seeing things again but then, I think, uh, it will change rapidly--a couple of months--three (M looks at L) or four months--(L nods head) maybe--I don't know."

L (H looks down) "Just the hope that the something . . ."

H "Yeah."

L (L looks at M, M looks at L) ". . . is changing should, uh, be--that's--ah--ah--I guess (L looks at H), the key."

- M (L looks at M, H looks at M) "What do you think would happen if, uh, his father got back on his feet (M looks down briefly) and he got back the respect (H looks down) he had for his father before--you think maybe (M looks at H briefly) that he might want to, ah, go into, business (H looks off) with his father?"
- L "That's possible."
- M (M looks at H) "Instead of going to school and I mean like, uh, he might want to go into business or something."
- H "hmmm."
- M (L looks at H briefly) "If his mother and father were (M looks at L) all of a sudden just drawn (L nods) together again and it was one (M looks at H, H looks down and nods) small happy family, he might want to, you know, stay."
- L (L looks at M and nods head, M looks at L, H looks down) "He might want to follow in daddy's footsteps."
- M "Yeah. That looks good."
- H (M looks at H, L looks at H) "What, uh, was there anything in it when his father was in the tailor shop did it say anything about him?" (H looks at L)
- M (H looks at M) "He was, uh, he's a very studious kid --he was going to school."
- H (L says "Yeah" and nods head) "What about his relationship to his parents?"

- M (M looks at L, L looks at M) "I get the impression that he respected his father."
- L "Yeah." (mumbles a few words)
- H (M looks at H, H looks down, L looks at H) "Yeah, but it didn't say anything in particular--(H looks at M) like he wanted to be in the same business."
- L (H looks down, M looks at L) "No, no. It didn't say anything about it."
- M (M looks at H, L looks at M) "But he was young then, too--I mean--he wouldn't even be thinking about it."  
(L nods head and says "Yeah")
- H (H looks at M) "Well, yeah--but you know there's always a kid that thinks (L looks at H) oh, I want to be like my daddy (H looks down), you know."
- M "Hmmm" (and laughs)
- H "Ok, so, he might want to go in but I doubt (H looks at M) it because (H looks at L), uh . . .,"
- L (L shifts in seat and looks at M, M looks at L) "It seems to me that the fact that he was quiet and studious and he indeed impressed his teachers as quite (H looks down) intelligent, bright--(M looks down) back when his father was in the tailor shop--it seems to indicate that perhaps, uh, he would go ahead and go to college . . ."
- M (Interrupts) (M looks at L) "Go back to the way he was before?"

- L "It's possible." (Everyone is talking at the same time)
- M "Wish I was a psychiatrist sometimes." (while smiling)
- H (H speaks above them. L looks at H, M looks at H, H looks at M and L) "Ok, wait a minute. Now listen. If (H looks at L) nothing happened to his father and he (H looks at M) had that tailor shop--(H looks at M and L) he built it up, right? (L says "Yeah" and nods) Now that thing. (H looks at L) How many years has it been since he's been disabled?"
- L (L looks away, M looks at L and H) (sighing loudly)  
"Hmmm."
- M (H looks at M--mutters) "Four--five years, maybe!"
- H (H looks at M and L, L looks at H, M looks at H) "Must be. Well, anyway--(L looks down) he would have quite a business there and his (H looks at M) son wouldn't have gotten into that gang and, uh, he would have stayed in school and (H looks at L) probably wouldn't have been taking (H looks at M, M looks at H, L looks at H)--ah--business courses."
- L (shakes head) "No."
- H "He probably just automatically . . ."
- L "Hmmm."
- H ". . . think (H looks at L) of going to college. (M looks at H and nods head, L nods) Right? (H looks at M) Doesn't--doesn't--that what everybody thinks?"

- L (H looks at L) "Yes. Yes." (L nodding his head)
- M "Yes" (while nodding head) (Process III ends)
- H (H looks down, M looks down briefly) "So--ah--what was I going to say now?"
- M (M looks at L) "The question is what will they actually do--you know--if (M looks at H) they're brought together?"
- H (M looks down, L looks down) "I think he would. I think he would go to college."
- L (H looks up at L briefly) "I think if he was offered the chance--(M looks at L) a scholarship--(L looks at M) if he (L looks at M) lives with his parents for (H shifts in his seat) a--I don't know--in (M looks down briefly) the situation that he's in now he's obviously in some kind of rebellion."
- H (H looks down, M looks down, L looks at H) "No, he just doesn't, uh . . ."
- L "Well, he's--he's--not motivated to follow any of the (M looks at H) standards because of, well he's, he's following the standards (M looks at L) of the street gang (L looks down) because he--they're the only ones that he can, uh, find any companionship with. He's not finding it at home."
- H "Yeah."
- L (continuing) "I mean, if you can substitute the home for the--the street gang here. (H shifts in seat)"

H (M shifts in seat) "Well, look, uh (H looks at M and L), as soon as they get out of (H looks off) debt-- they're probably in debt--(M looks at H) no, maybe not --(H looks at M) if his wife has a personal secretary . . ."

L "Hmmm."

H (H looks at L) ". . . as soon as they can get out of the slums then they'll be moving (H looks at M), he'll be having a good job (L looks at M briefly), they'll probably get different friends--maybe--but listen (H looks at L), he was caught stealing money."

L (H looks at L, L looks at H, M looks at H) "Yeah."

H (H looks off) "But that is only a situation because he didn't (H looks at M) have a . . ."

M ". . . Money." (M looks at L briefly)

H "Nothing else to do--he didn't have any money."

L "True." (H looks at L)

M (H looks at M, L looks at M, M looks at H and L) "He might have done it because he wanted money or just to do it you know, because he didn't have anything (H looks off) else to do."

L (L nods head) "The street gang. The street gang."

H (H nods, L looks at H, M looks at H) "The street gang, yeah."

M (garbled)

- L (H looks at L, M looks at L) "But would that--would that--do something to impair his ability to get (M looks at H and shakes head, H looks at M and shakes head) scholarship? Or could it be (H looks at M briefly) or should it with the (L looks at M) judges recommendation--?"
- H (L looks at H, M looks at H and L) "I don't--that wouldn't--see--they wouldn't have anything to do with that. (H looks at M) So, if you've been arrested or so before, it doesn't ask anything on the questionnaire (H looks down and shakes head) have you been arrested --(H looks at M), if so (H looks at M, M looks at H), how many times?"
- M (M looks at L and shakes head, L looks at M) "Not on a scholarship, no. Or stuff like that."
- H (H looks down) "Ummm. They figure (H looks at M, M looks down, L looks at M) that even if you have and you are applying for a scholarship--(H looks down) well, then you must have changed."
- M (Process IV begins) (M looks at H and L, L looks at M, H looks at M) "I think maybe you're right (H looks at M) when you say that he'd probably go to college because--stop to think about the leadership he's gotten in this gang (L nods and says "Uhhh")--(M looks at L) right there he's got something going for him (L says "Yeah") and, uh, I think, you know, he's got the desire to be on top."

- L (H looks at L) "But that's going to be a problem (H looks down briefly) because he's got--the very fact that he has the leadership in the gang is going to be a problem--trying to get him back from it because (H looks down, L looks at H), he's got the top dog position now and he's going to have to into someplace else where (M looks down, L looks at M) he's going to have to fight for it again and he may not want to do that."  
(Process IV ends)
- H (L looks at H) "Yeah, but look. (H looks at M) Once his parents do get that job (M looks at H), he's going to realize that what can be gain (H shakes head) out of it."
- M (L looks at M, M looks at H and L, L looks at M)  
"Yeah. He'll see that his parents are getting more out of--(L nods head) (H looks down and nods) you know --working than the--the street gang is going . . ."
- H (L looks at H, H laughs and looks at M while speaking, M looks at H and smiles) "How much money is he going to earn a week stealing money from bums?" (H looks down)
- L (M looks down) "Not too much."
- H "Yes. So he'll realize like that what was it the marriage counselor (M looks at H and shifts on seat) (L looks at M) said that, uh, the father didn't talk much and (L looks at H) the only time that (M looks down

briefly) he reacted was when he talked (H looks at L) about his job before (M looks down)--if only I could get . . ."

L "Yeah" (and nods)

H (H looks at M and L) ". . . back into the groove--so once he does get back into the groove, he starts making money, and if his wife continues (H looks at M) making money--mother and father earning money (M smiles)--mmmmmm--boy--"

M (L looks at M, M looks at L, H looks at M and nods) "I don't think she'd work too long."

L (L looks at H, M looks at H) "I don't think she . . ."

H "Well, no, but she'd have to continue . . ."

M (interrupts) "For awhile--for awhile . . ."

H ". . . because his loan they'd have to pay it back . . ."

M (M looks down, H looks down, L looks at M) "Until they get back on their feet. (M looks at L) But I think that as soon as they get the loan (M looks at H) paid off and the business was going, you know, pretty good." (H nods)

L (M looks at L, H looks at L) "As soon as it became clear that the business was going--(H looks down) if the business was going to (L looks at H) succeed she'd probably quit her job--there (M looks down) wouldn't

be a need for it. They said she took the job to help support the family. But that need (H nods head) would not be . . ."

H "Yeah. Because she never--wait a minute--(M looks at H, H looks at L) wasn't there something in there about him needing an extra hand." (M and L shake heads somewhat puzzled)

M (H looks down) "One of the other articles." (All smile)

L (M looks down, H looks at M and L, L looks at M) "Ok, now what have we decided upon?"

M (M looks at H and L, H looks at M) "That it would be better if he probably took the college prep course."

L (M looks at L) "Yeah, but the boy should be--shouldn't be sent to the reformatory but should be . . ."

M (nods head) "Yeah. Right."

L (Process V begins) (continues) (M looks down, L looks at H) ". . . but should be maybe placed on probation (H looks at L) on condition that he did something like attending the youth center. Placed under the (L looks at M briefly) guidance of possible--under (H grimaces) a social worker."

L (M looks at L, H looks down) "I don't know. He may be run into. You're going to have to have someone or something or some (M looks down, L looks at M) kind of check on it to make sure that things are coming along on it."

H (L looks at H) "Wait a minute. No, uh, this stuff is, uh, is, I don't know, it's let's say, uh, that's-- he's got a great (H looks at L) ambition and intuition and all that stuff. Right? (M looks at H) Now, if he has somebody that--ah--what did you say put him on probation?"

L (M looks at L) "Well--the--boy."

H "Yeah, I know."

H (M looks at H) "And that's--a--yeah (H shifts in seat), the boy. He's got a--pretty good a--intelligence and everything and he's gonna realize I'm not going to have none of this. I'm not going to report every so often to some judge that (H looks at M briefly) or something--I don't know--whoever you go to."

L (M looks down and shifts in seat, H looks at L) "But, uh . . ." (few words are inaudible)

H (M looks at L, H looks down briefly) "That just makes him worse, you know."

L "But can you--can you really--I mean wouldn't most guys just forget it?"

H "No. That's a--he's going to (M looks at H briefly then looks away) we got the marriage counselor (H looks at M and L) and who the social worker?"

L "Yeah."

H (M looks at H) "And the judge or whoever we have. Now look. (H looks at M) We get them all working

together and we find some (M shifts in seat and looks down briefly) money and just don't, you know (H looks at L, L looks down), say all right come in every week and see what happens because you (H looks at M) know what will happen maybe is that he'll get that money and go (H looks down) spend it on beer or something. The father you know . . ."

L "That's possible." (while looking at H)

M "That's not possible." (looking at L)

H "But if they start working and if (H looks at M) they get the money and help look for a job in a store or something so he can start working and all of this well then things (H looks at L) will be a lot better than putting him on probation and saying ok report in every month, you know, see how you're doing." (H shrugs shoulders)

L (M looks down, H looks down away from L periodically)  
 "Well, uh, I didn't really put him on probation as far as report to the judge--perhaps, uh, the social worker looking in from time to time just to check up how things are going."

H (M looks at H and L) "I mean, what about his family? (H looks at M) Are we going to help them? (L shifts in seat) Same social worker?"

L "Yeah. Just have the same social workers whose taking in the whole group. Because having one social (H

shifts in seat and looks down) worker checking on the whole thing. Would simplify matters."

H (M looks at H) "If it's the right kind of guy. (H looks at M) But I've seen some--I don't know if they're just movies (M looks down briefly, L looks down) made up or something but (H looks at L) where these social workers go and (H looks down), well, that article--it said the social worker--no (H looks at M), it was the marriage counselor that says that he did not have any--(M looks down, H shakes head and looks down) he didn't want to talk to me--the father, you know--so, if--ah--there could be some type of people that are, uh--that just (H looks at M and L) don't have it--you know--somebody came--if I was real poor or something why should I talk to you--look at the money (M looks at H) you're making and everything, you know. (M looks down) You don't want to help me. (H looks down) You know."

L "Yeah. But you're going to be fighting that (L looks at H) no matter what you do. (H nods) It's a situation where it's the lesser of two evils."

H "I think instead of one guy you should have all of 'em work (H looks at L) together because if you (L looks down) just have one person--like just the social worker--(H looks at clock) so--who knows."

- M (M looks at H, H looks at M, L looks at M) "So we don't actually put him on probation, right?"
- L (L nods) "Hmmm. Right. That's--ah--. . ." (Process V ends)
- H (H looks at M and L, L looks at H) "Not see. I don't --you know, he should be on probation. Not probation in the sense where it's just that you come in (L nods head and says "Yeah") so and so but a probation where --uh--you don't just forget about it. (M looks down) I don't know exactly (H looks down, L looks down) but you know, I've heard--a--kids, you know, who get in trouble and their probation (H looks at M) is to go over to the priest's house or the minister's house or (L looks at H) whatever or someplace and talk (H looks at L) to the minister (L nods) a couple hours a week, you know (H looks down), go on Saturday or go maybe not Saturday but (H looks at L) Wednesday night and the priest will take you to dinner and just talk over everything."
- M (M looks at H, H looks at M, L looks down) "Then again it depends on the individual priest, you know. What type of guy he is."
- H "Yeah--well--you see, well--priests (M laughs, L looks at H) are supposed to be good all the time." (M and L talk simultaneously)

- M (M looks at L, H looks down, L looks at M) "Yeah, but they're human. (M looks at H and L) I mean, you know, like he could have (L looks down briefly) a bad personality, you know. Be really up tight when he's talking to these kids and another one could be really (H looks at M briefly) friendly and just, uh, the conversation would just roll out between them."
- L "Yeah, he just may not have it."
- H (H looks at M and smiles) "Yeah. You see, it all depends, you know, how hip the minister is." (H smiles and chuckles)
- L (M looks at L, L looks at H and M) "Well, you know, he figures he may (H looks at L) it may be irregardless of how hip (M looks down) the minister is. The personalities just may not go."
- H (H nods head and looks down, L looks at H) "Yeah, yeah, I know. Ok. (L looks down) So we get a job for . . ."
- M (H looks at M, L looks at M) "Get a loan for the mother and the father. (M looks at H, H nods) Delay the divorce." (L and H say "Yeah") (H nods, L nods) Don't send the kid to reform school."
- L "Go on."
- H (H looks down, L looks at H) "Yeah, ok. Now, him about, uh, should he take the (H looks at M briefly) scholarship chance, you know, uh, right now? (M looks

away) The test for (H looks at L) the scholarship or should (H looks at M) he stay into business course?"

M (M looks at H, H looks at M, L looks at M) "Well, he brought it up to his father to take the scholarship . . ."

L (L looks at H) "Yeah."

M "Exam . . ."

L (M looks down, H looks at L) "He's interested."

M (H looks at M and nods) "So it must be that he is interested."

H "Ok."

M (H continues nodding) "Probably be better for him to take--to take it."

H "Hmmm."

L (M looks at L, L looks at M) "Encourage him to do that."

H (M looks down, H looks at L, L looks at H) "Yes. What is--his father says don't take the--the prep . . ."

L "The father says not to do it."

H "Now wait a minute. Are you sure he said don't do it?"

L "Yeah. He was . . ."

H (M looks at H) "Because--look--he (H looks at M) says you cannot take it . . ."

M (M looks at L, L looks at M) "Yeah. He gave him a choice. He said if he stayed in the commercial he'd have a guaranteed job as a bookkeeper." (L nods)

- H (H nods) "Yeah."
- M (M looks at H, L looks down) "And otherwise . . ."
- H (M looks down) "If he took this preparatory course . . ."
- M (M looks at L, H nods) "And didn't get a scholarship."  
(M looks at L, L looks at M and H, H and M say simultaneously "He'd be out altogether," H looks at L)
- L (L looks at H) "Would he really?"
- H (M looks at H) "Well, no. That's why he says (M looks at L) don't take the rest . . ."
- L "Yes, uh, that's what the dad--would he--or would he really be out in the cold altogether, though?"
- H (M looks at H) "Ok. But look--how many jobs--probably back then there was quite a few jobs for accounting and everything and (H looks at M) he could probably get a job low (M looks down) and build up but (H looks at L) how fast could he get a job--for college--like us (H looks at M), we all took college courses and everything. (H looks at L) Now, what would have happened (M looks at H) if we didn't go to college and tried getting (M looks down) a job as bookkeeper (H looks at M) (L says "Yeah" and nods) or something."
- M (Process VI begins) (M looks at L, L looks at M)  
"Here's something to think about. For instance, if his father got the grocery store going (H nods) again and then he had his college (M looks at H) preparation

he could always (H looks at M) wait like a year and (M looks at H and L) maybe work with his father and get some money, you know, like that. Have his father pay him a little bit or something."

H (M looks at H, H shakes head, L looks at H) "Well, yeah, but that won't work because the father needs money."

M (H looks down, L looks at M) "Yeah, but if his mother was working (H nods) and his father got the business going, he might be able to make enough (M looks at L briefly), you know, to have the kid go (L looks down, H looks at M) to school and then after (H nods head) one year of college it (L looks at M) would be a lot easier to get a job somewhere."

L (M looks at L, L looks at M) "I think--as it stands-- I think (L looks at H) it be foolish for the boy to throw away, though. He's obviously got the ability."

H (M looks at H, H looks at M and L) "Ok. Wait a minute. Now, listen. He does have the intuition because all of his teachers says he was smart. (L nods head and says "Yeah, Hmmm") So (M looks down, L looks down) I think he would if he did take preparatory courses he would get the scholarship."

L (L looks down) "Chances are from the recommendations that he would get it."

H (nods his head and says "Hmmm") (H looks down) "Ok. So have him take preparatory courses." (Process VI ends)

XG-7D

Footage 605-636

M (M looks at L, H looks at M, L looks at M) "The complication would be (M looks down) if they stayed in the same place (M looks at H and L), he might have trouble (H looks down and nods) with the other kids that were in his gang."

L (M looks at L, L looks off) "Yeah. He may have been, you know . . ."

H (M looks at H, H looks at M) "Ok. Wait a minute. He's (L looks at H) the biggest--(M says "Yeah," H looks at L) he's the leader of the biggest gang . . ."

L "That's the problem (H looks down), you know--well (M looks at L), he's gonna have pressures to stay there . . ."

H (M looks at H) "This is going to . . ."

M (M looks at L, L looks at M) "It might be better for him to (M looks at H briefly) move, you know--not to well, it all depends like where the wife's job is, too."

L (H looks at L, L looks down) "Well, chances are that if--if the father--well, I don't know (M laughs) about that."

- M (interrupts) "That's a problem."
- L (L looks at M) "You don't know that the father (H looks at M and then looks down) would be located."
- M "Yeah. Maybe the judge could (H looks at clock), you know, advise them to--ah--. . ."
- L "Well, uh, he probably would advise (H looks down) them."
- H (L looks at H) "Well. Ok. Wait a minute. We only got two (M looks at clock) minutes. So (M looks down) we forgot about the complication that he is the (H looks at M) biggest leader--leader (H looks at L) of the biggest gang. So what's (H looks at M) going to happen . . ."
- L (H looks at L) "That's where I think the youth center comes in. The youth center. The neighborhood youth center (M looks at H) that they mentioned. If we can (M looks at L) get him interested in some (L looks at M briefly) program there where he can apply himself . . ."
- H (M looks at H, H looks at M) "I think we ought to get the whole gang . . ."
- L "The leader should be . . ."
- H (H looks at L) "Just the whole gang."
- L "If you could continue . . ."
- H (H looks at M) "The baseball team or (M laughs), something, you know or something like that, you know."

- L "It's far fetched but it's worked before."
- H "Because look it--(H looks at M briefly then looks at L)--the only thing why they're doing this is because they got all (M looks down briefly) of this energy and nothing to do. Right?"
- L (L looks at H) "Right."
- H (Process VII begins) (H looks at M and L) "You know, the best way--you know (M looks down), if you've got some guy (L tries to say something but he can't be heard because H is speaking) in put him down and start working, you know, just sitting there, well, hell, he's going to feel so cramped and everything, you know--so, the best thing to do--the easiest way to stop all this is for (M looks at H) physical exercise."
- L "Yeah." (L says something else but it's drowned out by H speaking)
- H "And after (M looks at L briefly) they get done they are going to feel so tired and (M laughs) everything they won't want to do stuff like that . . ."
- L "Well, well, you've got to . . ."
- M (M looks at H, L looks at M) "Yeah, but you can't make 'em, you know (H looks at M), like go out and run two miles (M shifts in seat, L smiles) every day . . ."
- H (L looks down) "No, I mean, uh, baseball . . ."
- L (interrupts) "Something that's fun."
- H "I mean something that's fun--baseball."

- L "Something (H looks at L, L looks at M) sporting, you know."
- M (M looks at L) "Where could you do (H looks at M) that in the slums, though. (M looks at H) Where? Where everything is all together . . ."
- L (M looks at L) (mumbles a few words) "They've got a program set up to handle these things--kids like this --so (L looks at H) the only problem is the kids interested in it (M says "Yeah") and get him to shift (L looks at M) his, uh, ideas (H looks down) about it a little bit. And if the--(M looks at clock) I think that they can get--if you can get him interested in the scholarship program--surely (M looks down), they should be able (H nods head) to interest him in the youth center."
- M (H looks at clocks) "Well, supposedly he's already (M looks at L) interested in the scholarship (H looks down) program."
- L (L looks down) "Hmmm."
- H (M looks down, L looks at H) "I know we're going to have to stop (M looks at H) the whole gang first, you know, and (H looks at L) get them interested in (H looks at M) something and that will help him. (H looks at L) Possibly we could help the others in the gang, too." (Process VII ends)

- M (Process VIII begins) (H looks at M) "Or maybe something (M looks at L briefly, L nods) like Junior Achievement (several words unclear) a business . . ."
- H "Yeah, but look it (L shifts in seat and looks at H), that's, uh, I've never (H shakes head) heard of Junior you know. I've heard over TV and stuff."
- M (M shakes head) "I've never seen it either."
- H (M looks down) . . . but I've never seen any of (H looks down) the stuff you're talking about."
- L (H looks at L) "I have. It's a (several words unclear) program."
- H (M looks at H, H looks at M) "I've heard something, you know. I went to one meeting where it was something like Junior Achievement I'm pretty sure but that's all one meeting (H looks down) and I've never went to any more--too busy or something because I live on a farm and I'm always working (M says "Yeah, yeah.") and I could never get to anything like that. (M and L say "Yeah, yeah." L looks at M) So if, uh, we could get the whole gang interested (L looks at H) in something and help him (H looks at M briefly) off--to stop being the leader--a (M looks down, H looks at L, L nods head and says "Hmmm") physical activity . . ."
- L (L looks at H) "It's ah--it's ah--with the entire gang."

H (H looks down, L looks down) "Something that they would be interested in, not (L looks at H) you know, like you know, go out there and rake (M laughs) leaves or pick (H looks at L briefly) up (L says "True") garbage--oh, my gosh, who wants to pick up garbage. (pause) (H looks at clock) Time's up."

XG-8A

Footage 88-321

H (H looks down, M looks at H) "Definitely right now, I will (H looks at L briefly) establish my opinion (L looks at H and shifts in seat) that--that--I feel that George can be rehabilitated . . ." (H looks at L briefly)

L "I do too."

H (M looks down) "Partially because he's not a loner. Partially because he is a leader. (H looks at L briefly, M looks at H) Also because of his mental abilities."

L "Hmmm."

H "And, uh, a divorce even on a high school age youth who is very (M shifts in seat) close to his parents and is a very traumatic experience. I think the best thing that could be done for George . . ."

L "Right."

M "Uhhmm."

H "Would be to get him away from his parents so that he could, uh, to, uh, he could, um, set himself (H looks away) apart . . ."

L "Apart--right." (and shifts in seat)

H "And look back over his--what is happening."

H (Process I begins) (H looks at L, M looks at L, L looks down) "And, um, and also--(H looks down) first

you have to get him away from the parents which is gonna be hard--uh--because of his, well--well, I mean his (L looks at H) involvement there. I mean he is close with his parents--that's one--one--obstacle that is in the way is getting him away from the parent and setting him into a new environment so that any of this outside effect (M looks down briefly) that the slum area had on him doesn't come back but also in another sense you have to look at it this way--after he has been rehabilitated (M looks down briefly), what's going to happen when, um, when he comes back to see his parents (L looks at M briefly) and if they're still together, is he going to want to stay there or is he going to want to try to get them out of there. If he stays there, what are the consequences he may have to pay, uh, by facing his friends again or his parents again or trying to get a job, you know. It's--it's like rehabilitating him and putting him back in the slum area where another outside (L looks down) force could just get back into the kid's mind since he--he is the outgoing (L looks at H) type and type that wants to be a leader all the time."

M (H looks at M, M looks at L, L looks at M) "I'm against--really--having him move away from his parents. Because I don't think that's completely the solution and, uh, I don't think that would really rehabilitate him . . ."

L (L looks at H) "I know."

M (M looks at L) "Before he says--at the age of seven apparently he had a great deal of respect for his parents, he had (L nods and looks at M) a sense of belonging. (H looks down) They (M looks at L and H) respected him. (L looks at H) It was a close companionship."

L "Yeah." (L looks at M)

M "When his parents had their fights and started breaking up over monetary (L nods slightly) values. He (L periodically looks down) had to find someone else that could respect him and feel towards him and it was his gang. Now if you take him away from his--ah--his gang, what's he going to have? Is it going to have to be--ah--what kind of people is he going to be associating then with?"

L (L nods and shifts in seat) "Right." (coughs)

H (H looks at M briefly, M looks at H, L looks at H) "I don't think we have to worry about that because he's not a loner so if you stick him in a college environment (H looks at M briefly) or if you stick him in a youth center environment, uh, he's going to because of this (H looks at L briefly) outgoingness reform new friendships. (M looks down and writes) Secondly, uh, I don't think taking, uh, him away from his parents would be a great obstacle. First of all, the family

is entirely breaking up. (M looks at H) He evidently has lost some respect for both his (L looks down) folks by going and forming outside (L coughs) influence and his mother has filed for divorce which would indicate that she wants to (L shifts in seat) get out of that particular situation. (M looks down periodically) Whether she would file for custody of him or not is a different story. (L and M say "Hmmm") The father is moody and apathetic according to the report, therefore, I don't think he really cares one way or the other. Ah . . ."

L (H looks at L, M looks at L, L looks away) "But see, right now, we're basically concerned (H looks down) with George but (L looks down and shakes head) you also have to--you've got to remember that if you remove George to rehabilitate him (M looks down) somewhere else, you're also involving three other people that were in this crime with him and you can't give them the short end of the stick to save George just because he may have a little more brains than either of them."

H (H shakes head, L looks at H briefly) "Oh, no. I'm not implying that. But ah . . ."

L (H looks at L, L looks down) "In fact, you don't even know how smart these kids are. These kids could be smarter kids (L looks at M, H looks down) than George."

There is a vague reference (M tries to interrupt) but  
--ah--we're not--but we're not sure of that."

M (M looks at L, L looks at H) "We're not trying their  
case either yet. (M looks down) Just one at a time.  
(L looks at M) In other words, what you are suggesting  
is that the marriage (L looks down) isn't possible--(M  
looks at H) there's really no reconciliation on either  
side regardless of what the court tries to do." (A  
few more words are spoken but L talks over them and  
only L can be heard)

L (L looks at M, M looks at L) "I think that--I think  
that, there will be a chance of reconciliation on the  
part of (L looks down) the marriage--ah--in trying to  
get them back together again. She is applying for a  
divorce. She wants the divorce in other words but  
. . ."

M (nods head) "Uhhmm."

L "Uh, her husband still claims that he loves her and  
. . ."

M "Hmmm."

L (H continues to look down, M looks down periodically)  
"If they can go to a counselor together then they get  
something straightened out where her husband is given  
some kind of opportunity to make him feel--I don't  
know--(L looks at H) more superior (L looks down) I  
guess--ah--to his wife (M nods slightly) by making

more money if that's just (M looks at L) what he is concerned with. Then, uh, maybe they could save the marriage. (L shifts in seat and looks at H) Who knows, you know."

H "Hmmm. (H looks down, M looks down) (Process I ends) So we have three questions basically (M looks at L) to decide. Is our (M looks at H) are we going to consider Charles, which is the husband, a loan so that he can reestablish himself? (M looks down) Are we going to grant his wife the divorce (L looks down and writes) or suggest that they go through marriage counseling and also with regard to his wife, whatever are we going to do about the job? Are we going to give the husband the loan before she has quit work or are we going to say ok keep your job but and then put stipulations on it? And the third question is, are we going to send George to college and/or the youth center or are we gonna say he's not--well, we've already decided he's worth rehabilitating."

L "Right. (M nods) (L looks at H briefly) Uh, there's one question that I was going to bring up. (H looks at L, M looks at L) Uh, well, I think I could probably cover that later. (H looks down, M looks down) Start talking about our areas right now. Uh, the first thing we have to talk about though I think--is--ah--outside environmental effects on these people--well . . ."

- H "We can't change the environment, so how . . ."
- L (H continues to look down, M looks at L, L looks at H)  
"No, but we can change the peoples environment by if they get the loan not having him open up a store there but having him open up his store probably in some different section of town where--where the people are lower middle class or putting him out in a--(M looks at H briefly) if it's a large city--putting him out in the suburb or something like that where--(L looks at M briefly) where George and Charles (L looks down), the father, is open for opportunity and different ideas instead of this inside environment they have right now."
- M (H looks at M, M looks at L, L looks at M briefly) "I think you also have to ask the question of whether the father's really serious of opening the store because of the way (M looks down) the social person described him as a (H looks down) person that is not (M looks at H and L)--he's lost all his goals--he's--(L looks at M and shakes head) very moody and apathetic . . ."
- L (interrupts) (L looks at H) "Right. He's completely down--completely down in the dumps."
- M (continues--H looks at M) "Maybe that this is just an --(L looks at M) an excuse--maybe he's saying maybe (H looks down) that the job that I got (L shakes head) is

the real cause why I'm like this. If I had another chance I could do a lot better or he's just fooling himself."

- L (Process II begins) (H looks at L, M looks at L)  
 "Right. Or like he could (H looks down) get the money and then complete and take a reversal (H looks at L) scaring himself (L looks at H) you know (L looks at M and H), saying can I really do (M looks down) it again or do I really have (H looks down) the stuff to say go out and get 'em, man, and start a new--a new life."
- H "Uh, personally I think, uh, if (L looks down) Charles, which is the husband had been as resourceful and successful (M looks at H) and dedicated and whatever other adjectives you want to describe him with as he himself (M looks down) thought he was, he wouldn't have let (M looks at H briefly) an accident or personal injury deter him from his goals. He would have overcome this. uh . . ."
- L (H looks at L) "That's the first thing that hit me too, when I read about the questionnaire because, uh (M looks at L), he may not have been able to, um, keep up his tailoring (H looks down) work but, also I don't think he should have sold the store in the first place. I think maybe (L looks at H) if he would have hired, uh, if he had--the store was that successful, he could (H looks at L and nods, M nods slightly and looks down)

have probably hired someone to do some tailoring and . . ."

M (H looks at M) "Yeah, yeah."

L (H looks down, M looks down, L looks at M) "Run the business himself as--and just have this person as the (L looks at H briefly) tailor (M looks at L then H and nods, M looks at L), you know. I mean, people (L looks at H) can do that. I mean it can be done."

H (H looks at L periodically, M looks at H) "Even with a crushed hand he could, uh, rehabilitate himself so he could do part of the work again."

L (H looks down) "Right."

M (M looks at L, L looks at M) "Like, uh, he could handle the customers (M looks at H), the personnel, the . . ."

L (M shrugs his shoulders) "He could take measurements and things like that, you know. (M looks down) Yeah, right. (L looks at H) I think that (M looks at L) was his first wrong move, right there was selling the, um, his business."

M (M looks at L and H, L looks at M) "Of course we don't--we really don't know what kind of financial pinch he might have been in at that time."

L "Well, uh . . .,"

M (M looks at L and H) "He might have been forced out of business. You know, um, maybe he couldn't have got

help." (L and H kinda go "No, uh-un" and make other disagreeing noises)

L (H looks at L, M looks at L, L looks at H) "She said that he, uh, was successful at the business (L looks at M) and just because of his (M looks down) hand that --(H looks down) that's the impression that I got. Because of his, ah, hand. His handicap now. Hmmm. (M looks down) He just sold the business at a loss."

M "That's right."

L (L looks at H) "Because he felt he could no longer keep it up." (L looks at M)

H (M looks at H briefly) "Plus, it sounded to me like he dumped it (M nods slightly) rather than--than bargaining because" (L looks at H and nods)

L "Right, right."

H "Certainly he (L looks at M) wouldn't have to sell (L looks at H) a business at a loss just because of a personal injury like that."

M (M looks at H) "Especially if it was successful."  
(Process II ends)

H (H looks at L and M, M looks down) "So, first of all, shall we decide, uh, whether or not we should give Charles (M looks at H briefly) the loan and why or why not?" (M looks down)

- M (H looks down) "Well, like they pointed out that we have to first of all formulate (M looks at L and H) whether he's a good risk or not."
- L (L looks off) "Right."
- M (Process III begins) (M looks at L and H) "That's kind of touchy because banks normally aren't quite-- they don't jump forward to something like this."
- H "Well, uh, I . . ."
- L (H looks at L briefly, M looks at L) "I think--I don't know--I think that--ah--with a little inspiration--by giving him the (L looks at M) loan I think he could do it again."
- M (M looks down) "Oh, yeah, yeah."
- L (L looks at H) "I think he could get back on his feet --think . . ."
- M (M looks at L and nods slightly) "I think he needs another chance to get along."
- L (M looks down) "Another chance, right. I think, um, I'm in favor of giving him the loan. I don't know, uh, what do you think?"
- M "That is the (L looks at M) source that you . . ."
- L "Right." (nods)
- M ". . . have to worry about. (M looks at L) Finding an appropriate source that would be willing to give him a loan."

- L (L looks at H) "Say, we can, should we give him a loan?"
- H (H looks at L periodically, M looks at H briefly) "I don't know, uh, I uh, I'm inclined to (M looks down) think that he would be inclined to view the loan as more or less a charitable type thing."
- L (L looks off and shifts in seat) "Yeah, that's true."
- H "And take advantage of it. Not to the extent of becoming . . ."
- L (H looks down) "No. I don't think he would take advantage of it. I think he might refuse it because, um, he's been independent so far as to his income and --and taking a charitable outside donation like this could hurt his pride and, um, he may just refuse it. We don't know. He may be the type of man to refuse it because if he resents his wife making more money than he does and, uh, he's always having--a good job before he crushed his hand and being very independent, he may just resent the whole (L looks at H) idea entirely and not want the loan."
- H "I don't know. The words moody and apathetic to me seem--plus the fact that he's changed or lost all his goals. It would seem to me that, uh, he's a changed man. (L looks down) Surely he resents his wife making more money but (M looks at H), um, think that the possibilities of refusing (L coughs) a loan are very,

very slim. (H looks at L briefly) Therefore, I tend to think he would accept one if one were offered."

M (M looks at L and H, H looks at M) "It sounds to me by reading this stuff that is his only way out. (L nods head)

L "Right, right."

M "He really needs this and maybe you're . . ."

L "I think we should give it to him."

M ". . . right about this that he given the opportunity (H looks at M) say, just given the opportunity to say this is a loan it's not a gift. You pay it back. (L looks down) Then he just might say, well, let's do it. (H looks down) Let's try to make it."

L "Let's try to get him the loan."

M (M looks at H) "But he also has to have cooperation from his wife."

L "Right."

H "Ok. (L looks at H) That'll entail our next decision then. So (M looks down, H looks briefly at L) first of all we feel (H looks down and writes) that we should give Charles the . . ."

M (interrupts) "We have solved that."

H ". . . loan with (H writes) stipulations." (pause)

M "This will help improve the marriage (M looks at H) situation better for . . ."

L "Yeah."

- M ". . . him. (M looks at H) Plus she has to be counseled with." (H nods)
- H (M looks down) "Ok. Now we both er--(L looks at H and coughs) we all feel that the (H looks at L periodically) marriage could be saved once the monetary problems are remedied."
- L (L looks down and writes) "Once the money's there." (Process III ends)
- H (H looks down) "Therefore, it's my understanding that we should recommend that they both seek marital counseling. Right?" (pause) (H is writing, L and M go "Um-hm." M looks at H briefly)
- M "Well, it seems that they've already had some sort of counseling which if they should continue it they should refuse a divorce."
- H (H looks at L briefly) "Now, with regard to the wife's job. What is the consensus here?"
- M (M looks at H) "Well, if the loan comes through (L looks at M), the gentleman takes and applies it in a way that we are hoping that he will, her job really won't (M looks at L) be that significant."
- L (M looks down, L looks off) "Right. Well, and also you can't--have an alternative here. You can (L looks at M) ah--have (H looks at M briefly, M looks at L, L looks at H) have her and him in with the husband."
- M (L looks at M) "Perhaps quit her job and . . ."

- L "Quit her job, right and help him or (L looks at H) have her, uh, earn her money (M looks at H briefly) but also instead of being independent on each (L looks down) other's money, pool--to--(H looks at L) their together and work as, uh (H looks down), work together better. Because he, uh, well (M looks down, L looks away), once he gets going again his income will probably be much higher than hers. Hers, like you said, her income would be very insignificant. So (L looks at M chuckling) we have two alternatives. Or she has two alternatives rather."
- H (Process IV begins) (H looks at L periodically, L looks away) "Hmmm. Do you feel that, ah, we should (M looks at H) recommend that she continue working not as the sole means (L looks at H and shifts in seat) of support but rather with the idea of pooling money to help her husband?" (M looks down and nods)
- L (L looks down and writes) "Right. I think that's-- that's what we should recommend."
- H (H looks at L) "And then once he is back on his feet (H looks down), cease work, uh, outside work . . ."
- L (M looks at L, L looks at H) "Hm. No. I--no--I don't think (L looks at M and H) altogether cease outside work (M looks at H briefly) because, uh, uh, by this time you're (L looks down) going to find that George is going to be a little older. And that, uh

(M looks down briefly), it's going to take them some time to get on their feet . . ."

M (nods head) "Hmmm."

L ". . . and that, uh . . ."

M (M looks down) "They will have a really good pay."

L "Right. I, uh, college--I think that, uh, um, she is going to be very necessary that little bit of outside (L looks at H) income because her husband may not be able to handle the whole situation by himself."

H (nods head while looking down) "Hmmm."

L (L looks down) "And I think that she should continue her working."

M "Yeah." (M nods head looking at L)

H (M looks down) "Ok. (Process IV ends) Now I want to push on to the third question because I want to get back and consider the (H looks at L briefly) consequences of our decision--and see if we want to alter them (H looks at L briefly) or reconsider them--after we've decided the third question here. Now, with regards to (H looks at L periodically, L looks down and writes) George, we have agreed that he is worth rehabilitating and we differ on the means by which it should be done. Ah, I still am in favor of, uh, putting him through college or and/or a youth center. Thereby removing his dependence on his parents thus enabling them to get back on their feet without

having to--in addition to (M looks at H) concern themselves with watching out for him so to speak. (M looks down) I don't think he would have any (M looks at H) problems being away from his parents and adjusting to college because he is not a loner--he's a natural leader. And likewise, I don't think he'd have any problems if we were to channel his leadership through the youth center."

M (H looks at M, M looks down) "One way out. An alternative that (M looks at H, L looks at M) we could would be that say he did go to the youth center--(L looks at clock) say that's a stipulation that when his parents wanted him back into the household that it was satisfactory with the judge or the officer whoever was in charge of it (H looks down) that the situation had much improved that George would be allowed to return to the family."

H (H looks at M, M looks at L, L looks at H and shifts in seat) "Oh, yes. (M looks at H) We're not removing him in the sense of taking away custody. To sort of like (H looks at M and L) allowing him to remove himself from--(M looks down) so that he can look at it more abstractly."

L (H looks at L, M looks at L) "And also--and also socialize with different people. (H looks down) "Now wait a minute. (M looks at H, L looks at M) They

were talking about the youth center. (M looks at L)  
 Are we talking about something like, uh (L looks at  
 H), reformatory or, um . . ." (M and H go "Um-no")

H (M looks down) "The youth center I took to mean . . ."

L (H looks at L, M looks at H) "Because I'm against  
 sending him to a reformatory (M looks at H) altogether  
 because I think that is just the wrong way for reha-  
 bilitation."

H (H looks down) "To me, the way the statement read  
 was (M looks at ) uh, if guilty (M looks down) and  
 not worth (M nods slightly) rehabilitating the course  
 (L looks down) left open was a rehabilitation center  
 . . ."

M "Hmmm."

H ". . . and (H looks at L) if worth rehabilitating and  
 stuff it (H looks down) would be a youth center which  
 (H looks at L) would be to my interpretation more like  
 a boys' (M looks at H and nods) club or . . ."

L "Right. Ok."

XG-8B

Footage 340-380

H (L looks down and writes) "Now, there's a couple (M  
 looks down, H looks down) major consequences that I'd  
 like to consider. (L looks at H) To me, in my mind,  
 there is still in doubt as to whether Charles would

succeed (M looks at clock) (M looks down) if we were to give him (L looks down) a loan. Now, you, uh, if you--because if he fails, that's going to put us in a bind . . ."

L (L looks at H briefly) "Right."

H (M looks at clock) "Because living in a slum, I don't think they (H looks at L briefly) have too much in collateral to be put up . . ."

L (M looks down) "That's right."

H "And if he did fail, and this whatever collateral was taken, that would further endanger their situation as far as the social-economic sense is concerned."

L "And, um."

M "And if his wife decides that she's (M looks at L and H) going to continue the divorce--and broken up the home permanently . . ." (M looks at H)

L (L looks at M and H, M looks at L) "Right. Or even if George feels that (M looks down) he isn't going to go back to school or . . ."

M "Yeah."

H (Process V begins) (L looks at H, M looks at H)  
"George? George. I don't think--(M looks down) I don't anticipate any problems with him because he hasn't (M looks at H) committed a serious (M looks down and writes, H looks at L briefly) crime (L looks down) classified as a misdemeanor."

- L "No, but . . ."
- H "He's not a loner and--and has several other very good characteristics."
- L (L looks away) "Yeah, I realize that but he . . ."
- M (M looks at H and L) "But he's ran with the gang for seven years."
- L (interrupts--M looks down) "Right and also had various outside influences by (L looks at H) his friends."
- H (M looks at H) "Hmmm. Oh, I think George could be-- could be--re-channelled. (H looks briefly at L) It's uh . . ."
- L (M looks at L) "Well, I think if we get--if we (L looks down) re-channel George (H nods head)--I think we're going to have to re-channel the whole family."
- H "Hmmm."
- L (M looks down) "Because, uh, you got like they are close--they are a close family and . . ."
- H (interrupts) "Well, they were (L looks at H, M looks at H, H looks at L periodically) I don't know--I would seem to think more that (L looks away) they were a close--now . . ."
- L (H looks down, M looks at L) "Well, if--I think that if, uh, they're given another opportunity that their, ah, family closeness is going to come back together again because (L looks at H), I mean, it's easy for a person to change and it's also easy for a person to

change back--it's even easier I feel for a person to change back from what he had changed to previously."

H (L looks down periodically, M looks at H) "Well, let's just consider one problem at a time before we get bogged down. Ah, do we still feel that we could take the risk on giving Charles the loan? Ah . . ."

L (interrupts--L looks at M and H) "I think we should take the risk on giving him the loan. (M looks down) I think it's a good shot. I'm for giving him the risk. I, uh, just giving him the loan. (L nods head) I think it would produce for us . . ."

H (interrupts) "Provided (H looks at L briefly) that--provided that we set certain stipulations."

L (L looks at H) "Ah--stipulations, right. Right."  
(Process V ends)

H "Ok. The wife (H nods), ah, I don't think is obsessed with the idea of divorce as is . . ."

M (L looks at M) "It just sounds like it is their only release. She's . . ."

L (L looks at M and H, M looks at L and nods) "Right. She's fed up with her house life right now and she's (M looks down) like a change."

M (L looks at M) "He must be miserable to live with . . ."

L "Right." (nods)

M ". . . and I'm sure by his misery she's (L nods, L and M say following in unison, M looks at L) miserable, too. (L nods) And so they're at each other's throats."

H (L looks at H) "Even--even--(H looks at M briefly) when they're on the way down and hadn't reached quite this bad she did not like the idea of moving into the slums. I think that has a lot to do with it."

L (L looks down) "I think that if he's given the loan and he has the opportunity--he gets his business going I think you're going to find that the Edwards family will not any longer live in the slum. I (L looks at H) think that they'll move back out."

H (looks down and nods slightly) "Hmmm."

Discussion proceeds to other topics by H.

## APPENDIX C

### EXPERIMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS

#### Phase I

(Seat subjects in seat number indicated by schedule.)

Good \_\_\_\_\_. I'm \_\_\_\_\_. I want to thank you for coming today. I think you'll find this study interesting and enjoyable.

I'm a member of a team of social scientists who are interested in studying how individuals and discussion groups solve problems. Our work today will be divided into two parts. In Part 1 you will be asked to work alone on a set of problems and in Part 2 you will be asked to work together as a group. I'll explain the nature of these problems as we go along.

Let's turn to Part 1 of our work. In the last few years psychologists have found that individuals differ in their insight into difficult social situations (pause) and individuals differ in their ability to predict the outcome of these situations. This ability to see insightfully into social situations and accurately predict the outcome, social scientists call Social Insight and Prediction Ability.

Even though most of us make use of this ability every day, there is actually no reason to believe that any of you here really have a true picture of your own ability. We have found again and again that how much ability a person thinks he might have is frequently not the same amount of ability he actually has. So a person cannot be sure of his own ability, or lack of it, until he has been tested. Psychologists have also found that an individual's social insight and prediction ability is in no way related to his intelligence.

(Show questionnaire) Do you remember the personality questionnaire that you filled out a couple of weeks ago? This is one way we have of measuring a person's social insight and prediction ability. We call this test Form I. We have found that personality differences are highly related to how much social insight people have, and in particular that a person with high insight will approach social situations differently (pause) and react to them differently. In our method of scoring your answers we can assign a maximum of 100 points and, of course, a minimum of zero. From past experience with college groups we have found that (point)

80 to 100 points	is very unusual and indicates high ability
51 to 79 points	is an average score and indicates average ability
0 to 50 points	is also very unusual and indicates low ability

I have here your scores for Form I, the personality questionnaire.

Before I tell them to you, though, I should explain that we use these scores to create groups with different kinds of people in them. We put the three of you together because one of you has an unusually high score, one an unusually low score, and the third an average score. Let me show you what I mean. (pass out scores) (Name), no. \_\_\_\_\_ got 91 points, which, as you can see, puts him (her) in the top category (pause) and (Name), no. \_\_\_\_\_ got 45 points, which puts him (her) in the bottom category. (pause) (Name), no. \_\_\_\_\_ got 63 points, which puts him (her) right in the middle of the average category. (pause)

This is not the only way we have to measure social insight and prediction ability. (Go get tests from table) We have a more direct test which we call Form II. This test is also prepared for college groups, and to be absolutely sure that we have an accurate measure of your ability, we are going to ask you to take this one, too.

The test consists of a series of specially selected descriptions of actual social situations taken from the files of psychiatrists, social workers, and counselors. In each of these situations a person is faced with a difficult decision to make. We know from information given us that in each case there were really only two possible courses of action available to the person. We

also know exactly what the person actually did do in each situation.

Research has shown that some individuals are able to analyze the descriptions and on the basis of that analysis to predict what actually happened. They can "get right into the situation" and understand what's going on, and are able to tell what will happen next. Other persons do not have this ability to the same extent. As you might guess those persons with high social insight and prediction ability are able to reliably predict the actual outcome of these situations. Those with low ability cannot.

Let's look at an example. Here is a case taken from a social case work file. Let me read it to you.

Floyd Briggs was a Negro living in a middle-Atlantic state. When his father died, he was raised by his aunt and uncle. Floyd loved them as parents. His uncle worked as an attorney for an organization which supported civil rights for minorities.

In the first two years after high school, Floyd, although he was intelligent and reliable, had a hard time finding a job. Finally he was given a job as a grill cook in a restaurant. He said, "Getting the job was just luck. But now that I've learned how to get along with whites, I'm going to keep this job."

He had been working in the restaurant for two years when his uncle came to him with a request. Floyd

had told his uncle that in several ways the restaurant secretly practiced discrimination. His uncle said that a suit had been filed against the restaurant and that with Floyd's testimony they could win the case.

Floyd felt that he should testify, but he also realized he would lose the only good job he had ever had.

Floyd Briggs actually did which of the following:

- A. He testified.
- B. He did not testify.

A person with high social insight and prediction ability would very probably be able to tell us what Floyd Briggs actually did. Interestingly enough, though, that same person would not necessarily know how he arrived at his insightful prediction. That is, the ability is primarily intuitive, although, let me assure you it is nonetheless real and reliable.

By the way, I don't want to prejudice the test results so I'll have to tell you later what Floyd decided.

Let me review briefly what I've said so far.

First. We are going to administer a second test which measures a person's social insight and prediction ability--that is, the ability to see insightfully into social situations and to predict their outcomes.

Second. The test consists of a series of descriptions of actual situations in which a person was faced with a difficult decision.

Third. In each situation we know what happened. You will be asked to indicate in each case what you think actually happened.

And last. The amount of social insight and prediction ability you have will be indicated by how accurately you predict the outcomes of the situations.

I have put on the board over here a table of standards which you can use to evaluate your ability at the end of this test. These standards are based on research at schools across the country with college students like yourselves.

We will give you the descriptions of 20 situations to read. As you can see (point)

A score of from 16 to 20	is a very unusual score and represents a superior performance. A person who scored there would have very high ability.
A score of from 11 to 15	correct is an average score and indicates an average amount of ability. Most people score around 13 (indicating middle range). Fifteen is getting a little toward the high category. Eleven is getting a little toward the low category.
A score of from 0 to 10	is also a very unusual score and represents an inferior performance. A person who scored there would have very low ability, about the same as chance.

If everything is clear (pause) we are ready to begin. I will give each of you the same set of descriptions. Read each carefully. Then decide what you feel actually happened. Indicate your answer by marking the appropriate place on the answer sheet.

Let me caution you about something very important. You are not, I repeat, not to indicate what you think should have been done. Rather (pause) you are to objectively predict what you feel actually was done, whether you approve of it or not. Just so we're clear let me say it once more. Indicate what you feel actually was done not what should have been done.

Ok, you may begin as soon as you receive your material. Please put your name and seat number on the answer sheet, and let me remind you not to converse. (Leave and return when done) / I'll have these scored shortly. (Leave and return when scored) / I have the scores for the second test now. Let me refresh your memory about the tests. The first measures your ability based on your personality. (point) The second measures your ability based on your predictions of the outcomes of social situations. (announce scores)

Now here are your scores for Form II--the situational test. (pass out scores) (pause--look at clipboard) As you might expect, since both tests measure the same thing, your scores here (point) are similar to your first

scores. Number \_\_\_\_\_ got 18 correct which again puts him (her) in the top category, Number \_\_\_\_\_ got 13 correct which again puts him (her) in the bottom category, and Number \_\_\_\_\_'s score of 9 is again right in the middle of the average category. (pause)

This means that both forms of the test agree, Number \_\_\_\_\_ has an unusually high score, Number \_\_\_\_\_ has an unusually low score, and Number \_\_\_\_\_ is about average. Is this clear? (pause)

## Phase II

Let's turn to Part 2 of our work. As you've probably already noticed, this is a special room for studying group discussions. There are microphones in the ceiling and cameras at either corner of the room. We are going to record what you say and do on video tape with this equipment.

For your discussion today we're going to give you another description of a case to read from the files of a social agency. This is actually a case that was previously presented to an advisory panel for a juvenile probate court. That panel, after some "soul searching" and much discussion, was able to arrive at a set of decisions upon which action was taken.

Since these advisory panels are such an important part of our juvenile court system, we have undertaken to

study the way decisions are arrived at and what factors make for better, more effective discussions in such panels. So, today, we're going to ask you to act as if you were an advisory panel in a juvenile probate court. You will discuss and evaluate the case I mentioned and you will have to come up with a set of recommendations for action by the judge.

In fact, because these advisory panels are becoming such an important part of the juvenile court system, the tapes of some of these discussions are going to be carefully studied by a group of Michigan judges. (check list) Let's see, your group today will be included in those studied by the judges. Please take your work seriously. The results of these studies can have an effect on how juvenile cases are handled by the courts.

Persons who serve on these advisory panels are carefully selected by the court. They are usually volunteer professional people, and our work so far has shown that those who work most effectively on such panels display considerable amounts of insight, perceptiveness, and understanding. The nature of the cases which confront them require that they see insightfully into the situation and be able to predict how the individuals involved will behave in various circumstances. They have to be able to know what a person will do or not do if some action is taken to change his situation. Thus, we believe that

social insight and prediction ability is very relevant to the work of panel members. (pause) However, we don't know whether groups operate better with similar people in them or different people. We hope to find this out.

Like most cases, in the case I'm going to give you, the events involved are complex and the information available is never as complete as we would like it to be. This is almost always the way it is in real life cases. Nevertheless decisions must be made. You are to discuss the case and come up with a set of decisions upon which action can be taken. Moreover, whatever those decisions are, they must be agreed to by everyone. Are there any questions?

Ok. I will now pass out the case for you to read. You will have about five minutes to read it and then I will collect the cases. You may take any notes you wish, however, on the pads which have been provided for you. (leave, wait seven minutes, and return)

Ok. I guess we're ready. I will re-read the final part of the instructions so that you have clearly in mind what is expected of you in this discussion. You are to discuss this case material acting as an advisory panel to a juvenile probate court. You must come up with a set of recommendations that you all agree on, which can be used as a basis for action in the case. Is that clear?

We give groups different amounts of time for discussion to see what effect that has, and your group today will be given 30 minutes. So at \_\_\_\_\_ I will return. If you think you've finished before the 30 minutes are up, please be sure you have considered all points in the case and any complications that may arise from your recommendations. You may begin your discussion.

## APPENDIX D

### THE CASE OF GEORGE EDWARDS

On March 12, 1956 George Edwards, a freshman at Morgan Park High School, was arrested for rolling drunks (stealing money from drunkards who had fallen asleep in the streets). He was arrested with three other teenagers who had been members of his street gang--The Ellis Chiefs. The members of the gang were arraigned before the Cook County Juvenile Court where they were tried and found guilty of petty thievery. It was now the duty of the judge to sentence them. Before passing sentence on George the judge reviewed the reports of the family service agent of that district, the court marriage counselor, George's teachers, and the social worker. Excerpts of these reports are printed below.

#### Report from the Family Service Agent-- Excerpt on History of Family

George's family moved to the slum area, where this felony took place, when he was seven years old. Previously his family had lived in a lower middle class suburb where George's father owned a small tailor shop. The father's initiative and ability had made the shop a success. At

this time, according to reports of each member of the family, the family was a happy one. The parents also reported that George was a quiet, studious boy. Then the father mangled his hand in a pressing machine. No longer able to run his business he had to sell out at a loss. Injured as he was, the only job he could obtain was that of parking lot attendant. Subsequently George's family moved into the slum area around Ellis Avenue. George's mother went to work as a private secretary in order to help support the family, and very shortly was earning more money than her husband. The family entered a period of stress. George said in an interview that he had once been very close to his parents; but when this started to happen, he began to seek companionship outside the home which was no longer a pleasant place to be. George turned to people of his own age for companionship and joined the Ellis Chiefs. The more he associated with this group, the more he tended to adopt their values. As he grew older, he turned away from school where he had once shown great promise. By the age of fourteen George had become the leader of the Chiefs.

#### Report of the Marriage Counselor

The family is extremely unstable. The husband, Charles Edwards, seems to have lost all goals, and is moody and apathetic. The only time he showed any interest

in his conversation with me was when he spoke of his past successes as a tailor. He said, "If I could only get on my feet again. I know I could be successful running a grocery store like I was with my tailor shop. But where am I going to get the money?" About his wife he said, "I still love her although she has become a stranger to me. Since she's gotten that job, things have been different. I don't think she respects me. She's always mentioning that she's the one that earns the money for the family."

The wife is very depressed with the family situation. Her only source of pleasure is her work which today provides the major source of income for the family. She said, "I don't know what to do about Charles. We were once so close to each other but now he seems to resent me. Its getting so I hate to come home because of the continual fights we have. I like to work because it gives me a chance to leave the house. And Charles doesn't even appreciate that I am working to help the family. If it weren't for the children, I would have left before this. As it is, I'm applying for a divorce now."

#### Report from George's Teachers

George's teachers were unanimous in agreeing that George is alert and intelligent. They recommended that he take the college preparatory course; and they said that if he applied himself, he would stand an excellent chance of

getting a scholarship to college. George discussed this with his father who said, "If you don't get a scholarship, I won't be able to send you to college. There is no money. If you take the college preparatory course and don't go to college, you won't get any kind of a decent job. I don't think you should take the risk. Stay in the commercial course. At least when you get out, you'll be assured of a job as a bookkeeper."

#### Report of the Social Worker

The social environment in which George moves is very unhealthy. Unless he is removed from association with the Ellis Chiefs, it is difficult to see how he can be rehabilitated. The neighborhood Youth Center would seem to provide a means for this change. There are, however, problems connected with this. We must realize that George's presence, since his is a gang leader, may be a danger to our youth program. The big question is what are his potentialities for responsible group behavior.

As the judge read these reports, he began to realize that more was involved here than the simple question of punishing the boy. The lives of three people were involved. It would be comparatively easy to send George to the State Reformatory for boys, but it seemed worthwhile to try to rehabilitate him if it were possible. If it were not, then sending George away would be best. Then

the judge realized that if George were to remain at home, several other decisions involving his rehabilitation would have to be made.

First was the matter of helping Charles Edwards get started. The judge had previously been able to help others who appeared before his court to get loans from the local bank. But it was always important in these cases to be reasonably certain the individual was a good risk. Could he take the chance with Charles Edwards? He didn't know.

Then there is the matter of the wife. He would have to make a recommendation regarding the divorce and certainly one about the wife's job. Closely tied in with this is the question regarding the college preparatory courses. Finally, there was the matter of recommending that George be encouraged to join the Youth Center. Does George have the potentialities for responsible group behavior? He knew that if he did not decide to send George to the State Reformatory for boys, he would have to make recommendations in each of these fields.

You have been called in as a Juvenile Advisory Panel to consider this case and make recommendations to the judge. YOU WILL BE EXPECTED TO REVIEW THE FACTS OF THE CASE, CLARIFY WHAT HAS TAKEN PLACE (SUCH AS THE MOTIVES OF THE INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED), AND GIVE THE JUDGE A SPECIFIC SET OF CONCRETE RECOMMENDATIONS. If you decide

to rehabilitate George you will have the services of the court, marriage counselor, and the local family service agent to help you carry out your program.

## APPENDIX E

### THE PRESENTATION OF FORMULAS USED IN TABLES 10-23

The following formulas were used to calculate the rates of support presented in Tables 10-16. These formulas had been devised and used by Theodore Mills in his article "Power Relations in Three Person Groups."<sup>44</sup> Although these formulas are used in processing some of this experiment's data, it is important to note that some of the assumptions and experimental conditions of the formulas are not met here. This is permissible since we are using such formulas as another indicator of certain trends present in our tables, and also any failure to meet original assumptions of the formulas does not negate the validity of such formulas when used in this context. The categories originally employed in the formulas have been translated from the Bales system to the Berger-Conner system.

The rate of support of one actor for another is given by the equation:

$$R.S._{12} = \frac{A_{12} - D_{12}}{B_2 + C_2} \cdot 100$$

Where:

$A_{12}$  refers to the number of positive reactions initiated by member one and directed at member two.

$D_{12}$  refers to the number of negative reactions initiated by member one and directed at member two.

$B_2$  refers to the number of performance outputs initiated by member two, and  $C_2$  refers to the number of action opportunities initiated by member two. Each represents the total number of performance outputs or action opportunities initiated by member two regardless of the recipients of the acts.

The rate of total support output of member one is given by the equation:

$$RTSO_1 = \frac{(A_{12}+A_{13}+\dots A_{1n}) - (D_{12}+D_{13}+\dots D_{1n})}{(B_2+B_3+\dots B_n) + (C_2+C_3+\dots C_n)} .100$$

The rate of total support intake of member one is given by the equation:

$$RTSI_1 = \frac{(A_{21}+A_{31}+\dots A_{n1}) - (D_{21}+D_{31}+\dots D_{n1})}{B_1 + C_1} .100$$

Where: The letter n represents the last member of the group, e.g. if the group had only five members n would represent the fifth member.

A modified version of these formulas was used in Tables 17-23. In the calculations for the modified tables, the term  $C_1$  was omitted from the formulas. The purpose of doing this was to get a more refined form of table. Since

this experiment centers on positive and negative reactions we had decided to delete the action opportunities because all positive and negative reactions are directed solely at performance outputs not action opportunities.

## APPENDIX F

### TABLES

Table 1.--Person to person acts in XG-1.

	H	M	L	O	Total acts initiated
Performance Outputs					
H	-	5	31	10	46
M	8	-	0	2	10
L	27	1	-	6	34
	35	6	31	18	(90) Total acts received
Action Opportunities					
H	-	0	0	3	3
M	2	-	0	0	2
L	6	0	-	0	6
	8	0	0	3	(11) Total acts received
Positive Reactions					
H	-	4	4		8
M	4	-	0		4
L	16	1	-		17
	20	5	4		(29) Total acts received
Negative Reactions					
H	-	1	5		6
M	0	-	0		0
L	4	1	-		5
	4	2	5		(11) Total acts received

\*Total number of acts initiated according to score

Score	Number of acts	Percent of group total
H	63	44.6
M	16	11.3
L	62	43.9

Table 2.--Person to person acts in XG-3.

	H	M	L	O	Total acts initiated
Performance Outputs					
H	-	30	32	7	69
M	32	-	46	26	104
L	29	13	-	25	67
	61	43	78	58	(240) Total acts received

Action Opportunities					
H	-	1	7	1	9
M	5	-	0	4	9
L	4	1	-	2	7
	9	2	7	7	(25) Total acts received

Positive Reactions					
H	-	8	4		12
M	10	-	8		18
L	9	11	-		20
	19	19	12		(50) Total acts received

Negative Reactions					
H	-	0	3		3
M	0	-	0		0
L	1	3	-		4
	1	3	3		(7) Total acts received

\*Total number of acts initiated according to score

Score	Number of acts	Percent of group total
H	93	28.8
M	131	40.6
L	<u>98</u>	30.4
	322	

Table 3.--Person to person acts in XG-4.

	H	M	L	O	Total acts initiated
Performance Outputs					
H	-	44	27	1	72
M	42	-	0	55	97
L	45	0	-	8	53
	87	44	27	64	(222) Total acts received
Action Opportunities					
H	-	1	0	0	1
M	1	-	0	4	5
L	2	0	-	1	3
	3	1	0	5	(9) Total acts received
Positive Reactions					
H	-	19	15		34
M	16	-	2		18
L	1	0	-		1
	17	19	17		(53) Total acts received
Negative Reactions					
H	-	1	1		2
M	6	-	0		6
L	6	0	-		6
	12	1	1		(14) Total acts received

\*Total number of acts initiated according to score

Score	Number of acts	Percent of group total
H	109	36.5
M	126	42.2
L	<u>63</u>	21.1
	298	

Table 4.--Person to person acts in XG-5.

	H	M	L	O	Total acts initiated
Performance Outputs					
H	-	0	16	1	17
M	18	-	9	0	27
L	7	11	-	21	39
	25	11	25	22	(83) Total acts received
Action Opportunities					
H	-	0	4	0	4
M	0	-	1	0	1
L	0	3	-	2	5
	0	3	5	2	(10) Total acts received
Positive Reactions					
H	-	10	6		16
M	0	-	0		0
L	4	9	-		13
	4	19	6		(29) Total acts received
Negative Reactions					
H	-	1	1		2
M	0	-	0		0
L	1	1	-		2
	1	2	1		(4) Total acts received

\*Total number of acts initiated according to score

Score	Number of acts	Percent of group total
H	39	30.9
M	28	22.2
L	59	46.8

Table 5.--Person to person acts in XG-6.

	H	M	L	O	Total acts initiated
Performance Outputs					
H	-	7	3	0	10
M	2	-	4	4	10
L	1	1	-	2	4
	3	8	7	6	(24) Total acts received
Action Opportunities					
H	-	2	0	0	2
M	0	-	0	1	1
L	0	1	-	1	2
	0	3	0	2	(5) Total acts received
Positive Reactions					
H	-	4	0		4
M	3	-	0		3
L	1	1	-		2
	4	5	0		(9) Total acts received
Negative Reactions					
H	-	0	1		1
M	2	-	3		5
L	0	0	-		0
	2	0	4		(6) Total acts received

\*Total number of acts initiated according to score

Score	Number of acts	Percent of group total
H	17	38.6
M	19	43.1
L	<u>8</u>	18.0
	44	

Table 6.--Person to person acts in XG-7.

	H	M	L	O	Total acts initiated
Performance Outputs					
H	-	41	45	67	153
M	35	-	25	18	78
L	47	34	-	8	89
	82	75	70	93	(320) Total acts received
Action Opportunities					
H	-	7	7	16	30
M	5	-	3	2	10
L	3	2	-	0	5
	8	9	10	18	(45) Total acts received
Positive Reactions					
H	-	24	17		41
M	13	-	5		18
L	30	22	-		52
	43	46	22		(111) Total acts received
Negative Reactions					
H	-	5	4		9
M	5	-	1		6
L	3	2	-		5
	8	7	5		(20) Total acts received

\*Total number of acts initiated according to score

Score	Number of acts	Percent of group total
H	233	46.9
M	112	22.5
L	<u>151</u>	30.4
	496	

Table 7.--Person to person acts in XG-8.

	H	M	L	O	Total acts initiated
Performance Outputs					
H	-	5	35	53	93
M	19	-	17	20	56
L	27	14	-	43	84
	46	19	52	116	(233) Total acts received

Action Opportunities					
H	-	0	2	8	10
M	4	-	0	1	5
L	2	1	-	1	4
	6	1	2	10	(19) Total acts received

Positive Reactions					
H	-	3	8		11
M	8	-	11		19
L	16	20	-		36
	24	23	19		(66) Total acts received

Negative Reactions					
H	-	2	6		8
M	2	-	1		3
L	4	1	-		5
	6	3	7		(16) Total acts received

\*Total number of acts initiated according to score

Score	Number of acts	Percent of group total
H	122	36.5
M	83	24.8
L	<u>129</u>	38.6
	334	

Table 8.--Aggregate matrix of acts for groups XG-(1-7).

	H	M	L	O	Total acts initiated
Performance Outputs					
H	-	132	189	139	460
M	156	-	101	125	382
L	183	74	-	113	370
	339	206	290	377	(1212) Total acts received
Action Opportunities					
H	-	11	20	28	59
M	17	-	4	12	33
L	17	8	-	7	32
	34	19	24	47	(124) Total acts received
Positive Reactions					
H	-	72	54		126
M	54	-	26		80
L	79	62	-		141
	133	134	80		(347) Total acts received
Negative Reactions					
H	-	10	21		31
M	15	-	15		30
L	19	8	-		27
	34	18	36		(88) Total acts received

Table 9.--Aggregate matrix of acts for groups XG (1-7)  
expressed as a percentage of the total acts.

	H	M	L	O	Total percentage acts initiated
Performance Outputs					
H	-	10.9	15.6	11.5	38
M	12.9	-	8.3	10.3	31.5
L	15.1	6.1	-	9.3	30.5
	28.0	17	23.0	31.1	(100.0) Total acts received
Action Opportunities					
H	-	8.9	16.1	22.6	47.6
M	13.7	-	3.2	9.7	26.6
L	13.7	6.5	-	5.6	25.8
	27.4	15.4	19.3	37.9	(100.0) Total acts received
Positive Reactions					
H	-	23	6.4		29.4
M	17.3	-	8.3		25.6
L	25	19.8	-		44.8
	42.3	42.8	14.7		(99.8) Total acts received
Negative Reactions					
H	-	11.4	23.9		35.3
M	17	-	17		34
L	21.6	9.1	-		30.7
	38.6	20.5	40.9		(100.0) Total acts received

Table 10.--Rates of support in XG-1 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts.\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (High)	2 (Low)	3 (Medium)	
As initiator				
1 (High)	-	-2.5	25	3.8
2 (Low)	22.4	-	0	14.1
3 (Medium)	8.2	0	-	4.5
Rate of total support received	32.7	-2.5	25	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 11.--Rates of support in XG-3 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts.\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Medium)	2 (Low)	3 (High)	
As initiator				
1 (Medium)	-	10.8	12.8	11.8
2 (Low)	7.1	-	10.3	8.4
3 (High)	7.1	1.4	-	4.8
Rate of total support received	14.2	12.2	23.1	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 12.--Rates of support in XG-4 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts.\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Medium)	2 (High)	3 (Low)	
As initiator				
1 (Medium)	-	13.7	3.6	9.3
2 (High)	17.6	-	25	20.3
3 (Low)	0	-6.8	-	-2.9
Rate of total support received	17.6	6.8	28.6	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 13.--Rates of support in XG-5 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts.\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Low)	2 (High)	3 (Medium)	
As initiator				
1 (Low)	-	14.3	28.6	22.4
2 (High)	11.4	-	32.1	19.4
3 (Medium)	0	0	0	0
Rate of total support received	11.3	14.3	60.7	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 14.--Rates of support in XG-6 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts.\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Medium)	2 (High)	3 (Low)	
As initiator				
1 (Medium)	-	8.3	-50	-11.1
2 (High)	36.4	-	-16.7	21.4
3 (Low)	9.1	8.3	-	8.7
Rate of total support received	45	16.7	-67	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 15.--Rates of support in XG-7 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts.\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (High)	2 (Low)	3 (Medium)	
As initiator				
1 (High)	-	13.8	21.6	17.6
2 (Low)	14.8	-	20.2	17.3
3 (Medium)	4.4	4.3	-	4.3
Rate of total support received	19.1	18.1	44.3	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 16.--Rates of support in XG-8 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts.\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Low)	2 (High)	3 (Medium)	
As initiator				
1 (Low)	-	11.7	31.1	18.9
2 (High)	2.3	-	1.6	2
3 (Medium)	11.4	5.8	-	8.4
Rate of total support received	14.3	19.4	35.7	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 17.--Rates of support in XG-1 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form).\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (High)	2 (Low)	3 (Medium)	
As initiator				
1 (High)	-	-2.9	30	4.5
2 (Low)	26.1	-	0	15
3 (Medium)	8.7	0	-	7.1
Rate of total support received	34.8	-2.9	30	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 18.--Rates of support in XG-3 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form).\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Medium)	2 (Low)	3 (High)	
As initiator				
1 (Medium)	-	11.9	14.5	13.2
2 (Low)	7.7	-	11.6	9.2
3 (High)	7.7	1.5	-	5.3
Rate of total support received	15.4	13.4	26.1	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 19.--Rates of support in XG-4 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form).\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Medium)	2 (High)	3 (Low)	
As initiator				
1 (Medium)	-	13.9	3.8	9.6
2 (High)	18.6	-	28.3	21.3
3 (Low)	0	-6.9	-	-3.0
Rate of total support received	18.6	6.9	30.2	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 20.--Rates of support in XG-5 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form).\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Low)	2 (High)	3 (Medium)	
As initiator				
1 (Low)	-	17.6	29.6	25
2 (High)	12.8	-	33.3	21.2
3 (Medium)	0	0	-	0
Rate of total support received	12.8	17.6	63	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 21.--Rates of support in XG-6 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form).\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Medium)	2 (High)	3 (Low)	
As initiator				
1 (Medium)	-	10	-75	-14.3
2 (High)	40	-	-25	21.4
3 (Low)	10	10	-	10
Rate of total support received	50	20	-100	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 22.--Rates of support in XG-7 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form).\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (High)	2 (Low)	3 (Medium)	
As initiator				
1 (High)	-	14.6	24.4	19.2
2 (Low)	17.6	-	25.6	20.3
3 (Medium)	5.3	4.5	-	5.0
Rate of total support received	22.9	19.1	50	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 23.--Rates of support in XG-8 according to each member's ranking on initiation of acts (modified form).\*

	As recipient			Rate of Total Support Output
	1 (Low)	2 (High)	3 (Medium)	
As initiator				
1 (Low)	-	12.9	33.9	20.8
2 (High)	2.4	-	1.8	2.1
3 (Medium)	11.9	6.5	-	9.0
Rate of total support received	14.3	19.4	35.7	

\*The arabic numerals designate the ranking a member with a given score receives based on the total number of acts initiated, e.g. 1 (High) means that the high score member has initiated the most acts in the group whereas 3 (Medium) means that a person with a medium score has initiated the lowest number of acts within the group. See also Appendix E.

Table 24.--Expected rankings for each group member on the initiation and reception of specific types of acts according to the score of the participant.\*

High Score	Medium Score	Low Score
P.O. <sub>I</sub> =1	P.O. <sub>I</sub> =2	P.O. <sub>I</sub> =3
A.O. <sub>I</sub> =2	A.O. <sub>I</sub> =1	A.O. <sub>I</sub> =3
+R <sub>I</sub> =2	+R <sub>I</sub> =1	+R <sub>I</sub> =3
-R <sub>I</sub> =1	-R <sub>I</sub> =2	-R <sub>I</sub> =3
P.O. <sub>R</sub> =2	P.O. <sub>R</sub> =1	P.O. <sub>R</sub> =3
A.O. <sub>R</sub> =1	A.O. <sub>R</sub> =2	A.O. <sub>R</sub> =3
+R <sub>R</sub> =1	+R <sub>R</sub> =2	+R <sub>R</sub> =3
-R <sub>R</sub> =1	-R <sub>R</sub> =2	-R <sub>R</sub> =3

\*This table presents the expected rankings for each group member on the initiation or reception of specific types of acts. These expected rankings are elaborated in Hypothesis I. The arabic numerals indicate a person's ranking relative to the other members in the group. A number 1 indicates that a person has either received or initiated the most acts in that particular category while the number 3 indicates that a person has initiated or received the fewest acts for that particular category. The subscripts I and R are abbreviations for the words "initiated" and "received" respectively. Other abbreviations used in the table are: P.O. = performance output; A.O. = action opportunity; +R = positive reaction; and -R = negative reaction.

Table 25.--The combined rankings of subjects for all groups according to subject's score and type of act.\*

Score Rankings	Score								
	High			Medium			Low		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Type of act									
P.O.I	4	2	1	3	1	3	1	4	2
A.O.I	4	2	1	2	3	2	3	2	2
+R <sub>I</sub>	3	2	2	0	4	3	4	1	2
-R <sub>I</sub>	4	3	0	2	2	3	3	2	2
P.O.R	4	2	1	1	3	3	3	2	2
A.O.R	4	1	2	1	4	2	2	4	1
+R <sub>R</sub>	3	3	1	5	2	0	0	3	4
-R <sub>R</sub>	4	3	0	0	4	3	4	2	1

\*The table presents the frequency of certain rankings that each group member received on specific types of acts. The arabic numerals indicate a person's ranking relative to the other members in the group. A number 1 indicates that a person has either received or initiated the most acts for a specific type of act while the number 3 indicates that a person has initiated or received the fewest acts for a specific type of act. The subscripts I and R are abbreviations for the words "initiated" and "received" respectively. Other abbreviations used in the table are: P.O. = performance output; A.O. = action opportunity; +R = positive reaction; and -R = negative reaction. The row headings represent the type of act and the column headings represent the frequency of rankings on each score for all the groups. For example, in row one under the high status heading we have the numbers four, two and one. These numbers indicate that out of the seven experimental groups: the high status member was the highest initiator of "performance outputs" four times; the second highest initiator of "performance outputs" two times; and the lowest initiator of "performance outputs" one time.

In ranking the participants for each group, the following procedure was used. In the case of ties for the rank, both participants received the same rank. The next lowest participant received a ranking only one lower than the other two. For example, if the high and medium score men were tied for the highest rate of initiation of P.O. they would receive the rank one. The low score man would receive rank two.

Table 26.--The frequency of successful "influence processes" according to activity level of initiating acts.

Active	Less active	Least active	Total
24	6	6	36*

\*The number of successful "influence processes" is greater than the number of "influence processes" because in two of the processes two members were in disagreement with a third member. Each successfully persuaded the third member so that each member was considered successful in these "influence processes."

Table 27.--Relationship of rate of participation to power position.

	High	Medium	Low
Level of participation			
Most active	2	3	2
Less active	4	0	3
Least active	1	4	2

Table 28.--Comparison of rankings in total support intake according to group score and rate of participation.

Score	High	Medium	Low
Frequency of members having highest RTSI*			
Participation level of members			
Most active	1	1	0
Less active	0	0	0
Least active	1	3	1
Frequency of members having second highest RTSI			
Participation level of members			
Most active	1	2	0
Less active	3	0	0
Least active	0	1	0
Frequency of members having lowest RTSI			
Participation level of members			
Most active	0	0	2
Less active	1	0	3
Least active	0	0	1

\*The abbreviation RTSI represents the term Rate of Total Support Input. There is no difference in rankings as presented in this table between the tables based on Mills' original formulas and those based on the modified form.

Table 29.--The expected rankings in the flow of communications and support among the members of the power hierarchy.\*

Hypothesized flow of communication	Number of acts** communicated person to person	Rates of support (regular)	Rates of*** support (modified)
H-M = 1	225-4	1	1
M-H = 2	242-3	5	4
H-L = 3	250-2	3	6
L-H = 4	298-1	4	3
M-L = 5	146-6	6	5
L-M = 6	152-5	2	2

\*The rankings were calculated by assigning a numerical rank to the person to person rates of support in Tables 10-23. The rankings of a specific relationship, e.g. L-H rankings were based on the L-H rankings in each of seven groups relative to the other person to person rates of support. These rates were added for all seven groups then an average was taken upon which the rankings in the table were based. In cases where two or more person to person rates of support were identical in any group, an averaged rank was computed. Each identical rank received sequential rankings and the next lowest number received the next lowest ranking after the identical numbers ranks. The sequential rankings for the identical numbers were averaged. For example, let us say that the ranks for a group followed the hypothesis except M-H, H-L, and L-H had the second highest rate. The ranks 2, 3, and 4 were added and averaged to give us a rank of 3. The rank of 3 was then assigned to each of these statuses while M-L which has the next lowest rank was assigned rank 5.

\*\*The numbers represent the total number of person to person acts while the numerals beside them represent the ranking of the acts proceeding from the highest number to the lowest.

\*\*\*The numerals in the rates of support column are taken from Tables 10-23. The ranks were arrived at by the method previously described.

Table 30.--Frequency of success in "influence processes" according to score.

Experimental group number	High	Medium	Low
XG-1	5	0	2
XG-3	1	2	0
XG-4	1	5	1
XG-5	0	1	0
XG-6	0	3	0
XG-7	7	2	0
XG-8	2	2	3*
	16	15	6

\*Although there were only five "influence processes" in XG-8, seven successful processes were counted due to the fact in two of the processes two members were in disagreement with a third. Each persuaded the third to accept his idea so the two "influence process" accounted for two successes. XG-2 was the group eliminated from the study.

Table 31.--The trend of successes in "influence processes" over time.\*

"Influence process" number	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Group number								
XG-1**	L	H	H	H	L	H	H	
XG-3	M	H	M					
XG-4	M	H	M	M	L	M	M	
XG-5	M							
XG-6	M	M	M					
XG-7	M	M	H	H	H	H	H	H
XG-8	M&L	H	M&L	L	H			

\*The numbers represent the earliest "influence processes" to the latest, i.e. the number one means that that process was the first to occur in that group and the highest number for the group indicates the last.

\*\*XG-2 is missing from listing of groups because it had been eliminated for failure of the status manipulation to work.

## FOOTNOTES

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Murray Webster, Jr., "Source of Evaluation and Expectations for Performance," Sociometry, XXXII, No. 2 (1969), pp. 243-244.

<sup>2</sup>Robert F. Bales, Fred L. Strodbeck, Theodore M. Mills and Mary E. Roseborough, "Channels of Communication in Small Groups," American Sociological Review, XVI, No. 4 (1951), p. 461.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 468.

<sup>4</sup>Webster, "Source of Evaluation," p. 244.

<sup>5</sup>James C. Moore, "Status and Influence in Small Group Interactions," Sociometry, XXXI, No. 1 (1968), p. 48.

<sup>6</sup>Joseph Berger and Thomas L. Conner, "Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups," Acta Sociologica, XII, No. 4 (1969), p. 188.

<sup>7</sup>Joseph Berger and Thomas L. Conner, "Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups: A Revised Formulation," Rough draft, material quoted with permission of Dr. Conner, p. 6 (mimeographed).

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>9</sup>Joseph Berger and Thomas L. Conner, "Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups," Acta Sociologica, XII, No. 4 (1969), p. 188.

<sup>10</sup>Joseph Berger and Thomas L. Conner, "Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups: A Revised Formulation," Rough draft, material quoted with permission of Dr. Conner, p. 4 (mimeographed).

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Joseph Berger and Thomas L. Conner, "Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups," Acta Sociologica, XII, No. 4 (1969), p. 186.



<sup>14</sup>Bobbie Norfleet, "Interpersonal Relations and Group Productivity," Journal of Social Issues, LIV (Spring, 1948), p. 69.

<sup>15</sup>Philip Slater, "Role Differentiation in Small Groups," American Sociological Review, XX, No. 3 (1955), pp. 302-303.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid. This reference has been closely paraphrased, pp. 304-305.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Henry W. Riecken, "The Effect of Talkativeness on Ability to Influence Group Solutions of Problems," Sociometry, XXI, No. 4 (1958), p. 313.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 320.

<sup>20</sup>Theodore M. Mills, "Power Relations in Three-Person Groups," American Sociological Review, XVIII, No. 4 (1953), p. 353.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Theresa Turk and Herman Turk, "Group Interaction in a Formal Setting: The Case of the Triad," Sociometry, XXV, No. 1 (1962), p. 54.

<sup>23</sup>Fred L. Strodbeck, "Husband-Wife Interaction Over Revealed Differences," American Sociological Review, XVIII, No. 4 (1953), p. 353.

<sup>24</sup>Fred L. Strodbeck, Rita M. James and Charles Hawkins, "Social Status in Jury Deliberations," American Sociological Review, XXI, No. 6 (1957), p. 713.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 715.

<sup>26</sup>O. J. Harvey, "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Status Relations in Informal Groups," American Sociological Review, XVIII, No. 4 (1953), pp. 357-367.

<sup>27</sup>E. Paul Torrance, "Some Consequences of Power Differences on Decision Making in Permanent and Temporary Three-Man Groups," ed. by A. Paul Hare, Edgar Borgatta, and Robert F. Bales, in Small Groups (New York: Alfred Knopf Inc., 1966), p. 603.

<sup>28</sup>Moore, p. 50.

- <sup>29</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 52.
- <sup>31</sup>Ibid., "(Self)" not part of original quote, pp. 55-56.
- <sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 56.
- <sup>33</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 49-50.
- <sup>35</sup>Robert F. Bales, Interaction Process Analysis (Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley Press, 1951), pp. 55-56.
- <sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 56.
- <sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 55.
- <sup>38</sup>Robert F. Bales and Christopher Heinicke, "Developmental Trends in the Structure of Small Groups," Sociometry, XVI, No. 1 (1953), p. 36.
- <sup>40</sup>Joseph Berger and Thomas L. Conner, "Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups: A Revised Formulation," Rough draft, material quoted with permission of Dr. Conner, p. 4 (mimeographed).
- <sup>41</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>42</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>43</sup>Ibid., pp. 4-5.
- <sup>44</sup>Mills, n. 4, p. 352.

## LITERATURE CITED



#### LITERATURE CITED

- Bales, Robert F. Interaction Process Analysis (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, 1951).
- Bales, Robert F., and Heinicke, Christopher. "Developmental Trends in the Structure of Small Groups." Sociometry, XVI (No. 1, 1953), 7-38.
- Bales, Robert F., Strodtbeck, Fred L., Mills, Theodore M., and Roseborough, Mary E. "Channels of Communication in Small Groups." American Sociological Review, XVI (No. 4, 1951), 461-468.
- Berger, Joseph, and Conner, Thomas L. "Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups: A Revised Formulation." Rough draft. Material quoted with permission of Dr. Conner. 1-35 (mimeographed).
- Berger, Joseph, and Conner, Thomas L. "Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups." Acta Sociologica, XII (No. 4, 1969), 186-198.
- Harvey, O. J. "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Status Relations in Informal Groups." American Sociological Review, XVIII (No. 4, 1953), 357-367.
- Mills, Theodore M. "Power Relations in Three-Person Groups." American Sociological Review, XVIII (No. 4, 1953), 351-357.
- Moore, James C. "Status and Influence in Small Group Interactions." Sociometry, XXXI (No. 1, 1968), 47-63.
- Norfleet, Bobbie. "Interpersonal Relations and Group Productivity." Journal of Social Issues, LIV (Spring, 1948), 66-69.
- Riecken, Henry W. "The Effect of Talkativeness on Ability to Influence Group Solutions of Problems." Sociometry, XXI (No. 4, 1958), 309-321.

- Slater, Philip. "Role Differentiation in Small Groups." American Sociological Review, XX (No. 3, 1955), 300-310.
- Strodtbeck, Fred L. "Husband-Wife Interaction Over Revealed Differences." American Sociological Review, XVI (No. 4, 1951), 468-473.
- Strodtbeck, Fred L., James, Rita M., and Hawkins, Charles. "Social Status on Jury Deliberations." American Sociological Review, XXII (No. 6, 1957), 713-719.
- Torrance, E. Paul. "Some Consequences of Power Differences on Decision Making in Permanent and Temporary Three-Man Groups." Small Groups. Edited by A. Paul Hare, Edgar Borgatta, and Robert F. Bales. New York: Alfred Knopf Inc., 1966.
- Turk, Theresa, and Turk, Herman. "Group Interaction in a Formal Setting: The Case of the Triad." Sociometry, XXV (No. 1, 1962), 48-56.
- Webster, Murray Jr. "Source of Evaluation and Expectations for Performance." Sociometry, XXXII (No. 2, 1969), 243-258.
- Whyte, William F. Street Corner Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955).

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293011010547