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CHAPTER I
DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

The general problem with which this research is concerned is a study of the dynamics of a group which contained two distinct subparts, one of which was recognized by both as being of inferior status relative to the other. The method employed to secure this difference in status between the two subgroups consisted in having an adult group leader who favored the larger of the two subgroups and discriminated against the smaller. The assumption underlying this method was that the attitudes of the leader toward the members of the two subgroups would be taken up by the members of the groups themselves: i.e., that the members of the subgroup favored by the leader would discriminate against the members of the subgroup discriminated against by the leader, and that the members of this latter subgroup would show by their behavior that they felt themselves to be members of an "inferior" or underprivileged group.

This aim involved a study of three types of relationship within the group, in addition to and as a resultant of the attitude of the leader toward the members of the group. These types of relationship were based on 1, the attitude of the girls toward the leader; 2, the attitude of the girls toward the members of their own subgroup (either favored or discriminated against); and 3, the attitude of the girls toward the members of the other subgroup.
In a much more general way, the study was also concerned with the applicability of the experimental method to studies of group living. Considerable doubt has always been expressed as to the effectiveness of the experimental method in social psychology because of the difficulty of controlling all the salient factors and the feeling that it was not, therefore, an economical procedure; too much time and effort were expended in the setting up of an experiment which produced results that could have been secured far less laboriously by other methods. The experimenter believed that the experimental method had not been given a proper opportunity of proving itself and thought that it would be of interest to see just what results could be secured. The previous work of Lippitt and of Lippitt and White indicated that this approach could prove to be highly productive.

CHAPTER II
SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

Social psychology has been progressing rapidly in the last few years, if progress in any field can be judged by the number of studies which have appeared. The tendency seems to be toward the placing of more and more emphasis on the interrelation which exists between the individual and his environment, conceived as the sum total of those factors which influence his behavior at any given time. It is in the setting of a field theory that experimentation in social
psychology becomes possible. The work of L.B. Murphy (15) is an excellent example of the productiveness of such an approach, as is also that of Sherif (19), who calls sharp attention to the prominent part played by social factors in the development of concepts which had hitherto been considered as purely individual.

There is little material which is directly related to the problem under consideration. Bateson (1) is interested in the problem of what he terms schismogenesis defined as "—a process of differentiation in the norms of individual behavior resulting from cumulative interaction between individuals." He describes this process as going on within individuals, and between individuals, groups, and cultures. However, there is a vast amount of literature on the status and problems of national, political, and religious minorities. This material is rich in its suggestions of methods whereby discrimination against a group can be carried on and the effects which such discrimination can be expected to produce on the persecuted group. This is especially true of some of the articles which have recently appeared concerning the persecution of the Jews in Germany; for example, the article by Singer (18) entitled "The Influence of Sudden Oppression of a Racial Minority."

Lewin (9) discusses the psycho-sociological problems of a minority group, comparing the space of free movement which was allowed the Jew in the days of the Ghetto with that of pre-war and post-war Germany, and relating it to the conflict
within the individual. He concludes that the conflict within the individual is produced not only by a limited space of free movement but also by a lack of certainty in his reactions to others outside his minority. A great many more studies have been done on the relation between the Negro and white in this country. Criswell (3) has measured the amount of cleavage present between colored and white children in a school in Brooklyn. She points out 1, that in elementary school classes of colored and white children containing minorities of four or more white, an increase in race cleavage was observed; 2, that withdrawal of one race is not necessarily associated with equal withdrawal of the other; and 3, that group preferences are affected by the percentage composition of the whole group. Horowitz (7) has studied the development of the attitude toward the Negro, and emphasized the cultural origin of these attitudes. Brenman (2), in a series of lengthy interviews, has described the relationship between membership in a minority group and identification with that group.

There is a great body of material on the Negro in American industry exemplified by some of the work of C. S. Johnson (8), Dollard (4) surveyed a southern community and wrote very interesting reports on the relationship which existed between the colored minority and the white majority in that particular community, emphasizing the psychoanalytical mechanisms involved.
While these materials cannot be referred to as previous studies of the problem here undertaken, nevertheless, each definitely contributed to the understanding of the kind of situation which it was desired to create experimentally, and suggested methods whereby this might be accomplished. But it was not in any sense the purpose of the experiment to attempt a duplication of the complicated position of any of the so-called minority groups. Rather than that, the purpose was to set up the kind of group constellation which it was desired to study - a group containing a cleavage between more and less privileged subgroups produced by discriminating leadership - and to derive from it as much understanding as possible of the laws which govern such constellations.

There are numerous studies available concerning the structure of groups (Hanfmann); competition among children (Greenberg); group leadership (Whitehead and Pigors); special problems of group membership (Stonequist); and the technical problems involved in the study of group life (Newstetter, Feldstein, and Newcomb). Many of these studies contain excellent bibliographies. The list is far from exhaustive, but it is fairly representative, and offers ample suggestions for anyone interested in reading further.

There are two very important studies in the field from which the methodology of this study was directly borrowed--the studies of Lippitt (12, 13) and of Lippitt and White (11). Both of these studies are concerned with
the effect of certain defined atmospheres upon group life, and were carried on under conditions of controlled observation by which it was possible to secure information concerning the life of the group as well as of its individual members. These studies will be referred to from time to time in the discussion of this problem.

CHAPTER III
HISTORY OF THE EXPERIMENT

A discussion of what might be called the history of this experiment may furnish at least a partial explanation of how and why the experiment reached the final form which is presented here. As it was first conceived, it was to be a study of a majority-minority cleavage within a group, the majority and minority being the larger and smaller of two subgroups into which the group was divided. It was arbitrarily decided that the majority should be privileged and that the minority should be discriminated against.

The experiment was set up in the fall of 1938, after the experimenter had spent a period observing in Girl Scout groups and conducting a recreational group for children for the experience. Prior to this the experimenter had tried to secure a group of children which contained two subgroups, one of which was definitely underprivileged relative to the other, for the purpose of studying and possibly of counteracting the factors which were operating
in that particular case. This did not prove feasible, and it soon became clear that if a group which was divided into subgroups was going to be studied, it would have to be created first. So while the main goal remained the study of a group containing an underprivileged minority and a relatively privileged majority, a preliminary goal, that of the experimental creation of a group containing such a structure, had to be reached first.

It was decided to start from scratch and build the cleavage into a previously homogeneous group. Two marionette clubs were organized with volunteers from two of the local public schools. The club members were selected from the girls of the fifth grade who wanted to join in such an activity. Since the number of volunteers was larger than could possibly be accommodated, some selection was possible. This selection was made so that the two clubs would be as nearly alike as possible in respect to the social relationship which existed among the members. In order to secure the necessary information concerning this social relationship, each girl who had volunteered was asked to name in order three girls she would like to have in the marionette club with her and three girls whom she would prefer not to have in the club with her. On the basis of this information a sociogram (14) was constructed showing the network of interpersonal relations. From the information revealed in the sociograms of the two fifth grades, nine girls were selected from each grade so that the
two clubs were as similar as possible in social structure: i.e., roughly speaking, each group contained the same number of popular and unpopular girls, and the preferences of these girls for one another as club members were more or less alike in the two groups. The groups from which the club members were chosen were too small to allow the matching of individuals on intelligence, or the like.

The girls were ten and eleven years old with the exception of one girl, who was twelve. The members of each group came from approximately the same socio-economic level, although there was a difference in this respect between the two schools - the fathers of the girls in one group were occupied in unskilled or semiskilled jobs, while the fathers of the other group were in white collar jobs. Judging from school grades there were no outstanding differences in intelligence; all of the girls seemed to be about average.

The club meetings took place in one end of a basement in East Hall at the University of Iowa. This end was partitioned off so that about two-thirds of it was used by the members of the club as a club room and the other third was used for seating observers and an occasional visitor. The room was divided by means of a row of tables behind which the observers sat. A wire netting was stretched from the tables to the ceiling of the room. The observers were quite visible to the members of the club who were told they were people interested in watching the preparation of a marionette show. The girls did not object to their presence and rapidly grew accustomed to them.
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Each marionette club, one of which was utilized as an experimental group and one as a control group, met once a week for about an hour under the leadership of the experimenter. Marionette heads and bodies had been made previously and two small stages constructed. The club members painted the heads, dressed the dolls, painted the stage and made sets for it—all the activities which are connected with the production of a marionette show. The members decided at the first meeting to have a play ready to present in their respective schools by Christmas time.

Each club was divided into a stage crew which contained three members, and a doll crew which contained six members. In the group which was designated as the experimental group, the task of working on the stage was represented as being less attractive than the task of working on the dolls. It was not such an "important" job. The girls who worked on the marionettes determined what kind of a stage setting they wanted for their dolls and were supposed to tell the stage crew what to do. The object was to create a subordinate minority by giving them a less desirable task and, by making them dependent on the majority for the course of their work, to destroy any autonomy or creative interest which might naturally develop in connection with the task and make it as desirable as working on the marionettes themselves.

The same division of labor was made in the control group but each task was given an equal value.
The members of these two subgroups - the stage crew and the doll crew - in each club were selected ostensibly by lot, but actually care was taken that girls in a similar position within the group (as judged by the sociograms) were members of the same subgroups in each club.

In the experimental group the leader was to set up and maintain the desired majority-minority group structure by giving more attention in the form of technical advice and general interest to the members of the subgroup who were working on the marionettes. She was to more or less ignore the minority and refer most of their suggestions to the majority for solution. This was a rather negative approach to the matter, but it was hoped that it, plus the original distinction in the value of the tasks, would produce the desired cleavage in the group, with the leader remaining a fairly neutral advisor. The general atmosphere of the group was free and easy with a general lack of constraint between the leader and the girls who were working on the marionettes.

In the control group the leader divided her time equally between the members of the two work groups. The same free atmosphere prevailed although this group was always much quieter and more restrained than was the experimental group.
Graduate students served as observers. The methods of observation will be only briefly discussed in connection with this first series of meetings as they were considerably revised later and will be explained in detail when the final set-up is discussed. The observations were taken on protocols which were marked off into five-inch intervals, each interval representing the observations of one minute. A clock which buzzed every minute synchronized the records of the various observers. Separate observations of each of the kinds listed below were taken for the majority and for the minority, with both observers taking the interactions between the members of the two sub-groups.*

a. Running account - an account of the activities which were going on in the subgroups and in the group as a whole were recorded in diary form.

b. Interactions - a record of all approaches and responses between members was taken in code. A classification of the approaches and responses into such categories as fact-minded, aggressive, ignoring and the like, was made at the time of observation.

c. Structure - the work and conversation subgroupings were taken by a checking system.

d. Conversation was recorded by three stenographers.

---

* This method of observation is practically identical with that used by Lippitt and White (11). Since the groups being observed were not like those of Lippitt and White, some changes were made so that the method was more suited to this particular kind of group experiment.
e. An individual running account on five girls was taken by five observers throughout an entire meeting. The girls were changed for each meeting.

The first series of club meetings ran for nine weeks in the fall, with the experimental group meeting nine times and the control group eight times. During this time there were a few brief periods when it seemed as if the experimental group might contain the embryo of an underprivileged minority, but the situation did not carry over from one meeting to the next, and at no time was the cleavage structure stable enough to be studied. Several factors were probably responsible for this initial lack of success, factors which seem very obvious now, but which were far from obvious at the time the experiment was first set up. The discoveries of the cause of this lack of success were positive discoveries in their way, and were later utilized to good advantage.

a. The high interest value of both tasks coupled with the desire to present the play by Christmas kept the girls so involved in their actual activity that they never stopped to define any relationship among themselves, or even to recognize more than momentarily that the task of one subgroup was not supposed to be as important as that of the other.

b. There seems to be reason to doubt that mere objective distinction in the "importance" of a task is sufficient to cause one subgroup to feel privileged and another underprivileged in a situation where both tasks are so attractive. It was never possible to build up the
degree of dependence of the minority on the majority which had been planned.

c. The free, democratic, and almost laissez-faire atmosphere which existed between the leader and the club members made the leader an object of such great attention that the girls vied with one another for her favor rather than striving for status among themselves. The leader never succeeded in withdrawing from the situation to any degree at all.

d. The very short time, less than an hour a week, during which the girls were together in the club situation in comparison with the time which they spent together in school and play, made it difficult to set up a situation in the club which was not negated by relationships outside of the club by the time of the next meeting.

During January the girls in the two clubs practiced on their marionette shows, which they had not succeeded in getting ready for production by Christmas. It was during this period that two of the girls dropped out of the control club and were replaced by two other girls who wished to join and who were desired by the other members. The position of the new girls in the school situation was not unlike that of the two girls who resigned except that one of the new girls was the most popular girl in the fifth grade while the girl who resigned had been merely one of the most popular. At the end of the month a play was given at each of
the schools with most of the student body attending. Both plays were a big success and all the girls wished to continue the club in the spring.

A period of six weeks elapsed and it was the middle of March before the clubs started again. During this interval a personal interview was had with each girl to determine her attitude about the club and about the different members in it. The methods of procedure and observation were also considerably changed at this time.

One of the most important changes which was made was a change in the conception of the function of the leader. When the possible reasons for the failure of the first set-up to produce a majority-minority cleavage were discussed, one of the reasons mentioned was the atmosphere of freedom which existed between the girls and the leader. This atmosphere made the girls vie for her favor and made the whole situation so uncontrolled that it was not possible, even after a foundation was laid, to get the club group to divide into two subgroups of unequal status. By this time it was apparent that the leader was the key to the situation and must take a more active part in the actual inculcation of the majority-minority ideology: i.e., must actively favor one subgroup and discriminate against the other, at the same time creating tension in the group to the degree which seemed most to favor the existence of a cleavage within that group. In this way the leader assumed the key position.
and the experiment automatically became a study of the results of discrimination by the leader on the relationship between the girls who were members of the discriminated against subgroup and the girls who were members of the favored subgroup. While this discovery of the importance of the leader in securing the group cleavage did not materially change the study it somewhat shifted its emphasis.

A man graduate student became the leader of the group instead of the experimenter. He followed a definite policy of discrimination. He created a sharp enough division in the group and established the subgroup belongingness of each girl so that any members of the group or any observer could tell to which subgroup a girl belonged. This separation was secured in several ways:

a. The members of the two subgroups wore different kinds of aprons

b. During the first part of the club meetings the members of the two subgroups performed with the dolls separately while the members of the other subgroup watched, and vice versa

c. During the latter part of the meeting the members of the two subgroups sat around different tables as they worked on their marionette heads.

In the second place, the leader adopted a critical attitude toward the minority and openly favored the majority. He urged the favored majority to criticize the minority and to direct their work. The leader was helpful and friendly with the members of the favored group
after a brief initial period of autocracy to establish his position. He remained authoritative and derogatory in his relationship with the discriminated against minority.

The club project was kept practically the same because it was the activity which the club members preferred. But this time the girls were to make marionettes completely beginning with papier-mâché heads rather than completing semi-made dolls. The subject of the play was a circus, and each girl made a circus character. The meeting period was divided with the first part spent practicing with the old marionettes and the second part working on the heads for the new marionettes. The leader was absent for about ten minutes during the last part of the period.

The time of the meetings was kept the same because it was impossible to get the groups together at any other time or more frequently.

The members of the club were the same with the exception of the changes which were mentioned as having taken place in January, and two other changes which were made in the experimental group.

After three meetings of each club there was little or no sign that the minority felt discriminated against or that the majority felt particularly favored. The difficulty seemed to be the same as the one which had been encountered previously: in one short hour a week it was difficult to break down the attitudes which the
members had previously developed toward one another in the play and school group during the week. The role of each girl in relation to the others was too firmly established to be easily changed. Although it is possible that a majority-minority structure might have been secured eventually working along this line (and the leader firmly believed it was possible), nevertheless, time was at a premium and it was decided to take more drastic action.

One possibility presented itself, and even though it meant abandoning the original desire to create the cleavage in a previously homogeneous group, it seemed worth trying. The two club groups were combined in such a way that each contained six of its original members and three members of the other club. This eliminated the contacts between the members of the two subgroups which took place outside the club situation. Only one of these clubs continued - the club containing six members of the control group and three members of the experimental group - and it is this club which will be reported on in this paper.

CHAPTER IV
GENERAL SET-UP OF THE EXPERIMENT

Subjects

The choice of subjects has been explained in the preceding chapter. All of the girls in the fifth grade of two of the local public schools were interviewed
in a body. They were told that marionette clubs were going to be organized and asked if they would like to join. The girls who volunteered were asked to write down the names of three other girls whom they would like to have in the club with them and the names of three girls they would rather not have in the club with them. The information thus received was set up in the form of a sociogram and two groups of nine girls each were chosen, one from each of the schools. About half the girls who volunteered were selected. The two clubs were as nearly as possible alike in the interpersonal relations which were revealed by the sociograms: i.e., each club contained several girls who had been very popular in the voting, and one rejected girl.

Several changes were made in the membership of the two clubs when they were reorganized for the first time during the latter part of March. The structure of each of the two clubs at this time is shown in the sociograms which follow. The information on which they are based was secured by personal interview several weeks before the clubs began their second session. The girls were asked, among other things, which three of the other members they would prefer to have in the club with them, and it is this information which is charted. After about three weeks of the second session the clubs were recombined so that each group contained six of its original members and three members of the other club. One group was discontinued. The three girls who were transferred from the experimental group are indicated in the sociograms which follow by blue circles.
SOCIOGRAM I

SOCIOGRAM OF THE CONTROL GROUP BASED ON GIRLS' PREFERENCES FOR EACH OTHER AS CLUB MEMBERS

Each circle represents a girl - the blue circles the girls who remained in the club throughout the second session, and the red, the girls who were transferred to the other group.

The red lines indicate a choice and the number on the line the number of the choice: 1, first choice; 2, second, etc. (A ranking of 2.5, for example, indicates that the girl had made a first choice and two second choices, which have been ranked 1, 2.5, 2.5). The blue line indicates that a choice was not returned.

*This girl was not a member of the final club, but was replaced by L.*
SOCIOGRAM II

SOCIOGRAM OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BASED ON GIRLS’ PREFERENCES FOR EACH OTHER AS CLUB MEMBERS

Each circle represents a girl - the blue circles the girls who remained in the club throughout the second session, and the red, the girls who were transferred to the other group.

The red lines indicate a choice and the number on the line the number of the choice: 1, first choice; 2, second, etc. (A ranking of 2.5, for example, indicates that the girl had made a first choice and two second choices, which have been ranked 1, 2.5, 2.5). The blue line indicates that a choice was not returned.
In the sociogram of the control group the girls who remained are also indicated by blue circles so that the girls who made up the membership of this club are indicated in both sociograms by blue circles. Attention is called to the fact that the three girls who were transferred were well accepted in their own group and had in no sense been discriminated against in previous meetings. The same was true of the three girls whose places they took in the new group which they entered.

The group studied for the effect of leader discrimination on the relationship between the two subgroups consisted of the girls F, M, L, T, P, B from one school and G, rP, and rB from the other school. The girls were now in the latter part of the fifth grade or the early part of the sixth grade in their respective schools. They were ten, eleven, or twelve years old, with the majority of them eleven.

**Arrangement of the Meetings**

The club meetings were divided into two periods. In the first part of the period the girls took turns giving skits with the marionettes. Several of the girls would put on a show together while the rest sat around the small stage in a semi-circle and watched the performance. The members of the minority always gave a skit together or watched together. The girls then rearranged the room and during the latter part of the period sat around tables and worked on papier-mache heads for new marionettes. The favored majority sat around one table and the discriminated
against minority sat around another and much smaller one. During this period the leader was absent from the room for an interval of time.

The general course of each meeting was something like this: The girls of the favored majority arrived first (their school let out ten minutes earlier than the other school). The leader, who had been waiting, went out to meet them and talked to them as they put on their aprons outside the club room. The aprons were marked with their initials which enabled them to be quickly identified by the observers. The leader returned to the club room with the girls. Part of the girls took marionettes and started a skit on the stage while the rest of them sat around and watched quietly. The other three members soon arrived and the meeting got under way in earnest.

When the skit in progress was finished, two or three girls from the other subgroup, in this case the minority, were called on to put on a skit. The leader reminded the watchers that they would be expected to offer suggestions and criticism when the play was finished. After this several more girls gave a skit and this time the leader suggested what it should be about. The members of each subgroup usually performed with the marionettes several times during each meeting.

Then the leader said that that was enough practice. The girls immediately got to work, pushed the stage back and pulled several long tables into position. Each girl collected the material on which she was working and
sat around one table and the members of the discriminated against minority sat around a much smaller table.

The leader gave help and offered suggestions to the various girls who needed it, spending most of his time with the majority and being very friendly with them. When everything was going smoothly, he left the room telling the members of the minority that if they needed any assistance the members of the other subgroup would give it to them, and telling the members of the majority to keep their eyes on the other girls. He also appointed a majority member as leader in his absence. In ten or fifteen minutes the leader returned and resumed his role of guidance. Shortly afterwards the meeting was adjourned.

The meeting actually averaged about an hour in length, but the observations have been analyzed only from the time when at least two members of the smaller group were present until the time when the leader told the members to start getting ready to leave.

The records of the experiment cover seven meetings of the club. One of these meetings, the sixth, is omitted from the quantitative results because it was not conducted along the lines just mentioned, but was inserted as a test situation. However, the results of it will be discussed briefly. The seventh meeting was also a test situation and so is considered separately in the results, but its organization was similar to the first five meetings and so a
comparison with them is possible. In the seventh meeting a new leader went into the group who discriminated against the previously favored majority and favored the previously discriminated against minority. The first meeting of this series was on April 17, 1939, and the last meeting on May 26. The meetings were on Monday afternoon with the exception of the last meeting which was on Friday.

A table showing the division of the time between and within the meetings is given below.

TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Total time</th>
<th>1st Part</th>
<th>Time spent performing</th>
<th>2nd Part</th>
<th>Time spent working on heads</th>
<th>Time leader out during 2nd part</th>
<th>Members present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td><em>M: M, P, T</em>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**m: rB, G, rP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>53'</td>
<td>13'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>13'</td>
<td>M: B, F, M, L, P, T</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m: rB, G, rP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>29'</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>22'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>M: B, F, L, M, P, T</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m: rB, G, rP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>45'</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>28'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>M: B, L, M, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m: rB, G, rP, T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>43'</td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>13'</td>
<td>M: E, F, L, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m: rB, G, rP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>195'</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>140'</td>
<td>53'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average membership M: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average membership m: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>47'</td>
<td>44'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td></td>
<td>M: B, F, L, M, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m: rB, rG, P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>242'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Majority
**Minority
***Changed from Majority to minority during third meeting.
Methods of Observation

It was felt that the methods of observation which had been employed in the fall session were not as well oriented to the purpose of the experiment and as economical of time and effort as they should have been. A good deal of waste was involved in having separate observers for the minority and for the majority. In addition they were both apt to miss the significance of the total group situation and its effect on the particular individual or subgroup which they happened to be observing. At the same time there were too many unnecessary duplications. It seemed probable that one observer could take down the whole group activity in the form of a diary account more effectively than he could part of it, so that change was made in the form of observation.

In the final form of the experiment the actual groupings of the girls were imposed by the leader most of the time, and, due to the nature of the activity, there would probably be very little spontaneous regrouping at any time. If this were the case (as it turned out to be), one observer could easily take group structure and some other kind of observation at the same time. So the person who took structure also took as much running account as was possible. As it finally turned out the group structure was so static and there was so little spontaneous movement that this material was not used at all. This made two individuals observing the group as a whole, with one of them also taking the structure: i.e., the smaller subgroupings
within the group. This much duplication seemed to be a good thing and it later served as a basis for measuring the reliability of all the observers.

Due to the new importance of the leader in this set-up, one observer, a stenographer, was assigned to devote her entire attention to the leader. She recorded verbatim all of his conversation and activities and all of the conversation of the girls which was directed to him. She also took enough running account to keep her account of the leader coordinated with the group running accounts.

Another stenographer took an account of the conversation of individual girls in units of ten minutes. She took the conversation of about five girls each meeting and supplemented her record with as much of the conversation of the other girls as she was able to secure.

Since more information about the individual girls was desired than that which was given by a group account, it was decided to record part of the activity of each girl during every meeting, rather than all of the activity of only several girls during an entire meeting, as had been done in the earlier meetings of the experiment. More samples of the girl's behavior in a greater variety of situations was secured in this way. These records were used in conjunction with the group running accounts and not separately. Three observers were assigned to individual running accounts. They recorded all the activities of
one girl including her approaches to other girls and those girls' responses to her, as well as her responses to the approaches of other girls. Each observer observed three girls, one at a time, in rotation for three minutes each during each meeting. This furnished a minimum amount of direct observation of each girl of a third of the total time of each meeting. The overlap in observations which occurred with the absence of a member and sometimes through a mistake of the observers was used to calculate the reliability of the observers. At the beginning of the observations these observers were furnished with a list of the kinds of behavior which were apt to occur and with which the experiment was particularly concerned. However, the list was merely suggestive and the observations were not limited to the types of behavior suggested on it. Emphasis was placed on the fact that they were to note not merely the attitude of the particular girl they were observing toward the rest of the members of the group, but also the attitude of the rest of the members toward her.

In addition to these observations the experimenter took running notes of the course of the experiment during each meeting noting possibilities for the improvement of the techniques, success of various measures, etc.

The observations were taken on protocols which were marked off for intervals of one minute of observation. The observers were synchronized every minute by the buzzing of a clock.
In summary the methods of observation consisted of:

a. Two observers taking a running account of the activity of the whole group. One of them also took the group structure.

b. One stenographer taking verbatim all conversation of the leader with the girls and of the girls with the leader. She also took a few comments which characterized the situation in which the conversation took place.

c. Another stenographer taking ten minute samples of the conversation of the individual girls.

d. Three observers taking three minute samples of the activity of the individual girls.

A sample of the methods of observation is given.

GROUP RUNNING ACCOUNT I

19' rB and G take dolls at leader's (A's) demand. T is told to go up with them. T asks which doll and leader tells her she ought to know.

20' rB has trouble with doll. Takes them a while to get started. rF watches loyally. Playlet goes on in the same vein.

GROUP RUNNING ACCOUNT II

19' T goes up with rB and G. Things very slow in getting started. Great silence. Leader looking at majority and grinning.

20' M and P whispering criticism. A has them say it out loud. Laughter and derogatory attitude evident. Leader has them with him now.

CONVERSATION OF LEADER

19' G and rB go up.
A-T Just to make things even, T, you get the other doll and go up.
T-A Which one?
A-T Well, which ever one the other one was.

20' Girls spend time getting dolls untangled. A doesn't watch the play. Just listens and grins and looks at the majority. M whispers a comment to P.
A-M I agree with you. Say it out loud.
| 21' | T still aggressive. Has learned something about subtlety but not much. Laughter on part of majority when the dog's bark is futile. M says wolf is going in circle. |
| 22' | Acting not so bad in climax. Really objectively superior. Leader asks for vote. |
| 22' | M-A He sort of circles through the air (one of the dolls) with the dog. A-M Take a vote now. Do you vote to continue? M-A Let's see how it ends up. |
ATTITUDE OF THE LEADER TOWARD THE MAJORITY AND TOWARD THE MINORITY

During Meetings I through V

The function of the leader was originally conceived as the production of the majority-minority cleavage within the club group by discriminating between the members of the two subgroups. Since in the final experiments the members were strangers to one another at the beginning, the group contained a cleavage from the very beginning which was not the product of the leader's discrimination. It is unlikely that this natural cleavage due to the strangeness of the girls would have been sufficient to produce a group structure in which one of the subgroups was of devaluated status without any assistance from the adult leader. There is no material available concerning the relationship between the two subgroups before the discriminatory leadership policy was initiated. However, it has been noted that the members of the subgroup, who were later discriminated against, were not discriminated against in their own original subgroups.

It seems fair to say that whatever spontaneous cleavage existed in the group at first was stabilized and strengthened by the attitude of the leader so that the members of the two subgroups grew to know one another as members of inferior and superior subgroups rather than as individuals.

The policy of the leader consisted of several parts. He set up and maintained a separation between the two
subgroups by telling the various girls where they were to sit, whom they were to sit with, etc. During the performance with the marionettes, he selected the members who were to be in the skit and sometimes what parts they were to take. The minority always performed together, and while some of the majority were performing, sat apart from the remainder of the majority. After a performance was over the leader called for criticism from those who had been watching and often offered a few criticisms himself. He was especially careful to ask the majority to criticize the work of the minority. He was apt to do this after he himself had implied that he did not think that the performance was very good. Generally speaking the leader was matter of fact, friendly, and helpful in his approach to the members of the majority and indifferent, autocratic, and sometimes derogatory in his attitude toward the minority.

The leader would give advice and help the girls who needed it while they were working on the marionette heads. He spent most of his time at the table around which the members of the favored majority worked and talked and worked with them more than with the members of the other subgroup. His contacts with the members of the minority were short and of a critical nature.

This was the general policy which was followed by the leader. The analysis of his conversation and behavior as it was taken from the group running accounts and from the
record of the observer who took his conversation shows quite clearly what his actual attitude and behavior toward the members of the two subgroups were. The behavior, consisting mostly of conversation, was classified according to the scheme presented below. At the same time the behavior of the girls in response to the leader was noted.

a. Objectives and matter of fact attitude toward members or subgroup
   1. Attitude showing itself in directions, suggestions, information pertaining to the activity at hand given in an objective manner.
      "Why don't you take the blue apron out there, Pat?"
      "All right, I want you to notice the method of the doll's manipulation, manner of speech, things said, and the general plot."
      "I think you're practically ready. Just make the ears a little smaller and then you'll be ready."

   2. Requests for criticism - asking the members to express their opinion of the play which they have just seen presented. This is a type of matter of fact behavior but is considered separately.
      "Is that perfect? What do you think, Jane?"
      "All right, does everybody else feel that way? Anybody else feel differently?"

b. Friendly attitude toward members or subgroup.
   1. Friendly comment - not directly related to work, laughing, joking, etc.
      "Do you think you'll recognize it next time?"
      Laughing with the girl.
      "Say, come around here where you can really see."

c. Discriminating attitude toward members or subgroup indicated in an indirect fashion
   1. Favorable comparison with the other subgroup. A statement in which it is implied that the subgroup
being addressed has done or can do something better than the other subgroup, or is in some way superior to it.

2. **Unfavorable comparison with the other subgroup**

"...when you're through over here and you're ready, go over there and ask one of them to OK it, and if it's all right, they'll tell you what to do next."

"Now that's the way it should be done, and not like that." (Pointing out the way other subgroup is doing it.)

3. **Commands which imply a criticism of the previous behavior of the girl or subgroup.**

"Won't you listen, Jane, so you'll know what's going to happen."

"That isn't the apron I told you to wear. Out there you'll find one with a red B on it."

"I told you not to do that until I said so."

4. **Jeering or laughing at.** Leader laughs at play or activity, or looks at the other girls knowingly when the members of the subgroup are doing something.

5. **Refusal to comply with a girl's request for information and sending her to some other girl to secure it.**

6. **Ignoring or disregarding**

   From record: Leader ignores her criticism and she does not say anything else.

d. **Discriminating attitude toward members or subgroup directly indicated**

1. **Favorable criticism or compliment of the work or activity at hand**

   "Yes, that's very nice."

   "I like that."

   "That's the way she should walk, sort of prissy like."

2. **Unfavorable criticism or disparaging remarks**

   "You're not very far along over here."
"Well, stop right there and start getting some eyebrows on. It can't be much worse."

"You don't have to sit like mummies - you're so quiet."

No statement was classified if the three observers disagreed as to its content. The accuracy with which one classifier reclassified 179 statements was 91%. The accuracy with which 315 statements were classified by two individuals was 87%. This calculation was made by dividing the total number of statements classified by both individuals into the number which the two had alike.

The results of the analysis are shown in the accompanying tables and charts. (Charts I and II and Table II). The results are presented for the first three meetings, the fourth and fifth meeting, and the seventh meeting separately. The total is also given for the first five meetings. The results were analyzed in this fashion so that it might be possible to determine any change which took place in the course of the club life. The seventh meeting is the test situation in which a visitor reversed the policy of the leader. It is kept separate for this reason. All of the analyses are divided in this manner. Information concerning the majority and the minority is given separately. It is also recorded whether the leader's comment was directed to the subgroup as a whole or to an individual member of it.*

* A total of 16 statements were addressed to the group as a whole. They were all matter of fact and are not included in the analysis.
### TABLE II - LEADER'S BEHAVIOR TOWARD MEMBERS

#### Favored Majority and Discriminated against Minority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meetings I, II, III</th>
<th>Meeting IV, V</th>
<th>Meeting I through V</th>
<th>Meeting VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directions, instructions, etc.</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requests for criticism</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly Joking</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorable criticism</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfavorable comparison with other subgroup</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorable comparison with other subgroup</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refusal to comply</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ignoring, disregarding</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making fun of, jeering</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfavorable criticism</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commands implying criticism of previous behavior</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discriminated against majority and favored minority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meeting I through V</th>
<th>Meeting VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directions, instructions, etc.</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requests for criticism</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly Joking</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorable criticism</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfavorable comparison with other subgroup</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorable comparison with other subgroup</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refusal to comply</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ignoring, disregarding</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making fun of, jeering</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfavorable criticism</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commands implying criticism of previous behavior</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of Communications to Individual Member of Subgroups
**Subgroup as Whole
*** I plus G = % of total items in each classification.
CHART I

BEHAVIOR OF LEADER TOWARD MAJORITY AND TOWARD MINORITY

Meetings I through V (193 minutes) — Favoring Majority
Discriminated Against Minority
63.4% of Total Volume of Leader’s Conversation Directed To Majority
36.6% of Total Volume of Leader’s Conversation Directed To Minority

Legend: Left Column Majority - Right Column Minority

---

Meeting VI (47 minutes) — Favoring Minority
Discriminated Against Majority
65.7% of Visit's Conversation Directed To Majority
34.3% of Visit’s Conversation Directed To Minority

Legend: Left Column Majority - Right Column Minority

---

Classifications of Behavior:
- Directions, Instructions, etc.
- Requests for Criticism
- Criticism of Other Sub-Groups
- Criticism of Previous Behavior
- Favorable Comparison of Other Sub-Groups
- Unfavorable Comparison with Other Sub-Groups
- Aggressive, Insulting
- Arrogant, Teasing
- Noting Fail or, Scoring At
- Unfavorable Criticism
- Favorable Criticism
CHART II

BEHAVIOR OF LEADER TOWARD MAJORITY AND MINORITY: DEVELOPMENT

Meetings I, II and III (107 minutes)
Legend: Left Columns: Majority - Right Columns: Minority

Meetings IV and V (88 minutes)

Classification of Behavior:
- Directions, etc.
- Appraisals of Other Group
- Friendly,亲切
- Commanding/Criticizing
- Unfavorable Comparison With Other Sub-groups
- Favorable Comparison With Other Sub-groups
- Ignoring
- Refusal to Comply
- Making Fun Of
- Unfavorable Criticism
- Favorable Criticism
The results presented in the table are given in the percent of the total number of items which fall in each category as well as the actual number of items. The charts are based on the percentages, so that direct comparison between the two subgroups is possible.

The leader actually gave more of his attention to the favored majority than to the discriminated against minority. 63.4% of his conversation was directed to the majority and the remainder to the minority. The content of his conversation with the two subgroups also shows very clearly his different attitude toward the two. 69% of his conversation with the majority was of a matter of fact nature and this figure becomes much higher when the category "requests for criticism" is added to it. Only 43% of his conversation to the minority was of this nature plus 4.1% in the category "asking for criticism." But the difference really shows up in the nature of the conversation to the two subgroups which was not matter of fact. The leader's behavior toward the favored subgroup falls almost entirely in the categories classified as friendly, joking, favorable criticism, or implications of the superiority of the majority over the minority. The 52.9% of the conversation directed to the minority which was not matter of fact falls into the following categories: commands implying criticism of previous behavior; unfavorable criticism or disparaging remarks; making fun of or jeering at; and implications of the inferiority of the minority compared with the majority.
The difference between the leader's treatment of the two subgroups is statistically significant according to the Chi-square method.

The discriminating behavior of the leader toward the two subgroups shifted almost not at all from the first three meetings to the last two. The proportion of his conversation to the two subgroups remained practically the same and the distribution of the conversation into matter of fact, favorable and unfavorable, produces approximately the same result for each series. The only obvious difference which occurred is a shift in the leader's general method of discriminating against the minority. During the first three meetings 26.9% of his conversation to the minority consisted of unfriendly criticism or disparaging remarks; this was true of only 7% of the conversation during the last two meetings. On the other hand the number of commands implying criticism of previous behavior rose from 16.7% to 25.6%. The only other noticeable increase was in the favorable criticism paid to the majority which rose from 2.9% to 10% of the total conversation.

The difference in the attitude of the leader toward the two subgroups was summed up in yet another way. On the basis of the conversation classification which has already been presented, the categories were classified into those showing a matter of fact attitude, and approving attitude, and a disapproving attitude.
a. Matter of fact comments and requests for criticism were given a value of plus 1.

b. Favorable comments, implications of the superior status of one's own subgroup, and friendly or joking comments were given a positive value of two.

c. Unfavorable comments, commands, jeering at, and implications of the inferiority of one's own subgroup were considered as denoting a disapproving attitude and were given a negative value of two.

The results of this classification are presented in Chart III for several of the meetings. The charts are in cumulative form and represent the attitude of the leader minute by minute throughout the meeting. In presenting the cumulative chart it is not assumed that the effect on the members will necessarily be cumulative. It merely seemed to be a good method of depicting the consistency with which the leader maintained his attitude of discrimination.

A brief summary may be helpful before the last meeting in which the leader was changed and the leader policy toward the two subgroups was reversed is considered. During the first five meetings the leader has been seen to have consistently maintained an attitude which was favorable toward the majority and unfavorable toward the minority. He gave less attention to the minority in the form of information and advice. A larger percent of the time which he gave to the minority was spent in contrasting them unfavorably with the majority or in negatively criticizing their work.
CHART III

LEADER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MAJORITY AND MINORITY:
MINUTE BY MINUTE

1 Step - Matter Of Fact Remarks
2 Steps - Favorable Remarks
3 Steps - Unfavorable Remarks
---- Majority
----- Minority
------- Leader Out Of Room

Meeting I

Meeting III

Meeting IV

Minutes
During Meeting VII

During the seventh meeting the leader was with the members of the majority for a few minutes at the first of the period. He left the minute the members of the minority began to arrive. The majority's skit was in full swing with all of the members participating and the minority members watching when the visitor, a member of the Child Welfare Staff, arrived. He sat down quietly and watched the performance for several minutes and then asked the girls to gather round him as he had something to tell them. He told them that at the end of the club meetings several dolls were going to be given to the school group, or to the girls in the school groups, which did the best work. He was going to make the selections and would appreciate any help which the girls might give him. Then he instructed the members of the majority to continue with their play.

The visitor moved over and sat by the minority consulting with them and asking them frequent questions. He criticized the majority's play and urged the minority to do likewise. When the minority gave their skit, the visitor praised it and ignored or disagreed with the criticisms which were offered by the majority.

A qualitative analysis of the visitor's conversation during this meeting is presented in Charts I and III and Table II, where it can be compared with the previous attitude of the leader.
There is not enough material present in the seventh meeting to make a detailed comparison of it with the first five meetings possible. However, there is a statistically significant difference between the attitude of the leader toward the majority and toward the minority in the first five meetings and in the seventh meeting. The visitor still paid more attention to the majority than to the minority, which can probably be accounted for by the fact that the majority members were used to more attention and continued to demand it. However, the chart shows the fact that 34.1% of the visitor's comments to the majority were in the nature of unfriendly criticism or disparaging remarks while they had received none at all from the leader and that 30.4% of his comments to the minority were favorable criticisms while only .8% of the comments of the leader had been of such a nature.

The reversal of this discrimination is shown quite dramatically in the cumulative chart.

CHAPTER VI

ATTITUDE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE TWO SUBGROUPS TOWARD THE LEADER

During Meetings I through V

How did the members of the two subgroups respond to this discriminating treatment on the part of the leader?
What was their attitude toward them?

In order to determine the attitude and behavior of the members of the two subgroups, one of the observation records was analyzed from the point of view of the individual group members. The classification into which the behavior of the members was analyzed is given below.

1. Matter of fact requests for directions or information or an objective response to directions or suggestions.

"Is this too much for the eye?"
"Are these too big?"
"Do you want me to go out and get water?"

2. Friendly comment not specifically involving the work at hand.

"This is certainly fun."
"Do you think we will be able to put on a play this time?"

3. Criticism of the other subgroup or of individual members of the other subgroup - indicates whether it is favorable or unfavorable. This is criticism which is either spontaneous or which is given in direct response to a request of the leader for criticism.

"Well, I think it's pretty good so far."
"They're either up in the air or they're flat on the ground, and marionettes don't do that."
"The conversation's kind of short. One would say something and then it would stop."

4. Bidding for attention - a statement injected into the conversation which seems to serve no practical purpose other than securing the attention of the leader. (This is a bit difficult to illustrate because of its close relation to the general situation.)
5. Response or request for directions in which the girl is unnecessarily meek or submissive, responding as if she feels herself inferior or incapable.

"RE finally gets up enough courage to ask A for a pencil."

"Asks a question in an inferior manner."

6. Resistant response - The girl resists a suggestion offered by the leader either by offering another suggestions or by refusal to comply with the suggestion.

After the leader has said that he doesn't like a particular piece of work, "I think they're doing all right."

Criticism from the leader, "Well, he's supposed to be sitting in a chair."

7. Ignoring behavior - the girl deliberately pays no attention to a suggestion or direction given by the leader.

All the material taken from the records concerning the behavior of the leader toward the members and the members toward the leader (as well as among the members of the club, which will be discussed later) was classified either by two different individuals or by the same individual twice. On reclassification by the same individual, 92% agreement with the first classification was secured; when the material was classified by a second individual, 87% agreement with the first individual resulted.

The table and charts which show the reaction of the girls to the leader (Table III and Charts IV and V) are presented in the same way as was the information on the behavior of the leader. In the table the results are stated in the actual number of interactions and in the percent of the whole which is contained in each classification, and in the chart they are stated in the form of percents.
The material is divided into Meetings I, II, III, Meetings IV and V, Meeting VII, and the total for Meetings I through V.

The members of the majority had more communication with the leader than did the members of the minority. This is probably in response to the fact that the leader gave more attention to the favored majority than to the discriminated against minority. Of the total volume of conversation directed to the leader, 69.4% of it came from the majority and only 30.6% from the minority.

When the difference* in the membership between the two subgroups is taken into account, the average member of the majority had 34 contacts with the leader during the first five meetings, and the average member of the minority, 29 contacts.

58.8% of the conversation of the majority to the leader was matter of fact, including requests of the members for suggestions, help, etc., in connection with the work in progress. They showed more attention getting behavior and made more friendly remarks which were not connected with the work at hand than did the members of the minority. 11.8% of the majority's remarks to the leader were in the nature of unfavorable criticism of the minority, while only 2.2% of their conversation consisted of favorable remarks about them.

*In the middle of the third meeting one member, T, was transferred from the majority to the minority, making the membership of the majority five and of the minority four, when all were present. Actually the majority averaged about four members at each meeting and the minority, three.
TABLE III - ATTITUDE OF THE MEMBERS TOWARD THE LEADER

Favored Majority and Discriminated against Minority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meetings I, II, III</th>
<th>Meetings IV, V</th>
<th>Meetings I through V</th>
<th>Meeting VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>m No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Matter of fact comments</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Friendly comments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (a) Favorable criticism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Unfavorable criticism of other subgroup</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bidding for attention</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Submissive attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Resistant response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per average member</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


CHART V

GIRLS BEHAVIOR TOWARD THE LEADER: TOTAL

Meetings I through X (195 minutes) = Favored Majority
Discriminated Against Minority
34 Communications From Average Majority Member To Leader
20 Communications From Average Minority Member To Leader

Legend: Left Columns Majority - Right Columns Minority

Meeting XI (47 minutes) = Favored Minority
Discriminated Against Majority
9 Communications From Average Majority Member To Leader
3.7 Communications From Average Minority Member To Leader

Classification Of Behavior

- Matter-Of-Fact Requests For Cooperation, From
  Members Of Majority To Leader
- Specifically Demanding Work
  From Other Sub-Group
- Favorable Criticism Of
  Other Sub-Group
- Unfavorable Criticism Of
  Other Sub-Group
- Looking For Attention
- Conversation In Which Girl
  Shows Excessive Submissive Attitude
- Active Response
- No Response To Leader
It is interesting to note that practically all of the criticism, either favorable or unfavorable, was made by the members of one subgroup about the other subgroup directly to the leader, and not to the members of the subgroup which was receiving the criticism. This seems to suggest that the primary purpose of the criticism was to secure the approval of the leader rather than to serve as a means of control over the other subgroup. But on the other hand, the criticisms were usually requested by the leader, and the comments of the members may have been addressed to him more or less in his capacity as chairman of the club meetings. To this extent the favored majority had absorbed the leader's unfavorable attitude toward the minority.

On the other hand, 5% of the conversation of the minority involved criticisms favorable to the majority and 3.3% unfavorable. This is scarcely a difference at all. 45% of their conversation was matter of fact and objective and 16.7% of it showed an excessively submissive attitude. The minority also showed more of what could be called resistant responses; i.e., disagreeing, refusing to comply, or making no response at all when they obviously heard the leader's remark. 28.4% of their reactions to the leader were of this nature, where this was true of only 8.1% of the majority's reactions.

The chi-square method shows the reactions of the majority and minority to the leader to be significantly different in the respects which have been discussed above.
The difference between the reaction of the girls in the first three meetings and the last two shows somewhat of a shift in the direction of increased acceptance of the leader's attitude although this difference is statistically significant only for one of the subgroups, the favored majority, and not for the other. Nevertheless, it does show the influence of the leader taking effect on the members of the club as his attitude toward them becomes impaired on their attitudes toward each other. There was an increase in the amount of unfavorable criticism of the minority by the majority, from 6.5% to 22.7%. Favorable criticism of the majority by the minority increased from 0 to 11.2%. The sum total of resistant responses remained about the same for the minority, but more of them consisted of actual resistance in the form of refusals to comply, etc., than in merely lack of response. The minority members are not quite as submissive toward the leader at the end as they were in the beginning.

Summarizing, it was noted that the members of the two subgroups reacted toward the leader in general keeping with his attitude toward them. The majority had more contact with him; it was more of an objective friendly nature than was that of the minority, which was at the same time more resistant and more submissive. The majority made more unfavorable criticisms of the minority, who made a few more favorable than unfavorable remarks about them. The difference between the reactions of the subgroups to the leader was statistically significant.
During Meeting VII

When the visitor came into the club and openly favored the minority and disapproved of the activity of the majority, the members of both the majority and minority reacted to him differently than they had to their original leader. (The difference between the behavior of the members of the two subgroups toward the leader in the first five meetings as opposed to the seventh meeting is statistically significant). In the presence of the visitor negative criticism of the other subgroup increased greatly in both subgroups, almost tenfold in the minority. (See Table III and Chart IV). Favorable comments about the majority increased in the minority, but dropped to zero in the majority. The members of the majority showed considerable resistance to the suggestions of the visitor. This change of adult leader made a very sudden change in the attitude of the girls toward the leader and judging from the amount of criticism his policy set them more against each other than they had been previously. This was especially true of the previously favored subgroup, the majority, who seemed intent on preserving their superior status against the encroachments of the minority. However, this record covered only 47 minutes and while it may be indicative, it is probably a bit precipitous to attempt to draw any conclusions from it.
Analysis of Behavior

A general picture of the relationship existing among the girls was determined by a summary of the analyses of the individual girl's behavior. All of the observations contributed to this summary; group running accounts, account of the behavior of the leader, and the records of the three observers who took individual running accounts.

It was explained earlier that the reliability of the group running accountists and the observer of the leader was not secured statistically, but that the material was used only when the observations were in agreement. However, an effort was made to get a rather crude statistical reliability for the individual running accountists. In the records there were 109 minutes of duplication; i.e., cases where two of the observers took down the activity of the same members of the group. The behavior recorded in these duplicated minutes, read with the group running accounts, was classified according to the classification on which the analysis of the material was based and which is given below. In 90% of the duplicated records there was no disagreement between the two observers, although in many cases one of the records contained more material than did the other.

The same method of analysis by classification was employed with this material as was used in the analysis of the leader-girl relationship. It will be recalled that all
this type of analysis was done together and the reliability taken for it as a whole. (See page 46). The material was classified into the following categories:

a. Types of behavior showing an ascendant of aggressive attitude

1. Unsolicited suggestions or criticisms of another's work or activity
   Interrupts and tells G and RP what to do.
   Tells T that she shouldn't do that

2. Hostile or unfriendly remarks
   "It is not a nice house; it's an old dirty one."

3. Personal commands; i.e., commands made to show status or authority
   Tells T to help her. T refuses and she repeats her request.
   P calls and tells them to bring their work over to her.

4. Refusal to comply with a command or a suggestion.
   L refuses to go and get the water.

b. Types of behavior showing a submissive attitude

1. Asking for or accepting aid or suggestions in what seems to be an excessively submissive manner.
   Hesitant and shy in asking for help.
   Listens meekly while F tells her what to do.

2. Defensive alibis, comments, etc.
   Repetition of some conversation in which it was noted by the observer that the girl seemed to be on the defensive.
c. **Matter of fact attitude**

1. **Self or own group criticism**
   
   F says she thinks they should start another play because the one they're working on isn't good.

   Smiles and objectively criticizes what she is doing.

2. **Objective criticism of another**
   
   P criticizes the work matter of factly.

   Criticizes RB's work in friendly, objective manner.

3. **Fact minded requests, commands or suggestions which pertain to the activity at hand.**

   M makes a comment about the paper on which she is working. P gives an objective response and M resumes her work.

   L asks F to hand her the water.

d. **Friendly attitude**

1. **Interest in another's work**

   Asks T if she may see her head.

   Watches with interest as M wets the cloth.

2. **Friendly cooperative behavior; any kind of work in which two or more girls take part and which is carried on in a friendly spirit.**

   RB holds the buckram as F cuts, then smiles at her.

3. **Conversation not pertaining to work, talk of school, the movies, the Scouts, etc.**

   Cuts paper and talks to the group about one of the teachers.

   T says she knows one of the girls who is coming in.
4. Joking, horseplay

P and L are laughing and acting silly.

M and P exchange a laughing comment.

e. Conversation, the content of which is unknown. This is sometimes recorded as whispering and usually implies that the content could not be heard.

Interchange with M.

G leans over and says something to B.

It will be noted that this analysis and classification rests more on the overt actions of a girl plus whatever attitude the observers thought lay behind it than it does on conversation, which was not taken verbatim for the girls as it was for the leader. Any reported action of the girl was taken as a unit and classified.

In the analysis a distinction was made between activity which occurred when the leader was in the room and when he was not there. The material was not divided between the meetings as has previously been the case, but, due to the smallness of the figures, is presented for the first five meetings as a whole in table and chart form, and for the last meeting, where the figures are even smaller, only in the table. Again the information is presented in figures representing the actual number of interactions in a particular category, and in the percent which this figure represents of the total number of interactions.
Relationship among Members of the Same Subgroup

The members of both subgroups carried on considerably more conversation amongst themselves when the leader was absent than when he was present.

During the time the leader was absent from the room the average member of the majority had 27 communications with the other members of her own subgroup, while the average member of the minority had 19. When the leader was present the average majority member had 16 communications and the average minority member, 12. It is recalled that the leader was present 142 minutes and absent 53 minutes: i.e., he was present about 2.7 times as long as he was absent. When this is taken into consideration, the difference between the number of intra-subgroup interactions with the leader present and with the leader absent increases, with the average member of the majority having 73 communications when he is absent and 16 when he is present, and the average minority member, 51 when absent, and 12 when present. The ratio for the majority then is 73/16 or about 9/2 and that for the minority 51/12 or about 4/1.

The increase of intrasubgroup communication among the majority members is partially explainable on the grounds of preoccupation with the leader, when he was present, rather than with each other. On the other hand, it also undoubtedly indicates somewhat of a tension
release even for the majority because the sum total of the interactions of the majority both with the leader (34) and among themselves during his presence (16) does not equal their interaction among themselves during his absence (70).

That the minority members felt the pressure of the leader to a greater extent than did the members of the majority is indicated by the fact that they were much more quiet, having fewer interactions both amongst themselves and with the leader. The amount of increase in communication which occurred when the leader left the room seems to have been about the same for them as for the majority, but the minority still did not attain anything like the degree of intrasubgroup communication which was present in the majority. The problem of whether or not this may have been the result of individual differences rises here and cannot be completely answered by this story. It can only be said that two of the minority members were very talkative (one of them the more talkative member of either group) in the club during the free sessions, while the third was rather quiet. Since the minority members were never preoccupied with the leader to the extent that the majority members were, the increase in their interactions seems to be attributable to a release from the pressure which they felt during the presence of the leader.
The problem of communication will be discussed further when the material on intersubgroup relation is presented.

The qualitative analysis of the material is presented in Table IV and Chart VI.

It did not seem to make much difference in the content of the conversation of the favored majority whether the leader was present or absent. There were a few requests for help from each other when he was absent and more joking and horseplay, and rather surprisingly, less interest in each other's work and less cooperative behavior. However, this is in line with the work of Lippitt (14), who found that under autocracy the group became less work-minded in the absence of the leader. The attitudes displayed in conversation were spread over a wide range of possibilities by the proximity of the leader. The range was greater when the leader was absent than when he was present.

Fourteen types of behavior were noted in the majority when the leader was absent and only nine of them when the leader was present. The types of behavior which appeared in the leader's absence denoted aggressive or critical attitudes and in one case, a submissive attitude. This is the kind of behavior which would be expected to appear in a group which was furnishing its own leadership as this one was during the absence of the leader. When the leader was present, this is the kind of behavior which
## TABLE IV- RELATIONSHIP WITHIN SUBGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings I through V</th>
<th>Leader in</th>
<th>Leader out</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Meeting VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive Attitude:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Unsolicited suggestions or criticism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hostile or unfriendly remarks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal commands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Refusal to comply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ignoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submissive Attitude:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Submissive asking or receiving aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Defensive alibis, comments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matter of Fact Attitude:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-criticism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Objective criticism of another</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fact-minded requests</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly Attitude:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Interest in other's work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conversation not about work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Joking, horseplay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Content Unknown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number for average member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average number of members - Majority (M) 4; Minority (m) 3.*
he contributed to the group.

The majority members showed more freedom in their choice of behavior patterns than did the members of the discriminated against minority. Of the fourteen kinds of behavior shown by the majority the minority exhibited only six, and none that the majority did not exhibit. These six types of behavior were shown in the absence of the leader and only five of them while he was present. The minority never exhibited any kind of aggressive behavior amongst themselves.

In addition to the facts which have been presented: i.e., fewer intrasubgroup communications and a narrower range of behavior, the material offers more evidence that the minority members were under greater tension than were the majority members: i.e., felt the pressure of the leader, more than did the majority members.

62.9% of the conversation of the minority while the leader was present was inaudible and 51.8% of it while he was absent. This is in comparison with 21.2% and 18.4% respectively for the conversation of the majority. (The acoustics were definitely bad). Four-fifths of the behavior of the minority, consisting mostly of conversation is undetermined because they huddled together over their little table and whispered. They evidently were afraid of speaking out, probably for fear of attracting unfavorable attention to themselves. Of the conversation noted, there was practically none which did not concern matters closely related to club activities, and no joking or horseplay at all. Along this line, Lippitt found less out of the field
conversation in autocracy than in democracy. While neither of these subgroups can be considered as having a democratic climate, the leader was undoubtedly more autocratic toward the minority than toward the majority. It is, of course, possible that some of this type of behavior took place but was not heard. However, this seems unlikely in view of the fact that joking especially can be told by the expression of the face. Few smiles and no laughter were in evidence among the whispering minority. As was remarked before, none of the so-called aggressive types of behavior were noted in the minority, while they did occasionally occur in the majority.

This difference between the intrasubgroup behavior of the minority and of the majority which has been discussed is statistically significant.

During the seventh meeting practically all of the conversation among the subgroups was of uncertain content, although they definitely seemed to be criticizing the members of the other subgroup. This was especially true of the majority and is born out by the content of the conversation of the subgroups to the leader, to the analysis of which the reader is referred.
Relationship between the Members of Different Subgroups

There was very little contact between the members of the two subgroups in comparison with the contact between the girls and the leader and among the members of the same subgroup. Of the 195 minutes which are considered for the first five meetings, there was contact between the subgroups in only 31 of them. Of these 31 minutes, 25 of them took place while the leader was absent from the room. It was not until the third meeting that the first of these inter-subgroup contacts in the absence of the leader took place.

The total number of contacts initiated by the members of the two subgroups is the same - 38 in each case. But the number of contacts for the average member of the minority is slightly larger than for the average member of the majority - 10 for the average minority member and 8 for the average majority member (for the total period of time - 195 minutes). It will be recalled that the number of contacts for the average girl with members of her own subgroup was 44 for the majority and 30 for the minority.

There were more contacts between the members of the two subgroups when the leader was absent, just as there were more contacts between the members within the subgroups when he was absent. When the leader was present there were two contacts with the minority for the average member of the majority and five contacts with the majority for the average member of the minority. These numbers
increased to 19 and 22 respectively with the absence of the leader. (These figures are corrected for the fact that the leader was present 2.7 times as long as he was absent.)

There were more instances of aggressive behavior on the part of the majority than on the part of the minority, 15 for the majority and 3 for the minority. (See Table V and Chart VII). The hostile behavior took the form of unsolicited suggestions and criticisms and hostile and unfriendly remarks. The discriminated against minority was much more submissive in its attitude (12 submissive contacts for the minority in comparison with zero for the majority) and even its matter of fact contacts with the majority were in the nature of requests for help or work directions while those of the majority were of the nature of giving advice or suggestions. At the same time that the majority were more aggressive toward the minority, they were more openly friendly (nine friendly contacts for the majority in comparison with three for the minority.) In other words, the majority members were less restrained in their contacts with the minority than vice versa.

Generally speaking, then, the interactions between the majority and the minority could be said to be on a superior-inferior status basis with the majority directing the behavior of the minority. This is the kind of inter-subgroup relationship which the leader set for the group indirectly by his attitude and directly when he announced
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meetings I through V</th>
<th>Meeting VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader in -142'</td>
<td>Leader out -53'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M No. %</td>
<td>m No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive Attitude:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Unsolicited suggestions or criticism</td>
<td>0 0 1 6.7</td>
<td>8 27.6 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hostile or unfriendly remarks</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>3 10.3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ignoring</td>
<td>2 22.2 2 13.3</td>
<td>2 6.9 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submissive Attitude:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Submissive asking or receiving aid</td>
<td>0 0 1 6.7</td>
<td>0 0 7 30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defensive alibis, comments</td>
<td>0 0 3 20.0</td>
<td>0 0 1 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matter of Fact Attitude:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-criticism</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Objective criticism of another</td>
<td>4 44.4 0 0</td>
<td>4 43.8 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Factminded requests</td>
<td>1 11.1 6 40.</td>
<td>1 3.4 8 34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly Attitude:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interest in other's behavior</td>
<td>0 0 1 6.7</td>
<td>2 6.9 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Friendly, cooperative behavior</td>
<td>2 22.2 0 0</td>
<td>4 13.8 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conversation not about work</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 3.4 3 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>2 22.2 1 6.7</td>
<td>7 24.1 3 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Content Unknown</td>
<td>0 0 1 6.7</td>
<td>4 13.8 3 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>9 100. 15 100.</td>
<td>29 100. 23 100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number for Average member</strong></td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number for Average member, corrected for time</strong></td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>19 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average number of members - Majority (M) 4
  Minority (m) 3
CHART VII

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUB-GROUPS

MAJORITY
Left Columns - Leader In — 2 Contacts For Average Member
Right Columns - Leader Out — 19 Contacts For Average Member
Time Leader Out = Time Leader In

MINORITY
Left Columns - Leader In — 3 Contacts For Average Member
Right Columns - Leader Out — 22 Contacts For Average Member

Classification Of Behavior

- Aggressive
- Submissive
- Matter Of Fact
- Friendly

- Hostile Or Unfriendly
- Ignoring
- Defensive Attitude
- Objective Criticism
- Inexcusable Behavior
- Conversation Not Pertaining To Work
- Content Unknown

Meetings I Through XZ
as he left the room each meeting that the minority members were to secure an OK on their work from the majority members who would also give them directions for further work.

The differences between the two subgroups which have just been discussed are statistically significant.

Not only was the number of contacts between the subgroups fewer than the number within the subgroups, but they were also more limited. Of the 14 types of behavior which were represented in intra-majority contacts only 8 of them were present in inter-subgroup contacts with the minority when the leader was absent and 4 when he was present. The minority also showed 8 different types of contacts in its relations with the majority, but they were not the same 8 as were shown by the majority. The majority and minority together exhibited 11 different kinds of behavior. Contrary to previous data, the minority exhibited more kinds of behavior when the leader was present than when he was absent.

In their contacts with the minority the majority members never exhibited a submissive attitude, while the minority was submissive in 12 cases. The minority members made no friendly and no hostile remarks to the majority and never made any criticism of their work, while the majority were hostile toward them on 15 occasions. The majority was aggressive toward the minority only in the absence of the leader and the minority aggressive very few times and only in the presence of the leader.
The difference in the way in which the members treated members of their own subgroup and members of the other subgroup is statistically significant for both the majority and minority.

Apparently the desire of the members of the two subgroups to communicate with one another was not great enough to overcome the "barrier" placed in their way by the discriminatory attitude of the leader. With the majority this force toward communication with the minority seems to have been practically zero. On the other hand the minority members were forced by the exigency of the situation; that is, their need to secure help and instructions from the majority, to communicate with the majority. In this case it is not possible to tell whether the contacts of the minority with the majority were forced by the instructions of the leader or whether there was a real desire for contact which was satisfied along lines which had been set down by the leader as acceptable.

Almost all of the inter-subgroup communications which took place while the leader was in the room were directly enforced by him; i.e., he would, for example, tell a member of the minority to ask a certain member of the majority to do something.

This information is summed up and presented in the diagram on the following page. An increased number of contacts did take place both between and within the subgroups
in the absence of the leader, and the intra-subgroup communications followed the pattern of communication which was suggested by the leader when he said that the minority should secure help in their work from the majority.

During the seventh meeting the leader was present all of the time and there were very few contacts between the members of the two subgroups: six were reported for the majority, three of which were aggressive, and only one for the minority. During this meeting the attention of the members was almost completely occupied with the leader and with the newness of the situation with which he confronted them. As it was pointed out in the chapter on the behavior of the club members toward the leader, the amount of criticism which the two subgroups directed toward one another greatly increased but it was still directed toward the adult visitor and not toward the members of the other subgroup.

There was a short period at the close of the seventh meeting when the visitor had departed and the leader had not returned. The whole group was disorganized and the members were very uncertain of what was expected of them. What slight evidence was present in this short period of time seemed to point to the fact that total group insecurity considerably weakened any difference which existed within the group. However, there is no positive evidence on this point.
CONVERSATION WITHIN THE SUBGROUPS

When the leader is present there are strong boundaries between the members of the subgroups which act as barriers against communication between the members of the group. When the leader is absent from the room the barriers are weaker and more communication takes place between the members of the two subgroups and among the members of each subgroup. The barriers are stronger in the minority than in the majority and are the strongest of all between the members of the two subgroups.

The majority sees itself in a simply constructed situation in which the path toward the goal-stated merely as a happy club experience—is facilitated by the attitude of the leader.

The minority does not exist for the majority as a factor which should be contended with.

To the minority, however, the majority and the leader stand together as a force which keeps the minority from reaching the goal.
When the leader was in the room, he exerted a force against communication between the subgroups. At first this force was completely induced by the leader.

After several meetings however, the majority and minority began to take over these forces and make them their own. They were then only partially induced by the leader.

With the leader absent from the room the forces which kept the members of the two subgroups from communicating were self imposed. However even with the leader absent from the room, what communication did take place took place through channels which were accepted by the leader. More resistance was offered by the majority than by the minority.
Subgroup Atmospheres

It was thought highly desirable to find some method of describing the reaction of the group other than that which we have just presented: i.e., a summary of the activity of the individual members of the group. It was felt that the breaking down of the activity of the group into individual units, by ignoring the actual feeling prevalent in the group, one of the most important aspects of group life had been disregarded. This material was contained in the group running accounts, but the question was how to get it out.

On reading the group running accounts it was noticed that the total activity of the group (conceived as attitude as well as overt behavior) fell naturally into units, or smaller wholes, which could be conceived of and classified on several levels: i.e., actual overt behavior or activity, or nearer the other extreme, the atmosphere which the group seemed to possess, such as restless, passive, involved in work, etc. In this case any classification based on activity seemed rather meaningless as far as determining the effect of the discriminatory treatment of the leadership on the group was concerned because the actual activity of the members was so thoroughly determined by the leader. Therefore, it was decided to make the division more in terms of group atmosphere.
or mood. However, the actual activity was considered as a necessary factor in the actual interpretation of the mood.

The two group running accounts plus parts of the record on the behavior of the leader were combined into one record with separate information concerning the two subgroups. The records were read and divided into units where the general tone or atmosphere seemed to change. All of the records were divided by two individuals. With a difference of one minute allowed in the point of division the two were alike in 75.8% of their divisions. This figure was secured by dividing the total number of divisions into the number which the two had in common. An abridged sample of one of the records is given below with the division indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority</th>
<th>Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play a little elaborate K*</td>
<td>Very silent atmosphere L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seem to be well planned L</td>
<td>Go silently and get their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompous version, very</td>
<td>dolls, apparently have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aristocratic G</td>
<td>their skit well planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P as usual in leading</td>
<td>for there is no whispering,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role, F a good second,</td>
<td>as they nervously straighten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ultrasocial tone set by P</td>
<td>their dolls G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When rB drops her doll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they all grin G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinning at A over delay K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching carefully, grin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when things don't go well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Initial of observer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Group/Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneously turning their heads to A and smiling subtly derogatory</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at A and at each other with smiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rB having a hard time getting her strings straightened</td>
<td>GKL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A suggests she get a new one but she goes right on trying to straighten out the old one</td>
<td>GLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play slow and hesitant</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playlet drags</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediately decide they don't want to write criticism</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitant to begin criticism</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L doesn't criticize</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P shy, but does it</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No word from the group while they are being criticized</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group cleavage the minute A says get ready for work</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A explains work and leaves with usual instructions</td>
<td>KLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to one another quite gaily and giving advice</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various kinds of contacts between members noted etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working quietly together</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking audibly together for the first time</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not seem as tense as earlier</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These units were classified according to what seemed to be the dominating mood of the unit. Several rules were set up by which it was possible to determine whether a unit should be classified or not.

1. A classification must be based on an agreement between at least two observers.

2. The record of only one girl is not to be considered as representative of the subgroup and classification cannot be based on it. However, the record of one girl may negate a classification of one type -self-centered- if she comes in contact with a member of the other subgroup.
3. If the activity changes and there is no record of the resultant atmosphere, the atmosphere which follows the change in activity cannot be regarded as continuous with that which preceded, otherwise an atmosphere continues until a change is noted.

The classification is presented below, illustrated with excerpts from the record; most of them are grouped as more or less opposites: self-centered versus overlapping; depreciative versus defensive; self-assured versus inferior; easy workminded versus subdued and tense.

**ATMOSPHERE UNITS**

1. **Self centered** - the attention of the subgroup is centered upon itself; i.e., the members of the subgroup are working, talking, etc., together to the complete exclusion of any member of the other subgroup.

This is characterized by such statements from the observers as follows:

"Talking about school work and paying no attention to the minority at all."

"No communication between the two subgroups, both quite self-contained."

"Ignoring the minority."

"Seldom if ever glance at the minority."

This atmosphere, which is dependent upon the relationship between the two subgroups may be used in combination with the three atmospheres based on intra-subgroup relations: i.e., subdued, tense, and easy work-minded.

2. **Overlapping** - in this situation the attention of the subgroup is centered partly on their own activity and partly on the activity of the other subgroup; i.e., while the members of the two subgroups are sitting around their respective tables the members of the overlapping group are
watching or listening to the members of the other subgroup.

"Attention equally divided between dolls and the majority table."

"Listen as leader talks to the majority."

"Looking at majority most of the time."

"Whispering and looking at the others."

This classification may also be used in combination with the intra-subgroup classifications, subdued, tense, and easy work-minded.

3. Self-assured - the members of the subgroup are self-confident, seem sure of their standing with the leader and set about an activity in a somewhat "show-off" fashion; for example, they may talk about matters with which the members of the other subgroup are not familiar, and so exclude them from participation.

"Selfconscious and quite ready to show off. Carry on play confidently."

"Girls up on stage to 'show others how it's done'."

"Looking at the leader and smiling at him in an obviously approval seeking manner."

"Snickers developing. B doing most of the improvising but none is having any difficulty. Giggle and look at leader. Girls have forgotten about dolls and are just talking. P explains plot to W (new leader has just come in)."

"Minority remain at the majority table and conversation goes on in complete disregard of their presence. They talk about things from which the minority are obviously left out."

4. Inferior - the members of one subgroup do not act as if they felt themselves to be of equal status with the members of the other subgroup. They lack self-assurance and are self-depreciative in their approach to the leader or to the members of the other subgroup, appearing shy or embarrassed. There may be no attempt at participation where it would naturally seem indicated.
"G and rP stand meekly by as if to pick up what they can by watching the majority."

"G watches the majority apprehensively."

"Shy in approaching the majority."

"G remarks about her inability."

"rP makes no effort to join the group."

5. Defensive - this atmosphere consists in resistance to aggression or depreciation by the members of the other subgroup, which takes the form of alibies, excuses, and the like. Coupled with this may be indications of resentment or extreme slowness in complying with what is expected of them.

"T alibies because of tangled string."

"Defensive laughter on the part of the minority."

"rB has trouble with her dolls and rP watches loyally."

"T defends plot and explains it. rP rather miserable and following T's lead."

6. Depreciative of other subgroup or its members - the lowering or the attempt to lower the estimate of the work or the status of the members of the other subgroup. This takes the form of negative criticisms, disparaging remarks, or derogatory laughter.

"Laughing and exchanging grins with leader. Think the play is not so good."

"P gives a spontaneous criticism."

"Laughter and derogatory attitude evident."

7. Acute awareness of the leader's discrimination between the two subgroups - it is difficult to characterize this atmosphere specifically, but it is the short period which followed a statement or action by the leader which indicated that he thought that the members of the majority were far
superior to the members of the minority. The records may merely indicate that the girls were silent for a moment or looked at one another.

"The leader's command is greeted by absolute silence and T moves." "The minority look at her strangely."

"All seem to look at the minority for a moment."

8. Uncertain, disorganized - the members of the subgroup show by their behavior that they do not know what is expected of them in the way of a response to the leader or to the demands of a situation. The response to the leader may also show reluctance to do as he suggested.

"First spontaneous criticism is difficult to secure."

"Hesitant to begin criticizing."

"Rather disorganized, don't know what to do."

"Girls are paralyzed to act or speak. Loosen up a bit and then after a long pause criticism comes."

9. Easy work-minded - the main attention of the members of the subgroup is turned to the activity at hand. The situation seems free, natural, and unaffected. The members are interested in what they are doing or talking about. There may be conversation which does not pertain to the club activities, but which springs up naturally in the situation.

"Working and asking spontaneous questions of the leader."

"Free spontaneous conversation about experiences outside the club."

"Free social exchange but all well involved in work."

"Whole group united against T, and is teasing her."

10. Subdued - this atmosphere is indicated by evidences of undue quietness in comparison with the natural activities or tone of voice that may otherwise be evinced. The members may speak in whispers and the whole general tone is low and somewhat repressed.
"Working silently."

"Whispering and looking at the others." (In combination with overlapping).

"T and rB talk quietly but audibly for the first time."

11. Tense, strained - signs of nervousness or embarrassment evident in the subgroup.

"Nervous laughter at his remark but no speech."

"Strain somewhat evident."

"...G looks embarrassed."

"They seem very shy and tense with strained looks on their faces."

All of the records were classified by two different people and their classifications were identical in 89.5% of the cases.

The results are presented in Table VI and Chart VIII. The actual number of minutes during which each atmosphere was present in each subgroup during the presence and absence of the leader is indicated. In order to make comparison between the first five and the seventh meetings possible, they were equated for time by raising the number of minutes in the seventh meeting to 195, and changing the classification accordingly.

These results substantiate those secured in the behavior analysis as was to be expected, since they are a supplementary method of approaching the same problem and the same material was used to secure both sets of results.
**Table VI - Atmosphere Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings I, III, II</th>
<th>Meetings IV, V</th>
<th>Meetings I through V</th>
<th>Meeting VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M Leader</td>
<td>m Leader</td>
<td>M Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-centered</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overlapping</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Easy work-minded</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subdued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Depreciative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Defensive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-assured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Inferior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Uncertain, dis-organized</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Awareness of discrimination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Unclassified</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 82 25 107 82 25 107 60 28 88 60 28 88 142 53 143 195 142 53 144 195 47 188 47 188
CHART VIII

SUB-GROUP ATMOSPHERE UNITS

Meetings I Through IV
Favored Majority-Discriminated Against Minority
- Total Minutes Majority Had Such An Atmosphere
- Total Minutes Majority Had Such An Atmosphere With Leader Absent
  Corrected For Time-Row Score Multiplied By 2.7
- Total Minutes Minority Had Such An Atmosphere
- Total Minutes Minority Had Such An Atmosphere With Leader Absent

Meeting VII
Corrected For Time-Row Score Multiplied By 4

Classification Of Behavior:
- Self-Centered
- Over-Eager With Other Group
- Long-Winded
- Subdued
- Overbearing Of Other Sub-Group
- Defensive
- Self-Assured
- Interior
- Vehemently Opposed
- Acute Awareness Of Leaders' Discrimination
- Unable To Decide
CHART IX

SUB-GROUP ATMOSPHERE UNITS—COMPOSITE SCORE
Meetings I Through IV
Total Time - Leader Both Present And Absent
- Majority, - Minority

- Self-Centered
- Easy Workminded
- Depreciation Of Other Sub-Group
- Self-Assured

Composite Score

Time Leader Absent (Corrected For Time)

- Self-Centered
- Easy Workminded
- Depreciation Of Other Sub-Group
- Self-Assured

Composite Score
The favored subgroup was more self-assured and depreciative of the minority (16 and 49 minutes respectively for the majority and none at all for the minority), while the discriminated against minority was more tense, defensive, and inferior (15, 22, and 15 minutes respectively for the minority, and only one minute on the defensive for the majority). The minority was often in an overlapping situation and the members spent a considerable amount of their time (23.5') watching the majority. This was not so with the majority, whose members pursued their work and did not even glance in the direction of the minority (self-centered, 33'). The work of the minority was carried on in a subdued manner (42.5' as compared to none for the majority) while the majority was relatively more easy-going, spontaneous and natural. (71' for the majority, and 31.5' for the minority.)

When the different in time during which the leader was present and absent is taken into consideration, it is noted that both subgroups seemed more natural and spontaneous during the absence of the leader. The minority was not quite so tense, subdued, or inferior in manner. The majority was less depreciative and aggressively self-assured, although somewhat more disorganized. This is brought out more clearly on Chart IX, where each subgroup is given a score which represents the degree to which its atmospheres were self-centered or overlapping, easy work-minded, or subdued and tense, depreciative or defensive, and self-assured
or inferior. These composite scores were obtained by assigning a positive value equal to the number of minutes to the classifications of self-centered, easy work-minded, depreciative of the other subgroup, and self-assured; and, a negative score equal to the number of minutes, and then adding the scores. This was done with both the atmospheres for the total time of the first five meetings and for the time when the leader was not in the room (corrected for the fact that he was present 2.7 times as long as he was absent.)

However, in spite of this tendency of both subgroups toward greater naturalness, there is still a statistically reliable difference between the group atmospheres along the lines which were discussed in the preceding paragraph, with the leader both present and absent from the room.

In the seventh meeting both subgroups, especially the minority, were increasingly depreciative and critical of one another, (64' for the majority in comparison with 49' for the first five meetings, and 40' for the minority in comparison with none for the first five meetings). The majority, however, showed signs of tension which it had not exhibited before. (The minority was self-assured for a short period, an atmosphere which it had not exhibited before.) Both subgroups were more disorganized and uncertain of what was expected of them. (In comparing the first five meetings with the seventh meeting, rough account is taken of the fact that the first five meetings contained 195 minutes, while
the last meeting contained only 43 minutes, by multiplying the figures of the seventh meeting by four. This procedure may not be wholly justified because had the time which passed when the positions of the two subgroups was reversed been as long as it was for the first five meetings, a much greater variety of atmosphere would undoubtedly have been secured, rather than an increased amount in the same proportion of those which were present in the seventh meeting). However, there is still a difference in the atmospheres of the two subgroups, even though each of them has shifted from the position it held during the first five meetings.

Description of Group Structure

At the end of the third meeting the girls were told that they were to put on a play which they should plan ahead of time and make as good as possible. They were to choose with whom they would like to give the play and assignments would be made on that basis. At the same time they were asked to walk around and look at one another's work and then name the three girls they thought had done the best work. On the basis of these two pieces of information, a sociogram and a diagram were constructed, showing the structure of the group at that particular time.

The members of the minority are shown in red in the sociogram and diagram which follow. The girl, T, was
SOCIOPGRAM IV

* SOCIOPGRAM BASED ON THE CRITERION OF PREFERENCE FOR BEING IN A PLAY WITH THE CHOSEN GIRL

Blue circles represent the members of the majority, and red circles the members of the minority. T was a member of first the majority and then the minority.

The blue lines indicate a choice and the red lines indicate that the choice was not returned.

The numbers on the lines indicate the number of the choice, first, etc., as was explained in the first sociogram.

* Given at the end of Meeting III.
FIGURE II

* DIAGRAM** OF THE GROUP BASED ON THE CRITERION OF "BEST WORK"

Blue circles represent the members of the majority, and red circles the members of the minority. T was a member of first the majority and then the minority.

The blue lines indicate a choice and the red lines indicate that a choice was not returned.

The numbers on the lines indicate the number of the choice.

*Given at the end of Meeting III.

**Although the same form is used, this representation cannot be called a sociogram because the criterion on which the choices were based was not one of personal relationship.
transferred from the majority to the minority during the middle of the third meeting. Her position in the group will be discussed in greater detail later.

The sociogram based on the criterion of being in the play shows the five majority members to form a closed subgroup - every choice of these five girls went into that subgroup. Of the three original members of the minority two of them chose one member of the majority and two members of the minority. T chose one member of the minority and two of the majority. She was chosen by every member of the minority.

This situation is even more obvious in the diagram based on the criterion "best work." Again the majority forms a closed subgroup. The three minority members send all of their choices to the majority or to T. T gave two choices to the minority and one to the majority. According to different people who inspected the work of the group, that of the majority was in no way actually superior to that of the minority. However, in keeping with the attitude of the leader, both the majority and the minority believed that the majority members had done the best work.
The Sixth Meeting

During the sixth meeting an informal discussion was held and the girls talked about the kind of characters they were trying to portray with their marionettes. They also made plans for the production of a show, should their dolls be finished in time. They elected certain of their members to various positions: P, although absent, was to be head of the production; F was to be responsible for the learning of the parts which the marionettes would act; rE, a member of the minority, was to be janitor and general clean-up man.

The general attitude shown by the members of the two subgroups was the same as the previous analysis has indicated; the members of the majority were free and spontaneous with their suggestions, while the minority members said very little. The motions of the majority were usually passed by the group while those of the minority either never reached a vote or weren't passed, if they did. The minority had very little to do with the determining of the policy of the group.
Attitude of the Members Toward the Club

After the club meetings closed, each girl was interviewed by the experimenter. The girls were asked their opinion of the way the club was organized and run. Some of the material is presented in greater detail in the next chapter where the individual members are discussed. It is significant merely to note here while group results are under consideration that not one girl approved of having the membership of the club come from two different schools. For some reason or other every girl would have preferred to have had the membership completely from her school.

Now one of the most interesting aspects of the experiment was the reaction to the situation of leader discrimination which the girls showed after the club meetings were over. One question which was put at some appropriate point of the interview was whether or not the girl thought that the leader had treated all the girls equally. This point was then followed up as long as the girl would talk about it. With one exception the majority willingly admitted that the leader had treated them better than the minority; but even while they often admitted the general unfairness of such a procedure, they rationalized in such a way as to make the leader's preferential treatment of them acceptable. (See individual result for rationalizations of the members).
The rationalizations of the minority were of a different kind. The only direct complaint which they made was that the leader paid more attention to the other group. The nearest any minority member came to saying that the leader discriminated against them in more ways than just by amount of attention is the statement which came out after one girl said hesitatingly that she thought they had all been treated alike; "Sometimes he criticized us more, but it didn't hurt anybody, and we found out what was wrong."

Under some circumstances apparently individuals are loath to admit they have been treated as if they were inferior even when others say that they have been. The school teacher of the minority said that she never heard the three girls mention the club, although the other teacher reported that the majority members talked about it a great deal and were very free in their criticisms.
So far the study has reported only group results. By now the group situation has been fairly well defined and it seems profitable to take into consideration the behavior of the individual members of the group.

The material which has been presented in the discussion of intra-subgroup relation was reorganized so that the emphasis was on the individual members of the group. For the individual study the qualitative analysis of the types of interaction, the classification of which is presented on page 55, were summed for each individual girl in five different categories - aggressive, submissive, objective, friendly, and content unknown. This seemed to be the best method of presentation as there was not sufficient material to make a meaningful presentation of the material in the original forms in which it was classified. Only the material from the first five meetings is used.

The first comparison which was made was in actual quantity of interactions (Table VII). Since the minutes of observation on the girls ranged from 138 to 54, it was necessary to make a correction for this in the number of interactions which were credited to each girl. Both the original number and the correction number are given in the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes of observation</th>
<th>No. of Interactions with members</th>
<th>No. of Interactions with leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Corrected for time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rB</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rP</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average:</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOCIOMGRAM VI

*BASED ON PREFERENCE FOR ONE ANOTHER IN THE CLUB

The same symbols are used in this sociogram as have been used in the previous ones.

The red circles denote the members of the minority and the blue circles the members of the majority.

* Information secured during the week following the disbanding of the club.
The number of interactions for each member with all the other members, after the correction has been made, ranged from 61 to 24, and for each member with the leader ranged from 43 to 12. The number of interactions of each individual member of the minority is under the average for the group (with the exception of one - the interaction of rP with the leader - which is average). Nevertheless, their rank in the group will be seen to be about average, especially in interactions with Club Members where they rank 3, 5, and 8.5. (The averages are obviously greatly influenced by the high number of interactions by T and P).

A brief description of the general attitudes of each girl will be given with an especially detailed account of two girls, T and P, the former a member of the majority who was changed to the minority during the third meeting, and the latter, the leader of the group. The material is based on the information in Table VIII. Included in this account is a verbatim account which was taken at the time that each girl was interviewed at the close of the club meetings. She was asked what she thought about the club and whether she liked having the club contain girls from two different schools. At the same time she was asked to name the girls she had liked most having in the club with her. A sociogram was constructed based on this material. (Sociogram VI). It shows the position of the various girls in the group and is included so that the girls' positions in the group may be kept in mind when their individual behavior is being discussed.
The material given in tables VII and VIII is abridged and presented for all the girls in Charts X and XI.

B, member of the majority - The position of B in the sociogram shows her to have received one second choice from P and one first choice from L, who gave two first choices. Her first choice went to the leader, P. She was the least chosen girl in her subgroup and received no choice from any member of the minority. Her contacts with the members of her own subgroup and with the leader were about average in number. She had the fewest number of recorded contacts with members of the other subgroup of any girl in the club, except one. She was soft spoken (the content of 30% of her conversation was unrecorded due either to the fact that it was not heard or that the observer did not think it worth recording), and unaggressive, sometimes even submissive. Most of her conversation pertained matter of factly to the work at hand or was of a friendly nature. The influence of the leader on her attitude toward the other subgroup shows in the infrequency of her contacts with the minority. The girl's opinion of the club and of the leader is given below. This material was secured in the interview given each girl at the close of the club sessions. (This same information will be given for each girl).
### TABLE VIII - BEHAVIOR OF INDIVIDUAL GIRLS - SUMMARY
OF MEETINGS I THROUGH V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interactions with members of same subgroup</th>
<th>Interactions with members of other subgroup</th>
<th>Unknown content</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on corrected figures so that leader time out and in are equal (No. of interactions with leader out multiplied by 2.7 - then percent taken using that figure).
CHAPTER X

QUANTITATIVE SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL CONTACTS

Data From Meetings I through X

Left Columns Indicate Number Of Contacts With Girls
Right Columns Indicate Number Of Contacts With Leader
QUANTITATIVE SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR

M - Majority
m - Minority
Mm - First Majority Then Minority

Proportion of Contacts With Own and Other Sub-Groups

Kinds of Contacts With Members of Own Sub-Group

Kinds of Contacts With Members of Other Sub-Groups

% of Total Contacts
"I didn't like it having both schools. We weren't acquainted. We didn't like them very well. It would have been better if they sat at our table, but I'm glad they didn't because we all knew each other, etc. Mr. A was sort of crabby like at first, but he was different the next time. He was a good leader. He didn't treat those other girls as good as he did us. He should have treated them better, but us better. Their work was good. They didn't work the dolls as well. I think their heads were just as good as ours. I don't think the way he treated them made us not like them. We wouldn't have liked them anyway. Some of us don't like H.S. and the children who come from H.S."

F, member of majority - F was a bit more positive in her relations with the other girls in the group than was B. The sociogram shows a 1 - 1 attachment with P, the member leader. All of her choices were returned by members of her own subgroup and she received two choices from members of the minority, the most received by any girl. She had slightly fewer contacts with the other members of the club than the average and one of the highest proportion of contacts with the members of the other subgroup. There was no sign of either aggressiveness or submissiveness on the records; her dealings with both the members of her own subgroup and the minority were matter of fact and friendly. She seemed confident and self-assured. She seemed to have remained relatively uninfluenced by the discriminatory attitude of the leader, judging from the quality and quantity of her contacts with the minority.
"I didn't like having two schools as well. I didn't like Mr. A. I think the leader should be a woman. I preferred Miss G. to Mr. A. It seemed more interesting. He was too horsey. She worked more with us. I don't think it is a good idea to mix schools. We don't know them and don't like them. I thought they were nice, but the other kids didn't. I don't care what they dress like, but they just didn't seem as good. They were separated but they didn't like it. It was a good idea but it didn't work. He seemed to treat us better and I don't think it was fair. They should have been treated like we were treated. We should all have had the same advantages even if they weren't as good. Some people are just made that way."

L, a member of the majority - The records show the attitudes and behavior of L to have been very similar to that of B. She had relatively few contacts with the other members of the club and an average percentage of those which she did have were with the other subgroup - 23%. Her attitude was friendly and objective. Yet it seems to the writer that two different motives lay behind these similar methods of behavior. L lacked status in the majority as indicated by frequent remarks of the observers to the effect that she was left out, or toward the last of the sessions that her status was better than it had been previously. She gave very few criticisms of the minority. Probably because of these factors the minority very often turned to her for aid or suggestions. B's contact was more apt to be initiated by her and more or less carried on in disregard to the attitude of the rest, including the leader, toward the minority.
"I liked to act the marionettes. I think Mr. A. was nice, but not the first time. And I didn't think he was too bossy, after I got to knowing him. I don't like to have the schools mixed because we didn't know them. We didn't go over to them and their work because we were ahead of them. I didn't know them very well and didn't like them very well. He treated us nicer than them because he knew us and they weren't used to the dolls and didn't do as well. He treated us all according to the way we could do things."

M, a member of the majority - M was very work-minded. A larger proportion of her contacts with others were with the leader than with the members of the club. She was always objective or friendly with her own subgroup, but made an occasional aggression toward the minority. Her position in the sociogram shows that she held one of the lower positions in her group.

"I think it was pretty good. The kids didn't run wild. We stayed pretty well. I don't think Mr. A. was too strict. I think we get more done with a stricter person like Mr. A. I don't think the two schools get along very well. We didn't know them and didn't like the school. Mr. A treated them all the same way. They weren't experienced in it--not used to it. I think they didn't like it any better than we did. They liked to have T come over. They weren't as good."

rB, a member of the minority - rB's position on the sociogram shows her to be the best placed in the minority. Both her first and second choices are returned, although the two which she gives to majority members are ignored. She has the least number of recorded contacts with other girls of any girl in her subgroup. As is the case with all
the minority members. The content of a very high proportion of her conversation is unknown, although in her case it is the lowest in the minority, only 50%. In her contacts with the majority she was usually objective and matter of fact, but could be aggressive. She did not act in a submissive manner. The records show RB was apt to be sullen and resentful.

"I think we ought to have just one school. Some of us didn’t like some of them. I liked them, but I didn’t know them. I was with G most of the time and didn’t get to know them, but I think they were friendly. When we asked them for advice they didn’t know what to say. P got mad and sort of uppity toward the end. I think we didn’t do so well at first but got better at the end. To tell the truth, I didn’t like Mr. A very well. He stayed on the other side of the room and wouldn’t help us as much as he helped them. I don’t think that’s fair. They acted as if they liked us all right. They were nicer than we thought they were at first."

G, a member of the minority - G had the highest number of contacts with other girls of any girl in the minority, but she had the lowest number of contacts with the leader. She showed both an aggressive and a submissive attitude in her dealings with the girls of both her own and other subgroup. She seemed to be rather uncertain of the roll which she was supposed to play. If the sociogram on page 21 is consulted, G will be seen to have held a strong position in her original group. She was the member of the minority who was most apt to speak up to the leader in criticism of the majority.
"I think it should have friendly girls and not ones that get into fights. People from different schools aren't so friendly. I liked the girls from H.S. They did their job and were friendly. I liked Mr. A after I got used to him. He payed more attention to the other girls, and I don't think that is fair. People should get alike. It was all right to have the others help us because they were ahead. It was good of them to give us their advice. They didn't feel they were better than we were. I felt like we were all together and not uncomfortable."

rP, a member of the minority - rP's number of contacts with other girls and with the leader were about average. Yet her behavior was apt to be so restrained that it was impossible to hear what she was saying or to determine what she was doing. This excessive restraint, which also showed itself in her very submissive attitude toward the majority is very characteristic of the general impression made by rP. The writer remembers that rP was a very quiet member of the group where she was in the fall club session, but during this session she was exceedingly timid. The records of the observers carry constant references to her tenseness, meekness, and embarrassment.

"It was all right to have other girls. They were nice and didn't make so much noise. I liked it mixed. I think it was all right. I liked Miss G. as a leader better. I think Mr. A. treated us all alike. Sometimes he criticized us more, but it didn't hurt anybody, and we found out what was wrong. I liked it better the last time."

It is interesting to note, and it has been previously discussed in the group results, that the percentage
of conversation of each member of the majority directed to members of their own subgroup and to members of the minority is practically the same, while the attitude of the minority members toward the majority was often either aggressive or submissive; it was never friendly. However, the attitude of a majority member was often friendly toward a member of the minority. It illustrates the fact that in everyday life friendliness toward an inferior is the privilege of a superior, but not vice versa.

The leader, P - The most interesting girls in the group were P and T. Their behavior and the relationship which existed between them colored the whole course of the meetings. The records show both of them to have had a very high number of contacts with the other members of the group. T's contact with the adult leader was almost double that of any other girl.

When P came into the group in January, the leader was told by several girls that she was the "most popular girl in the room," or the "most popular girl in the school" by several members of the group. It was rather surprising to find (See Sociogram I) that when the members of her own group were asked to name the girls they liked best in the club, her ranking was one of the lowest in the group. In the interviews the members were also very free in their criticism of her, characterizing her as bossy and as the kind of person who always had to have what she wanted.
Nevertheless, it is difficult to explain this low standing unless you simply say that she was having a brief interlude of unpopularity, because the following sociogram showed her in a key position.

There was no doubt in the minds of any of the observers that P was doing a large proportion of the dictating of the policy of the group. She quickly took up the attitude of the adult leader toward the minority and led in criticism of them. An analysis of her behavior shows her to have been the most aggressive member toward members of her own subgroup and to have been exceedingly dominating in her relationship with the minority. She was also friendly, but she never hesitated to express her opinion.

The sociogram taken at the end of the third meeting, (Pages 87 & 88) as well as the one taken at the end of the meetings, shows her to be the strongest member of the group. When the other members of the club, including the minority, were asked who the leader of the group was, they unanimously replied that it was P.

"I don't think the girls from the two schools mixed. We liked rP, but not the rest of them. They showed off. Their work was good, it was their dispositions. They were sort of out of it, not quite our kind. Mr. A. sort of snapped at them. We didn't object to that, but we think he could have been nicer. Even if he'd been nicer, I don't think we would have liked them."
T, the Marginal Member - T was not liked by the members of her club in the fall and they were not particularly keen about having her back in it in the spring. She was aggressive, a show-off, unstable, and a non-conformer. She didn't know how to make friendly contacts with other girls. Most of her contacts with the leader were for the purpose of attracting attention.

When the leader was out of the room, the rest of the girls, especially P, picked on her. She was P's rival for attention and P never hesitated to assert her superiority over T whenever it was possible. Illustrative of this is the long excerpt from the records which follows, showing the struggle between P and T for supremacy and the reaction of the rest of the majority members of this struggle. This took place during the second meeting when the leader was out of the room.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Combined Running Accounts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31' Leader leaves and M table talks animatedly, free spontaneous conversation about experiences outside of club.

32' P is apparently trying to establish leadership status.

33' Talk centers about the activity underway and about events at school. Fairly playful tone. T is also making a bid for leadership.
Group Combined Running Accounts

34' Well involved in task but free social exchange among members of M. T wanders over to the stage and P tells her she is lazy.

36' P tries to direct T's activity, and tells her to get back to work after she goes over to the stage to play. P tries to lower T in the eyes of the group by asking about her tutor. T admits she has a tutor and seems piqued. T works by self at curtain rope as others tease her, whole group seems united against T.

37' T is very much on the defensive. P makes a rush for T, misses her and T comes at her. M stands up for T. When P tells her again to come on and get to work she does so.

39' P is establishing herself as top mogul fairly well. T is generally sat on when she bids for attention, complete isolation between the two subgroups very noticeable.

Conversation Record

P-T Come over here and help cut these papers up. (T is wandering around playing with stage).

T-P You and yourself.

P-T You come over here.

T-P You and yourself.

P-T You're lazy.

T-P I can't help that.

P-T Do you still have a tutor?

T-P Yes.

T-M If you want to ask me if that's true, it is true.

P-T All right, we'll feel free to ask you any questions. (P teasingly, half friendly, but pointed. Rest of M take it up.

T-P Of course she's nice, (the tutor).

P-T She ought to be

T-P What's the matter with you--she didn't say anything to you. (T comes over to table and begins mockingly to choke one of the girls for comment she has made).

P-T Phyllis, you come over here.

T-P Nuts.
T was obviously an unwelcome member of the majority and the experimenter decided to transfer her to the minority. Up to this point the minority had been very passive and subdued and it was hoped that her presence might make them a little more assertive. T was changed to the other group "because she was acting like one of them" during the third meeting just before the leader left the room. She made herself right at home in the minority and soon was firmly established as its leader. The observers noted that the "minority (are) making obvious advances to T and she is talking and showing various ones what to do." There is a "quiet undertone of talking at the minority table. T is showing them what to do and they are asking her questions." "The minority is easier and lighter-hearted since they have been joined by T." "T (is) the leader of what appears to be a very close knit group." "T has established herself as leader of the minority and seems well enough content with the role. Apparently has decided it is too much to buck both leader and P." However, T apparently did not consider that she had lost her membership in the majority and stayed after the minority had departed to help the majority clean up. At the end of the meeting before she had left early with the minority.

The sociogram (page 87) taken at the end of the meeting during which she was changed shows her complete rejection by the majority and acceptance by the minority and also her own divided loyalty.
In some respects T seemed to be particularly clear headed about the whole situation. In spite of her desire for constant attention from the leader, she did not hesitate to defend the minority even before she was changed to that subgroup. And she continued her first defense after her transfer. She seemed better able to judge a situation according to its actual merit, unclouded by preconceived attitudes than did any other girl present.

During the fourth meeting she again tangled with P, and the conversation, supplemented by remarks from the running account are reproduced below. Her attitude toward P was a good deal more submissive in this encounter than in the one previously noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Combined Running Account</th>
<th>Conversation Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36' P comes back into the room and enters into conversation with M. Conversation is about things m have not done and into which they cannot enter (G and rP are silently standing at M table putting cloth on doll).</td>
<td>M. working quietly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37' T speaks to L who responds with a smile. T apparently is interested in solidifying her position with rB</td>
<td>T. comes over to table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38' m at M table are ignored. T comes over to M. table. P criticizes T's doll</td>
<td>P. when are you going to move?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Combined Running Accounts

telling her the head is too big.
P starts asking T about moving.

39' P runs down house into which T is moving.

40' T moves over to other side of M table to stand by minority as P's remarks become insulting and derogatory. P asks P about her progress and P approves condescendingly.

41' P starts asking T about school work after T has started conversation with minority. G and rB ask T for approval of their work. P asks that the work be brought to her.

42' P waits till the others have returned and then criticizes their work with L nodding approval.

"Oh, it was pretty good. I liked the way he conducted us. I like it to be bossy, we need it. I liked the other girls. I knew Mr. A. and I think it was a good idea. He made me go to the other table because I was slow. But I got to like them, and it was fortunate, so to say. He did treat me different some time, and I didn't deserve it, but I wouldn't complain because I'm not that kind of a girl. You couldn't tell any difference between the two groups, maybe a teeney bit nicer to us because he knew us better. He was a very good director, good and stern. I preferred to work with the smaller group because I could help them. They were nice."
CHAPTER IX

DISCUSSION OF LIMITATIONS OF METHOD

This study presents a detailed analysis of the relationship which existed between two subgroups when the condition under which the subgroups existed was one of discrimination against the smaller of them. The inter-subgroup discrimination was produced partly by the behavior of the leader. To what extent this is done it is difficult to say. But this is a problem of origin which need not invalidate other results because it cannot be completely answered. It is still perfectly possible to say; i.e., that both of the majority and the minority behaved differently towards members of their own subgroup than toward members of the other subgroup, or that in this particular situation the members of the majority showed a much wider range of kinds of behavior than did the minority, without specifying the exact source of the attitude expressed by the behavior.

The study would have been more complete had it been possible for it to have answered certain questions. To be sure that it was the result of leader discrimination that was being studied and not the maturing of certain factors inherent in the composition of the group, certain questions should have been answered by the results. In the first place, there is the possibility that the cleavage in the group was inherent in the make-up of the individual
members; i.e., that the nature of the three minority members was such that they would have constituted a subgroup of inferior status in any group situation in which they had been placed. In answer to this criticism it has been pointed out that these three girls were not discriminated against and in no way constituted an inferior subgroup in their first club meeting. As a matter of fact, a glance at the Sociogram on page 21 shows both G and rP to be in especially popular positions.

On the other hand the cleavage might have existed merely because the two subgroups were from different schools and therefore felt a common belongingness. This factor undoubtedly would operate at the beginning when the members of the two groups were strangers, but it can hardly be held to account for the fact that the majority felt superior to the minority and discriminated against them. Also, if this factor of school solidarity operated to any extent, it operated to a different degree for the two subgroups. The sociograms showed the majority as a closed group (but excluding T who certainly should have been included under these circumstances) and the analysis of subgroup atmosphere shows that they were often self-content. But on the other hand, subgroup solidarity because of a common school did not seem to be operating in the case of the minority who expressed preference for the members of the majority and whose interest in their own work often overlapped with their interest in the majority's work.
However, this does bring up a question which the experiment cannot answer. The interviews showed that the majority considered the school from which the minority came to be inferior to their own school, and the girls who came from that school to be inferior to them. There is very little doubt that this greatly increased the ease with which the leader inculcated his inferior-superior ideology into the group. Since there is no information available concerning what the relationship of these subgroups would have been had the leader's attitude not been what it was, there is not any way of telling the exact extent to which the pre-existing notion of the inferior character of the school from which the minority came facilitated the leader.

However, can there be any doubt that the attitude of the leader was felt by the two subgroups. The results show that under the influence of the leader the majority became more critical of the minority and the minority gave more favorable criticisms of the majority. Although the extent to which the leader created the cleavage may be uncertain, the expression of the cleavage was determined by the modes of response which were set up by the leader. The inter-subgroup relations were channalized by the leader who dictated the type of relationship which would be acceptable. Certain types of hostility and aggression were sanctioned by the leader. By telling the members each time he left the room that the minority must get permission and
aid from the majority, the leader completely structured the type of interaction which would take place between the members of the two subgroups even during his absence.

The results of the seventh meeting offer another indication of the importance of the attitude of the leader in determining the behavior of the members. In less than three-quarters of an hour the minority were vigorously criticizing the majority, who in turn in an atmosphere of heightened tension were defending their threatened superior status with ten times as much criticism as previously. And even in this case the method of attack of the two subgroups followed the pattern previously set up by the leader as acceptable.

Although no generalizations can be made which go beyond the confines of this small group (and this would have been equally true no matter how the cleavage had been secured), the study does offer some first hand information as to how attitudes develop, a thing which is attempted by none of the standardized attitude scales of the Thurstone type. For this reason alone this kind of experimental approach to socio-psychological problems seems profitable.
CHAPTER X

SUMMARY

This study was concerned with the types of relationships which develop among the members of a group when that group is so structured by an adult leader that it contains two subgroups, the larger of them favored by him and the smaller discriminated against. The larger of the subgroups is referred to as the majority, and the smaller as the minority.

During the first five meetings of the club group the leader consistently maintained an attitude which was favorable toward the majority and unfavorable toward the minority. He gave less attention to the minority in the form of information and advice. A large percent of the time which he spent with the minority he devoted to contrasting its work unfavorably with that of the majority or to negatively criticizing it. The majority was encouraged to imitate him.

The members of the two subgroups responded to this discriminating attitude of the leader with different types of behavior toward him. The members of the majority approached him more often than did the members of the minority. They were more objective and friendly, while the minority members were at the same time both more resistant and submissive. The majority directed unfavorable criticism of the minority to the leader, while
the minority directed progressively more favorable criticism of the majority to him.

There were considerably more communications among the members than there were between the members of the two subgroups. The intra-subgroup communications also covered a wider range of behavior than did the inter-subgroup communications, with the majority showing a wider range in each case than the minority. The relative restriction in kinds of behavior which was observed in the minority plus the fact that a larger proportion of this conversation was carried out in whispers, led to the conclusion that the minority was under greater tension than was the majority.

The tension was relaxed considerably during the periods when the leader was absent from the room. This was indicated by the fact that both inter- and intra-subgroup communications increased and a greater variety of behavior occurred. However, the intersubgroup contacts were of a kind which was laid down by the leader as a permissible form of inter-subgroup communication: i.e., as questions and directions concerning work, before he left the room.

In a final test meeting another adult lead the club and he favored the minority and discriminated against the majority. This produced a great increase of unfavorable criticism of the other subgroup in both subgroups,
although this criticism was still directed to the leader. Individual differences were decreased and special attention paid to the club member who was the leader of the group and to a girl who was marginal to both subgroups.
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