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ABSTRACT

This experimental study examines the process that individuals use to organize themselves in order to perform a certain task. A theory of organizing which takes into account the nature of the task is presented and tested. It is assumed that the task will make a certain ideological dimension salient to the individuals involved. The major findings are: a) individuals develop congruent perceptions of each other along this ideological dimension. Particularly, an agreement develops about who the extremists along this dimensions are. b) those individuals perceived as extremists will also elicit strong and concordant emotional reactions from the other members; and c) group action tends to be concordant with the perceived position of the extremist individuals that are liked (pull-leaders) and in opposition to the perceived position of the extremist individuals that are rejected. A critical implication of these findings is that the classical notion of deviance has to be revised, since deviants are shown to be functional in the process of organizing. The hypothesis that the presence of deviance in groups enhances the level of satisfaction of the participants was also tested, however, the results were inconclusive.
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"The basic questions in group research are: What happens when certain individuals are put together to perform a task? How do we describe the actions that take place? How do we predict what will happen?" (Weick, 1969, p.32).

This study examines the "process of organizing in task groups". The focus is on the process that individuals use to organize themselves into a larger coordinated unit of social action. The research question addresses the features that allow a collection of individuals to engage in and perform joint action. By joint action we mean:

"[A] larger collective form of action that is constituted by the fitting together of the lines of behavior of the separate participants... Joint actions range from simple collaboration of two individuals to a complex alignment of the acts of huge organizations and institutions." (Blumer, 1969, p.70).

It is this "fitting together", the merge of individual behavior that interests us here. We assume, as
suggested by Weick (1969), "that there are processes which create, maintain and dissolve social collectivities, that these processes constitute the work of organizing, and that the ways in which these process are continuously executed are the organization."

In this sense, to describe an organization, be it a small group, a task force or a large bureaucracy, is to describe the set of processes that are being performed by the participants at any point in time. This description should be sufficient to account for the joint action or the "output" produced.

This view of groups and organizations, hereafter referred to as the "evolutionary" view, stands in contrast with two other research traditions: the "functionalist" and the "psychological" schools. Functionalist research focuses on taxonomic descriptions of social systems, in terms of some dimensions assumed to be important, like size, span of control, authority (at the organization level, conformity, differentiation of roles, and deviance (at the group level). The psychological tradition attempts to explain social action on the basis of individual attributes. Leadership style, motivation, needs are among the constructs used in this school of thought.

Though important in their own right, these research approaches do not allow us to address the question
of how an organization comes into being or how it maintains itself. (1)

A) GROUPS AND GROUPING

In this study, we try to understand the process of organizing by means of natural experimentation with task groups. (2) Collection of individuals are assigned a task that requires the coordination of individual behaviors. What we want to uncover and document is the development of this coordination, the process of organizing in groups.

These collections of individuals will transform themselves into organized groups capable of joint action. However, as Hare (1976) observed:

"there is no definite cutting point in the continuum between a collection of individuals, as one might find waiting a bus on a corner, and a fully organized 'group'." (p. 4).

(1) Several comparative analysis of the different approaches used in the study of groups and organizations have been produced lately. For reference see Mouzelis (1967), Weick (1969), Silverman (1971) and Moscovici (1976).

(2) The notion of natural experiments has been elaborated by Cicourel (1964). He states that the main differences between natural experiments and classical laboratory experiments are: "the theoretical questions being asked, the basic theoretical elements specified and the manner in which the experimental atmosphere was created". (pp.167-168). This point will be further discussed in Methodology.
The gradual transition from being a collection of individuals to become a group has been defined by Sheriff and Sheriff (1969) as the "degree of groupness". In order to compare collections of individuals as to their degree of groupness a definition of group is needed. (3)

Several such definitions have been proposed, each one reflecting the particular biases that each researcher brings to the field of group studies. Bales (1950) emphasizes the interactions among individuals that enables them to exchange "impressions or perceptions of each other". Schein (1970) is more restrictive by imposing that group members have to "perceive themselves to be in a group". Sheriff and Sheriff (1969) argue for a definition of groups in terms of structural properties. Role and status differentiation, values and norms that regulates behavior are such properties.

These definitions reflect respectively, interactionist, psychological and structural concerns. The three authors agree however, that interaction is responsible for the development of both the structure and the sense of belongingness that the members experience. The differences then can be reconciled within a time framework. (4)

(3) In this sense the notion of group represents, as Weber's definition of bureaucracy, only an ideal type.

(4) On this aspect Sheriff and Sheriff wrote: "...many
collection of individuals that interact will, in a given
time, develop shared norms, shared values (a shared
identity), and status and role differentiation of its
members. The extent to which these properties can be
identified is the degree of groupness.

For the purpose of this paper, we define that a
collection of individuals is becoming a group or "grouping"
to the extent that, through interaction, the individuals
develop an agreement about: i) what does the collectivity
represent to them (common values); ii) what are the rules
for accepting and rejecting membership (shared norms); and
iii) what members are to be rewarded (status
differentiation). (5) That is, for a collection of
individuals to be a group, members have to be able to
recognize the group, to refer to it as an entity to which
they belong and that has a shared image. Also, members have
to be able to define who is a member and who is not, as
well as who is central to the group and who is not. We will
call these group dimensions, respectively, "group image",
"group boundaries" and "member differentiation". (6)

(5) Note that the concept being used is quite similar to
what sociologists (of the symbolic interactionist
perspective) have termed the process of "defining the
situation". (see McHugh, 1968).

(6) Though we probably could have used such terms as "group
B) THE PROCESS OF GROUPING AND ITS COMPONENTS

Image, boundary, and differentiation are logically tied to one another. For an existing group, image is what the members perceive the group doing or standing for. The feasibility of such an image is dependent on the individual behaviors of the group members, therefore, rules for proper behavior and attitudes develop and are enforced. These rules will define the criteria for acceptance and rejection of membership as well as the relative importance of the members accepted. (7)

Hare (1976), among others, points to this intimate relationship of group properties:

"Given a set of goals, norms define the kind of behavior which is necessary for or consistent with the realization of these goals. When the norm refers to the expectations for a single individual they constitute the individual's role." (p.19).

For a collection of individuals, however, an image goals and values", "group norms" and "role and status differentiation", we purposely avoided it because of the multiple meanings that these terms convey.

(7) This notion of relative importance is what Van Maanen and Schein (1977) called inclusion: "this dimension involve social rules, norms and values through which a person's worthiness to a group is judged by members of that group". (p. 18).
has not yet developed. Therefore image, boundary and differentiation will have to emerge out of the interaction in a mutually consistent way. Action will precede the group definition, and group properties will be achieved, in this sense, retrospectively, as an evaluation of joint action.

According to Bales (1950), interaction enables individuals to form "impressions of each other" and "reactions to each other", which in turn will allow for the emergence of group properties. Every individual exhibits a certain performance when interacting with others. This performance is evaluated and reacted to by all the other individuals. To the extent that the evaluations of the performance are similar and that the reactions to it are concordant with each other, a consensus can be reached as to how acceptable the performance is. Defining a performance as acceptable implies a definition of proper behavior and attitudes which all the others will tend to follow. On the other hand, a negative reaction to a performance is a definition of improper behavior and attitudes. Once appropriate member behavior and attitude become defined,

(8) This distinction between ongoing social systems, that have already identifiable properties, and emergent systems, that have still to develop its own identity, is central in our discussion. As mentioned before, most organization studies focus on the inter-relationship of stable properties. We, on the other hand, are interested in understanding how stability is achieved.
group action can take place. Based on the actions taken the
group image can be assessed.

Organization is possible if the two following conditions are met: i) there is agreement about the ways in which members are perceived by other members; and ii) there is agreement about how members are supposed to react to each other. As Weick (1969) stated:

"... if shared beliefs are tied to to shared affect, than group formation should be more likely." (p. 14)

Agreement, as pointed out before is the key ingredient of organization. An organization is an agreed upon and shared definition of a social situation. This definition can only be reached if there is a prior agreement about perceptions and emotions.

Sheriff (1937) demonstrated that any collection of individuals will develop normalized responses to an ambiguous stimulus, that is, collectivities have a tendency to reach common perceptions about undefined subject matters. The tendency to normalize could account for individuals perceiving a certain member presentation, or more appropriately, its content, in the same way.

Agreement about the proper reaction to be given to a certain presentation, however, is of a different sort, as pointed out by Moscovici and Faucheux (1972):
"When differences of opinion or judgement focus on quasi-physical entities, they result in uncertainty and ambiguity; when they deal with persons, they result in exchange and conflict. In this latter case, influence must be seen as a negotiation process between persons." (p. 165).

According to these two French researchers the outcome of such a negotiation will depend on the presentation skills of the participants, as well as on the cognitive consistency and appeal of their presentation. (9) The acceptance or rejection of a presentation is negotiated between members in an exercise of mutual influence and confrontation. The outcome of such negotiation will bond together all the decisions and agreements that are made about norms of conduct, differentiation of roles and status, and group image.

(9) This is a radical departure from the traditional thinking on agreement in groups, in which the idea of conformity is of central importance. The majority, it is believed, will always force the minority to conform to the majority's point of view. For a thorough criticism of the classical experiments see Moscovici and Faucheux (1972) and Cicourel (1964).
C) THE ELICITATION OF PERCEPTIONS AND EMOTIONS

We have presented the role that perceptions and emotions play in grouping. We have also indicated that perceptions can be normalized and emotional reactions negotiated. However, in order for these processes to take place, some initial individual perceptions and reactions have to exist. The question then is: How are emotions and perceptions elicited from group members? Two different theories are relevant:

The work of group therapists and sensitivity trainers suggest that there are some basic personality traits that guide individual behavior in groups (Bion, 1950; Slater, 1951; Bennis and Sheppard, 1956). One's predispositions to relate to authority figures and peers is said to "color" one's perceptions of others, and in this sense determine one's behavior. In this psychological view of groups, no attention is given to the task at hand. In fact, performance on the task is said to be unidirectionally influenced by the clash of emotions. (10)

Alternatively, Hoffer (1951), Toch (1966) and Berger (1975) have suggested that people tend to react

(10) It should be noted that the groups used to develop this theory are groups in which the primary task is to deal with emotions. Therefore, probable influences of the task in determining emotions could not be observed.
emotionally to some simple ideological ideas, and that it is these reactions that make possible the emergence of groups, political parties and social movements. According to this perspective, the emotional predispositions that are elicited by a salient ideological dimension determines one's social behavior. Alliances will develop among people who perceive themselves as similar and oppositions will emerge between people who perceive themselves as dissimilar. Hare (1976) in reviewing studies on interpersonal attraction wrote:

"This tendency of subjects to describe others whom they like best as more similar to themselves than those they like least... presumably reflects some of the common interests which brought the pair together as friends in the first place." (p. 120).

A certain task can produce the salience of an ideological dimension, which in turn will make the participant individuals conscious of the positions of others along this dimension. Their ideological preferences will then determine the emotional reactions that they will direct to these others. (11) Figure 1 is an attempt to reconcile the differences between the two approaches. Although we

(11) At this point it is critical not to lose sight of the fact that even though the initial reactions to presentations are individually determined, the group reactions are going to be determined by negotiation. Social action is not a "release of an already organized tendency; it is a construction built up by the actor", as Blumer (1969, p. 32) suggests.
explicitly recognize the importance of personal characteristics in determining perceptions and reactions, we chose not to deal with them experimentally. Our focus, therefore will be on the nature of the task. (12)

(12) For obvious reasons, the nature of the task lends itself much more to experimentation than personality traits. Besides, we believe that in task oriented groups, the task itself will tend to have a predominant effect on how the grouping takes place.
D) THE IMPORTANCE OF EXTREMISM

Paicheler (1976) has demonstrated that whenever an ideological dimension becomes salient to a particular group, the presence of extremists in this group tend to have a profound effect on the ways the group operates and reaches agreements. Weick (1969), on the same vein, wrote:

"The important point is that movements form because views are extreme. They are not refined or complicated." (p. 13)

These observations indicate that groups are more likely to form as a consequence of negotiated reaction to individuals that are perceived to be more extremists than others along a salient ideological dimension. As an example, suppose that a collection of individuals is required to decide whether or not a certain state should adopt capital punishment. In the process of reaching this decision (and at the same time grouping) most of the attention will be directed to these individuals perceived to be the most liberal and the most conservative in the bunch. (13)

Extremists in a group represent the tentative limits for individual behavior or attitudes in that group.

(13) We are assuming that the liberal-conservative dimension is made salient by this particular task.
The reactions that they elicit will determine whether or not these are in fact acceptable limits.

In summary, groups and group properties emerge out of the interactions among individuals. These interactions tend to facilitate the necessary agreement about how people are perceived and what the proper reactions towards them should be. If a collection of individuals is faced with a task that makes a certain ideological dimension salient, perceptions will develop along this dimension and those perceived as relatively more extremists will receive more attention from the others, in the sense that they will elicit strong reactions.

It is important to note the consequences of this evolutionary view of groups on the notion of deviance. Deviants have been defined in most of the traditional social-psychological literature as the individuals who deviates from an established norm (e.g., in a group of conservatives an individual who professes his dislike of private property is considered a deviant). However, this definition is of little value when considering group formation since a norm has not as yet been established. Furthermore, how will one know that a norm exists if no deviance from it has been shown to cause sanctions?

The framework that we have been presenting ties the development of norms to the emergence of deviance. An
extremist who elicits negative reactions from the others is "helping" the others to define what positions are accepted. The deviants will represent the group's "counter-image". (14)

If a deviant can "help" a collection of individuals to shape its own structure, then the traditional view of deviants as dysfunctional is mistaken. Dentler and Erickson (1959) have collected anecdotal evidence that small societies and groups do in fact induce, maintain and resist the elimination of deviance. Their remarks are worth noting:

"Any group attempts to locate its position in the social space by defining its symbolic boundaries, and this process of self-location takes place not only in reference to the central norms which the group develops but in reference to the range of possibilities which the culture makes available. Specialized statuses which are located on the margins of the group, chiefly high-rank leaders and low-rank deviants, become critical referents for establishing the end points of this range, the group boundaries." (p.106).

In a similar vein, Cohen (1966) writes:

(14) Schachtel (1961) has coined this term. Counter-image is the alternate image, the collection of attributes or qualities that one (or a group) does not possess.
"Normative rules relieve some of the anxiety and uncertainty of social interaction by specifying the rights and duties, the permissible and the impermissible... it is only by overstepping the boundaries into the zone of deviance that one really learns what deviance is, and how far and how often he may safely venture into its confines." (p. 8).

Deviance in this respect can be seen as the opposite of innovative leadership since the extremist who elicits positive reactions from the others will be "helping" these other to determine what changes are appropriate. This relationship between deviance and change is well articulated by Schur (1971):

"We may well conclude that sometimes social change represents individual deviation that has 'succeeded' or 'become organized' and politically active." (p. 31).

Extremists "help" collections of individuals to organize, because they induce strong reactions on the part of others towards them. To the extent that the reactions are negative (rejection), the extremist becomes a deviant and a "counter-image" for the group develops. To the extent that the reactions are positive (affection), the extremist becomes in Schur's terms a "successful deviant" or an
"innovator" in Moscovici's (1972) language. When the latter is the case the group will develop an image, that is a shared definition of what the group does or is willing to do. (15)

Dentler and Erickson (1959) have also indicated that the level of satisfaction that individuals experience in groups may be positively associated with the presence of deviance in these groups. The same proposition has been suggested by other researcher based on the premise that deviants are in fact functional in developing a spirit of solidarity among those in the social situation where the deviant emerges.

E) GROUPING REVISITED: extremism and joint action

Figure 2 presents a typology of members that could emerge out of a situation in which a collection of individuals are assigned a task that makes salient the imaginary ideological dimension right-left. Individuals that

(15) It is important to observe that deviants and innovators are not defined once and for all, since this would imply that boundaries are defined once and for all too. One has to recognize the fragility of social negotiations and their changeability over time. In addition a member that is considered a deviant along a salient dimension can change his status as long as the dimension looses its relevance. That is to say that deviance is a contextually dependent concept.
are perceived as extremist to the left could, depending on their presentation skills and the cognitive consistency of their presentations, be transformed into either deviants to the left or "pull-leaders" of the left. The same could happen to those individuals perceived as extremists to the right. However, if a deviant to the left is created in a group, we could expect pull-leaders to emerge in the same group only if they were pull-leaders of the right, since the creation of deviance and pull-leadership reflects the outcomes of a negotiation process around the ideological preferences of the group members.

**MEMBER’S PERCEIVED POSITION ON A SIMPLE SALIENT DIMENSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTREMIST TO THE &quot;LEFT&quot;</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>EXTREMIST TO THE &quot;RIGHT&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVIANT TO THE LEFT</td>
<td>undesirable member</td>
<td>DEVIANT TO THE RIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY NEGATIVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIFFERENT OR MIXED</td>
<td>FOLLOWER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PULL-LEADER OR INNOVATOR OF THE LEFT</td>
<td>desirable member</td>
<td>PULL-LEADER OR INNOVATOR OF THE RIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY POSITIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some individuals that are perceived as moderates would eventually elicit some strong feelings towards them. This is a possible proposition for two reasons: i) emotional reactions to group members may be elicited by reasons other than cognitive or ideological preferences; and ii) other cognitive or ideological dimension could be salient at the same time that the left-right dimension is salient.

Figure 3 shows the relationship that the emergence of deviance and pull-leadership maintain with the positions or actions that were taken by the groups in which these roles emerged. Groups that develop pull-leaders of the right or deviants to the left will behave in ways that are consonant with the points of view of the right. Conversely, groups that develop a deviance to the right or a pull-leadership to the left, will behave in ways that are consistent with a leftist point of view.

FIGURE 3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCEIVED POSITION OF A GROUP'S EXTREMIST AND GROUP IMAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTREMIST</th>
<th>GROUP'S IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deviant to the left</td>
<td>right oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deviant to the right</td>
<td>left oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pull-leader of the left</td>
<td>left oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pull-leader of the right</td>
<td>right oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As said before, the joint actions or positions that a group takes are consistent with the development of norms of conduct for the group members and the relative status that is ascribed to the different members. A group's image, boundaries and differentiation of membership are interlocking pieces of a developmental process of group formation.

F) THE AIMS OF THIS STUDY: testable hypothesis

In order to test the plausibility of the theory presented, an experiment was devised. A sample of students of management were assigned to teams based on the similarity of their attitudes towards labor. (16) The teams were then asked to reach a decision on a labor-management conflict that has been presented to them.

It was expected that the nature of the task, as well as the climate established for the experiment would make the labor-business ideological dimension salient.

(16) Forming teams (collections of individuals) of similar attitudes is a form of control for competing explanations. If we can demonstrate that joint action is independent from pre-experimental attitudes, i.e., that joint action can not be explained by the sum of individual characteristics, then additional support is given to the hypothesis that social action is the result of interaction and organizing. (see also footnote 11).
Based on the data collected (17), it was hypothesized that:

1. Individuals will develop common perceptions about the relative positions of the team members along a labor-business dimension.
2. Individuals will develop strong and concordant emotional reactions towards some few focal members.
3. Those individuals who were perceived to be the most extremists in a team will also be among those few ones who elicit strong and concordant feelings, and vice-versa.
4. The teams decisions on the labor management conflict will be concordant with the perceived position of the extremist that is also the most liked and in opposition with the perceived position of the extremist that is most rejected.
5. The level of group satisfaction will be higher for those groups in which a deviant emerged than in those were no deviance was observed.

(17) For specific details on the nature of the data used see Methodology.
METHODOLOGY

A) THE SAMPLE AND THE SETTING

The study was conducted with 57 undergraduate students of organizational behavior at Worcester Polytechnic Institute. Eighty-five percent of the subjects were males and more than ninety-five percent were born in the U.S. All subjects were white and originate from middle-class families. Ages varied from 17 to 21.

The experiment was conducted in regular classrooms and during regular class hours. The students were informed that they were going to participate in a class exercise on group decision making and that the results of the exercise were going to be discussed the following week. (18)

Two runs of the experiment were performed. The first run occurred in December 1977 and the second in February 1978. Thirty students participated on the first run and twenty-seven on the second.

(18) The use of exercises as teaching devices is a common procedure in this class, therefore the experimental situation did not create any disruption of the subjects environment or expectations.
B) ATTITUDE MEASUREMENT AND TEAM COMPOSITION (19)

A modified version of Newcomb's (1939) questionnaire for personal attitudes towards labor was used to determine each subject's attitude (see Appendix). Newcomb's questionnaire has been widely used and it is considered to be quite reliable and valid (Shaw and Wright, 1967). The modifications made were minor in nature and intended only to update some of the items that would otherwise be meaningless. (20)

Scores on the questionnaire can vary from 0 (extreme sympathy with labor) to 64 (extreme aversion to labor's cause). This particular sample of 57 subjects had scores varying from a low 19 to a high of 45. The mean score was 33.32 and the standard deviation 5.79. The mode and the median scores were exactly 34.0. (21)

Based on the attitude scores individuals were rank-ordered from most pro-business to most pro-labor. Teams were then defined by selecting out four to six sequential

(19) The term team is being used as a substitute for "collection of individuals" and is not intended to be a synonym for groups.

(20) The author wishes to acknowledge the essential contribution of Charles Musselman in developing the necessary changes in the questionnaire.

(21) No significant differences were found between the first and the second runs in terms of the distribution of attitudes, therefore no distinction will be made in this regard throughout the presentation of the data.
subjects from this rank-order. A total of twelve teams were formed (six in each run) and their main characteristics are presented in TABLE 1. Note that the procedure used to compose the teams produced very little variance of attitude scores in each team. (22)

TABLE 1. TEAM COMPOSITION: SIZE AND ATTITUDE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM</th>
<th>SIZE = # OF MEMBERS</th>
<th>AVERAGE ATTITUDE SCORE</th>
<th>SCORES' AMPLITUDE (HIGHEST - LOWEST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No single individual knew before the experimental stimulus his or her own score, however all subjects were

(22) Actually fifteen teams were formed, however we had missing data in one of them, and two others were formed at random and consequently the data on these teams cannot be aggregated with the data collected from the other teams.
informed about the rank order of the teams. (For instance, everyone knew that, Team C was composed of individuals that in average were more pro-labor than those in Team A, but more pro-business than those in Team E.)

C) EXPERIMENTAL STIMULUS

The students were asked to read a short Wall Street Journal article in which the issues of an ongoing negotiation between management and labor in the coal industry were presented. Special emphasis was given to the miner's "right to strike locally" (RSL) issue. (23)

After having read the article, the students were asked to discuss the RSL in teams and to produce a document stating their position on the issue, together with a list of arguments to support this position. Every group developed a position on this issue and in all but two cases this position was presented as a result of unanimous decision.

(23) At the time the experiment was being conducted, the coal miners were on strike over contract renewal. One of the key issues being negotiated at that time was the so called "miner's right to strike locally". That is, the miners wanted a contractual provision to be made accepting as legitimate the right of local unions to strike without necessarily seeking the approval from the national union. Evidently the final decision on this issue was central in determining the balance of power between local unions and management.
D) POST-STIMULUS DATA COLLECTION

Once the task was completed, the groups were dissolved and the subjects were asked to respond a short questionnaire which covered the following issues:

- their perceptions of their own and former group members' attitudes towards labor. This was recorded on Likert type scales that ranged from 1 (sympathy with labor) to 7 (sympathy with business).

- satisfaction with group interaction. Each subject was asked to rate on a seven point Likert scale the quality of the group's paper, the quality of the group's working atmosphere, the quality of one's own participation and the quality of participation of all the others.

- their affective reaction to former group members. Each subject was asked to nominate the individuals who they would like most to work with again and those who they would like least to work with again.

(24)

(24) Some of the respondents gave very general answers to this question, such as: "I would like to work with everyone again". These answers were coded as missing data since they do not represent either preferences or restrictions.
E) DEFINITION OF VARIABLES AND DATA MANIPULATION

"Group image" - The groups that adopted an anti-RSL position were classified as having a pro-business image and the groups that adopted a pro-RSL position were classified as having a pro-labor image. This is of course an oversimplification of the RSL issue. However, an inspection into the arguments presented by the groups to support their points of view warrant such simplification. (25)

"Overall rank order of perceived attitudes" - By ordering the perceived attitude scores that each particular individual attributes to the team members we develop a rank of membership along the pro-business vs. pro-labor dimension. In a group of five members, five of these ranks are developed, which then can be tested for their level of agreement with each other, by using the Kendall coefficient of concordance (W). Also, as suggested by Siegel (1956), the sum of the ranks across perceivers and for each perceived member represents the overall rank order of perceived attitudes. This overall rank order balances out all individual rankings.

(25) Only one team did not perceive the issue as one primarily involving the pro-business vs. pro-labor dimension. This result will be further discussed in the next section.
"Extremism" - Though extremism could be defined as the highest and lowest ranks in the overall rank order of perceived attitudes, we opted for a more stringent definition. Our definition of extremism requires one member of the group to be perceived by a majority of the others as being either the most pro-labor or the most pro-business member in the group. Empirically this means that if a member has been perceived by all or all but one of the other members as the most pro-labor he/she is said to be an extremist pro-labor. (26)

"Concordant feelings" - An individual is said to elicit concordant positive feelings from the other group members when he/she has been appointed by all or all but one of the others as the person who they would most like to work with again. Accordingly, an individual is said to elicit concordant negative feelings when a majority of the others (all or all but one) indicated that they would not like to work with him or her again.

"Deviance and pull-leadership" - Deviance in a

(26) The probability of observing only one extremist in a group is very small. Assuming that people will only classify others as more pro-labor and more pro-business, this probability, in a group of five members is about .005.
group is defined operationally as being a situation in which an extremist is also the least liked member. Pull-leadership is said to have occurred when an extremist was also indicated as the most liked member.

"Group satisfaction score" - For each individual a total satisfaction score was computed by adding up his/her responses to the four satisfaction Likert items. The group satisfaction score was computed by averaging out these individual satisfaction scores.
RESULTS

A) SALIENCE OF THE COGNITIVE DIMENSION

The following analysis rests on the assumption that we have successfully manipulated the experimental conditions to make salient the pro-labor vs. pro-business dimension (hereafter referred to as the L-B dimension). Several factors indicate that this assumption was indeed a valid one.

An inspection into the kinds of arguments produced by the subjects to support their group positions reveal that the RSL issue was perceived as part of an antagonistic relationship between labor and business. The following quotations are typical examples of the arguments used:

"Management should not have complete power" (Group K)
"Unfair wages makes strikes the only available course of action for workers to follow" (Group J)
"Industry could suffer from loss in bargaining power" (Group C)
"The unions would have too much control over the industry" (Group A)
"Local strikes can create a domino effect in the industry" (Group E)
Other types of arguments dealt mostly with the implications of RSL on the organizational aspects of bargaining, and therefore within the context of bargaining. (27)

Another indication of the salience of the L-B dimension is that all subjects were pretty able to differentiate their former group members along this dimension. The average difference in scores given to the individual perceived as the most pro-labor and the one perceived as the most pro-business was 2.2. That means that despite the original homogeneity of group composition a differentiation of perceived attitudes took place.

[3B] AGREEMENT ABOUT PERCEPTIONS

Accepting as a fact that the L-B dimension was salient, we would then expect, according to our previously stated hypothesis, that there would be an agreement about the perceptions that members have of each other along this dimension. In particular, as stated in Hypothesis 1, there would be an agreement about who are the most pro-business and the most pro-labor members.

(27) Only one group defined the issue in a completely different manner. Group H presented arguments that emphasized the importance of the RSL on the national scene (e.g., "coal is essential to the country", "we are running out of coal and endangering people's lives"). This will be of critical importance as we further investigate the behavior of Group H.
Table 2 presents the $W$ measure of concordance calculated for each group on individual perceptions of each other. This measure can vary from 0 (total disagreement among perceivers) to 1 (total agreement). Six of the twelve groups have developed a considerably high level of consensus of their perceptions. These are Groups B, D, F, G, H, and J. (28) The other six groups, on the other hand, have very small $W$'s. This fact does not necessarily mean that they did not develop some form of agreement, but simply that the particular measure being used did not capture this form of agreement. (29)

**TABLE 2. CONCORDANCE OF PERCEPTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W-MEASURE OF CONCORDANCE</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEARMAN CORRELATION MEASURED vs PERCEIVED</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(28) The significance of the $W$ coefficient can be tested by determining the probability associated with the occurrence of the overall rank order under $H_0$. For the six groups referred to above the level of significance of their $W$'s is lower than .05.

(29) If only one member completely deviates from the others in his/her judgments, the whole measure is affected. The same happens with polarization of judgments. When a group is composed of two subgroups that have perfect agreement within each but in which disagreement exists across sub-groups, $W$ can be close to zero.
Based on this result, a point can be made that groups have a tendency to develop a tacit agreement on the relative position of each member along a salient dimension. This agreement does not depend, as we will see, on the positions that each individual has before joining the group.

For each of the six groups with high level of concordance about perceptions, a Spearman correlation coefficient was calculated between the measured attitudes of the participants and the overall rank order of perceived attitudes. (30) These coefficients, presented in Table 2, varied from -0.30 to +0.71, which shows that there is no stable relationship between perception of attitudes and the independent measurement of such attitudes.

Of special interest to us is the question of whether group members agree on who the extremists in the group are. Such an agreement is possible even with a low W. (31) Despite the low probability associated with the emergence of extremists, Table 3 shows that in all but two groups this occurred. We were able to detect eight groups with extremists on both sides of the L-B dimension, and two others with only one extremist.

(30) See methodology.

(31) A low W can be obtained based on agreement about the extremes and disagreement about those who fall in the middle.
### TABLE 3. PERCEPTION OF RELATIVE EXTREMISM IN GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MOST PRO-LABOR</th>
<th># OF INDICATIONS</th>
<th>MOST PRO-BUSINESS</th>
<th># OF INDICATIONS</th>
<th>PERCEIVERS <em>(SIZE - 1)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X2 **</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X3 *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X3(X4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X4 *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* these individuals did not perceive themselves as the most pro-business in their groups

** this individual perceived himself as being the most pro-business in his group.
An individual who is being perceived by others as an extremist, tends to perceive him/herself in the same manner. Sixteen of the nineteen individuals in Table 3 perceived themselves to be either the most pro-labor or the most pro-business member in their groups.

In summary, group members develop shared perceptions of each other along a salient cognitive dimension. This commonality of perceptions is particularly strong regarding the most extreme members.

C) AGREEMENT ABOUT EMOTIONAL REACTIONS

Again, despite the low probability of developing common feelings towards a particular group member, in all but two groups either a most liked or a least liked member emerged, as can be seen in Table 4. In four of these groups both a most and a least liked member emerged.
The number of least liked members are only half as large as the number of most liked members. This proportion is maintained when we count the total number of sociometric indications: there were 78 positive choices against only 38 negative ones. This fact can be interpreted as a manifestation of an underlying cultural norm of withholding negative feelings.

D) PERCEPTIONS OF EXTREMISM AND CONCORDANT FEELINGS

Hypothesis three stated that individuals who are perceived to be extremists will also elicit strong and concordant feelings from the other group members. We would expect, therefore, that the individuals who appear in Table 3 would also appear in Table 4 and vice-versa.

We found that forty-three percent of those who are perceived as extremists also elicit concordant feelings from the other members. Two-thirds of those who elicit concordant feelings are also perceived as extremists. The equivalent absolute figures are presented in Table 5.
### TABLE 4. CONCORDANT FEELINGS TOWARDS GROUP MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MOST LIKED MEMBER</th>
<th># OF INDICATIONS</th>
<th>LEAST LIKED MEMBER</th>
<th># OF INDICATIONS</th>
<th>PERCEIVERS = (SIZE - 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X1 (X4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION OF EXTREMISM AND CONCORDANT FEELINGS (cells contain number of cases).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEPTUAL DIMENSION</th>
<th>MEMBER IS PERCEIVED AS EXTREMIST</th>
<th>MEMBER NOT PERCEIVED AS EXTREMIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFECTIVE DIMENSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELICITS CONCORDANT FEELINGS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELICITS MIXED OR NO FEELINGS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = 11.56 \quad p < 0.001
\]
This result clearly confirms the hypothesis that emotions and perceptions are related to one another. Strong and concordant emotions tend to be directed to people who are perceived to be extremists.

**B) SHARED EMOTIONS, SHARED PERCEPTIONS AND JOINT ACTION:**

the emergence of group structure

Ten individuals were perceived as extremists and also have elicited strong and concordant feelings. These individuals come from eight different groups, as shown on Table 6.

**TABLE 6. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PULL-LEADERSHIP, DEVIANCE AND GROUP'S ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PULL-LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>DEVIANCE</th>
<th>GROUP'S ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>pro-business</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
<td>pro-business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
<td>pro-business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>pro-business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
<td>pro-business*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
<td>pro-business</td>
<td>pro-business**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-labor*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pro-labor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* one group member presented a dissenting opinion  
** this group did not perceive the issue as involving the pro-labor vs. pro-business dimension.
In Groups B, E, K and L a pull-leader emerged, i.e., in these groups the most liked member was also perceived to be an extremist. In Groups D and G a deviant emerged, i.e., the least liked member was also perceived as an extremist. Finally, in Groups A and H both a deviant and a pull-leader emerged. We were unable to observe the emergence of either pull-leaders or deviants in Groups C, F, I and J.

Note that in Group A the deviant is perceived as pro-labor and the pull-leader as pro-business. In Group H the situation is reversed, the deviant is perceived as pro-business and the pull-leader as pro-labor. This result indicates that the development of concordant emotions is related to preferences along the L-B dimension. When a most liked individual is perceived to be at one extreme of the L-B dimension, the least liked individual is perceived to be at the other.

These preferences may manifest themselves in the way the group acts. This is of course hypothesis four: group action will be consonant with the pull-leader's perceived position and dissonant with the deviants perceived position. Table 6 shows that in seven of the eight groups where either deviants or pull-leaders emerged this prediction holds true. The groups that decided against the RSL had either a perceived pro-labor deviant or a perceived pro-business pull-leader; and the groups that decided in
favor of the RSL had a perceived pro-labor leader.

The perceived position of the deviant is a position that the other group members reject. Accordingly, the perceived position of the pull-leader is a position that the other group members are willing to accept. In these sense, both pull-leader and deviant function as a sign-post or boundaries for acceptable and unacceptable member attitudes. The development of norms is, therefore, bond to role and status differentiation.

Furthermore, joint action can be seen as a consequence of these structural developments. The positions adopted by the groups are consistent with and reflect the ways in which the groups organized.

The competing explanation that joint action can be explained by the simple composition and aggregation of individual attitudes does not withstand testing. If individual tendencies and their aggregation were responsible for joint action, we would expect that the groups with higher average attitude scores would tend to assume pro-business positions and those with lower scores, pro-labor positions. In other words the last column in Table 6 would show a gradual change from pro-business positions to pro-labor positions. However, the fact is that a run test in this column reveal that there is no such regularity.
F) DEVIANCE AND GROUP SATISFACTION

No significant relationship was found between the emergence of deviance in a group and the level of satisfaction experienced by the group members, as can be seen in Table 7. The lack of significance can be attributed to the small size of the sample.

TABLE 7. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRESENCE OF DEVIANCE AND SATISFACTION (cells contain number of cases).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVIANE PRESENT</th>
<th>ABOVE THE MEDIAN</th>
<th>BELOW THE MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT PRESENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .45 (Fisher exact probability)
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

One of the clear results of this study is that organizing is facilitated by the existence of perceived extremism. The emotional reactions that are directed to these extremists help a collection of individuals to develop its own group image.

Extremism and not moderation seems to be the driving force behind order. Extremism helps create order in two different ways: by positive identification (in which case the extremist takes the role of a leader) and by negative identification (in which case the extremist takes the role of the deviant).

Deviance and leadership seem to emanate from the same need for group self-definition, and in this sense both roles are equally important and functional.

If this finding can be replicated by others, in different settings and with different methodologies, our present knowledge of the processes of deviance and conformity will have to be revised.
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Instruments used in data collection:
1. Attitudes towards labor inventory
2. Group interaction questionnaire.
ATTITUDE TOWARD LABOR INVENTORY

This is an attitude questionnaire and therefore there aren't any right or wrong answers to it. In fact there aren't any questions being asked. In the following page you will find fourteen pairs of statements. What you are asked to do is to read carefully each pair at a time and choose between them as to the one that you can most agree with. You may not entirely agree with either of them, but be sure to indicate the one that most closely represents your opinion by putting a cross-mark (+) in front of it. If you strongly agree with one particular statement in a pair, please indicate so by putting two cross-marks (++) in front of it. At the end, every pair of statements would have to have only one cross-mark in front of one of its statements.

Thank you very much for your time.

Name of respondent: ____________________________________________
A. Labor unions should be concerned only with such matters as wages, working conditions, hiring and firing, etc.

1. B. Labor unions can’t get and keep good wages and working conditions unless they help elect public officials who are sympathetic to them.

A. Anyone who is smart enough to become wealthy should be allowed to enjoy his wealth himself.

2. B. People who are wealthy are almost sure to use their power in ways which will keep working people down.

A. The main reason why workers are not better off is that labor unions don’t have as much influence in political circles as employers and businessmen do.

3. B. On the whole, national, state and city governments are run for the best interest of every group of people represented.

A. It is the workers’ business to work in a plant, and the owners’ business to manage it, and both sides should stick to their business.

4. B. Workers are affected more directly than owners are by what happens in a plant and so workers should try to become powerful enough to help decide how the plant should be managed.

A. I believe in the idea of majority rule. Workers are a majority in this country, and so if they all would join unions they would have the right to have the control of the government.

5. B. If workers are fair in their demands, their unions can get a fair deal for them without the trouble of trying to use their influence in government.

A. Sometimes it is necessary for the public employee to strike to secure just demands, even if such strikes are against the law.

6. B. Peaceful demonstrations, negotiations and arbitrations are more effective in the long run for public employees.

A. Talk about the working class as opposed to the owning class is foolish because both classes suffer or prosper together.

7. B. People who talk about workers and owners really having the same interests are usually afraid that labor unions will become strong enough to cut down owner’s profits.
A. White collar workers can get along better by playing ball with employers than they can by tying themselves up with the unions which include blue collar and unskilled workers.

B. The main reason why labor unions haven't got further in this country is that white collar workers consider themselves above unskilled and blue collar workers, and so unions can not increase their influence.

A. A worker's right to his job should be considered more important than an investor's right to his profits, because a worker usually has nothing else but his job to fall back.

B. Labor unions might as well admit that an employer's first responsibility is to the owners, and do the best that they can on that basis.

A. The National Labor Relations Act was intended to favor labor unions, because it was recognized that unions did not have a fair chance before that.

B. Labor unions would get more respect from the public if they admitted that the National Labor Relations Act is unfair to employers and tried to get it changed.

A. Almost anyone who has brains and is willing to work hard can expect to rise to a position of moderate wealth and influence.

B. Intelligence and hard work won't get you very far nowadays unless you have the backing of a powerful group.

A. It's hard to see how organized labor can have much influence on government if it doesn't include the millions of white collar workers.

B. Labor unions can put all the pressure on government that they need to by clever lobbying, and so they don't need to include millions of white collar workers.

A. Most people disapprove of "sick-outs" by teachers because no one ever has the right to deprive children from education.

B. Most people who object to "sick-outs" don't like them just because they have proved very useful in securing higher wages for teachers.
A. Labor unions should welcome Republicans, Democrats, Socialists and Communists alike, if they are honestly trying to do all they can to help the workers.

B. Labor unions should throw out all Communists, no matter how much they are helping, because they give the union a bad reputation of being radical.
GROUP INTERACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How would you rate yourself as to your sympathies with the labor and business sides of the labor-relations question: (circle one number)

sympathy

w/ labor

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

w/ business

2. How would you rate each one of your group members in the same scale:
   (use one scale for each member)

   a. member’s name: ____________________________

   sympathy

   w/ labor

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   w/ business

   sympathy

   w/ labor

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   w/ business

   b. member’s name: ____________________________

   sympathy

   w/ labor

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   w/ business

   sympathy

   w/ labor

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   w/ business

   etc.

3. How would you rate the quality of your group’s output in the following scale: (circle one number)

   excellent

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   poor

4. How would you rate the working atmosphere in your group in the following scale: (circle one number)

   excellent

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   poor

5. How would you rate the quality of your participation in the group: (circle one number)

   excellent

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   poor

6. How would you rate the quality of participation of all other members in your group: (circle one number)

   excellent

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   poor

7. Name one or two individuals in your group who you would be most interested in working with again:

   a. ____________________________

   b. ____________________________

8. Name one or two individuals in your group who you would be least interested in working with again:

   a. ____________________________

   b. ____________________________