Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1972

The Monopoly study of authority

Micheale Hall Williams
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#), and the [Sociology of Culture Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Williams, Micheale Hall, "The Monopoly study of authority" (1972). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 947.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.947>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Micheale Hall Williams for the
Master of Arts in Sociology presented November 24, 1972.

Title: The Monopoly Study of Authority

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Barry Lebowitz, Chairman

Jan Hajda

Dennis Brissett

The Monopoly Study of Authority was an institutional grant project designed to test the variables of authority and protection in a laboratory experiment conducted in the Small Groups Laboratory. Subjects (Ss) were recruited and paid a minimum wage to play Monopoly, while the Experimenter (E) manipulated the relevant variables, observed and video-taped the games.

The hypothesis states that the greater the investment, the more likely will the individual make efforts to protect it. The dimensions of investment were ego involvement (desire to win, competitiveness), and resource commitment (Ss were offered rewards of double-time pay for winning the Monopoly game). Efforts to protect the investment were expected to take the form of personal authority, whereby Ss would overrule or otherwise ignore written rules/or rule changes instigated by E; or, delegated authority, whereby the Ss would accept E and/or the written

rules as the legitimate authority over the game.

Various and sundry administrative, technical and design problems resulted in the decision to prepare a research chronicle to provide a fuller accounting of investigative activity and to document the role of the circumstantial, the irrational, and nonrational, as well as the systematic logic and specific methodology of the research process.

While the development of the research chronicle is well grounded in the work of William F. Whyte's famous Appendix, the most useful rationale for this project was provided by Phillip E. Hammond's collection of chronicles, Sociologists at Work. This presentation is organized around the sequence of events in time and the sequence of ideas in the mind of E.

The chronologic form is compatible with the underlying methodological approach of the project. Based on Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss' work, The Discovery of Ground Theory, wherein theory is understood to emerge from data and the notion of theory as process is presented, the research process was loosely structured, each day's design emerging from the previous experimental session. This methodology allowed that questions peripheral to the initial hypothesis could be examined, and, in fact, a follow-up questionnaire study is presented in Appendix D. The discussion of the chronicle form and the methodology of grounded theory comprises Section One of this thesis.

To conduct the actual experiments chronicled in Section Two, five, four person Monopoly sessions were scheduled. Ss were recruited on the basis of sex and affectual relationship. The Trial Session consisted of two males and two females instructed to play "ordinary Monopoly." The session was video-taped, and from the resultant tapes a demonstration

tape was prepared documenting S sensitivity to the laboratory situation. In Session I the Ss were required to play Monopoly "strictly according to the written rules," attempting to create an external authority condition. In Session II E instituted "Barry's Rule," an arbitrary variant of the basic income rule in Monopoly. This design change was intended to enhance a condition of arbitrary, external authority in the form of E's created rule. In addition, the Ss were advised that the winner would be paid double-time. Session III repeated the double-time pay for winners condition, and Session IV was cancelled.

All the sessions were video taped, and all the tapes were reviewed. However, no adequate coding system was developed, and no quantitative data was produced. Impressionistic analysis, fortunately, afforded several useful interpretations which are cited in Section Three. Firstly, the double-time incentive did not create an investment condition, most likely because the reward (paid by check, several weeks later) was too abstract and too small (\$12.00). "Barry's Rule" condition did elicit a strong negative response from the Ss, but also netted compliance.

Section Four presents an "ideal" research design, thus rounding out the thesis from a chronicle of a research process, to an examination of the results, to the articulation of an approved design.

THE MONOPOLY STUDY OF AUTHORITY

by

MICHEALE HALL WILLIAMS

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
SOCIOLOGY

Portland State University
1972

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Micheale Hall Williams presented November 24, 1972.

Barry Lebowitz, Chairman

Jan Hajda

Dennis Brissett

APPROVED:

Don C. Gibbons, Head, Department of Sociology

David T. Clark, Dean of Graduate Studies

November 27, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
A READER'S GUIDE AND AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION ..	1
I INTENT	1
II THE CHRONICLE	18
The de facto "Operationalization"	20
Pause For Technical Difficulties	24
Trial Session	26
Session I	29
Session II	32
Session III	34
Session IV	35
III WHAT DATA?	36
Trial Session	36
Session I	40
Session II	41
Session III	44
Session IV	45
Summary	45
IV THE IDEAL DESIGN	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY	55
APPENDICES	
A. REQUEST FOR RESEARCH FUNDS	57

B. THE PLAY-MONEY GAME THAT MADE MILLIONS	63
C. MONOPOLY QUESTIONNAIRE	69
D. THE ISSUE OF FURTHER RIGOR	71

A READER'S GUIDE
AND AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

1. ON FOOTNOTES

The extensive footnoting in this presentation is grounded in two precepts: experience; and the joint pursuit of academic accreditation and credibility.

The experiential grounding is best conveyed in the following anecdote: I once prepared a paper for Dr. Charles Bolton in a required theory course, the topic of which (assigned) was a symbolic interactional analysis of a then-current conflict between graduate students and faculty in the PSU Sociology Department. In that paper I made reference to "stroking" older faculty members who had ceased to perform their roles with flexibility and creativity. I did not footnote this reference to "stroking" thus allowing a consequential misunderstanding of intent. That is, Dr. Bolton interpreted my suggestion of "stroking" to mean causing heart attacks (strokes!), rather than the social psychological interpretation popularized by Eric Berne. In returning my paper, he further noted that while he thought I was "paranoid and full of hate", he had given me an "A". Speaking to the "paranoia" assertion, I can only say that the next time I used the "stroking" concept it was footnoted: see page 15, footnote 53 of this paper.

Turning to footnoting in the pursuit of accreditation, because a Masters' Thesis (for instance) is traditionally understood as a model

for the proper form of presentation, as well as a reflection of mastery of basic concepts and syntheses, it is singularly important to ground one's theory, analysis and methodology in a recognizable body of knowledge. Further, in presenting detailed and specific analyses of individual work in the relevant area, "credit where credit's due" is mandatory, both from the point of view of ethics and of understandability. In addition, the MLA Style Sheet, rev. ed., compiled by William Riley Parker (New York, 1951), provides explicit instructions on documentation in the preparation of learned articles and books.

Concerning footnoting as a means of conveying credibility, while the footnotes establish specific references, they also serve as an independent statement in that were the text of this paper lost, the substantive concerns could be reconstructed from the footnotes alone. In essence, then, this paper taken as a whole may be said to present the important arguments twice. And repetition from diverse sources serves to strengthen credibility (Arthur R. Cohen, Attitude Change and Social Influence, New York, 1964, esp. pp. 23-30, 37; 33; 28).

Finally, there are two hints for the footnote-weary. The footnotes herein are designed to be concise and accurate without straining the reader's attention. "Ibid" and "op cit" have been rejected in favor of the author's name for reference.

Secondly, some of my best (to my mind) thoughts, ideas and intellectual asides are contained in the footnotes. Extended footnotes also often contain relevant and interesting, but undeveloped themes.

2. PREPARING TO READ THIS THESIS

If you know little about the game of Monopoly, you are part of a

small minority of Americans as well as severely handicapped in understanding this study. For your own entertainment and enlightenment, then, I recommend reading the article on Monopoly contained in Appendix B.

3. READING THIS THESIS

There has been some discussion of the size of this paper. It has generally been indicated that this thesis may be too short. I should initially like to point out that this paper has been written, rewritten and revised several times. Rarely have these alterations been directed toward enhancing bulk. Rather, most reworking has been to "tighten up" the logic and connections. At this point I would honestly defend every word as important--if only to maintain my own stylistic inclinations.

However, because size continues to be a measure of worth, I shall present the most literal and pragmatic value data available:

$$\frac{C}{AB} = W(\text{orth})$$

C = total gross income to the Williams/Zeitlin household paid

for research and preparation of this thesis: \$2316.00

A = total number of pages of text: 45

B = number of words per page: 300

W = rate per word: \$.17 1/7

The resultant Worth of rate per word is approximately \$.17 1/7. This rate compares most favorably to the rates paid by the New Republic and Atlantic (approximately \$.10 per word); and the New York Times (approximately \$.25 per word); but unfavorably to the rate paid by Playboy (approximately \$.60 to \$1.00 per word).

In light of this assessment then, it is perhaps worthwhile to read

this thesis several times, following the form of "good study habits". That is, read it once-quickly for a superficial understanding of the theme and concepts; once in a concerted, deliberate and critical manner; and one final time for synthesis, overview, and summary interpretation.

4. AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge the continuing support, assistance and interest of Dr. Barry Lebowitz. Throughout my graduate school experience he has most consistently been responsive to my academic needs and inclinations, thereby affording me a respectable and ethical model of professionalism. With specific attention to the preparation of this thesis, Barry has treated my work, style and pace with unfailing respect and understanding. The freedom thus afforded has not only allowed me to work comfortably and without pressure, but has further allowed me to discover my own inclinations, capabilities and intellectual habits. In sum then, working with Barry has proved both enlightening and maturing, and I thank him most sincerely.

SECTION ONE

INTENT

There are three major and related themes in this presentation. There is first an attempt to prepare a research chronicle that presents the sequence of events in time and the sequence of ideas in the mind of the researcher. The chronicling technique is grounded in Section One while the actual research chronicle occurs in Section Two.

Secondly, there is a general application of the primary precepts of grounded theory as presented by Glaser and Strauss. This intention is reflected primarily in the theoretical conceptualizations of this study in the substantive area of Social Control.

Lastly is the methodological application of Goffman's analyses of encounters and the bases of fun, as well as frequent references to encounter phenomena throughout Section Two.

The most direct intellectual purpose in preparing this thesis is to chronicle the process of one small research project, as well as to present the substantive concerns and data emerging from the project. While the intent of this work is reminiscent of William F. Whyte's Appendix, (1) the rationale for such a presentation is most clearly stated in Phillip E. Hammond's collection of research chronicle essays (2).

(1) William F. Whyte, Street Corner Society (Illinois, 1955).

(2) Phillip E. Hammond, ed., Sociologists at Work (New York, 1964).

Such auspicious models, however, require humble qualifications. The Monopoly Study of Authority was a small grant (\$1500) awarded through the Institutional Grant Committee of Portland State University (3). The research term, by dictate of the grant conditions, was one fiscal year. And the project was entirely conducted by three persons: myself as the primary investigator and experimenter (E); Dr. Barry Lebowitz as the faculty advisor and basic resource person; and Susan Mc Clendon, a work study assistant, as the all purpose aide and colleague (4).

These scale characteristics are clearly stated to dramatize the unambitious structure of the Monopoly Study, in contradistinction to the "Sociability Project", for example, a study extending over more than four years, with four actively participating principal investigators, and numerous staff and assistants, etc. (5).

In addition, the Monopoly Study was designed to meet myriad needs, not the least of which was summer income for myself and a work study grant for Susan Mc Clendon. Because these and other extra-substantive considerations such as the existence of an unused Small Groups Laboratory, had significant impact on the theoretical concerns, the entire project is chronicled from its inception. The format of this presentation is "...chronologic (and) ideologic, that is, organized around the sequence

(3) Institutional Grant No. 90-262-4001, February, 1970, Portland State University. See Appendix A: "Request for Research Funds."

(4) The titles and roles noted here do not correspond to those cited in the grant proposal.

(5) Hammond, pp. 270-371.

of events in time (and) the sequence of ideas in the mind of the researcher." (6)

Finally, this presentation is not an appendix to a cohesive study as is Whyte's; nor is it a descriptive essay prepared separately and distinct from a body of research as are the essays in Hammond's volume. It is, instead, an attempt to present both the "context of discovery" and the "context of justification". (7)

Hammond argues convincingly for the need for chronicling the actual research process as well as the specific methodology of a study. Citing de Tocqueville's biographer, a quasi-autobiographical essay of Edward Shils, Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld (8), Hammond impressively establishes the value and validity of a fuller accounting of investigative activity.

A chronicle of the research process "...conveys as do few other documents the role of the circumstantial, the irrational, and non-rational, as well as the logical and systematic, nature of social research." (9) Beyond its anecdotal interest, however, the research chronicle further serves to make explicit the various sources of influence; informal linkage of concepts; and the implications, impact and ethics of social inquiry as a social activity.

Though a consideration of the impact and ethics of social inquiry

(6) Hammond, p. 4 .

(7) Hammond, pp. 3-4.

(8) Hammond, pp. 1-3, 16.

(9) Hammond, p. 2.

is an undeveloped theme throughout this presentation, the problems of empathy with subjects (10); ethics of and in research activity (11); and the problems akin to those of participant observation and interviewing (12), are all implied, alluded to, or discussed.

Hammond's encouragement to chronicle the context of discovery is closely related to the variant methodological procedure of Glaser and Strauss called "grounding theory", (13) by which they describe the processes of conducting large-scale research, most particularly, qualitative field research. The fact that the entire schedule of procedures is not applied to this project stems primarily from utility considerations.

While the use of their extensively detailed comparative analysis technique and the application of diverse source-searching models (Chapters V-VII) would greatly extend the scope and substance of this research, their use was precluded by intent (a pilot or exploratory study rather than specifically theory generating research) and pragmatism (lack of time and material resources). Selected use of their procedures, however, is well grounded in the oft-repeated dictum to "fit the theory

(10) Blanche Geer, "First Days in the Field," in Hammond, pp. 372-398.

(11) Melville Dalton, "Preconceptions and Methods in Men Who Manage," Hammond, pp. 58-110.

(12) Morris S. and Charlotte B. Schwartz, "Problems in Participant Observation," American Journal of Sociology, 60 (January, 1955), pp. 343-353; and Howard S. Becker and Blanche Geer, "Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison," in Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer, eds., Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology, (Massachusetts, 1967), pp. 109-119.

(13) Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research, (Chicago, 1967).

to the data", "fit the method to the question". (14)

Lest this argument become an onerous exercise in the rhetoric of qualification (15), the relevant considerations of credible procedure should be presented. (16)

Firstly, Glaser and Strauss present an excellent and practical (17) argument for theory grounded in data rather than data verifying theory (18). That the use of the word "practical" calls to understandings of the arguments of utility in dramaturgy, and an audience of lay practitioners, is clearly reflected in Glaser and Strauss' assumption that theory is for application to social problems, social practitionering, sociology as the vanguard of reformism.

Toward applying grounded theory to substantive practical considerations, Glaser and Strauss suggest four criteria:

The first requisite property is that the theory must closely fit the substantive area in which it will be used. Second, it must be readily understandable by laymen concerned with this area. Third, it must be sufficiently general to be applicable to a multitude of diverse daily situations within the substantive area, not to just a specific type of situation. Fourth, it must allow the user partial control over the structure and processes of daily situations as they change through time. (19)

(14) Glaser and Strauss, p. viii, 261, etc.

(15) Glaser and Strauss, "It is also necessary to leave out qualifications in order to write a theory that is readable, because the rhetoric of qualification can be as onerous to read as to write.", p. 232.

(16) Glaser and Strass, pp. 223-235.

(17) Glaser and Strauss, p. 237.

(18) Glaser and Strauss, pp. 3-6.

(19) Glaser and Strauss, p. 237.

all the properties clearly speak to considerations of the theory's application to social service professions. (20)

The consequence of theory that emerges from data is the notion of

...theory as process; that is, theory as an ever developing entity, not as a perfected product...The person who applied theory becomes, in effect, a generator of theory, and in this instance the theory is clearly seen as process: an ever-developing entity. (21)

While the focus of Glaser and Strauss' presentation is substantive theory, they briefly (with disclaimer) speak to the emergence of formal theory from substantive theory. (22) One may logically extend formal theory to "grand theory", but the near questionable value of formal theory at this point in discipline history effectively precludes the value of any grand theorizing. The general notion of creating developmental (emergent) theory, however, "...especially facilitates the generation of theories of process, sequence, and change pertaining to organizations, positions and social interaction." (23)

In addition to the two points above (theory that fits the data and theory that grows), Glaser and Strauss present articulate arguments concerning the readability and credibility of theory. Their encouragements to "make data real", "accessible to the layman", "vividly describe", were all well considered in the preparation of this paper, as well as in the basic form decision to use games (lay structures). That these arguments

(20) Glaser and Strauss, pp. 32, 242.

(21) Glaser and Strauss, pp. 32, 242.

(22) Glaser and Strauss, Chapter IV, pp. 79-99.

(23) Glaser and Strauss, p. 114.

also hearken to dramaturgical notions is clear in the "rhetoric" (24) discussion of "Conveying Credibility", (25) reference to which I shall make when the "play-within-the-play" aspects are manifest. (See pp. 22-24).

Turning to more precise (codified) methodological procedures results in efforts to create theory general enough to be applicable:

...it is more important to accumulate a vast number of diverse qualitative 'facts' on many different situations in the area. This diversity facilitates the development of a theory with both a sufficient number of general concepts relevant to most situations and plausible relations among these categories to account for much everyday behavior in the situations. (26)

Further, "...the researcher should regard all statements about events pertaining to the area under study as being data." (27) The operationalization of these dicta (organization of the research) is made quite clear in the structure of descriptive chronology used throughout Section Two of this paper (pp. 13-25):

Joint collection, coding and analysis of data is the underlying operation. The generation of theory, coupled with the notion of theory as process, requires that all three operations be done together as much as possible. They should blur and intertwine continually, from the beginning of an investigation to its end. To be sure, in any investigation the tendency is to do all three simultaneously; but in many (if not most) studies of description and verification, there is typically such a definite focus

(24) Dennis Brissett, a lecture in "Advanced Social Psychology," Portland State University, Fall, 1970.

(25) Glaser and Strauss, pp. 228-230.

(26) Glaser and Strauss, p. 243.

(27) Glaser and Strauss, p. 254.

on one operation at a time that the others are slighted or ignored. This definite separation of each operation hinders generation of theory. For example, if data are beginning coded and a fresh analytic idea emerges that jolts the operation, the idea may be disregarded because of pre-established rules or plain routine--thus stifling at that moment the generation of theory. (28)

Speaking specifically to the consideration of new analytic ideas emerging from the initial hypotheses, the development of the marijuana question (Section Two, particularly pp. 23-25) provides a useful example. And extending from this new consideration is the "Issue of Further Rigor", (29) wherein more rigorous methods are applied to raise the level of plausibility of a hypothesis, or extend qualitative research to the discovery of a grounded substantive theory. In this case, the methodological precepts of Glaser and Strauss are reflected in Appendix D's presentation of the drug and political attitude correlations.

The "unstifled" development of the peripheral drug consideration was greatly stimulated by the factor of insight, as discussed by Glaser and Strauss in Chapter XI (30). In their discussion, the researcher is characterized as a highly sensitized and systematic agent; one who

...can get--and cultivate--crucial insights not only during his research (and from his research) but from his own personal experiences prior to or outside it...one should deliberately cultivate such reflections on personal experience...as springboards to systematic theorizing. (31)

(28) Glaser and Strauss, p. 43.

(29) Glaser and Strauss, p. 43.

(30) Glaser and Strauss, pp. 251-257.

(31) Glaser and Strauss, p. 252.

While their presentation is necessarily brief (and my application non-specific), the implications of considering this crucial issue are well worth further pursuit; a task I propose to undertake in preparing my Ph.D. dissertation.

Returning to the initial point of formulating substantive theory from data for use by social service practitioners, one recalls Glaser and Strauss' requisite properties of fit, understandability, generality and control. Of these four, an important element to consider in the terms of this study is that of control.

The substantive area of interest in this study is Social Control. The actors are figures of legitimate authority (police, for instance), and individual citizens (property owners, for instance). The action/object is the protection of property by authority (legitimate or delegated) or individuals (personal authority). The intervening variable is hypothesized as investment (ego or material). The broadest intellectual intent of this study was to "establish more definitive parameters" around the three main concepts of authority, protection and investment: substantive theoretical statements in the area of Social Control were expected to emerge from the data.

Glaser and Strauss' notion of control, however, speaks to methodological considerations of theory application:

The substantive theory must enable the person who uses it to have enough control in everyday situations to make its application worth trying. (32)

(32) Glaser and Strauss, p. 245.

In the substantive area of Social Control, however, it is particularly important to recognize that the agents of Social Control are also the practitioners of the substantive theory. Glaser and Strauss' discussion explicitly excludes consideration of the ethical problems in controlling situations, and is concerned "...only with the partial, beneficial, shifting, often benign controls that people already engage in without theoretical guides..." (33)

Despite the disclaimer, the model for developing theory and the discussion of control for the practitioner are two extremely important considerations. It strikes me as perfectly reasonable that one carefully consider the use and consequences of one's work, even if such a consideration stems from a privileged position of pseudo-choice. It is a curious fact indeed that were this paper not being prepared for the exclusive purpose of certifying my talent as a sociologist, it would not be written (by me) at all. Harrumph. Rustle. Rax.

For a general statement of the control consideration, I cite Glaser and Strauss at length:

The person who applies the theory must be enabled to understand and analyze ongoing situational realities, to produce and predict change in them, and to predict and control consequences both for the object of change and for other parts of the total situation that will be affected. As changes occur, his theory must allow him to be flexible in revising the theory itself if necessary. To give this kind of control, the theory must provide a sufficient number of general concepts and their plausible interrelations (sic); and these concepts must provide the practitioner with understanding, with situational controls, and with access to the situation in order to exert the controls. The crux of controllability is the production and control of change through 'controllable' variables and 'access' variables...A theory with

(33) Glaser and Strauss, p. 245.

controllable concepts of sufficient generality, that fits and is understandable, gives anyone who wishes to apply these concepts to bring about change a controllable theoretical foothold in diverse situations. The controllability of a conceptual variable is enhanced by its being part of a theory that guides its use under most conditions that the user is likely to encounter. (34)

Applying this discussion to the substantive concern of Social Control, the prime controllable variable of this study is "protection". Authorities (35) determine the creation, maintenance and changes in the forms and extent of protection afforded citizens, groups and property (36).

When "protection" is understood as a controllable variable, its explanatory power rests in the interaction of the access variables of "authority" and "investment". That is, the nature of protection (37) will depend upon considerations of investment (or value) varying by response to authority. Or, protection is a dependent variable, investment an independent variable, and response to authority an interaction variable.

(34) Glaser and Strauss, p. 245.

(35) Authorities at the level of theory application and social practitioner are fully understood to be performing in administrative and executive roles in the general area of law enforcement. Policemen are more appropriately understood as workers for or symbols of, authority. While this distinction is not crucial to their discussion, Glaser and Strauss are consistently speaking to administrative positions of theory application, because these are the roles that afford true "discretion" (as in power or latitude of free decision) and autonomy, two aspects of power implied in their notion of "controllability".

(36) Glaser and Strauss, p. 246.

(37) An accepted fact of the phenomena of police protection is the variability of application and intent. Ghetto, poor and/or rental neighborhoods are sensitive to the selective and inadequate nature of police protection; whereas wealthy residential and tract neighborhoods receive specific patrolling, as well as augmenting their protection with private patrols. A study of this phenomenon directs our attention to the formation of vigilant neighborhood patrols. This last (latent) consequence of police protection is reflected in the "response to authority" variable.

The notion of control then, has shifted from the focus of a substantive area, to a conceptual concern, to a methodologically defined variable.

Two additional points of Glaser and Strauss serve to bring our attention to an additional intellectual intention of this study: "... control usually involves the efforts of two parties; that is, control of the interaction between two people by one or both of them"; and "Objects and physical spaces are of strategic importance as variables that help control situations and people's behavior". (38) Both points are relevant particularly to the micro-analysis employed in this study. And, a micro-analytic study of this type clearly calls for a consideration of Erving Goffman's work, Encounters. (39)

The design of the Monopoly Study of Authority is traditionally understood to be one of a small groups study. Goffman, however, makes useful argument for the distinction between a small group, and a focused gathering, (40) concluding that in the case of laboratory gatherings (encounters) "...the researcher is often studying processes characteristic of focused interaction rather than groups as such...most laboratory experiments on small groups are experiments with action systems". (41) That this study is not an analysis of small groups is clear; the interaction framework (or, type of social arrangement) is instead a focused

(38) Glaser and Strauss, p. 248.

(39) Erving Goffman, Encounters, (New York, 1961).

(40) Goffman, pp. 9-14.

(41) Goffman, pp. 10,11.

gathering, a situated activity system, an encounter: "Focused interaction occurs when people effectively agree to sustain for a time a single focus of cognitive and visual attention, as in...a board game...". (42)

The experience of games provides the repeated example/analogy for Goffman's discussion of the form and processes of encounters. Citing Gregory Bateson, Goffman notes that "...games place a 'frame' around a spate of immediate events, determining the type of 'sense' that will be accorded everything within that frame". (43) The game is described as a "little cosmes" with a world and context of its own, and a world of meanings exclusive to it. (44)

Games, of course, do not alone possess these "world creating" properties. Games are one example of encounter situations, and encounters are made specific and complete by the operation of "rules of irrelevance". (45) Rules of irrelevance constitute a structure of inattention most clearly exemplified in gaming encounters where actors "...forswear for the duration of play any apparent interest in the esthetic, sentimental, or monetary value of the equipment employed...". (46) The properties of the material context (laboratory situation, for instance) are held at bay and not allowed to penetrate the mutual activity. Social and personality characteristics of participants are also selectively (dis)attended, but

(42) Goffman, p. 7.

(43) Goffman, p. 20.

(44) Goffman, pp. 26-27.

(45) Goffman, pp. 19-26.

(46) Goffman, p. 19.

in the gaming encounters presented in this paper, the former properties are more analytically useful.

Goffman makes several other observations particularly relevant to this study in his section on the "Bases of Fun". (47) Noting that problematic or uncertain outcome is one "common sense" source of fun, (48) a basic Monopoly rule (49) was manipulated to enhance the chance factor at a crucial point in the game, as well as to establish E as a secondary figure of authority. Further, in a four-person Monopoly game, it frequently occurs that while two persons may be effectively eliminated from play late in the game, two persons remain locked in a delicate balance of power to the end.

Secondly, Goffman states that games frequently provide the players with opportunities to exhibit attributes valued in the wider social world; or, games are formats of sanctioned display. (50) This assertion may be approached generally and specifically.

The general point is that Monopoly represents the epitome of the American game reflecting wider social values. (51) Further, its

(47) Goffman, pp. 66-81.

(48) Goffman, P. 67.

(49) "When you pass Go collect \$200.00" is the source of regular income in Monopoly. The structure of this rule was altered and named, "Barry's Rule". See p. 32.

(50) Goffman, p. 68.

(51) See Appendix B, a copy of an article that appeared in Sports Illustrated, entitled "The Play-Money Game That Made Millions", by J.F. Wilkinson. The copy was sent me when I wrote Parker Brothers requesting information on the history, sales, and idiosyncratic uses of Monopoly. This article, being essentially the only public information Parker Brothers was inclined to release to me, is virtually required reading for persons evaluating this paper.

fundamental familiarity was established in the context of this study by a pilot questionnaire investigating attitudes, knowledge and practice of Monopoly. (52)

The particular application of the assertion concerns an extension of the general point to the behavior (actions) of individuals. In two important experimental sessions (Session I and the Trial Session), the subsequent winners were anticipated on the basis of their aggressive playing and determination to win. In each case, the winners displayed ritual ruthlessness; feigned ignorance when crucial information could bring them losses; patronizing stroking of victims (53); and a clear and persistent understanding of the goal and processes of victory. Clearly the game attribute of sanctioned display noted by Goffman is admirably met in the concept and action of Monopoly.

The final relevant observation made by Goffman concerns his notions of the dynamics of "betting games":

If the participants perceive that the betting is very low relative to their financial capacities, then interest in money itself cannot penetrate the encounter and enliven it. Interest in the game may flag; participants may fail to 'take it seriously'. On the other hand, if the players feel that the betting is high in relation to their income and resources, then interest may be strangled, a participant in a play flooding out of the gaming encounter into an anxious private concern

(52) See Appendix C for a copy of this pilot questionnaire. A brief discussion of the methodology and results of this questionnaire is included in Section Two, p. 20.

(53) "Stroking" herein refers to the notion of Eric Berne (Games People Play: The Psychology of Human Relationships, New York, 1964, p. 15) which describes "stroking" as a fundamental unit of social action; any act implying recognition of another's presence.

for his general economic welfare. A player in these circumstances is forced to take the game 'too seriously'.

When players at the beginning of play give thought to an appropriate scale of stakes, they are seeking for that kind of screen behind which an interest in money can seep into the game. This is one reason for restricting the game to persons who, it is felt, can afford to lose roughly the same amount. We can similarly understand the tendency for the level of bets to be raised part way through the gaming, since by then the game itself has had a chance to grasp the players and inure them against what they previously considered too worrisome a loss. (54)

I quote Goffman at length because he provides an excellent statement of the considerations in designing the manipulation of the investment variable in this study.

As noted earlier, investment is a theoretically independent variable when one is assessing the form and extent of protection, the dependent variable. In operationalizing this study, however, the intention was to manipulate the extent of investment and compare Ss' response to authority (as symbols and forms of protection). Methodologically speaking, four, four person Monopoly games were to be scheduled, in two of which the Ss would be given \$15.00 apiece: a ratio of real money to Monopoly money of 1/100. The \$15.00 would constitute a stake in the game, or, an investment condition. This variable manipulation was expected to produce changes in the qualitative access (and interacting) variables of protection (of investment) and concomitant response to authority.

It is in the context of specific methodological application

(54) Goffman, pp. 69-70.

(designing the experiment) that Goffman's remarks on the Bases of Fun are relevant. (55)

In conclusion, then, the Monopoly Study of Authority is a "small groups" pilot study in the substantial area of Social Control. The methodology of the study is grounded in the precepts of Glaser and Strauss, and Goffman; while the chronicling of the study is reflective of the dictums of Hammond, and Glaser and Strauss.

(55) See also Erving Goffman's, "Where the Action Is", Interaction Ritual, (New York, 1967), pp. 149-270.

SECTION TWO

THE CHRONICLE

In the beginning there was an idea...

In December of 1969, a general interest in the substantive area of Social Control resulted in the formulation of broad hypothesis designed to examine the contemporary social problems of response to authority, in the form of the police, over issues of private property and equal rights, and freedoms to attain, protest or protect them: (56)

The greater the investment, material and/or ideological, the more likely will an individual protect the investment. The form of protection is defined as either personal authority or delegated authority. The dimensions of investment are ego involvement or resource commitment.

Actualizing a realistic research project to "test" this hypothesis was achieved through the perennial mix of creativity and contingency. (57) The availability of a new Small Groups Laboratory and the possibility of Institutional Grant funding led to the design of a small groups experimental study based on a game as the structural framework.

(56) Gary Waller, unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Chapter IV, pp. 11-12; final chapter, p. 16.

(57) James A. Davis, "Great Books and Small Groups: An Informal History of a National Survey", in Hammond, pp. 244-269; Hammond, pp. 1-17.

The utility of the game approach is well expressed by James S. Coleman, a noted authority in "simulation game" research:

A game...constitutes a kind of caricature of social life. It is a magnification of some aspect of social interaction, excluding all else, tearing this aspect of social interaction from its social context and giving it a special context of its own.

Coleman further posits a "...close liaison between explicit games and the behavior people engage in as part of everyday life". (58) Coleman's work has specifically dealt with "simulation games": games created with the intent of abstracting from life, basic elements of social relations or organizations, and through their playing, to reconstruct the principal rules and rewards by which behavior is governed. In the present study, however, an established and culturally familiar game, Monopoly, was used. (59)

There are several reasons why Monopoly was selected as singularly appropriate to this study. Since its production by Parker Brothers in 1935, Monopoly has enjoyed notable popularity in America being the best selling game for at least thirty years; total sales running from 35 to 40 million. (60) Its fundamental familiarity was subsequently established in a pilot questionnaire.

From these considerations follows the assumption that the value structure of the game is basically accessible, if not acceptable, to the

(58) James S. Coleman, "Introduction: In Defense of Games", American Behavioral Scientist, 10:2, October, 1966, p. 3.

(59) For an interesting critical discussion of the game-theoretical approach, see Erving Goffman, Encounters, pp. 34-37.

(60) Appendix B, *op. cit.*

"general population", affording the researcher some assurance of common understanding.

Finally, the structure of the "play" concerns matters of investment and property; presents two immediate dimensions of authority (money and rules); and provides for a manipulable element of chance: three specifically built-in aspects that directly pertain to the initial hypothesis.

A grant proposal was prepared with two explicit experimental intentions. The first was to make simple changes in the rules, to both enhance chance factors in winning and to introduce an arbitrary authority figure (E) as the source of the changes. The second intention was to manipulate the variable of investment and resource commitment through the use of real currency (\$15.00, a ratio of real money to Monopoly money of 1/100) as a stake.

A final consideration centered around the desire to make initial and strong use of the more sophisticated possibilities in the Small Groups Lab: the use of the video-taping facilities to develop observation techniques and provide the form to create demonstration tapes as teaching aids.

The de facto "Operationalization"

Shortly before the grant award was confirmed, a pilot questionnaire (61) was prepared to determine the validity of Monopoly as a specific research form. There were twenty items designed to test knowledge of the

(61) See Appendix C, op. cit.

game; attitudes and practice; and "constant error", or idiosyncratic rules. The questionnaire was presented to two General Sociology classes, comprising ninety-one respondents (forty-nine female, forty-two male) with a general age range of eighteen to twenty-eight:

88 had played Monopoly

38 could correctly identify the most valuable properties

71 had played in the last year

55 named two correct rules

48 rarely referred to the rules in normal play

49 referred to rules only to settle disputes

59 could identify the correct rule for getting out of jail

39 played an idiosyncratic rule of "Free Parking".

In conclusion, Monopoly proved to be a very familiar game, with several basic rules known to nearly all respondents, and certain non-rules common to many.

In late May the research grant was awarded with a one-quarter budget cut (\$2000 to \$1500). Efforts were made to locate a/the procedure for handling real currency as per the investment condition requirements, only to be finally advised that a state gambling law could be interpreted as applying to this research. After several elaborate and devious alternative designs were considered and rejected, it was decided to focus primarily upon the authority variable, a fundamentally weak aspect

of the design without the interaction of the investment variable. (62)
 At this point in the project, some degree of "freedom and flexibility" (63) was circumstantially achieved.

In late June, 1970, an ad was placed in the Portland State University school paper, the Vanguard; "Wanted: Subjects for game research. Approx. 4 hours work, \$1.50 per hour. Leave name and number with Sociology Department or call...". One trial session and four experimental sessions were planned and scheduled with John Mac Kenzie, then head of the Television Services Department, on the basis of the availability of video-taping machines and technicians. The trial session was set for July 2, with the four experimental sessions scheduled for July 14-17, four consecutive weekday mornings with starting times ranging from 9:00 A.M. to 11:30 A.M.

The subject variables were established as sex, and affectual relationship to the other players. The five sessions were structured thusly:

(62) That the gambling law was ever a serious consideration is a story of absurdity in itself. When I met with administrative persons in the Business Office to discuss a procedure for procuring real currency through a grant, the lack of precedent inspired one official to recall a gambling law that might negate their bureaucratic quandry. Without explicit support of the Sociology Department, let alone the University, the clever official was proved right. If I were Erving Goffman, however In any case, the initial design remains a powerful and direct means of testing the original hypothesis.

(63) Glaser and Strauss, p. 186: "The freedom and flexibility that we claim for generating theory from quantitative data will lead to new strategies and styles of quantitative analysis...".

Trial Session: 4 strangers, 2 male and 2 female;
 Session One: 4 strangers, 2 male and 2 female;
 Session Two: 4 strangers, 2 male and 2 female;
 Session Three: 2 (fe)male roommates, 2 (fe)male roommates;
 Session Four: 2 couples.

As interested respondents phoned in about the ad, they were assigned to conditions on the basis of their personal availability and accessibility of the necessary relationships. All subjects were assured four full-pay hours, but informed that the game would be ended after three and a half hours of play if no winner emerged. All the subjects were required to fill out requisite payroll forms, the California Personality Inventory, and the pilot questionnaire (tasks requiring forty-five minutes) before the game.

The designing of experimental sessions toward the end of manipulating the variables was again structured firstly in terms of pragmatic considerations. Because the grant funding was with the intent of producing pilot research (in the Small Groups Lab), which would in turn stimulate more specific research designs to test the particular hypotheses, it was decided to superficially skim the several variables: to test a different aspect of the general question in each session. Once a skimming procedure was adopted, funding constraints disallowed matched group to group comparisons.

The session designs were intellectually influenced by an interest in pursuing freely emergent forms: each day's design and focus was determined by the previous day's collected "data" and impressions, and a continued interest in the original hypothesis. The specific intent was

to remain consistently alert to explore any feasible interest that emerged from the research process, design or data.

PAUSE FOR TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES

The Small Groups Lab is a huge room and was poorly "detailed" at the time of the research. It consists of the main room (40' x 22') walled with two-way glass, and presenting constant and disarming reflections: There were no curtains. Camera ports are located at the four corners, providing the requisite electrical facilities for the video-taping equipment. Observation rooms line the four sides. There were no screens to section off a "small group" area.

A round table was requisitioned as the efficient and companionable prep for the game. When that proved unavailable, a squarish desk was suggested, totally, uselessly uncomfortable for four. A less than adequate, standard 6' x 3' work table was used.

The table was located near the N.E. corner of the lab to facilitate the video-taping machines. Two cameras were used, though three would have been most appropriate and useful. Given the size and shape of the room, however, there was no effective place to position a third camera and keep it semi-obtrusive. The consequent taping angles were cheppy and awkward. A diagram of the lab area, with "X's" marking the table and camera ports (small group) area is provided below.

It was impossible to disguise the observation situation. Three factors, however, were expected to attenuate the intense laboratory situation. The Ss were shown the lab facilities and taping equipment, the procedural and viewing techniques were demonstrated and explained by E,

and Ss were advised of the tape review sessions and invited to attend and contribute observations and opinions. Secondly, it was expected that the length of time in the gaming encounters would slowly but steadily draw attention away from the intruding structure. Lastly, it was anticipated that involvement in the game itself would focus Ss' attention away from the observation aspects.

As demonstrated by the demo-tape prepared from the Trial Session, however, the laboratory situation was sufficiently obtrusive to elicit by-play and comment from the Ss.

TRIAL SESSION

The Trial Session was precisely that: a "dry run" intended to fix specific difficulties and generally test the workability of the design. Four strangers, two male and two female, were scheduled for 9:00 A.M. They proved on arrival to be unacquainted among themselves, though one male S was known well by E. Simon (64) was a close friend, living in Portland under an assumed name, and was hired inadvertently. He was not a student, but had many close friends in the University. Simon was functioning under an alias because he was wanted for destroying draft records in Chicago. He subsequently turned himself in to the authorities (as they say on "Dragnet") and is currently serving a seven year sentence at Terminal Island, California.

The second male S, Jerry, was socially met by E several times in the months following the research, and was further frequently encountered

(64) All S names are fictitious.

in community cooperative food and day care projects. He too may be counted as a good friend. Jerry was not a summer student but attended part time during the school year.

The first female S, Zee, was very friendly and personable. She was the only S to return to view the tapes, and took a sincere interest in the project intentions and results. She was a student at PSU and periodically (two or three times a year) has returned to visit E at school and talk of the project and the field of research. Needless to say, Zee, Jerry and Simon have all afforded interesting and important sources of secondary impressionistic data.

Dettie was the second female S, and was not encountered by E outside the testing situation. She was also a full time student.

All of the Ss were most interested in the "easy money" (\$6.00, gross), and had the vague appearance of being hip. That is, the men's hair was long and loosely groomed and they displayed sideburns, beards and/or mustaches. Both women wore their hair long, and Zee was dressed in a long, bright skirt and barefoot (this was summer, remember). Their collective appearance and manner was youthful and casual.

After filling out the myriad forms and questionnaires, the Ss were introduced to the lab, provided with peanuts and Coca-Cola, and simply instructed to "play Monopoly". The session began with quiet jokes and references to the food, the lab, the game. Jerry assumed a task-oriented leadership role, setting up the board, distributing the money, and getting out the rules. He was casually appointed Banker and play began. After half an hour of serious but quiet playing, they introduced themselves to one another, at the specific request of Dettie.

The dynamics of the group, and the interaction among the players was quite interesting. Jerry was clearly rule-oriented and agreeable. He initiated all rule questions, and, looked up all the answers. He instituted the first group decision regarding the dispensation of the Free Parking money, a common idiosyncratic rule; and discovered while casually reading rules between his plays that one could collect rent while in jail, an important and much misunderstood rule of Monopoly. (65)

Dettie was an arbitrary and aggressive leader in the game. At the outset she overruled Jerry's statement of the order of play with a precise statement of the written rules; she arbitrarily stated that bidding on unclaimed property be made in units of ten; and was facile and smug at pseudo-cheating: rushing the game before an opponent can charge rent, for instance. In addition, she was socially adept at introducing topics of small talk, open about her personal life, and fairly attentive to the other players.

Dettie's assertive eagerness to win appeared to irritate Zee, who was clearly open and friendly in the beginning. As the game progressed she paid specific and particular attention to the two men, especially supportive of Simon, a passive and bumbling player. Her responses to Dettie, however, were increasingly abrupt, critical, and petulant. (66)

Simon, as has been noted, was particularly passive. He seemed unable to grasp the basic point of the game (winning), and was regularly

(65) "...one form of leadership that can be extremely important in gatherings is the maintenance of communication ground rules, i.e., 'order'...", Erving Goffman in Encounters, p. 13.

(66) See Goffman, Encounters, pp. 41-41 on tension in encounters; and p. 48 on the integration and cooling out of tension.

somewhat duped by Dottie. Further, he was often skipped in the order of play, a mistake only sometimes noted. While he initiated little exchange, he remained responsive and cheery, losing soundly a half hour before the game ended, with Dottie uninhibitedly grinning and sincerely pleased with her victory.

The tension that E perceived between Zee and Dottie was later confirmed when Zee came in for the tape review session. In the course of discussing the game, E inquired of Zee's impressions and opinions of Dottie. Zee expressed confused but conscious dislike for Dottie. She could not account for her dislike but variously alluded to Dottie as "pushy", "aggressive", and "domineering".

This aspect stimulated E's interest in the affective nature of interaction between females. The male affective content had been precisely neutral and friendly-efficient. A second interest centered around the fact that all the Ss in the Trial Session revealed moderate experience with marijuana, either mentioned in conversation during the game or in private conversations and encounters with E.

A demo-tape ("Subject awareness of laboratory observation"), presenting fifteen separate instances of specific reference to the lab condition, taping and observation situation, were edited together from the two cameras. The resulting demo-tape is quite unprofessional, but the examples are clear and direct.

SESSION I

This session was to be peopled with four strangers, two male and two female, but one male failed to arrive. The Ss completed their forms,

teured the lab, and finally settled down to play. They were instructed to "play by the rules", to "follow the rules closely", to play "strictly according to the rules". The Ss were initially confused and flustered by the instructions and some of the written rules, due to the precise insistence of E's instructions. Once the rules were established, however, regulated play was easily managed. There remained violations of the rules, but they remained consistent errors and were ascribed by E to ignorance.

The general interaction tendencies were curiously similar to the patterns in the Trial Session. The lone male, Jim, was rather quiet and polite. A veteran of Vietnam, he was attending school full time and usually spoke with caution and hesitancy when questioned about his experience.

Mavis was the female S who asked the most direct and potentially incriminating questions ("Did you ever shoot anyone?"). She was also the person who initiated the name exchange, quite late in the game. Mavis was selectively supportive of strict rule observance: particularly outspoken when it was to her advantage, and singularly silent when it was not. There was one sudden argument over a questionable rule between Mavis and the second female S, Melinda.

Melinda was a very quiet, passive player, frequently skipped in turn as was Simon in the Trial Session. She approached Jim tentatively, and Mavis rarely, often failing to "hear" her (Mavis') direct questions. There was also a fairly heated argument (again, as in the Trial Session, the passive woman was the most obviously angry and offended) about birth control and abortion, Melinda being a staunch supporter and button sporter for ZPG (Zero Population Growth). In all, Melinda was an excessively

pelite player, and became fairly withdrawn and abrupt as the game progressed and she steadily lost. Near the end she was quite physically removed from the gaming table itself, leaning in only to smack her Coke can on the table. (67)

As a group, the Ss were less conscious or outwardly attentive to the lab situation than those in the Trial Session. However, because of the heavy emphasis on the rules, they maintained an alert awareness of E as an "authority", frequently referring to "she" and obliquely indicating the mirrors, behind which E observed.

They also became involved in several serious conversations, slowly stopping play to discuss. One conversation concerned drug use, most specifically, drug use in the Army. Mavis initiated the discussion and confided to having smoked marijuana. Jim allowed as how it did "happen" in the service, yes, but Mavis never asked directly and Jim was inclined to freely offer little information. Melinda listened politely, somewhat discomfited, essentially detached.

Mavis won the game.

Efforts were made to edit a second tape concerning the "interaction of unacquainted females in small gaming encounters". It proved impossible to create the desired effect (one of increasing tension between the two women), because of a technical failure to achieve tight synchronization (visual and sound) and close editing. This project was abandoned after four exhausting hours of editing, on the professional advice of John Mac Kenzie.

(67) See Goffman's Encounters for a discussion of tension and ease in encounters, pp. 45-48.

SESSION II (68)

Several major changes were made in this session. Two males and two females were recruited but the women failed to arrive. The two men, Mark and Brian, were unacquainted, and had the appearance of colloquially labelled "freaks": their hair was quite long and loosely styled with headbands; their clothing was brightly colored and intricately layered; and Mark spoke and moved with the fluid casualness of a person who is "stoned" on marijuana. Mark was subsequently met by E in several social and collective action situations, from which encounters it was learned that he had indeed been "high" on grass that morning. (69)

The Ss filled out the forms and were taken through the lab. They were then instructed to play "ordinary Monopoly" with the addition of one specific rule, "Barry's Rule": when Passing Go they were to collect ten times the amount shown on the dice, rather than the written rule requirement of \$200.00. This rule change was devised to enhance the chance

(68) In describing this session, a conscious effort has been made to "convey credibility" through vivid description as per Glaser and Strauss, pp. 228-230. A secondary argument for impressionistic description is made in Chapter VII, pp. 161-183, wherein Glaser and Strauss explore the wealth of data to be found in the library (all non-sociological sources are regarded as valid references). Further, in discussing Erving Goffman's use of illustrations Glaser and Strauss present an excellent justification:

The justification for this approach (as I take to be the justification for Simmel's also) is that the illustrations together fit into a coherent framework that ties together bits of experience the reader has already had and provides the student with a guide worth testing in case-studies of institutional life., Glaser and Strauss, p. 137.

(69) This is the session in which the final impetus for consideration of the marijuana aspect was gained. I refer the reader back to p. 8.

factors (through the arbitrary agency of E) at a regularly and crucially attended point in the game: receiving the only assured income in the game. A "Voice of God" (VOG) microphone was set up and Ss' attention was called to its presence and purpose.

This particular microphone set up was designed to allow E to speak to the Ss from the observation room. The effect is quite dramatic as there is a slight echo in the lab room, and the voice comes abruptly (generally with the whine of the microphone to preface) from the air. The effect is particularly startling for E, who hears also the videotaped feedback. The VOG-mike was intended to "remind" the Ss of Barry's Rule.

Lastly, the Ss were informed that the winner would be paid double-time: for eight hours of work rather than four.

The game commenced with the bank placed between themselves and Brian appointed Banker. In the middle of the very play that followed, this first decision was forgotten. Mark was totally ignorant of the game and showed no pattern or logic to his play, randomly building houses on single properties rather than the rule-given monopolies. This procedural vacuum was filled with a creative and entertaining set of rules, carefully mulled and shaped.

For instance: the Ss "invented" (much to their glee and pride) the notion of Free Parking as a "loose money" space, but couldn't determine a way to "win" the money! After six or seven rounds of play and some careful discussion, it was decided that rolling "12" would entitle one to collect the Free Parking money. And, it was well into the game before they "discovered" the rule stating that one must own a monopoly

of property to build houses; but it was a busy twenty minutes before they thought to remove the illegal houses. They granted, by silent agreement, no extra roll of the dice for rolling "doubles".

They were careful, careful capitalists, considering cost, potential development and long term returns on investment. They constantly grouched and muttered over high rents, high costs, and regarded every dunning (persistent demand for payment) and fine as a personal jab.

Though they regularly forget Barry's Rule, on the occasions of recall or VOG reminder they complained mightily. It was effectively the only rule in the game and singularly disliked. Counterposed to the myriad invented and discovered rules they accepted with placid tractability, Barry's Rule was poorly received. When the first "reminder" echoed from the walls, the Ss quietly "thank-you-ed" and forgot, never flinching or glancing up from the board. And later times when they would note their own failure to invoke Barry's Rule, turns late they would shrug and wonder at E's random interruptions, casual and friendly.

The game lasted two hours, point-counterpoint, as victory shifted and finally settled: Brian won. It was an intriguing game with its smooth flow, and a demo-tape was planned to edit out a fluid statement of process through unordered segments of creative/aberrant decisions. But the audio of one camera was scrambled, and one full hour of the visual erased through a technician's error.

SESSION III

Two roommates, half the scheduled Ss, arrived for the Third Session. Bert and Ernie were tree planters and close friends. They were not

attending school.

They were instructed to simply play Monopoly and the winner would be paid double-time. Bert and Ernie instantly agreed to split the "winnings", effectively denying E's authority.

The game lasted less than one hour, with the Ss bidding against themselves and muddling wearily through a boring pseudo-game. In addition, the two one hour video-tapes were factory-flawed and useless.

SESSION IV

The evening before the Fourth Session one couple called E to report that they would be unable to come. The fourth Session was cancelled by E: small victory.

In summary, the experimental sessions were remarkably dissimilar from the intended sessions. The multiple technical and structural difficulties were depressing; the "data" seemed random, irrelevant, and beyond synthesizing principles. (70)

Section Three, however, represents efforts to analyze and interpret the "results" of this study. This section initially approaches the analysis from the perspectives of the original hypotheses, thus extending the theoretical precepts of Section One.

SECTION THREE

WHAT DATA?

TRIAL SESSION

In pursuing the general hypothesis the lab design was structured to look at two explicit focal points of authority: the written rules and E; and at two dimensions of investment: material and ego.

In the Trial Session, the authority was implied. That is, the authority vested in the written rules is assumed but not focused upon; the fact of rules is implied in the gaming concept. The potential authority of E, though never actualized, was implicit in the laboratory situation, as evidenced by the completed demo-tape.

With regard to the investment variable, no material rewards (in the gaming context) were presented, the focus being ego investment, or, effort to and interest in winning the game.

The data collection intention was to devise a system for coding and counting Ss' responses to the rules; and coding expressions of sympathy and offers of aid made to a player losing by the rules. Efforts to code references, however, proved impossible as the game moved quickly and comment-content was erratic and random. Later attempts were made to efficiently code data during tape review sessions. Video-taping, unfortunately, has no slow-motion capabilities (as does film). Lastly, a need to process the tape quickly, to erase and recycle it, the length of the game (three hours of play, recorded by two cameras, makes six hours of

unsynchronized tape for review), and flawed and unusable reproductions, encouraged the abandonment of the coding procedure.

There remains an abundance of "impressionistic" data. Regarding the "authority" aspects, the Ss evidenced total passive acceptance of the written rules. (71) They questioned one another's interpretations of the rules in fairly friendly terms, consistently unthreatened by the possibility of ambiguity, manifesting the essence of game-playing, rationality. (72)

The parallels in the substantive area of social control are immediately clear. In the rational political and legal system, laws are assumed; they are binding, definitive, reflective of consensual value systems and observed by rational, socialized citizens.

The development of the rational, socialized polity is well documented in The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, (73) the process being a simple transfer of respect for authority from concrete interpersonal individuals (father), to increasingly abstracted individuals (the policeman, the President). In the ideally developmental sense,

(71) "...rules in our society stand beside law, religion, and tradition, as guaranters of social order...For Americans rules are a form of authority,...a belief in rules as a means to social order.", Hugh Dalziel Duncan, Symbols in Society, (New York, 1968), pp. 38-39.

(72) "In relationships which depend on rules that can be changed at will, but that must be obeyed once agreed to by the majority of those who are to apply the rules, the test of a rule is a rational test. Rules are always open to discussion when those who created them, and subject themselves to them, find them to be unsatisfactory or unworkable.", Duncan, p. 36.

(73) Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, (Illinois, 1967).

authority is first conceived of as vested in persons, then institutions, and finally, political processes.

Hess and Torney provide excellent data attesting to the early acquisition of passive trust in benevolent authority (rational power). The polity pictured is a complaisant, compliant, law-abiding body, possibly manifesting apathy, in turn possibly reflecting the system's stability and lack of "major social conflicts". (74)

The understanding is finally that the passive and tolerant response to the written rules evidenced by the Ss in the Trial Session is reasonably reflective of a rational political understanding of effective, efficient democracy.

Regarding E as a source of covert authority proved beyond substantiation in the Trial Session. (75) Aside from regular references to E's "somewhere" presence, there were no definitive statements or allusions to E's interference or power. Once the role of E as authority was understood to be effectively neutral in the laboratory situation as a whole, design changes were made in subsequent sessions.

The final area of direct relevance to the original hypotheses

(74) Seymour Martin Lipset, Political Man, (New York, 1960), p. 185.

(75) This conclusion requires an important qualification. While this study sought to present E as a secondary (to the written rules) base of authority, an excellent argument can be made for E's functioning as an umpire or guardian of rules: "His power is derived from his knowledge of the rules and his ability to apply them quickly and surely in all moments of play." (Duncan, p. 37) The role of umpire is analogous to the role of judge or arbiter, an interpretive function. Presenting E in this context was considered and rejected in this experimental design, because the intent was to experimentally create an analogy to Law rather than to further explore the role of rules.

concerns the dimensions of investment, in the Trial Session a consideration of ego investment. As noted in the description of this session, one S, Dottie, was a singularly aggressive player, Aggression may be regarded as a definite advantage in playing Monopoly, the final winner being frequently easily noted early in a game by his or her consistent pressure and attention. Dottie remarked several times on having often played Monopoly with her young children and always winning. She won in the Trial Session.

Analysis of this variable hinged upon coding the California Personality Inventories completed by the Ss before the experimental sessions. This method proved an inadequate and unfocused bundle of irrelevant data. Completing the CPI forms was time consuming; they were frequently sloppily and incompletely filled out; and they required the skills and reluctant cooperation of the Testing Center for coding. While there remained an interest in the psychological data, a clear and precise measure of the relevant variables (aggressiveness and competitiveness, for example) was unavailable.

The Trial Session did generate a number of interesting questions peripheral to the initial hypotheses: What is the nature of the "typical student population" used in laboratory and experimental research? Is drug use a specifically interacting variable? How and to what extent does the laboratory environment create or contribute to a sense of authority? To what extent and how is sex a factor in the formation of casual acquaintenship and affect?

SESSION I

Returning to consideration of the authority variable, Ss in this session were explicitly required to "play by the written rules". While the flow and interaction of this game was remarkably similar to the Trial Session game, the initial difficulty with the written rules may be attributed to the interacting effect of E's precise instructions. That is, the combination of written rules emphasized by E, established two seemingly distinct authority structures.

The confusion was short lived, however. Once E left the lab room for the observation port, the written rules were easily established as the real consideration. Despite random references to E, to "she", to the observation room--all interpretable as allusions to the presence of some authority--the written rules were not compulsively attended as the specific focal point of the game. The few rule violations noted by the Ss were not responded to with any particular agitation, guilt, or remorse.

The only direct reference to E's authority was based on an arbitrary and personal sense of power rather than any rational, rule-based objections: a tentative alliance or team play was suggested to prolong the game and more quickly distribute the property. After a short discussion, Melinda stated that "She" (indicating the two-way mirrors) instructed play by the written rules. The question was dropped.

It was concluded that E constituted an incomplete figure of authority insofar as E's influence was confined to prefatory remarks: the involvement flow of the game served to negate the sense of observing

authority, (76) thus maintaining the established and accepted form of authority, the written rules.

As in the Trial Session, the most aggressive player (Mavis) won; and a seemingly hostile acquaintanceship was established between the two women. Again, it was impossible to assess commitment or involvement in the game in a codified manner.

Session One did, however, serve to further establish the legitimacy of several peripheral questions. Namely, to reconsider the impact of drug use and sex as important S and small group variables.

SESSION II

This was the session in which major design changes were made to manipulate the specific variables under consideration. To enhance the arbitrary authority of E (counterposed always to the written rules), a created rule was added to the game. "Barry's Rule" states that when Passing Go, one collects ten (10) times the amount shown on the dice. The written rule, "When you Pass Go, collect \$200.00", was stricken.

Barry's Rule was so named to heighten the sense of vague authority. That is, naming the rule in the possessive, for someone unknown to the Ss was expected to at least raise the question, "Who's Barry?"; and at most, to maintain consciousness of the rule throughout the game, through low-level curiosity. The rule was further intended to alter (raise) the chance factor at a significant and recurring point in the game, thus creating an impression of mechanical, technical authority,

(76) This growing indifference to the laboratory situation was earlier anticipated to "soften" the dramatic experimental effect.

comparable to the written rules.

The VOG microphone was intended to provide pseudo-one-way access for authority comments. In the written rules condition, access is two-way, but initiated by Ss (or encouraged by E at the outset). In the E authority condition, initiation rests with E and there is no explicit means of response; though the entire session was observed, the Ss were not advised or encouraged to interact with E during the session.

Aside from controlling the access variable, the VOG microphone afforded the technical means to "interfere" or regularly "remind" Ss of Barry's Rule, thus reinforcing the E authority variable.

The second important change was to create a "material investment" condition by doubling the pay for the winner. This change was regarded as eminently straightforward, but the results were markedly ambiguous. After a few casual comments indicating they understood the "double pay for winners" condition, the Ss seemingly forgot or did not relate to the fact. They quickly became quite engrossed in the game, directing all attention toward moves, plays and game-related decisions. In this session it may be said that material rewards had no observable effect.

Returning to the authority variable manipulation, the instigation of Barry's Rule may be said to have had impact on the Ss' relationships and attitudes toward the game. While they several times neglected to effect the rule, awareness of its presence occurred randomly throughout play. When reminded by the VOG microphone or recalling the rule themselves, the Ss clearly indicated irritation, impatience and annoyance. Barry's Rule was related to as the singular source of a legitimate authority; it was clear that the Ss were sensitive to its external and

imposed basis (i.e., E), and were consistently resentful.

That a condition of external authority was successfully created is repeatedly evidenced in the Ss' responses to Barry's Rule. Further, this authority was respected to a small extent in the Ss' actions. Primarily, however, the Ss can be said to have relied upon personal rather than externally delegated authority. Their casual, offhand and irregular compliance served, finally, to effectively negate the external authority of E.

This was the session in which final impetus was given to the peripheral consideration of drug use. The fact of marijuana use had come up several times in prior sessions, but in Session Two it was clear that the condition of at least one S being "stoned on grass" during the experimental session had a notable impact on the play.

Several impressionistic observations come readily to mind: the Ss' surprising and consistently placid indifference to the offensive and sudden noise of the VOG microphone; their seemingly perpetual casualness that bordered on insolence; the erratic and offhand flow of play; the myriad invented and created rules; and their amused but complete involvement in the game only: they engaged in no small talk or discussions outside the range of game commentary for the entire three hours of

play. (77) In terms of previous research on the effects of marijuana, at least one S evidenced clear signs of short term memory loss and heightened attention to a singular and specific stimuli. (78) At this point in the study, it was decided that drug use could reasonably be posited as an intervening variable.

SESSION III

This session was designed to observe more directly the interaction

(77) An alternative interpretation of the drug consideration is provided in Goffman's discussion of "spontaneous involvement", Encounters, pp. 37-41:

When an individual becomes engaged in an activity... it is possible for him to become caught up by it, carried away by it, engrossed in it--to be, as we say, spontaneously involved in it... A visual and cognitive engrossment occurs, with an honest unawareness of matters other than the activity; what Harry Stack Sullivan called 'selective inattention' occurs, with an effortless dissociation from all other events ... By this spontaneous involvement in the joint activity, the individual becomes an integral part of the situation, lodged in it and exposed to it, infusing himself into the encounter in a manner quite different from the way an ideally rational player commits his side to a position in an ideally abstract game. (p. 38)

Further, shared spontaneous involvement in a mutual activity often brings the sharers into some kind of exclusive solidarity and permits them to express relatedness, psychic closeness, and mutual respect... (p. 40)

It is probably most reasonable to regard the fact of drug use during an experimental session, and Goffman's discussion of spontaneous involvement as related information and analysis. In this situation neither explanation stands alone.

(78) Marihuana and Health Reports to Congress, 1971, 1972: HEW Report, 1971, p. 57, on common emotional and experienced cognitive effects; p. 61, on detecting psychomotor and cognitive effects; and p. 62, on distorted memory, temporal disintegration and depersonalization.

of the two primary variables, investment and authority. Two male room-mates appeared for the session and were instructed to "simply play Monopoly", and the winner would be paid double-time. The authority of E was invoked by establishing differential rewards. This modicum of external authority was quickly dissolved when the Ss drew instead upon their personal authority, agreeing to split the winnings.

The game play itself was remarkably tedious, uninspired and muddled: The Ss bid against themselves, finding two-person Monopoly unwieldy and unexciting. The game lasted less than one hour.

SESSION IV

This session produced only thoughts on methodological procedure. That is, this was the session that unequivocally demonstrated the value of "back-up" Ss: Ss recruited and paid to be available for the experiments should other Ss not appear. This obvious solution was posited after Session One, at which time it was determined that there was not enough money. (We should have done it anyway: See Appendix D.)

SUMMARY

To summarize the results of this study we first return to a consideration of the initial intentions. A chronicle of the research process is indeed presented. Every relevant decision and its rationale is documented, both in terms of specific chronology and the history of the idea. The rather overwhelming sense of frustration with seemingly minor difficulties may be understood to reflect my lack of experience with the long-term activity of researching. That is, perhaps my irritation with

the "details" (the badly equipped lab; the technical errors in recording and processing the tape; the failure to negotiate an essentially simple-minded bureaucratic maze of detail, etc.) reflects my ignorance of the range of petty hassle that is associated with conducting a small but complicated piece of research.

Further evidence supporting this proposition is contained in the eminently humble rhetorical response, "Yes, I would do it differently". (79) One absolutely vital step toward the obvious need for a specific and well planned "daily design" would be the acquiring of the rote bureaucratic approval for the original research design, with the concomitant availability of necessary resources: I would have insisted on the requisite professional support of every appropriate university body (the Sociology Department, the Institutional Grant Committee, the Graduate Dean, etc.) in either protesting the State Attorney General's "gambling decision", (80) or persuading the Business Office to be creative (81) in its own professional capacity. (82)

(79) Hammond, p. 4, "...indicate freely where changes would be made if the research were to be repeated...".

(80) The "gambling decision", by the way, occurred during a five minute phone call to Salem seeking a routine interpretation: ("Of course a University sponsored research project is not a back room crap game or numbers operation").

(81) Hammond, p. 15: "Everyone, if he thinks about it, knows that in scientific inquiry...imagination is of great importance...".

(82) This difficulty with the Business Office is not a singular incident. Appendix D chronicles a small follow up design based on the peripheral drug question, during which a virtual scandal of bureaucratic abuse occurred!

Had this one effort been made, a very direct and precise design methodology would have been available. The denial of this procedural efficiency, however, served to restructure the entire project more literally in the direction of a pilot or exploratory study. It is in this context then, that the variant methodological procedures of Glaser and Strauss were both relevant and useful. Once the research design shifted from testing a codified arrangement of variables, I was afforded a degree of freedom and flexibility in generating theory. (83) That is, the very open intentions of designing daily experiments allowed a more fluid and E-specific logic to emerge.

While the understanding of the investment and authority variables drifted far from their substantive applications, (84) some important interpretations can be made. Turning first to the investment variable, it was clearly shown that doubling the wage pay did not create an individual investment condition in the terms of this study. It is quite possible that the literal amount (an approximate shift from \$6.00 to \$12.00) was too small and/or too abstract a reward. Ss interested in earning ready cash were dismayed to learn how unavailable was the pay or rewards. (85) While this explanation accounts for the non-investment condition in

(83) Previously cited in footnote (63), p. 22.

(84) The gap between laboratory and substantive applications is one of the most cogent and important criticisms of laboratory and experimental research per se.

(85) The value of using cash is herein evidenced. Fifteen to twenty minutes were spent in filling out tedious payroll forms, to receive checks (anytime from three weeks later to never), that the Ss had to return to PSU's Payroll Office to pick up. To my mind, that is a fairly abstract "reward".

Session Two, the failure to create an investment condition in Session Three is clearly accounted for in the solid, collective (as opposed to competitive) nature of the friendship between Bert and Ernie (the tree-planting roommates). In addition, it is reasonable to posit that the abstract nature of the reward was again a factor.

The data on the ego investment conditions (Trial Session and Session One) would be greatly enhanced by appropriate psychological data. Relying on the impressionistic data reinforces the consideration of specific personality variables, but contributes little to a sociological interpretation of this aspect of investment. It remains clear, however, that a more thoughtful consideration of this variable and the research intention would have produced an adequate measure.

Turning to the authority variable, Session Two provided the strongest measure of impact. The design of this session was most elaborate, creative and theoretically articulated. The invention of Barry's Rule, totally external to the written structure of the game, elicited both verbal and action responses from the Ss. It is clear that an external and arbitrary authority was created, though more in the realm of the abstract (a rule) than concrete (an authority agent, E). In the terms of Hess and Torney's discussion of respect for authority, this distinction is theoretically predictable.

The strength of this authority condition is demonstrated in the Ss' consistent irritation with that singular Rule, to the exclusion of all other rules, or rule-like decisions. Further, while the Ss recognized and directed their attention to this "aberration", they did not consistently invoke their personal authority. That is, the fact of an

external authority (E) was accepted and extended to an acceptance of an arbitrary rule. It is in this context that the earlier remarks of Duncan are particularly relevant. (86)

Efforts to create an external authority condition in the other sessions were thwarted by ambiguity, imprecision and interaction effects. It is clear, for instance, that E's authority was never effectively counterposed to the authority of the written rules. When, in Session One, the Ss were instructed to play "strictly according to the rules", E might have established herself as an umpire, being physically present throughout the game to encourage careful observance. The failure to make a clear distinction between the written rules and E served to undermine the cogency of an important variable. And, when establishing authority was attempted through the investment condition, the interaction of two ambiguous and weakly defined variables resulted in no clear experimental condition at all.

In applying these results and conclusions to the substantive area of Social Control, I suspect that I have few relevant findings (verification), but some added measure of precision ("groundedness") in conceptualizing the variables and theoretical propositions. While investment is definitely a consideration in the protection of property, the investment conditions in this study were scarcely achieved, let alone shown to possess any analytical power. My interpretation of the failure to create an investment condition, however, leads to the following revision of the concept, investment.

(86) Previously cited in footnotes (71), (72), and (75).

Investment in property as a literal phenomenon is a factor in protection, but value, once ownership is established, is of small importance. When property of real relative value is owned or possessed it will be subject to the protective activity of individuals, be that action locking doors or shooting trespassers; and subject also to the "potential" protection of delegated authority when seriously (meaningfully) threatened. That this study failed to create a meaningful investment condition does not reflect on the validity of this proposition.

Secondly, authority is a real phenomenon, responses to which are clear whether in a laboratory situation or a citizen encounter. Response to authority can be theoretically understood as developmental and possessing distinctions between the agents of authority and the abstract dictums (rules and laws) that the agents enforce. The results of this study clearly demonstrate that the fact of authority has impact as well as a tendency to produce distinctions between the rule and the rule maker.

In conclusion, then, this study did serve to elaborate some of the primary concepts in the substantive area of Social Control; has further contributed to one's understanding of the research process per se; has produced a potentially workable and interesting research design and propositions, yet to be effected in a controlled and efficient research process; and has lastly applied variant methodological procedures with some small success. (87)

(87) See Appendix D, "The Issue of Further Rigor", for the final application of Glaser and Strauss.

SECTION FOUR

THE IDEAL DESIGN

IF

If I had unlimited resources and perfectly appointed facilities; no other academic or intellectual tasks or interests; free access to technical aide and expertise; if I had freedom and power, I might possibly re-design and execute a study similar to the one just chronicled. This ideal study would, of course, draw from the experience of the pilot study, as well as be greatly aided by the eradication of technical and monetary difficulties through the operation of the "ideal" structure.

The intent of the study would be to manipulate an investment variable and elicit differential responses to authority. Responses to authority would consist of body gestures, verbal statements, attitude and behavioral patterns. A code sheet would be designed to allow classification of S responses to the written rules, E, the banker, the social and/or task leader (s), group consensus, skillful players, male Ss, etc. Responses could be classified as dissenting, agreeing, neutral, economically vested, supportive, etc.

In analyzing the data, efforts would be made to determine patterns of responsiveness to authority vis à vis considerations of momentary and specific investment, to the larger consideration of monetary investment. That is, data collection, coding and analysis would simultaneously focus on game-specific instances of investment during decision making instances

as well as to the investment condition per se.

The structure of the research design is quite similar to that of the Monopoly Study of Authority. Ss for four experimental sessions would be recruited through the college newspaper. Back-up Ss would be paid to be available in the event of a scheduled S failed to arrive for the appointed session. All Ss would be paid a flat rate of \$8.00, the equivalent of four hours work at a rate of \$2.00 per hour. The Ss would complete the payroll forms when they were hired, and the forms would be filed until the sessions' completion.

Ss would be randomly assigned to one of four, four participant sessions, two of which would be investment conditions and two of which would not be investment conditions. Two males and two females would be assigned to each session, and participants in each session would be strangers to one another.

The investment condition would consist of giving each of the participants in two sessions, fifteen dollars cash, a ratio of one real dollar to 100 Monopoly dollars. The Ss would be instructed to play Monopoly according to the rules until a winner emerged. The winner would keep (win) the sixty dollars.

The non-investment condition would not be played with real currency but would be a regular Monopoly game played according to the rules with Monopoly money. This condition is more appropriately a control than an experimental condition.

The sessions would occur in a small groups laboratory facility, approximately 12' x 12', equipped with a small round gaming table and four comfortable chairs, bathroom facilities nearby, and at least two

video-tape camera ports. Ss would be provided with refreshments and encouraged to consider a "stretch break" halfway through the game.

All four sessions would be run on two consecutive days, and initial coding would be done during the sessions. A second tape review session, to which the Ss were invited, should complete the coding process.

The major consideration, of course, is the development of an effective and workable coding and analysis system. The most general and useful discussion of the methodological concerns in small group experimental research is that of W. Edgar Vinacke (88), "The Miniature Social Situation", wherein coding and classification are likened to content analysis. For the purposes of this study, it is most likely that the well tested techniques of R. F. Bales (89) would be considered and adapted to the concerns and interests of this study. Clearly the intent and design of the coding, classification or categorization system is the most important consideration in terms of the research producing systematized and consistent data for analysis.

In addition, a more serious and concerted effort would be made to edit the session tapes for development of primary hypotheses, themes, and interactional tendencies in small group gaming encounters, and to create and prepare demonstration and teaching aid tapes. This capacity to create knowledge in a new medium is one of the fundamentally strong aspects of this design and technique. The actual work of editing,

(88) W. Edgar Vinacke, Warner R. Wilson, Gerald M. Meredith, eds., Dimensions of Social Psychology, (Scott, Foresman and Co.), pp. 359-378.

(89) R. F. Bales, Interaction Process Analysis; A Method for the Study of Small Groups. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1950.

however, is tedious, difficult, and frustrating, and requires very specific and sensitive talents. In this aspect of the research design, then, one requires the patient and unqualified assistance of a skilled technician or artist.

The initial major task in effecting the overall research design would therefore be the development of a comprehensive, workable and relevant coding system. The second major task would be collecting and analyzing the data. The final major activity would be the editing of the session tapes.

This brief design proposal approximates my understanding of a research project based on the Monopoly Study of Authority pilot project. The positing of an "ideal" research situation serves to alleviate many if not all the extra-substantive difficulties of the pilot study, leaving to the researcher the challenging and creative responsibility to develop a measurement technique and an analytical understanding of an experimental data form (i.e., video-tape).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bales, R. F. 1950. Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups, Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Becker, Howard S., and Geer, Blanch 1967. "Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison," in Manis, Jerome G. and Meltzer, Bernard N., eds., Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology, Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berne, Eric 1964. Games People Play: The Psychology of Human Relationships, New York: Grove Press.
- Brissett, Dennis, Fall 1970. "Advanced Social Psychology," lecture at Portland State University.
- Coleman, James S. October, 1966. "Introduction: In Defense of Games," American Behavioral Scientist, 10:2.
- Dalton, Melville 1959. "Preconceptions and Methods in Men Who Manage," in Hammond, Phillip E., ed., Sociologists at Work, New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Davis, James A. 1964. "Great Books and Small Groups: An Informal History of a National Survey," in Hammond, Phillip E., ed., Sociologists at Work, New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Duncan, Hugh Dalziel 1968. Symbols in Society, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Geer, Blanche 1964. "First Days in the Field," in Hammond, Phillip E., ed., Sociologists at Work, New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Glaser, Barney G., and Strauss, Anselm L. 1967. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Goffman, Erving 1961. Encounters, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Goffman, Erving 1967. "Where The Action Is," Interaction Ritual, New York: Anchor Books.
- Hammond, Phillip E., ed. 1964. Sociologists at Work, New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Hess, Robert D., and Terney, Judith V. 1967. The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Lipset, Seymour Martin 1960. Political Man, New York: Doubleday.

Marihuana and Health Reports to Congress, 1971. HEW Report.

Schwartz, Morris S., and Schwartz, Charlotte B. 1955. "Problems in Participant Observation," American Journal of Sociology, 60.

Vinacke, W. Edgar; Wilson, Warner R.; and Meredith, Gerald M.; eds., 1964. Dimensions of Social Psychology, Scott, Foresman and Co.

Whyte, William F. 1955. Street Corner Society, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilkinson, J. F. Dec. 2, 1963. "The Play-Money Game That Made Millions," Sports Illustrated, 19:52-4.

APPENDIX A

REQUEST FOR RESEARCH FUNDS

Date: February 28, 1970
Account No.: 9262-4001

Submitted by: Barry D. Lebowitz, Ph.D.
Micheale H. Williams, B.S.

1) Title of Project

Small Group: Games and Authority

2) Major Objectives

We are interested in assessing the viability of games as research tools to focus on specific aspects of social interaction. The general hypotheses we wish to test are:

- A. The greater the investment in something (material and/or ideological), the more likely will the person protect it;
- B. The conditions under which protection will take the form of
 - (i) personal action, or
 - (ii) delegated authority;
- C. The dimensions of investment,
 - (i) ego involvement, and
 - (ii) resource commitment.

3) Justification for Project

In an exploratory study, we hope to establish a procedure for the use of small group-laboratory experimentation in the contest of games; and further, to develop appropriate research designs, measures and methods to test the general hypotheses.

The validity of game as a structural framework in which to observe behavior is well expressed by James S. Coleman, a noted authority in "simulation game" research: "A game...constitutes a kind of caricature of social life. It is a magnification of some aspect of social interaction, excluding all else, tearing this aspect of social interaction from its social context and giving it a special context of its own." Coleman further posits a "...close liaison between explicit games and

the behavior people engage in as part of everyday life."* Coleman's work has specifically dealt with "simulation games": games created with the intent of abstracting from life, basic elements of social relations or organizations, and through their playing, to reconstruct the principal rules and rewards by which behavior is governed. Whereas Coleman was focused on the use of "simulation games" as learning tools in education, we are interested in the use of established games (namely Monopoly) as research tools in the examination of certain basic social processes of conflict and consensus formation (to cite just two examples). We will test whether the explicit and simple rules of games allow us to focus on the specific behavioral aspects of authority and investment.

The relevance of the general hypotheses is best expressed in the contemporary social problems of response to authority, in the form of the police, over issues of private property and equal rights, and freedoms to attain, protest or protect them.

4) Brief Plan of Attack

Using the basic game of Monopoly as the framework, we intend to make simple changes in the rules, to both enhance chance factors in winning, and to introduce an arbitrary authority figure (the experimenter) as the source of the changes. We would hope to observe changes in strategy, not based on contingencies inherent in the game. More specifically, we would observe the frequency of attempted and achieved informal rule changes; and the frequency of attempted and achieved alliances between players, as compared with the same attempts in a standard Monopoly game.

Secondly, we intend to manipulate the variable of "investment" and resource commitment, through the use of real money as opposed to Monopoly money, testing for the interaction between the two variables of authority and investment.

The exploratory project will run from July 1, 1970, to September 15, 1970. The research will be conducted in the Small Groups Lab of the Sociology Department, which is more than adequately suited to this kind of project. The nature of the project will require the use of the lab's observation facilities and filming equipment.

5) Possibilities for Future Expansion of the Project

The proposed project is basically a pilot study--it seems likely that if successful, the study can be easily expanded into a full scale research program with independent sources of funding.

The pilot study will be designed to develop basic measures and

* Coleman, James S. "Introduction: In Defense of Games", American Behavioral Scientist, 10:2, October, 1966, p. 3.

methods which will then be expanded to more precisely delineate the attributes of the two primary variables studied--authority and investment. We are particularly interested in the forms that authority can take and the effects (variety and degree) of such authority on individual action with regard to property and/or ideas.

Future funding for such a full-scale research project is likely to be available through the Carnegie Foundation, NSF, Abt Associates, or Parker Brothers.

6) Investigators

Principal Investigator: Barry D. Lebowitz, Ph.D
217-F, Cramer Hall, Portland State Univ.
226-7271, est. 1945

Research Assistant: Micheale Hall Williams, B.S.
217-D, Cramer Hall, Portland State Univ.
226-7271, est. 1944

Work Study Assistant: Susan Rae Mc Clendon
1821 S.W. Park Ave., Portland, Ore. 97201
227-5108

7) Recent Research and Publications

Principal Investigator, Barry D. Lebowitz, Research Experience:

- Research Assistant, Action for Boston Community Development.
Design and supervision of a scheme for the processing of school and test records of the Boston School System. May-September, 1967.
- Research Assistant, Cornell University, Statistical Analysis of comparative data from the U.S., Germany, England, and the U.S.S.R. on adolescent socialization influences under the direction of Urie Bronfenbrenner and associates. September, 1964 - February, 1965.
- Research Assistant, Cornell University, Statistical Analysis of survey data in a study of the role requirements of nurses under the direction of Joan Dodge. June - September, 1965.
- Research Assistant, Cornell University (Program in Social Psychiatry). Duties included the design and execution of the analysis of descriptive, ethnographic survey and case study data under the direction of Alexander Leighton. February, 1965 - September, 1966.

Consultant in Methodology, Portland State University (Program in Medical Sociology and Urban Studies). Duties include the development of research designs and general analysis procedures in the Health Services Research Center of the Kaiser Foundation, participation in the research of the HSRC, and the supervision of the research of students involved in the program developed jointly by Portland State and the Kaiser Foundation. 1968 -

Thesis and Papers:

An Inquiry into Status Consistency, M.A. Thesis, Cornell, January, 1967.

Social Theory and Statistic Interaction, Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell, 1970.

"The Effects of a Dissonant Family Setting on the Mental Health of Children", Cornell Program in Social Psychiatry, 1966.

"Conceptions of Organizational Worth: A Replication and Extension" in Progress.

"The Comparative Analysis of Rate of Social Mobility: Some Refinements" in Progress.

"Status Consistency and Social Mobility: Some Problems of Theory Construction and Social Design" in Progress.

(with James E. Weiss) "Modes of Access to a Medical Care System" in Progress.

Research Assistant, Micheale Hall Williams, Research Experience:

Research Assistant, University of Oregon, Department of Psychology. Ran subjects in behavioral conditioning experiment--ostensibly to curb smoking. Coded and plotted data for analysis, under the direction of Hayden Mees. January-March, 1966.

Planning Assistant, Central Lane Planning Council, Eugene, Oregon. Duties included computation of land use data, and research and preparation of a major survey of poverty in Lane County, Oregon, for a report on poverty and planning for the area; published June, 1968, under the direction of David Petersen and Diane Wechak. March, 1966 to December, 1967.

Research Assistant, University of Oregon, Department of Psychology. Duties included preparation of stimulus materials, running subjects, compilation of data for statistical analysis; for experiment in perceptual filtering under the direction of

Joe Lewis. June, 1967 to September, 1967.

Honors Symposium, University of Oregon, Department of Psychology.
Presented paper based on experimental research on "the effects of the subjective effects of marijuana use". June, 1967.

Teaching Assistant, University of Oregon, School of Community Service and Public Affairs. Duties consisted of a survey of the placement policy of the Holt Agency, and adoption placing interracial children. Prepared a report and recommendations for a major research project concerning interracial adoptions, under the direction of Herb Bisno. January to March, 1968.

Teaching Assistant, Portland State University, Department of Sociology. Duties include leading discussion sessions, grading papers, and preparation of research proposal and design for laboratory studies in the effects of resource commitment on response to authority, under the direction of Barry Lebowitz. September, 1969 -

Papers:

"Poverty and Planning: A survey of Lane County, Oregon".
Central Lane Planning Council, Eugene, Oregon. June, 1968.

8) Budget

ITEMIZED EXPENDITURES

Salaries:	Research Assistant, Micheale Hall Williams. Salary 1/3 of Teaching Assistant Grant (\$2800).	933.00
Wages:	Two cameramen from the Educational-TV Dept. to film for 16 hours; rate, \$15.00 per hour. Projected that Educational-TV will pay for 6 hours of filming: 10 hours x \$15.00 per hour	150.00
	Wages for 16 subjects, at \$1.50 per hour, 4 hrs.@	<u>96.00</u>
	Personnel Total:	<u>\$1247.00</u>
Materials:	Sixteen hours of video-tape, at \$35.00 per hour projected that Educational-TV Dept. will pay for 6 hours of tape (tape reusable up to 50 times) 10 hours x \$35.00	350.00
	Miscellaneous materials	<u>40.00</u>
	Materials Total:	<u>\$550.00</u>

Equipment: Two video-tape machines for 16 hours, at \$15.00 per hour. Projected that Educational-TV will pay for 6 hours. 10 hours x \$15.00	150.00
Miscellaneous equipment	<u>53.00</u>
Equipment Total:	<u>\$203.00</u>
Total Amount Requested:	<u><u>\$2000.00</u></u>

Principal Investigator

Proposal Number

Amount Granted

Appendix B, pages 63-68, was eliminated due to copyright difficulties.

APPENDIX C

Lebowitz, Portland State University

Spring, 1970

Your sex _____

Your age _____

1. Have you ever played Monopoly? 88 yes, 3 no.
2. What are the most valuable properties to own? 38 correct; 38 other; remainder a logical combination.
3. When was the last time you played Monopoly? 28, one to three years ago; 23, four to six; 18, last 12 months.
4. Do you play exactly by the rules? If not, why not? 31: more exciting or shorter game, 48, yes.
5. How much and how is the money distributed? 63, don't know; 14, correct; 14, incorrect.
6. Have you played in the last year? 71, yes; 20, no.
How often? 21, 1 to 3 times.
7. Name two rules that come to mind. Most common: pass go, collect \$200, go to jail; 55 named two correct rules, 13 named one correct rule, 23 NA or wrong.
8. How do you determine who is to be the banker? 36 - choice, 21 - roll dice, 12 - oldest or who offers.
9. Have you played the "short" version of Monopoly? 60 never heard of it, 22 yes.
10. With how many people do you usually play? 3-4.
11. Do you make up rules specific to your own way of playing? 30, yes; 45, no.
12. What are they? 6 - kitty or free park, 5 - rules for loans and trades, 66 - NA.
13. Passing Go, you collect \$200? 68 correct, 23 incorrect.
14. Do teams form in your Monopoly games? 22 yes, 51 no.

15. How often and when in the game (why) do teams form?
14 - revenge, 17 - help.
16. How often do you refer to the written rules? 48 - rarely, 11 -
sometimes, 14 - never.
17. At what points in the game do you refer to the rules? 49 - settle
disputes, 5 - beginning.

APPENDIX D

THE ISSUE OF FURTHER RIGOR (1)

In the spring of 1971 it was decided that the summer Monopoly Study had generated several workable interests in the general area of marijuana use and effect, particularly as such use and effect is a factor in experimental research. The abstract theoretical questions centered around the consideration of marijuana use as an intervening variable that mitigates established political responsiveness.

An "official" articulation of this proposition is contained in the March 1971, Health, Education, and Welfare Department Report to Congress:

The Hang-Loose Ethic

Certain attitudes and interests have been shown to be even more closely related to marihuana use than are the socio-demographic characteristics. None of these attitudes was true only of marihuana users, nor true necessarily of all of them. And there is no indication that marihuana use caused them. Characteristics of the hang-loose ethic have been defined as: dissatisfaction with own education and the system; opposition to the Vietnam war and the draft; approval of sexual freedom; feeling a communication gap between self and parents; anticipation of satisfaction from future leisure activities more than from work; participation in 'happenings' and mass protests; interest in underground newspapers; and acceptability of possible circumvention of laws (but not necessarily of breaking them). (2)

(1) Glaser and Strauss, pp. 233-235, "...more rigorous testing may be required to raise the level of plausibility of some hypotheses.

(2) Marihuana and Health: A Report to the Congress from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1971.

To develop a measure of these related characteristics, a socio-political questionnaire was designed. Adapted from the "New Left Scale" developed by Christie, et al, (3) the questionnaire was revised to test the attitude and interest correlations implied in the "Hang-Loose Ethic." The revised form included the first twenty items of the "New Left Scale;" an additional six items specifically designed for this study to measure attitude, use and knowledge of marijuana; one short answer item designed to elicit opinions and understandings on attitude and behavioral effects; and two yes/no items concerning the Ss' participation in experiments and research. A copy of the final questionnaire, "A Modified New Left Scale," is contained at the conclusion of this appendix.

The questionnaire was administered to ninety-five Ss in two groups. Forty-five students completed the questionnaire during the first twenty minutes of their General Sociology class, and constitute the non-volunteer or coerced group. Forty Ss were recruited through an ad in the PSU Vanguard: "Wanted: Subjects for game research. \$2.00 for one hour. Leave name and number with the Sociology Department." These volunteer Ss reported to the Sociology office during specified hours (Tuesday, 8:30 to 11:30 am, for instance), completed the questionnaires and requisite payroll forms.

In analyzing the resultant data the hypothesis was: the stronger the New Left attitude, the more favorable one would be to marijuana

(3) Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes (Appendix B to Measures of Political Attitudes), John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver, eds., Michigan, 1969, pp. 386-391.

legalization. The mean New Left score on Item 9 (marijuana should be legalized) was 1.09 indicating strong agreement; and the mean non-New Left score on Item 9 was 3.15, indicating a tendency toward disagreement.

It is very likely worthwhile to elaborate on this study somewhat. Much of the initial impetus to extend the research came from my vaguely frantic need for some "real data." In my early experience and training I had learned that questionnaire research was the easiest and cheapest way to generate data with a wide range of analytical (and statistical) possibilities: I had little time (two months until a Grant Committee Report was required) and depleted funds (about \$96.00).

The propositions were truly extensions of my observation of Session II in the Monopoly Study, though the conceptual articulation occurred in the measure selected. That is, I was interested in the relationship between political attitudes and marijuana use, but the concepts ("use" and "attitudes") were exclusively operationally defined. Glaser and Strauss would regard this as an eminently fine situation, as the theoretical articulation would be grounded in (emerge from) the data. I was discomfited.

The New Left Scale was selected from a book of socio-political scales, and it was not precisely what I's had in mind, thank you. I had been looking for something less "left" and more "radical" (popularly speaking); something with maybe a splash of drugs here, a hint of subversion there, a line of rebellion around the edges.

The New Left Scale, did however, reflect a more important chain of aspects than the accoutrements of "radicalism" noted above. The

items included statements on political structure ("The political structure of the Soviet Union is more like that of Red China than that of the United States"); statements of strategy ("Authorities must be put in an intolerable position so they will be forced to respond with repression and thus show their illegitimacy"); and statements on social structure and consequences ("The structure of our society is such that self-alienation is inevitable" and "The bureaucracy of American society makes it impossible to live and work spontaneously"). These items encouraged me to regard the New Left Scale as providing a small measure of analytical sophistication as well as the more simplistic distinctions, ("Competition encourages excellence" and "Dialogue is preferable to disruption").

Unfortunately, the questionnaire had no drug items, and I was disinclined to either design or administer a specific measure of drug attitudes, knowledge or practice because a great deal of practical and interesting information is regularly and systematically being collected by the government.

Turning to the HEW Reports, then, I discovered the general population use data, (4) a selection of which I shall present for the reader's edification. (5)

(4) Marijuana use reported and measured is usually any use by individuals in their lifetime.

(5) With regard to considerations of methodological procedure, Glaser and Strauss' discussions of library materials (pp. 176-178); effort, cost and speed of data gathering (p. 178); and on government documents is useful: "Although we have focused on library research, documents useful for generating theory obviously are found elsewhere. Thus, documents in government archives and company files could be as useful for generating social theory as for revealing historical and political fact. When sociologists use such documentary materials, they tend to use them almost wholly for verification or description." (p. 183).

An October, 1969 Gallup Poll (6) sampling adults twenty-one and over indicated that 4% of the population had used marijuana. The total number of persons who had used marijuana was estimated at ten million. A study by William McGlothlin (7) concludes that in mid-1971, fifteen million, or 9% of the population over the age of eleven, had used marijuana. Projecting this trend to 1972, the HEW Report estimated that the number of persons who had smoked marijuana would fall between fifteen and twenty million.

Use data more specific to this study includes the finding that 32% of the servicemen in Vietnam have used marijuana; and from a preliminary nationwide study of college students (1970) (8) the figures of 31% "sometimes using" and 14% "using every week or two."

Statistically associated characteristics of marijuana users include the data that they are twenty-one to twenty-nine years old, male, single and college educated. They come from upper income, professional families; are not affiliated with a formal religion; major in arts, humanities, or the social sciences; and participate less in organized activities except political ones. (9)

In considering any characteristics of dope smokers, those of the hang-loose ethic or socio-demographic, there are two important points to

(6) HEW, 1971, p. 23.

(7) HEW, Marijuana and Health: Second Annual Report to Congress, 1972, p. 38.

(8) HEW, 1971, p. 24.

(9) HEW, 1971, p. 28-29.

remember. First, these characteristics are associative, not causal. And secondly, one must recognize the general law that the more widespread the practice, the less deviant the characteristics.

Data on the effects of marijuana smoking are somewhat more ambiguous. For instance, the 1971 HEW Report classifies the effects as subjective, physiological, hormonal, behavioral, neurological, psychomotor, genetic, metabolic and cognitive. Many of the cognitive effects described are related to those noted during Session II. Of particular relevance are the interference with short term memory, and temporal disintegration. (10)

These effects, however, are to be distinguished from the attitudes and interests related to marijuana smoking. It is political and socio-cultural attitudes that are reflected in the "Hang-Loose Ethic" and it was these attitudes that were measured and related to marijuana use in this study. In what was essentially a testing of HEW's "Ethic," the resulting data analysis showed a significant and predictive relationship stating that the more New Left the political attitude, the more favorable one was to marijuana legalization.

Two groups of Ss were tested to enhance the specific relevance of this study. It was hoped that the data generated would reveal significant distinctions between volunteer and non-volunteer populations. The expectation of significant differences is based on Robert Rosenthal's conclusion that "...the chances are very good indeed that a sample of

(10) HEW, 1971, p. 61-62.

volunteer Ss will differ appreciably from the unsampled non-volunteers." (11)

Rosenthal notes several attributes associated with a higher degree of volunteering, and several general situational variables which are also important, but he summarizes by stating:

Granted that volunteers are never a random sample of the population from which they were recruited, and further granting that a given sample of volunteers differs on a number of important dimensions from a sample of non-volunteers, we still do not know whether volunteer status actually makes a difference or not. (12)

Testing the resultant data for differences between the volunteer and non-volunteer groups revealed a non-volunteer New Left mean of 62.05 (n 38); and a volunteer New Left mean of 64.83 (n 42). That is, the volunteer Ss tended to evidence stronger New Left scores.

One final consideration in this follow-up questionnaire project should be presented. The volunteer Ss were hired and contracted for the meager sum of \$2.00 for something less than one hour of filling out a questionnaire and a ream of payroll forms. As in all the experimental sessions, cash was not available for payment, and the checks were of too little value to be mailed by PSU. This meant that the Ss would have to return to the PSU Payroll Office and pick up their checks. The hiring of these Ss and establishing a rate of payment was fully considered in light of the remaining funds in the grant account. In fact, I expected to complete the research as planned and return to the Grant Committee the humble left-over sum of \$12.00.

(11) Robert Rosenthal, Human Relations, pp. 400-406.

(12) Rosenthal, p. 402.

However, a mysterious deficit of some \$376.79 appeared in this account. I was notified of this fund insufficiency about the same time the Ss were to be paid. The mechanics of this mystery remain obscure to this day. Of course, inquiries were made (by Dr. Leonard Cain, then Acting Department Chairman for Sociology) and crucial evidence was lost (work-study forms, the alleged source of error) from the Payroll Office files.

This was clearly a situation which required specific bureaucratic pressure for resolution. In my scrambling efforts to at least assure payment for the forty Ss who had performed their required tasks, I was informed: a) it was certainly not the Payroll or Business Offices' responsibility to pay the Ss; b) the Sociology Department had no responsibility in this matter (except to inquire); c) the Grant Committee was not responsible, of course; d) it was likely that Susan McClendon had misfiled a work study form (the responsibility); e) however, this form was missing; f) no individual would be prosecuted (!); g) no Ss would be paid.

In conclusion then, I am pleased that the study produced two data grounded conclusions of some relevance and interest. If producing data (especially significant results) is a reasonable and valuable pursuit in itself, this study was a success. However, my own possibly peripheral interests in the entire process of research have led me to understand my recent research experience as a discouraging, frustrating and likely worthless activity.

APPENDIX D

MODIFIED NEW LEFT SCALE

Age _____

Sex _____

1. A problem with most young people is that they have not learned to accept society as it is.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

2. While man has great potential for good, society brings out primarily the worst in him.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

3. The solutions for contemporary problems lie in striking at their roots, no matter how much destruction might occur.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

4. Drugs are an important part of the college scene.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

5. Radicals of the left are as much a threat to the rights of the individual as are the radicals of the right.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

6. Marriage unfairly restricts one's personal freedom.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

7. The United States needs a complete restructuring of its basic institutions.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

8. The political structure of the Soviet Union is more like that of Red China than that of the United States.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

9. Marijuana should be legalized.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

10. Authorities must be put in an intolerable position so they will be forced to respond with repression and thus show their illegitimacy.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

11. Use of some drugs heightens intellectual experience.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

12. Competition encourages excellence.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

13. "The Establishment" unfairly controls every aspect of our lives; we can never be free until we are rid of it.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

14. The structure of our society is such that self-alienation is inevitable.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

15. The right to private property is sacred.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

16. There are important differences between marijuana and heroin.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

17. A mass revolutionary party should be created.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

18. The processes of rebuilding society are of less immediate importance than the processes of destroying it.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

19. Because institutions have worked well in the past, they must not be destroyed.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

20. If marijuana were legalized I would try it.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

21. You can never achieve freedom within the framework of contemporary American society.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

22. Sexual behavior should be bound by mutual feelings, not by formal and legal ties.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

23. Printing presses are a more appropriate medium for change in our society than the streets.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

24. The bureaucracy of American society makes it impossible to live and work spontaneously.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

25. A marijuana high is not a big deal.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

26. Dialogue is preferable to disruption for changing our society.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

Some authorities assert that marijuana use alters attitudes and behavior; others disagree. What do you think?

I have taken part in experiments and/or questionnaire research in other classes. Yes No

I have answered campus newspaper ads for experimental subjects.
Yes No