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ABSTRACT

The YMCA of Greater Miami established a "Pilot Project" involving group work with illegal fraternities in two junior high schools. Three groups received service. Two group work trained staff members sponsored these groups, acting as non-directive adult role models. Goals of the Project were to bring the fraternities and community into more "meaningful communication" with each other and improve the members' school performance.

This study attempts to determine if fraternity school performance changed following the provision of service. Four school performance indicators are: academic performance, conduct, rate of absence, and rate of tardiness. Since school officials view the fraternities as "problem groups," it can be expected that fraternity school performance will be poorer than that of the male population of the school. If service is effective, fraternity school performance will improve, becoming more like that of the male population of the school. Each fraternity's school performance was compared with a control group sampled from their school: 1) prior to the fraternity's receiving service; and 2) during service. Fraternity school performance during service was also compared with this performance the year prior to service.

Hypotheses are:

1. Each fraternity in the year prior to service will have
lower academic grades, lower conduct grades, a higher rate of absence, and a higher rate of tardiness than its control group in a comparable year.

2. Fraternity academic and conduct scores would be higher, and rates of absence and tardiness lower in the service year than in the year prior to service.

3. In the service year, fraternity academic and conduct scores would equal or exceed the control and rates of absence and tardiness would equal or be less than that of the control.

The findings are:

1. Academic scores and conduct scores of the fraternities prior to service are lower than the controls, although these differences are statistically significant in only one-half of the comparisons. Fraternity rates of absence and tardiness are higher than the control in two-thirds of the comparisons, but none of these differences is statistically significant.

2. Fraternity academic scores increased for the service year in one-third of the cases; none of these changes is statistically significant. Conduct scores improved in two of nine cases, neither of which was statistically significant. In only one case was the fraternity rate of absence or tardiness less in the service year than the year prior to service.

3. None of the fraternity academic scores or conduct scores in the service year equaled or exceeded those of the controls. None of the fraternity rates of absence or tardiness was equal to or less than the control.
These data do not show improvement in fraternity school performance during service. By these measures, the Project cannot be rated as effective. Project goals were diffuse and the service was not an intensive effort to improve school performance per se. It is possible that service contact was too infrequent or in being directed at the group level did not influence other factors influencing school performance. Service may have added to group cohesiveness, strengthening values antithetical to satisfactory school performance.

On the other hand, school adjustment might have improved without showing on the chosen indicators. The Project might have fore­stalled more serious delinquency had not service been provided. Other Project goals were reached. Evidence other than that generated in this study indicates that communication between the fraternity boys and school and community was enlarged.

Using case materials compiled by the group workers, this study also includes in Appendices a description of the social structure of the serviced fraternities.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE SETTING, SIGNIFICANCE, AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study of the group has been, and is, one of the focal points of sociological work. This study has involved groups in two general contexts: (1) the "natural" group studied in neighborhood, community or social setting and (2) the "laboratory" group studied in controlled settings. As the "rehabilitative" approach becomes more a part of the control and prevention of delinquency, group-work oriented social scientists have experimented with various "group-work"


For examples of the latter, see Robert F. Bales, Interaction Process Analysis (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950); or Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, eds., Group Dynamics (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1953).


3Though delinquency control had been a major concern of criminology, "the field of prevention is by far the least developed area of criminology." Peter P. Lejins, "The Field of Prevention," in William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford, eds., Delinquency Prevention (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 1. To Lejins, and conventionally, "prevention" is a measure taken before a criminal or delinquent act for the purposes of forestalling that act, while "control" refers to action taken after the act in question.
approaches in attempts to redirect "problem groups" toward a more "pro-social orientation."

Frequently these have been delinquent or pre-delinquent groups, most often of lower or working class origin. As these "treatment" efforts proceed, there is increasing call for the evaluation of these approaches. At the same time, a renewed emphasis upon the study of groups in their "natural" settings is coupled with a new emphasis upon the study of middle-class delinquency.

This dissertation represents a convergence of these research emphases and trends. It is primarily an attempt to analyze the effectiveness of a "helping agency's" group-work approach directed to some junior high-school fraternities defined as "problem groups" in their "natural" school, neighborhood, and community setting.

The Setting Of The Problem

The existence of fraternities and sororities in the secondary schools of the United States has been recognized and defined as a problem since the start of the 20th century (See Chapter II, pp. 24-25 of this dissertation). In Dade County, Florida, "despite over 20 years of legislative efforts to squelch illegal social groups, not-so-secret (some school activities directors have lists of club membership) fraternities and sororities continue to mushroom, their

4In the literature, this term reflects a variety of usages of varying specificity. Herein it means a group whose presence and activities become defined as a problem to the community. The activities may involve varied non-delinquent and delinquent behaviors viewed as undesirable by important community "definers," e.g., the police or school authorities.
existence affecting not only individual members but the entire youth community."

Originally established in 1943, Florida Statute 232.39 states:

It is unlawful to establish a fraternity, sorority, or other secret society or to go on school premises to solicit members; it is unlawful for any public-school pupil to be a member, or to join or pledge to be a member in such an organization. Excepted are organizations fostered and promoted by the school authorities or which are first approved and accepted by the school authorities, and whose membership is selected on the basis of scholarship or achievement.

The statute provides that "County boards of education are required to enforce these provisions by suspension, or, if necessary, expulsion of pupils, and are empowered to prescribe and enforce such rules and regulations as are necessary." The illegal status of fraternities and sororities, youth participation in them is widespread, and school officials and community leaders are concerned about these groups as "problems." Several adult organizations have, through sponsoring some of these groups, tried to lessen the problem. Florida statutes exempt from the scope of the law:

---

5 Nancy Beth Jackson, "Secret Teen Frats: 'Where the Action Is,'" Miami Herald, March 12, 1967, p. 29G.


7 Ibid., p. 52.

8 Jackson, op. cit., p. 29G. The groups are widely believed to be involved in rowdiness and delinquent behavior. School officials view them as disruptors of orderly school routine and suspect them as offenders whenever school property is defaced and vandalized.
Any junior organization sponsored by the Knights of Pythias, Oddfellows, Moose, Woodsmen of the World, Knights of Columbus, Elks, Masons, B'nai B'rith, YWCA, YMCA, YMHA, YWHA, Kiwanis, Rotary, Optimist, Civitan, and exchange clubs.9

As interpreted, this statute provides that the secondary school fraternities and sororities "can find legality by asking an adult organization for sponsorship."10 Several organizations have established youth groups which often resemble "fraternal groups in pledge-ships, brotherhood concepts and selective membership."11 Though parallel in structure to the illegal fraternities and sororities, these organized groups do not often succeed in drawing the fraternity and sorority youth from his group to the sponsored group. Another approach, shown to be effective in reaching the "hard-to-reach," is to "reach out" to the fraternities and sororities by offering sponsorship, hoping that acceptance of sponsorship will provide the helping agency the opportunity to assist the "problem group" in achieving a more "pro-social adjustment." This approach, directed at the group as an entity in community context is the core of the YMCA of Greater Miami's experimental "Pilot Project."

The "Pilot Project"

By the 1960's fraternities and sororities were not only widespread in the high schools of Dade County, but were frequently found

9Shapiro, op. cit., p. 52.
10Jackson, op. cit., p. 29G.
11Ibid. The organizations cited are the Knights of Pythias, Oddfellows, Moose, Woodmen of the World, Knights of Columbus, Elks, Masons, B'nai B'rith, YMHA-YWHA, YMCA, YWCA, Kiwanis, Rotary, Optimist, Civitan, Exchange Club, and Florida Federation of Garden Clubs.
in the junior high schools as well. These groups became the focus of YMCA's Pilot Project.

The General Secretary of the YMCA of Greater Miami explains the inception of the project:

Ever since my arrival in Miami in September 1962 . . . I have heard continuously and repeatedly about the problems being encountered with the young people at the Junior and Senior High School levels regarding fraternities, sororities, illegal clubs and their behaviour patterns which were not in accord with acceptable social standards.

We began exploring ways and means whereby the YMCA could effectively serve the needs of young people, . . . It was decided that a new approach needed to be made to determine if the YMCA could be relevant for this day and time in relating itself to young people. Here we felt a Pilot Project, centering in three school areas, could perhaps demonstrate (if given sufficient time and if desired by the school officials involved) that a significant social change could be achieved. Contacts were made with the Principals of (the three schools involved). These principals evidenced a sincere interest in the Pilot Project and reemphasized the need. This was then related to the Metropolitan Board of Directors, and they authorized the Project.12

A YMCA trained group worker13 was hired to direct the Pilot Project and serve as "Director of Youth Projects," for the organization's Miami branch.

The Pilot Project was put into operation in fall 1965. The group worker became the "sponsor" of two junior high school and one senior high fraternity. The General Secretary of the "Y" accepted sponsorship of one junior high school fraternity. The approach of both was "non-directive," providing guidance through functioning as an adult role model while influencing the groups through example and

12General Secretary, YMCA of Greater Miami. Untitled, undated statement. (Mimeographed.)

13The worker received a Master's degree from George Williams College, Chicago, Illinois.
suggestion rather than authoritative direction. The group worker and the General Secretary systematically recorded observations and actions for each fraternity in a continuing case record termed a "journal." Included in these journals are descriptions of week to week activities, special incidents, and observations about the group and the roles and behaviors of specific members.

The group worker enlisted the aid of behavioral scientists, clergymen, and educators in forming the "consulting team." Originally the consulting team was composed of two psychiatrists, one sociologist, one psychologist, one Catholic priest, one PTA president, a YMCA Board president and two staff members. For the duration of the Pilot Project the composition of this team was in flux. However, from three to five individuals met regularly with the group worker to discuss the latter's direction, methods, and progress of his work with the fraternities.

Community response to the Pilot Project was positive and favorable. Many school officials were convinced these groups were "easier to deal with" during their sponsorship by the "Y." Many parents were highly supportive of the project, and most of the boys in the fraternities viewed the sponsored status more favorably than their earlier situation. In sum, community and school response to the project was positive, but this judgement was based on only impressionistic evidence. It was considered successful, but no systematic evaluation of the "success" of the project had been undertaken. A concern was generated for "more objective" evaluation of the effect,

14Chapter III of this dissertation includes a discussion of this approach and an analysis of how each functioned in this therapeutic role.
if any, of the Project upon the activities and orientations of these fraternities.

The sociologist serving on the evaluating team brought the group worker, the General Secretary, and this writer together. This writer sat in as an observer on several meetings of the worker and the evaluating team. After discussion of possible cooperation between the group worker and this writer in a research effort, it was agreed that the group worker would provide copies of each journal to this writer to be used as basic source data for a sociological analysis of these groups. In addition, it was agreed that of the many possible "positive changes" that might result from the worker's efforts with these groups, a more positive adjustment to school was one of the most important, and also one that the worker expected to occur. This writer agreed to construct an evaluation study to investigate change in school performance which, if present, might be attributable to the efforts of the Pilot Project.

The Significance Of The Problem

The "gang" has long been viewed as the focus of initial
delinquency. In recent years, as group work becomes more popular as a social work intervention approach, the study of the "gang" and group work intervention approaches have converged. It is becoming more common to see the group work approach applied to delinquent or pre-delinquent gangs.

Collaborative effort between social scientists and social workers has been slower in developing, although the need for such collaboration is a recurrent theme in the writings of social work practitioners. Despite such problems as the reconciliation of what Greenwood terms value-laden "practice theory" and value-free "scientific theory" he argues collaborative research can be accomplished in a practice setting wherein social scientists have access to the operations of the social work practitioner while the research

---

16 One of the most influential proponents of this view has been Clifford R. Shaw. Robert E. L. Faris states that "after some years and many hundreds of case studies, Shaw was able to state in lectures to graduate students at Chicago that he had not yet found a boy who had committed his first delinquent act alone. In every case the boy was led into delinquency by other experienced delinquents, and his motivation was mainly to conform to the expectations of a primary group." Chicago Sociology 1920-1932 (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1967), p. 76. Shaw's major work in the etiology of delinquency includes: The Jack-Roller: A Delinquent Boy's Own Story (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930); The Natural History of A Delinquent Career (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931); and Brothers in Crime (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938).


program can be "better controlled by social workers." Fruitful collaboration between the sociological analyst and social work practitioners is seen as possible as well as desirable, though not without its difficulties.

Students of group work have also recognized a general failure of social workers or others to systematically investigate the effectiveness of group work services to delinquent and other groups. Maxwell argues "few studies have attempted to do a qualitative measurement of services. This is the point at which group work has fared poorly in most community wide studies." This has occurred despite the fact that "over the past two decades assessing the results of service has been a major concern of both social work practitioners and social work researchers." The same can be said of "street club" work programs. Caplan, et. al. point out that:

> Despite the increasing utilization and growing popularity of street club work programs, surprisingly little has been

---

20 Ibid., pp. 26 and 31.

21 For example, Greenwood's implication that "control" of research be vested in the social workers will be resisted by many social scientists. See, for example, Read Bain, "Action Research and Group Dynamics," Social Forces, XXX (October, 1951), 1-10; and John R. Stratton and Robert M. Terry, Prevention of Delinquency (New York: Macmillan Co., 1968), p. 118.


24 A "street club" work program is a variant of the group work approach to delinquency. These matters will be discussed in Chapter III, pp. 51-55 of this dissertation.
approaches found wanting. One is left with the impression that the effectiveness of various approaches remains wholly problematic, and evaluation research leads one to only negative conclusions. Consider the following typical assessments:

Considerable time and energy have been expended by American communities with a view to the prevention and treatment of crime and juvenile delinquency. The relatively poor success which has attended these efforts cannot be lightly dismissed.\(^{28}\)

Despite the expenditures for public and private programs of delinquency prevention and treatment in the United States, there is practically no research evidence supporting their validity.\(^{29}\)

Organized efforts aimed at delinquency control and prevention in this country have been and are still very ineffective.\(^{30}\)

Early identification and intensive treatment of delinquency usually address themselves to an unknown problem with an unproved technique.\(^{31}\)

The sum of activity aimed at reducing delinquency, when put to the pragmatic test of impact upon the problem, must be counted as negative.\(^{32}\)

Berleman and Steinburn come to similar conclusions about work in this area:


\(^{30}\)C. K. Cheng and Douglas S. Yamamura, "A Proposal for Research in Delinquency Causation," Social Forces, XXXIX (May, 1961), 349. These authors suggest this condition prevails because we lack sufficient knowledge of the etiology of juvenile delinquency.


For approximately the past thirty years, delinquency prevention experiments, broadly defined, have yielded but one dismal result: the provision of a preventive service seems no more effective in reducing delinquent behavior than no service at all.33

Similar evaluations can be made of social work technique in general,34 delinquency rehabilitation as well as prevention,35 and even most modification techniques.36

In sum, research in the effectiveness of various modification approaches can serve useful pragmatic needs in evaluating change, specifying and modifying techniques, as well as contributing to theoretical knowledge of social structure, so-called "problem behavior" and its etiology.

This dissertation, an evaluation of a preventive group work effort, can contribute to sorely needed research findings. Such a


34Mary E. MacDonald, "Reunion at Vocational High: An Analysis of Girls At Vocational High: An Experiment in Social Work Intervention," Social Service Review, XL (June, 1966), 188.


36"Reviews . . . conclude that therapeutic counseling does not measurably increase average positive adjustment changes over and above what one ordinarily finds among untreated controls. In fact, most attempts to influence or modify the behavior of others, whether they be deep psychotherapy . . ., less intensive corrective techniques . . ., social intervention . . . or resocialization procedures . . . produce only very limited change effects when individuals are considered in the aggregate." Nathan Caplan, "Treatment Intervention and Reciprocal Interaction Effects," Journal of Social Issues, XXIV (January, 1968), 63.
study of groups in their "natural" settings is not without difficulty. The challenge is strong; and the results are potentially a useful contribution. Cohen describes best the challenge and value of such efforts:

Our techniques for the study of small groups in action are crude and the problems of "getting close" to live delinquent groups and observing them at first hand are enormous. On the other hand, no type of research is of potentially greater value for throwing new light on delinquency and the challenge is worth all the ingenuity we can muster. 37

The Statement Of The Problem

This sociological problem involves an evaluation of the effectiveness of non-directive group work in attempting to redirect junior high-school fraternities toward more "pro-social adjustments." The basic research question is: does a group-worker acting non-directively to provide a positive adult role model for adolescent males in peer groups have any effect upon the school adjustment of these groups and/or the individuals that comprise them?

The approach will initially involve specification of the nature of "treatment" in an analysis of social group work and the role of the group worker in his attempt to promote "pro-social adjustment." Since group-school relations was a primary focus of worker effort, and school adjustment is seen by many as the key to delinquent involvement, 38 school adjustment will be the measure of "social adjustment."


38 This is not a universal position, of course. See however: Aaron V. Cicourel and John I. Kitsuse, "The Social Organization of the High School and Deviant Adolescent Careers," in Earl Rubington and Martin S. Weinberg, Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective (New
School conduct, academic performance, attendance, and tardiness will be the focus of the operational indicators of school adjustment.

Each of the three junior high school fraternities sponsored by the YMCA in the Pilot Project will be compared with the others and a systematic sample of the male student population in each of the two junior high schools attended by fraternity members. The design includes, therefore, three fraternities receiving "treatment" as experimental groups with a sample of the male pupil population in two schools serving as control groups. Comparison will involve "before" and "during" treatment periods.

**Organization Of The Dissertation**

This dissertation consists of five chapters in addition to this chapter stating the setting, significance, and statement of the research problem. The pertinent literature is reviewed in Chapter II. The theoretical structure and working technique of the role of the group workers' approach is the subject of Chapter III. Chapter IV

---

York: The Macmillan Co., 1968), pp. 124-35. They state: "the adolescent's school affiliation is (together with the family) one of the first institutions to which his conduct or misconduct is referred." P. 131. It follows, therefore, that "the school system may be conceived as an organization which produces, in the course of its activities, a variety of adolescent careers including the delinquent. Because the school occupies a strategic position as a coordinating agency between the activities of the family, the police, and the peer group vis-a-vis adolescents, it also provides a 'clearing house' which receives and releases information from and to other agencies concerning adolescents." P. 126.

See also John P. Koval and Kenneth Polk, "Problem Youth in a Small City," Klein, op. cit., pp. 123-38, who state "school maladjustment appears more important than economic status in the generation of delinquency. It may be, in fact, that the effect of economic status on delinquency is mediated through the process of school maladjustment." P. 136.
describes the methodology used in the study, including the restatement of the problem in research hypotheses. Chapter V contains the analysis of the data, and the summary and conclusions are stated in Chapter VI. Appendices I and II include an analysis, based upon case records prepared by the group workers, of group structure of the fraternities and the school and community context in which they function.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In the literature, there is a dearth of studies of the fraternity in the junior high school. No studies similar to this dissertation could be located in the literature. Related work, however, permits four pertinent areas of study to be briefly discussed in this chapter: 1) the social context in which these groups function—the social status of adolescence, 2) studies of the fraternity or "secret society" in American secondary schools, 3) studies of juvenile "gang" structure, and 4) experimental studies of "delinquency prevention."

The "Problem" Of Adolescence

In the sociological literature, adolescence is an age-specific social status marking the period between childhood and adult status. Clearly demarcated in industrial societies, adolescence becomes a "problem" in these societies. Entry into adolescence is marked, most


agree, in biological terms, with the onset of puberty. For youth in industrial societies, this newly achieved biological maturity does not coincide with passage into full adulthood. The conferral of the "social maturity" of adult status lags behind the achievement of biological maturity, creating a transitory social status— "adolescence." In industrial societies, "the lag becomes greater, and adolescence . . . extends farther into organic adulthood." Moreover, no clearly defined end to adolescence is established in industrial societies. The achievement of adult responsibility is marked by different indicators and these indicators do not coincide at any clearly identifiable point. For example, educationally, adolescence may end with high school graduation (or today, college graduation), while occupationally, it may end with full-time entry into the labor force. Adolescence may be viewed as ending at the age when marriage is possible without consent of parents, or at that point when one


achieves full status as a citizen. The "exact nature and timing of his assumption of adult privileges and responsibilities are left to be settled by a 'bargaining struggle.'"\(^5\)

Adolescence becomes a period of ambiguity of social status—a time of socially induced role conflict and strain:

In our society, even apart from the family, the adolescent finds an absence of definitely recognized, consistent patterns of authority. Because of the compartmentalization of the culture he is defined at times as an adult, at other times as a child. Furthermore he is subjected to a confusing array of competing authorities, of which the school is the principal but not the happiest one.\(^6\)

In sum, then, in contrast to preliterate societies, in which puberty is often accompanied by rites de passage introducing the individual to adulthood, in modern industrial societies the individual reaches biological maturity considerably in advance of social maturity. The biologically mature individual is expected to defer acquiring full adult status while functioning in the ambiguous part-child part-adult status of adolescence. By deferring conferment of full adult status, these modern industrial societies "create" adolescent status.

Our modern society tends to emphasize the transition period between childhood and maturity. The adolescent, however, is disposed to conceive himself as an adult and to demand that his family and society no longer treat him as a child. Perhaps this conflict of roles--of youthful aspiration for autonomy and of the parental insistence upon dependence--is in large part responsible for the characteristic phenomena of adolescence in our American culture.\(^7\)

\(^5\)Williams, op. cit., p. 79.


The Emergence of an "Adolescent Subculture"

By "creating" an ambiguous social status, modern societies also create "strain and stress" felt by individuals occupying this status. Stress and strain result in the development of the shared experiences and perspectives important in the formation of an adolescent or youth culture. This adolescent subculture serves to "ease" the difficult transition to adulthood, and is particularly pronounced where this transition is lengthy and imprecisely articulated.

There is reason to believe that the youth culture has important positive functions in easing the transition from the security of childhood in the family of orientation to that of full adult in marriage and occupational status. But precisely because the transition is a period of strain it is to be expected that it involves elements of unrealistic romanticism. Thus significant features of youth patterns in our society would seem to derive from the coincidence of the emotional needs of adolescents with those derived from the strains of the situation of adults.8

In the adolescent subculture, especially in its American variant, the peer group becomes an exceedingly important reference group.9 The peer group serves as a "compensation" providing a sense of security and belonging during the period of adolescent


There is some evidence that peer influences are greater among joiners of fraternities. See, for example: Alfred M. Mirande, "Reference Group Theory and Adolescent Sexual Behavior," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXX (November, 1968), 572-77.
discontinuity.\textsuperscript{10} James S. Coleman is a leading proponent of the view that an adolescent subculture exists in American society.\textsuperscript{11} He argues that an adolescent subculture emerges in industrial society because of rapid change and economic specialization. Delayed entrance into the labor force results in the "setting apart of our children in schools."\textsuperscript{12} The child becomes relatively isolated from individuals on other age levels and is forced inward toward his own age group. Adolescents come to constitute a "small society"; a "separate subculture\textsuperscript{13}" with their own language, special symbols, and value systems which differ from adult values. A general affluence in society permits these adolescents to become an important buying force. As their affluence is recognized, they become the object of media merchandising efforts which glorify youthful values and tastes and reinforce the subculture. The result is "small teen-age societies\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10}Sebald, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 197 and David Gottlieb and Charles Ramsey, \textit{The American Adolescent} (Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1964), Chapter x.
  \item \textsuperscript{12}Coleman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}
  \item \textsuperscript{14}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 6.
\end{itemize}
within the society. "Society is confronted no longer with a set of individuals to be trained toward adulthood, but with distinct social systems, which offer a united front to the overtures made by adult society." Adolescents look to each other for their social rewards and "the old levers" by which children are motivated—approval or disapproval of parents and teachers—are less efficient. The "new levers" are other children, acting as a small society.

There is a tendency in the work of those who stress the clarity of the adolescent subculture to emphasize its discontinuity from adult orientations and values. Others, however, emphasize differences within a perspective of general continuity of adolescent and adult values.

---

15 Ibid., p. 4. Emphasis in original.

16 Ibid., p. 11. Coleman's major thesis is that it is possible for adults, by shaping the directions of this society or by breaking it down, to "control the adolescent community as a community and to use it to further the ends of education." P. 12.


Finding a continuity of adult and adolescent values leads Elkin and Westley to deny the existence of an adolescent subculture. See: Frederick Elkin and William A. Westley, "The Myth of Adolescent Culture," American Sociological Review, XX (December, 1955), 680-84 and William A. Westley and Frederick Elkin, "The Protective Environment and Adolescent Socialization," Social Forces, XXXV (March, 1957), 243-49. In the latter, case materials are presented which lead the authors to the summary conclusions stated in the former article.
Characteristic Activities and Values of the Adolescent or Youth Culture

Many authors have described the dominant values and behavior patterns of the adolescent subculture. For example, Parsons says the adolescent male role involves the "irresponsibility" of "having a good time" in social activities with the opposite sex, prominence of athletics, and a high value upon certain qualities of attractiveness. Elkin and Westley cite affirmation of independence, rejection of adult standards of judgement, compulsive conformity to peer group patterns, romanticism, and participation in "irresponsible" pleasurable activities, distinctive dress and argot, etc. To Davis, "youth culture" involves irresponsibility, "having a good time," athletics, sex attraction, and the repudiation of adult control. Vaz, studying middle-class delinquency, points out that "among middle-class teen-agers sociability is the quickest route to acceptability and status gain." "Sports, girls, and cars held high rank among middle-class teenagers, and school is taken pretty much for granted." Clark, using the label "fun subculture," claims it generates values and practices that range from non-intellectual to anti-intellectual and subvert the formal purposes of the school.

21 Vaz, "Introduction" to Middle Class Juvenile Delinquency, p. 4.
22 Ibid., p. 7. See also: Vaz, "Juvenile Delinquency in Middle Class Youth Culture," p. 132.
Although school experience is a near universal among American youth today (at least through the early years of adolescence), Coleman's work indicates it is not a positive force integrating the adolescent smoothly into the society:

The most modern adolescents in our modern society are most impatient with the passive dependency that the school imposes upon them in its educational activities. They have been liberated by parents and by the worldliness that today's mass media bring, and are no longer pleased by the congratulations that follow good report cards. Their parents have liberated them and the liberation is more social than intellectual. The areas on which this liberated adolescent society focuses are those areas in which it has responsibility and authority to act: the social games of dating and parties, athletic contests for the boys, yearbook, newspaper, and drama groups for the girls.24

The Matter of Internal Variation

Authors who write of a homogeneous adolescent subculture tend to ignore internal variation. Others offer a corrective to this simplification. For example, Gordon, in a study of the social system of the high school,25 identifies three "sub-subsystems" in which high school pupils are involved: 1) the "formal scheme of things" involving administrators, faculty, texts, class rooms, rules and regulations, and grades, 2) a semi-formal set of sponsored organizations and activities, including athletics, dramatics and clubs, and

24Coleman, op. cit., p. 292.

3) the "informal, half-world of usually non-recognized and non-approved cliques, factions, and fraternities." To Gordon, the adolescent's behavior is "ordered by his general standing in the school-wide social system." The informal organization is the greatest influence shaping this general standing. "The dominant orientation to action was to accept those roles which would establish a prestige position in the informal organization." The "informal half-world of . . . cliques, factions and fraternities" were "especially powerful in controlling adolescent behavior, not only in such matters as dress and dating, but also in school achievement and deportment."

Secondary School "Secret Societies"

Fraternities and sororities existed in the secondary schools of the United States as early as 1876, although they were not widely viewed with alarm by educators until they became more numerous during the last decade of the 19th century. Increasing concern was followed by widespread condemnation of these "secret societies" by educators and parents.

---


27 Ibid., p. 22. Italics deleted.

28 Ibid., p. viii.


condemned high school fraternities and sororities in 1905 and Indiana, Kansas, and Minnesota, in 1907, became the first of many states to enact "anti-fraternity" legislation. Although often challenged by parents and students, the courts have generally upheld restrictive statutes, and it is now common for these groups to be illegal. Despite this illegal status, fraternities and sororities have continued to exist in high schools operating "either without official approval or illegally," although no indication is found in the literature that they are common, or even exist, in the junior high school.

In the literature, the origin and existence of these fraternities are explained by citing as etiological factors "a general instinct . . . to form exclusive groups," a "tendency to form . . . cliques," a "gregarious . . . urge to associate with . . . peers,"

---

31 Hamilton, loc. cit.; Travis, op. cit., p. 521.
33 George Weinstein, "Our Senseless High School Secret Societies," Coronet, October, 1961, p. 44. See also: Coleman, op. cit., p. 97, footnote 1: "Sororities and fraternities, even when outlawed, frequently arise in large urban schools, less often in single-school communities, and in smaller schools."
34 "Frats," Current Opinion, LXXI (August, 1921), 166.
35 Travis, op. cit., p. 518.
"drives" to "enhance and extend . . . personalities through social relations,"37 and an "adolescent search for status."38

Several authors explain the development of these fraternities as the result of "satisfactions" gained in membership. To Hamilton, the groups "signify the taking on of maturity in an alluring mystery and glamour." Exclusiveness and secrecy provide a feeling of importance, while insignia prove to outsiders that members are "accepted." Social affairs give social experience and recognition while initiations provide adventure and fun.39 Van Pool feels youths join because fraternities provide prestige, the satisfactions of secrecy, allegiance, and social advancement. Identifying insignia provide a badge of identity, with initiations giving fun and a sense of adventure and excitement.40 A symposium reports that these groups exist because they provide the following benefits to members: prestige, secrecy, identification with the group, social recognition, allegiance, and fun and adventure.41 The group "code" reduces uncertainties and gives

37 Hamilton, op. cit., p. 23.


the member a feeling of assurance. To Weinstein, high school secret societies continue to thrive because they provide emotional appeal, status through restricted membership, mystery and secrecy by establishing rituals, passwords, and secret meeting, excitement and fun in initiation ceremonies, and public symbols (ring, pins, and sweaters) that demonstrate the member's belonging to a select group.

In addition to the satisfactions of membership, other factors are seen contributing to the continued existence of these groups. The failure of the regular school program to provide competing satisfaction, parental indifference, and unwillingness by school boards of education to support attempts to remove these groups from the schools may contribute in this manner. These groups often "become juvenile replicas of adult lodges or college fraternities and sororities and achieve relative permanence." In addition, Wattenberg fails to find strong sources of condemnation in the community, since "these secret groups faithfully mirror the standards of large segments of the adult community." Some parents promote membership for their children, feeling that membership brings prestige and social success.

Most writers concerned with high school secret societies are so

---


46 Ibid.

47 Weinstein, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
fully engaged in condemning these groups that few have provided analysis of the characteristics of secondary school fraternities. The following characteristics, however, are commonly mentioned: 1) a restricted membership, 2) closed or secret meetings, 3) symbols (secret oaths, passwords) and insignia (pins, sweater, rings), 4) initiations, 5) group-oriented social events, and 6) group participation as a "block-vote" in school elections.48

Of particular importance to this dissertation is the effect of fraternity membership upon school academic performance. Again, few systematic studies involve high school pupils, although college fraternities have been the subject of research directed at this dimension.49 Those concerned with high school secret societies often conclude that fraternity membership lowers scholarship and other school performance, frequently without offering substantiation. Weinstein, for example, concludes that, with fraternity or sorority membership, "marks, attendance, and behavior suffer."50 Others often develop the same conclusion with undescribed methods or incompletely analyzed evidence. Perkins concludes that although fraternity members' I.Q.'s


50Weinstein, op. cit., p. 46.
are above average, their scholarship was "below medium." Masters concludes from a study of seventy fraternity and seventy non-fraternity men selected from the Oklahoma City High School population that fraternity members have lower grades. Hamilton compares an equal number of fraternity and non-fraternity boys from the Lincoln, Nebraska High School and finds the fraternity boys were more frequently absent and tardy, earned fewer grades of 90 per cent or over, and failed more courses. Kohlsaat, however, in an early study, found fraternity membership "exerted no deteriorating influence" on grades, and concluded "with the vice of lowering scholarship the fraternities as organizations cannot justly be charged."

Few authors suggest an approach to dealing with the secondary school fraternity which parallels that of the Pilot Project studied in this dissertation. For example, absent—especially in earlier

---


55 I am not suggesting that the approach in this study is unique, or even not widely known, but the approach is rarely applied to secondary school fraternities. Two factors might be responsible for this situation: 1) much of the literature on the high school fraternity was written in the first two decades of the 20th century—before the "helping profession" of social work and its philosophy became widely known; 2) social workers and kindred professionals—to this day—have not been concerned with high school fraternities and sororities as objects of their professional efforts.
writings—is the thought that through the techniques of one or another of the "helping professions," these groups might be approached to assist them in making "positive" social and community adjustments. Van Pool touches upon this thought by suggesting that school authorities might elect a strategy of "recognizing and controlling" these clubs, but rejects this approach as "ineffective." Wattenberg, alone of all the authors writing of high school secret societies, suggests an approach proximating the one used by the workers and described in this dissertation. He suggests "rather than ban them outright, it would be better to let them continue under responsible guidance of parents or teachers." 

**Approaches To Structural Analysis Of The Delinquent Male Adolescent Peer Group**

The tendency for youth in our society to form one-sex peer groups has long been noted, although the widespread approach to some of these groups as "gangs" probably dated from Frederic Thrasher's classic analysis. To Thrasher:

The gang is an interstitial group originally formed spontaneously, and then integrated through conflict. It is characterized by the following types of behavior: meeting face to face, milling, movement through space as a unit, conflict, and planning. The result of this

---


58 See, for example: Arthur W. Blair and William H. Burton, *Growth and Development of the Preadolescent* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951), pp. 33-42 and 91-95, or any of the standard texts in the sociology or psychology of adolescence.

collective behavior is the development of tradition, unreflective internal structure, esprit de corps, solidarity, morale, group awareness, and attachment to a local territory.60

Since Thrasher, students of the male adolescent peer group have identified various forms of grouping including, and in addition to, the gang, but no well established consensus has developed regarding the nature of delinquent groups.61 Much attention has been given to etiological theories of delinquency viewing the gang as a highly cohesive subculture arising in response to social and cultural influences.62 These views, based on data showing an inverse relationship between socio-economic level and officially identified delinquency, were class-linked explanations focusing almost exclusively on the lower class delinquent. In their preoccupation with lower class forms of delinquent grouping these authors have generally neglected the incidence of middle class delinquency and the forms of grouping found in that class position.63

60Ibid., p. 46. Italics removed.


62Probably the most influential of these are Albert Cohen, loc. cit.; Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960); and Walter Miller, "Lower Class Culture As A Generating Mileau of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, XIV, No. 3 (1958), 5-19. All were concerned with explaining the development of lower class delinquent subcultures.

For an excellent summary and critique of these three views, see: David J. Bordua, "Delinquent Subcultures," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXXVIII (November, 1961), 119-36.

Forms of Adolescent Grouping

Charles B. Spaulding points out that certain quasi-primary groupings are important devices for members in adapting to their social milieu. Among these, he identifies the "clique," "gang," and the "network." A clique is:

A small, informal, intimate, non-kin, face-to-face group usually demonstrating a considerable degree of "we-feeling," some fairly well-defined customary rules of conduct, and a well-developed internal structure. It may or may not be tied to a geographic location.

A clique ranges in size from two to thirty members, but toward the upper reaches of size breaks down into a number of sub-cliques. When conflict increases a sense of unity and strengthens clique internal organization the clique becomes a gang. A network, in contrast, appears to be a more accommodative grouping not so dependent on conflict for its formation. A network is:

A set of relatively stable emotional linkages between persons which result in selective channels of communication through which intimate information and emotions may be rather freely translated to the members of a community so linked.

Lloyd T. Delany argues that cliques--informal groupings based on personal preferences--are sub-units of gangs. Delany and others

64 "Cliqued, Gangs, and Networks," Sociology and Social Research, XXXII (July-August, 1948), 928-37.

65 Ibid., p. 928.

66 Ibid., p. 929.

67 Ibid.

point out that gangs often have distinct age graded segments and frequently combine into loose and shifting "federations." The former have been termed "vertical" organization and the latter a "horizontal" arrangement.

**Gang Types.**--The literature abounds with terms applied to identify types of juvenile gangs. Cohen writes of delinquent, stable corner-boy, and college-boy subcultures among the lower class male adolescent while Cloward and Ohlin describe delinquent, conflict, and retreatist subcultures also in the lower class. Gannon delineates "corner groups," "social clubs" and two variants of the

---


72 Cohen, *loc. cit.*

73 Cloward and Ohlin, *loc. cit.*
"conflict group"—the "fighting gang" and the "defensive gang."\(^7^4\) Smith distinguishes between "cliques" (members in school) and "gangs" (members out of school),\(^7^5\) while Yablonsky writes of "violent," "delinquent," and "social" gangs.\(^7^6\)

In addition, much effort has been devoted in attempt to delineate the nature of a gang.\(^7^7\) Howard L. Myerhoff and Barbara G. Myerhoff\(^7^8\) maintain that descriptions of gang structure commonly take one of two general patterns. In the first, the gang is viewed as a kind of primary group. The gang is described as highly structured, relatively permanent and autonomous, and forming a well-developed delinquent subculture. The gang is, in this view, "an integrated and relatively cohesive group."\(^7^9\) More recently, the gang has been


\(^7^5\)Ernest A. Smith, op. cit., pp. 39-44 and 68-69.


\(^7^8\)Howard L. Myerhoff and Barbara G. Myerhoff, "Field Observations of Middle-Class 'Gangs,'" Social Forces, XLII (March, 1964), 328-36.

\(^7^9\)Ibid. As examples of this view they cite the work of Cohen, loc. cit.; Talcott Parsons, "Certain Primary Sources and Patterns of
viewed as similar to informal short-lived secondary groups without clear-cut stable, delinquent structure.\(^80\)

Recently, growing awareness of, and attention to, middle class variants of delinquency can be observed in the literature.\(^81\) Despite this "growing awareness," few studies describe distinctively middle class forms of adolescent grouping.\(^82\) For example, Myerhoff and

---


\(^80\) Ibid. Their example is Lewis Yablonsky's The Violent Gang.


\(^82\) This probably is due to the recency of attention paid to these groups and will be corrected in time. In one extensive study of "group process and gang delinquency" the authors found no middle class gangs because they are "rare." See: Short and Strodtbeck, op. cit., p. 15.
Myerhoff maintain that middle class youth groups are not "gangs," but resemble Yablonsky's "near-group" in structure. Middle class groups, however, are non-violent, and personal aggression is rare. The authors favor a "subterranean value" thesis and claim that:

Middle class deviants may differ from lower class delinquents not in the frequency of their anti-social activities, but only in the from which they take and the sophistication, social intelligence, judgement, and skill with which they are executed.

Gang Characteristics

Gangs, being primary groups, have functional limits on size which limit the probability of a high number of members. Although it is difficult to fix an upper limit of numbers, it would seem that estimates in excess of twenty-five, if accurate, are likely to combine several separate age divisions. In addition, gang members often inflate estimates of size due to uncertainty as to exactly who belongs to the gang and because of a need satisfied by a feeling of large numbers. Furthermore, there is a tendency to confuse "core" with "peripheral" membership.

Although gangs are one sex peer groups, occasionally a few girls will be included as members. At times a female peer group will be

---

83Myerhoff and Myerhoff, op. cit., p. 334.
84Ibid., p. 335.
85Smith, op. cit., p. 69; Thrasher, op. cit., p. 221; and Myerhoff and Myerhoff, op. cit., p. 330.
86Thrasher, op. cit., p. 221.
87Yablonsky, loc. cit.
88Thrasher, op. cit., pp. 158-61; Bogardus, op. cit., p. 59; Wolman, op. cit., p. 175; John M. Gandy, "Preventive Work With
associated with a male counterpart. These groups of girls are commonly
tered "auxiliaries" by writers and "debs" by the youth.\textsuperscript{89} Gang
internal organization often tends to be loose and relatively
unstructured,\textsuperscript{90} with membership boundaries often poorly defined.\textsuperscript{91} Ob-
servers, if not so often members, recognize "core" and "peripheral"
members.\textsuperscript{92} Others find a definite set of "offices" or "titles" present
in the gang structure.\textsuperscript{93}

Gangs will often select a special name for their group. These
labels serve to provide some sort of common identity for the members.
Also noted are the use of secret signals such as passwords, badges,

\bibitem{89} Leon R. Jansyn, "Solidarity and Delinquency in A Street
Corner Group," \textit{American Sociological Review}, XXXI (October, 1966),
600-14; Bradford Chambers, "An Approach to the Gang," \textit{Survey
Midmonthly}, LXXX (September, 1944), 256; Walter B. Miller, Hildred
Geertz, and Henry S. G. Cutter, "Aggression in a Boys Street-Corner
Group," \textit{Psychiatry}, XXIV (November, 1961), 284-98; and Walter B.
Miller, "The Impact of a 'Total-Community' Delinquency Control

\bibitem{90} Gannon, "Dimensions of Current Gang Delinquency," p. 122;
Gannon, "Emergence of the 'Defensive' Gang," pp. 44-48; Yablonsky,
loc. cit.; and Thrasher, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 31.

\bibitem{91} Arnold, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 68; Short and Strodtbeck, \textit{op. cit.},
p. 187; Klein, "Factors Related to Juvenile Gang Membership Patterns,"
p. 50.

\bibitem{92} Yablonsky, \textit{loc. cit.}; Schumach, \textit{loc. cit.}; Jansyn, \textit{op. cit.},
Klein, "Factors Related to Juvenile Gang Membership Patterns," p. 50;
and Klein, \textit{Street Gangs and Street Workers}.

\bibitem{93} Wolman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 176; Schumach, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 7; Delany,
\textit{op. cit.}, p. 40; and D. J. Brown, \textit{The Sociology of Childhood} (New
codes, or secret language, the existence of common territorial base, a special meeting place, and initiations.\(^{94}\)

Two views of the "cohesiveness" of the gang are found in the literature.\(^{95}\) First, the "traditional perspective" which views delinquent groups as characterized by internal cohesion. This view emphasizes "esprit de corps, solidarity, cooperative action, shared tradition, and a strong group awareness." It emphasizes the "culture-generating qualities and attractiveness of the peer group." A second theme is "irrationalistic and deterministic." Less romantic, this view implies that external pressure produces cohesion. The group then becomes the instrument that translates the members' "discontent" into a collective solution. Group cohesiveness has been found to be associated with long term acquaintanceship prior to group membership, having respect for the group, feeling happy in the group, feeling that group activity will broaden the members, and when a "group spirit" is present.\(^{96}\) Others have pointed out that delinquent groups will go through phases marked by increases and decreases of solidarity and states of "organization and disorganization":


\(^{95}\) The following closely follows Empey, op. cit., pp. 32-42.

\(^{96}\) See also: T. C. Keedy, "Factors in the Cohesiveness of Small Groups," Sociology and Social Research, XL (May, 1956), 329-32.
Solidarity, it appears, has a tendency to decline. It reaches a level where it becomes threatening to the boys. There is a spirit of group activity which generates interest and increases attendance and solidarity.  

The activity which often best induces a higher level of solidarity is the commission of delinquencies. Recently, some have argued that assigning a group worker to the gang will result in increasing the solidarity of the group.

**Delinquency Prevention Programs And Evaluation Of Their Effectiveness**

The field of delinquency prevention is viewed as extremely wide in scope and requiring a diversity of integrated efforts. As early as 1936, Frederic Thrasher pointed out that:

Prevention turns out to be not the function of a single preventive agency, but a problem requiring the concerted attack of a co-ordinated community program in which the services of all preventive and remedial agencies must be integrated in the achievement of a common end.  

Various attempts at delinquency prevention have been undertaken, yet these efforts have lagged behind work in other areas of criminology.

---

97 Jansyn, op. cit., p. 612. See also: Short and Strodtebeck, op. cit., p. 187. Short and Strodtebeck's work is one of the most extensive studies of group processes in the delinquent gang.

98 Short and Strodtebeck, op. cit., p. 187.

99 The most complete exposition of this view is Klein, Street Gangs and Street Workers, Chapter iv, pp. 103-43. See also: Yablonsky, loc. cit.

100 "The Boys' Club and Juvenile Delinquency," American Journal of Sociology, XLII (July, 1936), 78.

Early prevention programs were primarily local efforts and involved the extension of local serving agency practices into the areas of delinquency treatment and prevention. As interest in evaluating the effectiveness of these programs grew, certain impediments to systematic evaluation were noted:

Prevention programs are not implemented under controlled laboratory conditions where problems can always be anticipated and planned for, but are instead implemented in the complex and sometimes chaotic environment of the community where frustrating and disruptive contingencies are likely to arise.

The result of these and other impediments is to prevent the development of an integrated scientific approach to delinquency prevention. Authors writing of the "state" of this field fail to find integrated theory or research. Consider the following examples of the common position:

Prevention programs have not developed a central, organized discipline, body of knowledge, action, or research that can be identified as a theoretical schema.

There has been very little theory-building, and attempted research under such circumstances has failed to produce any significant results.

The Evaluation of Delinquency Prevention Programs

Delinquency prevention programs have been evaluated in a variety of ways. For example, Sullivan and Bash (op. cit., pp. 51-52) have commented:


103 Sullivan and Bash, op. cit., p. 54.

104 Lejins, op. cit., p. 1. See also: Klein, Street Gangs and Street Workers.
of ways using varied standards. James C. Hackler provides a perspective for viewing evaluation attempts as he lists five approaches to evaluation. First, some studies compare the effect of "treatment" upon official rates of delinquency, asking if treatment does lower such rates. "When these criteria have been used as the basis for evaluation, prevention programs have almost universally been failures," generally because factors other than the treatment may influence official rates of delinquency or these official measures may not be particularly relevant to the type of program. A second approach involves gathering "subjective opinion," e.g., polling all of those working on or under the influence of the program as to their evaluation of it. To Hackler, "a subjective evaluation . . . is really not an evaluation at all, but rather a statement of faith." Subjective opinion, however, should not be overlooked for "many tools used by the social scientist are insensitive to some revealing information." On the other hand, "the action worker . . . should not assume that such an assessment can be considered a true evaluation." A third approach looks for "changes as predicted by the theoretical

---


107 Ibid., p. 45.

108 Ibid., p. 46.

109 Ibid.

110 Ibid.
A related fourth approach is a test of theoretical ideas, while the fifth investigates the "integrity of the program."  

The result of attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of delinquency prevention programs has been a number of studies of varied design. Some have used as subjects "natural groups," self-selected and found in the environment. Others have used investigator-selected subjects or subjects provided the investigator by some other selective process (e.g. official commitment to institutions). Most delinquency prevention experiments have utilized subjects from lower-socioeconomic levels. The "treatment" provided the experimental subjects has varied from general advice and counsel by a worker serving as a role model to intensive psychiatric therapy. When evaluating change, indicators of change have usually been some measure of official involvement with police or court authority. In some works, an "index of anti-social behavior" is utilized as an indicator of change. These studies come to monotonously similar conclusions: they have generally failed to show that effective change occurred at all, much less that any changes observed in the behavior and orientations of group members could be attributed to the treatment effort.  

Ibid.  


As one example of many evaluation studies coming to this conclusion, see Joan McCord and William McCord, "A Follow-Up Report on the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXII (March, 1959), 89-96. For summaries of evaluations of delinquency prevention projects, see: William C. Berleman and Thomas W. Steinburn, "The Value and Validity
No study was located in the literature which combined all the features of the evaluation of change described in this dissertation: 1) work with middle-class pre-delinquent "natural groups" as they are found in the environment, 2) "treatment" provided by a professional group worker acting largely as an "adult role model" and mediator between the boys and institutional authority, and 3) behavioral change measured by indicators of school performance and adjustment. For this reason, only a brief summary of delinquency prevention experiments resembling that described in this dissertation in at least one of the above dimensions will be attempted here. Table 1, pp. 44-45 describes the subjects, treatment, and evaluation of several evaluation studies of delinquency preventive programs.

An Outlook on Evaluation Study Results

Although effectiveness of programs has not been shown, Berleman and Steinburn argue there is no reason to accept the findings "with gloomy finality," since to do so would require the assumption that the experiments were flawless.114 These authors point to two major


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Shield Boys Club&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A &quot;natural group&quot; of members of a boys' club</td>
<td>Citizenship training</td>
<td>Comparison of delinquency rates in areas (1 including the club). Cannot attribute change to service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys' Club Study of N.Y.U.&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Members of a boys' club</td>
<td>Activities directed by volunteer group leaders</td>
<td>More delinquency in club than in community: ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Youth Project, Chicago&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11 street clubs from a lower-socio-economic area</td>
<td>Group workers serving as &quot;significant male role models&quot;</td>
<td>Some reduction of delinquency in 46% of cases, some increase in 10%. Reached the least delinquent. &quot;Demonstrated an effective approach&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls at Vocational High&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>189 girls with &quot;potential problems&quot;</td>
<td>Professional social workers providing casework or group counseling. Directed at the individual</td>
<td>Varied evaluative criteria including school academic and conduct grades: ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcity Project&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Lower class adolescents in 7 street-corner groups</td>
<td>Social workers serving as &quot;role models,&quot; supplemented by psychiatric casework service</td>
<td>Comprehensive indicators focusing upon &quot;disapproved behavior,&quot; &quot;illegal acts,&quot; and &quot;court appearances.&quot; Treatment of &quot;negligible impact&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Guidance Project</td>
<td>4 Negro gang</td>
<td>Group programming by detached workers</td>
<td>&quot;Project ... clearly associated with a significant increase in delinquency.&quot; Increase greatest in gangs most intensively served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;clusters&quot; (800 members)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladino-Hills Project</td>
<td>A Mexican-American gang cluster (140 members)</td>
<td>Install activities other than group programming. Treatment strategy: reduce cohesiveness</td>
<td>Reduced cohesiveness and recruitment. No change in delinquency rates, but decline in gang size led to a decrease in number of offenses—continued in follow-up period when workers withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


*g* Ibid.
deficiencies in the delinquency prevention experiments they reviewed. First, the degree of exposure to the treatment services varies from one experiment to another and often from one individual to another in the experimental group in each study. Two important aspects of exposure to service can be identified: 1) "attention," i.e., the number and duration of contacts, and 2) the "dynamism of the service," i.e., the intensity of the relationship between the subject and the worker. Attempts to specify the former have only been approximated and efforts to address the latter aspect have been rudimentary and poorly standardized. The authors conclude that the experimental subjects were so lightly exposed to services that positive change could not be expected. 115 A second deficiency involves measuring the treatment services. Instruments in the reviewed experiments were not devised for the collection of data that would clarify the dimensions of the services given, hence it is "impossible to assess accurately the amount and kind of attention the experimental subjects received." 116 To avoid future "duplication of ineffective efforts, we will need to know with more precision what has failed to work thus far." 117 In sum, Berleman and Steinburn point out that:

The overall negative results occurred not so much because the service itself was faulty but because the subjects were so woefully underexposed to the service agents that the forms of service were never actually tested. 118

115 Ibid., pp. 471-74.
116 Ibid., p. 471.
117 Ibid.
118 Ibid., p. 476.
A failure to provide sufficient exposure may be due to a wasting of effort in providing preventive services to those who are compulsory participants in the service program. In addition, specification and evaluation of treatment is impeded when an experiment brings together service agents and researchers whose methods and goals differ. To these authors, this is very apparent in standards of record keeping. The service agent "traditionally has kept discursive prose records that indiscriminately and inconsistently embrace a wide range of fact, opinion and interpretation, . . ." Research of this type needs records that are quantifiable, i.e.:

Records that consistently collect information along well-defined dimensions and that are . . . shorn of much of their uniqueness for reduction into categories.119

119 Ibid., p. 477.

120 Ibid.
CHAPTER III

THE THEORETICAL BASIS AND TREATMENT

STRATEGY OF THE SERVICE EFFORT

The group workers of the Pilot Project made no effort to explicate a theoretical model of intervention. Their effort in early stages was exploratory—e.g., an attempt to make successful contact with the selected problem groups and to understand structure and process in these groups. Once established with these groups, the workers established goals of modifying the behavior of these groups by acting as adult role models for the boys. This weakness of theoretical underpinning of the service effort is widespread among programs of this type. One cannot say these workers "had no theory," but it is clear they did not explicitly formulate the assumptions and theoretical context within which their service effort was shaped. Later in this chapter such a context can briefly be described, but it is not implied that this theoretical context was understood and acted upon by the workers. No such inference should be drawn. Selected examples of the workers' performance conclude this chapter.

The Workers' Conception Of The Project Service Effort

In a paper written prior to beginning the Pilot Project, Worker L. described several "basic beliefs," "over all [sic]
intentional goals," and tactics involved in his service effort.\footnote{Joe B. Lawley, "Miami Pilot Project" (unpublished paper prepared for "Human Development," George Williams College, August, 1965). The following paragraphs are based upon this paper. In this dissertation Lawley will be referred to as Worker L. The second worker will be identified as Worker A.} Worker L. believed that adolescents "consciously and unconsciously seek help" in alleviating the tensions of adolescence. He feels that adolescents have the capacity to help each other through "sharing some of their real concerns" and "questioning and exploring each other's behavior." An "environment" can be created in which values are learned and "desires are wholesomely directed" as adolescents "reach out for new experiences." "Significant others" are important in this process due to their "power of influence during the adolescent period." It is imperative that adolescents "have encounter \[sic\] with persons of conviction who, at the same time, respect their freedoms" and are "sensitive" to the "role change from youth to adult."

In the service effort, Worker L. aimed to promote "the development of conscience, identity, acceptance of self and self awareness." He felt it would be necessary to "intervene to provide leadership functions that are missing, yet encouraging these functions to be picked up and carried on by individuals within the group." He would also be active in "encouraging their capacity for growth in the area of values and moral development."

Worker L. planned to accomplish this by "changing behavior primarily through personal relationships, peer group association, and cooperation with school, home, church, and other agencies." As Worker L. states:
including enlisting community support of the Project, increasing communication among the groups, school, and community, as well as efforts to:

Help clubs to manage their conflict with the community concerning drinking, fighting, paddling and destruction of school property.\(^4\)

Thus, from the preceding description of goals and aims, it can readily be seen that during the Project little attention was given to identification and elaboration of anything that could be called a theoretical basis for the service effort.

**The Pilot Project As "Street Club Work"**

The Pilot Project involved a service program carried out by trained workers working with adolescent male peer groups existing in the community. As such it is a variant of what Spergel,\(^5\) Kobrin,\(^6\) Austin,\(^7\) and Caplan, \textit{et. al.}, among others,\(^8\) call "street club" or

\(^4\)\textit{Ibid.}, p. 19.


"street gang" work. To Caplan, et. al.:

Street club work programs are, essentially, methods of dealing directly with the delinquency problem through the use of relatively free agents (variously called gang workers, extension workers, detached workers, etc.) who intervene in the lives and activities of street corner groups or delinquent gangs in order to influence their behavior . . .

To these authors, street club work, compared to other programs, has a greater effectiveness in "relating the client population to institutional complexes (family, school, police, employers) that effect the lives of young people." Klein is more emphatic in that he argues that this type of program is based upon the assumption that the detached worker is the only way to maintain contact with the "hard-to-reach" membership.

Most students of this type of service program would agree with


Klein's assessment that "the theoretical underpinnings of gang intervention process are very shaky." As Austin observes, these programs start with a "problem not a program," wherein the "essential tool is the individual worker and his network of relationships with the group." Most such programs are rooted in what Klein calls the "transformation assumption":

First, delinquent behavior is assumed, at least in part, to be the consequence of predisposing attitudes, values, and perceptions. Second, it is assumed that these attitudes, values, and perceptions can be transformed into variations not predisposing toward antisocial conduct.

Many of these programs attempt to achieve this transformation through the presence with, and influence upon, these groups of a mature adult. Through example, encouragement, disapproval, and advice, the

---

12 Ibid., p. 157.
13 Austin, op. cit., p. 44.
14 Street Gangs and Street Workers, pp. 152-54.
15 Ibid., p. 153. (Emphasis in original.) To Austin, op. cit., p. 47, the goal of the street group worker is to modify forces bringing about delinquent acts "in such a way that law violations and socially disapproved behavior will occur less frequently and that community-approved behavior will occur more frequently."

16 Many have described qualities desirable in the incumbent of such a role. Hogrefe, for example, indicates that the worker should be flexible, warm, friendly, and reasonably secure. He should have the ability to retain his perspective and to prevent his own standards and morals from intruding. He should have the ability to listen and to learn the neighborhood mores. See: Russell W. Hogrefe, "An Agency Works With Street Gangs," in Clyde Murray, Marx G. Bowers, and Russell W. Hogrefe, eds., Group Work In Community Life (New York: Association Press, 1954), p. 139. Elsewhere in this volume, (pp. 240-42), these authors emphasize that the worker must have faith in people and in the group work method. See also, in addition to those works cited supra, n. 8, pp. 51-52. Trecker, loc. cit.; Sophia Robison, Juvenile Delinquency (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1960), p. 514; and Don C. Gibbons, Society, Crime, and Criminal Careers (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 504.
worker attempts to facilitate change in behavior patterns toward desired ends without assuming active direction and control of group activities. This kind of approach is not currently systematized into well-defined and effectiveness-tested procedures. In fact, Caplan, et. al., argue that, in this type of effort, the conceptual framework applied by the workers is built upon a series of common sense expectations that would apply to most interpersonal relationships. They maintain that the worker's role is not clearly defined by a technical vocabulary and well-established set of corresponding practices that would distinguish the workers role from such roles as parent, friend, or neighbor.

These service efforts are not without the influence of theory, but the worker's "theory" is usually an eclectic borrowing from several sources. The worker tends to borrow, "as the occasion demands, from Freud, Parsons, Cloward and Ohlin, or any other theorist who can be readily translated into action alternatives." Strategy and technique supersede a concern with theory, and varying actions become part of

17John M. Gandy, "Preventive Work With Street-Corner Groups: Hyde Park Youth Project, Chicago," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXII (March, 1959), 111, comments that "another dimension of the work that was found to be important but that has received little more than cursory attention in the literature is the role, 'significant male.'"

18Caplan, et. al., op. cit., p. 215. Gottesfeld argues that the delinquent responds most positively to this role. "The delinquent will not attach much value to his relationship with the worker unless the worker is perceived as a kind of idealized parent who is helping the youth to socialize." Harry Gottesfeld, "Professionals and Delinquents Evaluate Professional Methods With Delinquents," Social Problems, XIII (Summer, 1965), 58.

19Klein, Street Gangs and Street Workers, p. 149.
"worker style." The worker may engage in counseling, activity planning, club meetings, outings with the serviced group. He may also interact with parents of gang members by counseling them and participating in community organization programs. The worker also interacts with various social agents to interpret youth behavior, maintain channels of communication, seek permits for group activity, gather information, arrange meetings, and offer services. His activity becomes diffuse and the service effort that develops is a reflection of what the worker does in meeting the exigencies of the situations which he encounters. Klein succinctly summarizes the consequences of these actions:

The program is the worker; the worker is the program. What he does, what he thinks, what he avoids constitute the form of the intervention.  

The Theoretical Context Of This Type Of Service Effort

In the United States, adolescence is a social status wherein the incumbent adolescent is confronted with conflicting expectations. The individual is expected to behave as an adult while in a status where full adulthood is denied. Recently in the study of stratification, the term "status consistency" has been developed to refer to a situation in which an individual occupies approximately the same position in each of several status dimensions.  

20 Ibid., p. 159.
21 Ibid., p. 158.
concept would place the adolescent in a position of status **consistency**, since he ranks low on such dimensions as income, educational achievement, power, prestige, etc., within the society simply by virtue of the fact he is not yet an adult. However, adolescence might be viewed as a status of status **inconsistency**, particularly among middle class adolescents. In this class, adolescents are often given great latitude to act like adults, as parents permit them cars, tolerate their drinking, etc., while at the same time the adolescent is not viewed as an adult by police, school authorities, and various members of the community.

Those experiencing status inconsistency are subject to pressures which may lead to stress. Goffman recognizes that younger persons may frequently be status inconsistent.\(^{23}\) The structural conditions of a society which create status inconsistency often impair the establishment of "satisfying" social relations:

The status consistent possesses sets of behavioral expectations which either reinforce or are consistent with one another. A condition of social certitude exists and social relations are fluid and satisfying. The status inconsistent possessess [sic] sets of expectations which conflict with one another.\(^{24}\)

Moreover, status inconsistency is seen to impair the adoption of a self-identity of clarity:

---


Absence of a clear and dominant identity is likely to impair the ability of the individual to use the self as a stable referent for perceptions, judgments and guides to behavior. To the extent that there is no stable internal referent, the individual is probably dependent on his social environment in several important respects.

The adolescent peer group may develop as a collective solution to these conditions. Moreover, in American society, male youths forming "gangs" are viewed as having problems of "masculine identification" stemming from a socialization process without the presence of an "adequate" male adult role model. In this situation, the adolescent may be highly susceptible to the influence of a "significant other" who symbolizes the socially responsible adult male.

The individual engaged in striving for adult status is engaged in "anticipatory socialization." As Merton points out, in anticipatory socialization:

The individual responds to the cues in behavioral situations, more or less unwittingly draws implications from these for

25 Goffman, op. cit., p. 279.


27 In Ibid., p. 168, Cohen states:
future role-behavior, and thus becomes oriented toward a
status he does not yet occupy.28

The socialization process is in part a process of role-taking. The
street group worker, acting as an adult role model, can serve as an
object for role-taking activity on the part of members of the street
group. Turner identifies variable ways in which taking the
"standpoint of the other" influences the one who engages in the
role-taking.29 Each of these patterns seem to be possible in the
relationships established between worker and group member. In the
"non-reflexive" pattern, "the other may serve as a model or standard
which is accepted without self-consciousness either in the absence of
alternative models or because of prestige or dependence in the
relationship."30 This pattern is a "major source of the values and
attitudes of the individual."31 A second, "reflexive" role-taking
pattern occurs "when the role of the other is employed as a mirror,
reflecting the expectations or evaluations of the self as seen in the
other-role."32 In this pattern, "a desire to conform to the other's
expectations or to appear favorably in the other's eyes may shape the
self behavior into conformity with the other."33

28 Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Revised
p. 385.

29 Ralph H. Turner, "Role-Taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference
Group Behavior," in Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, eds., Role
Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.,

30 Ibid., p. 154.

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid., p. 153.

33 Ibid., p. 154.
The purpose in adopting the role model in this type of program is to produce an emulation of this model by group members. In turn, this role-taking by the group member is held to result in the adoption of values, attitudes, etc., "predisposing" the group member to conform to adult expectations. In so doing, "anti-social" behavior should diminish in frequency or cease altogether. Changes resulting from this role-taking can be changes at at least two levels: "predispositions" to commit non-conforming behavior and/or behavior itself. In sum, the expected consequences of the intervention process are easily described in general terms, but attention should be given to the variable ways in which the process of role-taking can alter the participants. For example, Merton has pointed out that conformity may involve "attitudinal," "doctrinal," and "behavioral" conformity. An intervention model should take such distinctions into account. In so doing, expected consequences of the intervention program would not be left so undefined and unspecified.

The program which provides an "adult-role model" as the intervention strategy often is based on the assumption that no alternative role models of equal attractiveness are present for the adolescent.

34 See: supra, n. 15, p. 53.

35 This conception, despite the vagueness of the notion of "predispositions," should indicate that there are variable points in the process at which the effect of the workers efforts might be measured, e.g., by measuring attitudinal change, value change, etc., or behavioral change of several types. Which indicator is the "best" measure of change?

Whatever relationship established between the worker and the group member, the linkage is not independent of its context. This relationship is in part dependent upon the reference group structure in which it is established and the role-sets of each participant--group member and worker.\(^{37}\) Inattention to such contexts can result in the suspect assumption that the worker, simply by performing as the "adult role model," can be of greater influence upon the adolescent than that adolescent's peers or other adults in his social environment, such as teachers, parents, etc. Moreover, it is often assumed that this degree of influence can be achieved with contact of severely limited duration, without more active intervention by the group worker,\(^{38}\) and without establishing relationships with boys as individuals.

**Some Examples Of The Service Effort**

**In Practice: What The Workers Did**

The worker as a concerned adult who would advise but not order nor direct the group was a stance taken at first meeting with the groups. Worker L. describes his initial meeting with the "Knights":

[The] Assistant Principal at [School S] called me into his office and said he had a group for me to work with. . . . [The Assistant Principal] said he would call the boys in and say that I was to be their leader. I asked if we could just meet each other and then set another meeting at which time the boys could decide. [The Assistant Principal] called the boys in. As they came into the office, some asked what they had done wrong. [He] said that Mr. L. was here from the YMCA to talk to them about being sponsored and that they were to be honest with me. They nodded. . . . [The Assistant Principal] left the room. . . . I asked them individually their names. W. . . . asked if I sponsored them, could they still paddle.


\(^{38}\)Klein, *Street Gangs and Street Workers*, pp. 147-58.
I asked if they would give me a paddle. Some grinned. One of the group asked if they could drink beer. . . . The group tossed this around pro and con. I said I trusted their judgment. . . . I asked the boys to discuss this among themselves and others and we would meet again to decide . . . .

At the subsequent meeting:

We talked about becoming legal. J. was concerned with laws that would be imposed. I told J. I had no laws. . . . W. asked what I would do if they got into trouble. I said I would be in trouble with them. . . . F. asked me to step outside while they voted. . . . After about five minutes, F. called me in and said they had voted to have a sponsor. . . .

Workers made it clear that they had no intention of directing what the boys were to do, nor in establishing norms for the group by dictating rules to which they boys must adhere:

I spent a few minutes saying how much I enjoyed being a part of the club, emphasizing that if they were in trouble, so was I. . . . I told them I was not going to lay down any rules and regulations and that they would have to decide for themselves what kind of persons they wanted to be. I could see heads nodding in agreement on this.

---

39 Worker L., "Knights' Journal" (YMCA of Greater Miami, n.d.), p. 1. (Mimeographed.) To protect the anonymity of the boys involved, the groups will be given psuedonyms reflecting the tenor and tone of the original name. Each psuedonym will be placed within quotation marks and will replace the actual name of the group in material cited from the journals and in the text of this dissertation. In the passages quoted from the journals, the names of the boys will be replaced by a capital letter. It should not be assumed that these letters reflect either the boy's first or last name. A given letter may also be used to represent more than one boy.

40 Ibid., pp. 1-2. Worker A.'s initial involvement with the "Rams" was somewhat different. Two officers of the club sought out Worker A. and asked if he could make the "Rams" "legal." Their primary motivation was that their parents had forbidden them to belong and they felt that after the club became legal, this parental objection would be removed. Following a vote of the entire club, Worker A. assumed sponsorship of the "Rams." See: Lloyd T. Delany, "Establishing Relationships With Antisocial Groups and Analysis of Their Structure," British Journal of Delinquency, V (July, 1954), 34-45; and Miller, loc. cit.

41 Worker A., "Rams' Journal" (YMCA of Greater Miami, n.d.), p. 23. (Mimeographed) See also: Ruth S. Cavan, Juvenile
The workers, in their actions, held up conventional community standards as values to be emulated. Worker A., in refusing to lie for the group, adroitly emphasized not only the value of truthfulness, but also the benefits to the group of this kind of behavior:

R. had told [the "Rams] he would like to get back in "Rams" and could keep his parents from knowing it. . . . The decision of the club was that they would take R. back. At this point, I asked for the floor and said that both Mr. and Mrs. R. had told me R. was to have nothing to do with the "Rams," that I would not be responsible for notifying them he was at the meeting but that if they called and asked me if he were back and present, I would tell them so. I reemphasized I would not lie for them as I believed this would never do them any good.42

Having a sponsor was a new experience for the group, and the relationship involved "testing" the worker. Worker L. relates:

D. asked me hesitantly if I would go get some beer for the group. He said that others had said that the "Rams" advisor got beer for them. . . . I said I really wanted to help but this put me between a rock and a hard place. I would be breaking the law. G. said I shouldn't do it. D. agreed.43

The workers were aware of this testing, and in it reasserted their basic role:


42"Rams' Journal," p. 38. Candy, op. cit., p. 111 states: "After initial acceptance by the group the worker would try to establish himself as a representative of the community and its values, . . ." Miller, op. cit., p. 175, identified the "most persistent direct-influence technique" in the program he describes as the "continued presence with the group of a law-abiding, middle-class oriented adult who provided active support for a particular value position."

The boys were planning for a Hell Night and discussing how many licks to give. . . . At first the decision was two licks each at Hell Night. After some time, the group changed this to three. I could feel my presence as an adult again. They were testing me and asserting themselves as being capable of making decisions without interference. They were struggling to be independent and not lose their dignity as a group to make decisions or to be imposed on by an adult's opinion. The boys know that I don't agree with the harshness of their paddling. I did not say anything. I want the boys to know how I feel, but I don't want to interfere with their decision. I planned to ask them at Hell Night, when I felt a boy was being hurt, if I could receive licks for the boy. 44

A major concern of both workers was in encouraging the groups in establishing what the workers called "boundaries," i.e., certain working norms that the boys would accept and apply in the appropriate situation. 45 For example, the workers urged that the groups prohibit consumption of alcoholic beverages during their social events.

Two areas of group behavior were of special concern to the workers: drinking and "paddling." Their chief tactic was to discourage this behavior through expressed disapproval. 46 Worker L. cites one such example:

F. asked if they were going to drink at the party. . . . L., A., H., and G. all agreed there should be drinking. I commented that K.'s [home] had a lot of glass mirrors and we would be responsible for any damages. I said their decision to drink inside of the party made me a little angry. Several of the boys laughed good naturedly, and


46 Ibid.
the boys talked about taking care of each other if someone got drunk. . . .

Worker A. gives a second example:

K. said he had a quart of beer to drink, to which I made no reply, and then K. said (in a questioning voice), "You don't mind?" I said, "K., it is your life to live, you have to make your own decisions on what you are going to be and do. I don't like it, if that is what you are asking."

In trying to alter drinking patterns, the workers often took more active steps, as exemplified in Worker A.'s denying admission to a group function of those arrivals who had been drinking:

M. arrived with a car load of alumni and assorted individuals. I stopped them at the door. I let M. in since he had not been drinking. I let "Judy" in, as well as two other girls, none of whom seemed to have been drinking, but did not let in K. or F., both of whom had been drinking a lot.

On another occasion, Worker A. made strong objection to the "Rams" plan for a party:

I told G. the "Y" would have no part in the club activities if they were going to order a keg of beer because we could not assist them in breaking the law, nor did we think it was right. . . . I told [B.] I would not be a part of it or encourage this kind of activity. I said if a boy goes out and has a can of beer, that is one thing, but that the "Rams" as a club violating the law was absolutely wrong. . . . The attitude seems to be that this is the final big plast [sic] of the year, but I am going to do all that is possible to see it isn't a big blast.

To discourage the use of excessive force in initiations, workers negatively sanctioned this use by removing themselves from the scene

47Worker L., "Chiefs' Journal" (YMCA of Greater Miami, n.d.), p. 25. (Mimeographed.)


49Ibid., p. 115.

50Ibid., p. 72.
of this activity. Worker L. describes one such instance:

G. asked me how I could put up with the paddling. I said that I would walk away when I thought it was destructive. . . . When L. hit the pledge, I walked away because he hit him hard. I could hear some of the boys say as I walked away, "There goes Mr. L. . . ." I debated whether to take the station wagon and leave or to stay. I did not feel that the boys were being destructive to the point that I would have to leave in order to dramatize my distaste.51

Worker A. consistently refused to be present at "Hell Nights," in hopes this disapproval would have some effect upon the use of paddling.

Worker L. was successful, late in his sponsorship of the "Knights," in getting the club to substitute another activity for paddling in initiation. Worker L. describes his suggestion of this substitution:

I asked J. why they didn't have the pledges fight. He looked at me a little funny and asked what did I say. I said why don't you have the pledge and a member of the club fight or box each other. J. thought about this, laughed and said it was a good idea. . . .52

Subsequently, the "Knights" often boxed instead of paddling new recruits.

The workers rarely utilized what, in their approach, was their ultimate sanction--threatening to withdraw as sponsor. Probably, worker reluctance to do so early in sponsorship reflected a fear that to do so would fracture relations with the group and hence destroy that part of the Pilot Project.53 Whether this was the case or not, it is likely that, in the early stages of the project, the worker needed the

53In Klein's view, workers tend to overstate the tenuous nature of their rapport. Klein, Street Gangs and Street Workers, p. 154.
group more than the group needed the worker. Apparently, this was not the case as sponsorship continued and the group members found sponsorship useful. One of the more serious group internal disruptions resulted from Worker A.'s efforts to squelch a "rumble." One faction was critical of Worker A.'s effort. Here, an offer by Worker A. to withdraw was rejected by the group. Worker A. says:

I told the boys that I thought too much of the "Rams" to be the cause of the club splitting up and that maybe I should quit as well, as there were other clubs who wanted sponsorship by the "Y." . . . J. said that he knew I cared about the "Rams" but by taking them away from Burger King and not letting them go over, I had made them look "candy" to all of the brother clubs and all of the clubs at [the High School]. He said when [Worker L.] was meeting with the "Chiefs" and H. asked the "Chiefs" to come to Burger King, Mr. L. did not stop them from going and he didn't think Mr. L. thought as much of the "Chiefs" as I did of the "Rams." . . . I explained to B. if I had to do things over again, I wouldn't take the boys away from the Burger King but would let them work things out for themselves . . . I just wouldn't go myself.54

The amount of time the worker spent with each group and with given boys within the group cannot be determined from the workers' journals. We can assume more time was spent with boys who can be considered "core members" because they were more frequently at the group "hang outs." Although knowledge of the workers' "timetable" would be useful, no record of time spent in various tasks was compiled. Failure to be concerned with the relative amounts of time spent with different individuals within the group is due to the focus of the service effort. The workers' attention was given to the group, not to selected individuals within the group.55 Although the workers

54"'Rams' Journal,'" p. 121.

55Sutherland and Cressey, in describing group work with "near-delinquents," state that: "the essential characteristic of this
visited at times with parents and intended to do this as a part of the project, most such contact came about when parents and the worker encountered each other as both were present at some group function. Workers avoided intervention into child-parent relationships. \(^{56}\)

Worker L. indicates this in describing a suggestion made to him by one of the Evaluating Team. Worker L. relates that the Evaluating Team member:

> Cautioned me concerning personal discussions with the boys which did not pertain to their group experience and behavior. I feel I should confine my interventions to what happens in the group and not the boys' personal family life.\(^{57}\)

The workers were regularly present at the weekly group meeting and attended almost every fraternity party. In addition, they spent a great deal of time transporting the boys from place to place in their cars. They also took the boys to other activities, such as organized sporting events, shopping expeditions, target shooting outings, and on policy, as differentiated from other policies, is that some person attempts to enter into friendly participation with . . . gang members in order to try to change them into law-abiding citizens, not as separate individuals, but as a group. Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, *Criminology* (8th ed.; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1970), p. 632. (Emphasis added.)


\(^{57}\) "Knights' Journal, p. 24."
camping trips. The workers also held conferences with school administrators to discuss the nature and progress of the project.

Although school behavior was a concern of project effort, workers did not actively work with individuals to promote better school grades. They did, however, within their tactic of encouraging behavior in accord with the project goals, compliment academic achievement of one or another boy in the presence of others in the group, as exemplified by the following:

G. and R. and a group of their friends gathered around the car, and we talked about their grades. . . . I felt G. was real proud of his accomplishment for I sensed that previously he had gotten a lot of "F's" and I tried to encourage him by telling him his grades were pretty good and perhaps he could improve the next six weeks. I also complimented R. on his grades.58

In another instance, Worker A. gives general encouragement to the "Rams":

They seemed to be really cutting themselves down. I asked for the floor and told them I thought they were really not being honest with themselves, I thought the members were participating better than last year, I thought they had a fine picnic, that there weren't as many little cliques in the club as last year, that the purpose of the club was social and the more good social occasions they had the better they would be.59

In sum, the workers presented themselves to the fraternity boys as responsible adult males representing approved community values. They hoped to encourage emulation of this role by the boys and in so doing, to open and/or enlarge communication with other agencies--particularly the school--in the community. Their effort was non-directive and rested upon example, advice, encouragement, and the

59 Ibid., p. 93.
expression of disapproval. The workers' contact with the group usually involved several or all of the membership attending a given function. The workers avoided singling out certain boys for special attention and focused upon the group as target, not the individual. The workers' effort therefore involved broadly defined goals, regular but not intensive contact, and diffuse rather than specific treatment actions. In Chapter VI, we will return to these points in discussing the relationship of the service effort to behavior changes ascertained in the analysis of school performance.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This Chapter describes the methodology used in this study.

General Hypothesis

Fraternities viewed as problem groups by school authorities would evidence poorer performance by school criteria than a sample of persons of like sex attending that school. A service provided these fraternities by a trained male adult, acting as a role model, will facilitate greater adjustment by these fraternities to school expectations. Greater adjustment will be evidenced in the fraternity boys' performance on standard school performance measures, their performance becoming more like that of the general male population of the school which the fraternity boys attend.

The Groups Studied

Groups Receiving Service: Treatment Groups

Three fraternities received service: The "Rams," "Knights," and "Chiefs." Each is a "natural group," i.e., a group formed by the boys of their own volition and which existed in the community prior to the establishment of service. Service, or "sponsorship" by the YMCA was established by mutual consent of the boys, the workers, and the schools.
Identification of Membership.--Who were members of the fraternities in each of the three years of service was determined from lists of fraternity members compiled and supplied by the workers. Each list included boys who were active members of that fraternity for most of the given year.

School Affiliation.--Table 2, p. 72 shows the school affiliation of the fraternity members for each service year. The "Rams" attended School P. The "Knights," with minor exception, were affiliated with School S. The "Chiefs" attended both School P and School S, with their membership in 1965-66 mostly from School P and primarily from School S in 1966-67 and 1967-68. In addition to boys attending these two schools, each group contained a few boys who: 1) attended schools other than those from whom permission was obtained to use school records, 2) had dropped out of school, and 3) had transferred from School P, School S, or the school system during the membership year. Records for these boys were either unobtainable or incomplete and therefore these boys were dropped from the analysis.

---

1This procedure was also used by James F. Short, Jr. and Fred L. Strodtebeck, Group Process and Gang Delinquency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965). They point out (p. 14) that detached workers were their informants. These workers served as judges of which boys were members of the gangs.

2These boys were assumed to function in the group for the entire year. For a similar decision, see: Leon R. Jansyn, "Solidarity and Delinquency in a Street Corner Group," American Sociological Review, XXXI (October, 1966), 603. Jansyn states: "because attendance is often resumed after extended absences, all members were regarded as permanent during the year of observation."
### TABLE 2

**SCHOOL AFFILIATION OF FRATERNITY MEMBERS, EACH SERVICE YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity And Service Years</th>
<th>School P</th>
<th>School S</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; (1965-66)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; (1966-67)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; (1967-68)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; (1965-66)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; (1966-67)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; (1967-68)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; (1965-66)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; (1966-67)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; (1967-68)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>This includes boys for whom no school affiliation is known and those who were attending schools from which records were not obtainable. They will not be included in the analysis.

**Control Groups**

A control group was selected from School P for comparison with the "Rams" and from School S for comparison with the "Knights." The N for these control groups was 5 per cent of the male student population of the school in 1968-69. This 5 per cent sample was stratified so

<sup>3</sup>In these schools, pupil records for those enrolled in the current school year are kept in loose leaf binders, with each binder containing the records of students in a given homeroom. Within the binder, records of both males and females are arranged alphabetically. These binders are the best source of information on the total school population. In the next year, pupil records for those attending are rearranged according to that year's homeroom placement. Records of those who left the school are filed in the school vault. Filing of these records is alphabetically by all students, all years. For these reasons, it was not possible to obtain a complete list of all those attending in a given year except for the current school year. Since this writer arranged in 1968-69 to draw the control groups, the control groups were selected from the 1968-69 school year, rather than for any of the years in which service was provided the fraternities.
that the proportion of boys in each grade in the sample was the same as the proportion of boys in that grade in the fraternity over the three year service period. From these operations a control group from School P—herein called Control P—was obtained for comparison with the "Rams" and a second control group from School S—termed Control S—was constructed for comparison with the "Knights."

As Table 2, p. 72, indicates, the "Chiefs'" attendance was split between School S and School P. To make comparisons with the "Chiefs," a sample was drawn from Control P and Control S. This sample was stratified so that the proportion from each school, and within that resulting number, the proportion in each grade, was the same as the proportion of the "Chiefs" in each school and in each grade over the three year service period. This sample was designated Control SP.

^The calculation was as follows:

1) Number of males in the school (1968-69) \( \times 0.05 = \) Number in sample

2) Proportion of boys in grade (fraternity) \( \times \) Number in Sample = Number Needed from each grade

3) Number in grade (school) = Every nth to be selected
   Number needed from each grade

4) Within each grade, the first boy's name selected was the number in the rank order of males equal to an obtained random number. A new random number was chosen for each grade.

5) From the starting name, every nth name of a male was selected for the sample. A boy so selected whose name appeared on membership lists of the serviced fraternities (1965-68) was dropped and the name of the next male in the alphabetized list selected.

^The steps in this operation are as follows:
In sum, these operations provided three control groups for the following comparisons:

"Rams" - Control P
"Knights" - Control S
"Chiefs" - Control SP

**Definition Of The Time Periods In The Study**

The fraternity boys performance before the period of service is termed the "prior year" period. The comparable time period for the control groups is the "pre-comparison year." The years in which the fraternities were sponsored are called "service years." The comparable time period for the control groups is the "comparison year."

1) The N for this sample was set approximate to that of Control S and Control P: 45.

2) Percent of boys in Total Number needed
"Chiefs" from X number in = from
School P this sample Control P

3) Number needed X Percent of "Chiefs" Number in that
from Control P in a grade from = grade needed
School P from Control P

4) Number in grade in Control P = Every nth to
    Number needed from that grade be selected

5) Within each grade in Control P, names were alphabetized.

6) A random number was obtained for each grade. Count began in the alphabetized list with that number. Selection included that name and every nth to follow.

7) Number needed in Number needed Number needed
    this sample from School P from Control S

8) Repeat steps 3-6, substituting: Control S for Control P
    School S for School P
Service Year

Service was provided the "Rams," "Knights," and "Chiefs" for each of three successive years. Three one-year service periods for each fraternity are therefore identifiable. Performance scores\(^6\) for these years can be calculated from school records. Performance scores for the service years can also be calculated for each of six six-week periods within the year. The service years for each fraternity are 1965-1966, 1966-67, and 1967-68. Because of a large turnover in membership each year it is not possible to treat the service effort for any fraternity as a continuous effort over a three year period with the same group of boys. Because of this turnover, each service period will be treated as effort with a separate and different group of boys.

Comparison Year

The comparison year is the year in which data on the control groups were obtained. Performance scores for this year were obtained from school records.\(^7\) Performance scores for the comparison year are also available for each of six six-week periods within the year. The comparison year for each control group is 1968-69.

Prior Year

The prior year period is the year preceding the year of service. For example, the prior year for the "Rams," Service Year 1 (1965-66) is 1964-65. Performance scores for the prior year period reflect the

\(^6\)Performance scores are defined below, pp. 77-80.

\(^7\)Scores for the total year were obtained because the data were obtained in June and July, after the complete school year.
records the boys (in a fraternity in a given year) made the year before that service year. Data for prior years were obtained only for the total year. Because of large turnover in membership from year to year, the prior year data cannot be held to represent the performance of the entire fraternity "last year." It represents the performance the prior year of only those boys in the fraternity in a given service year, e.g., how those "Rams" serviced in 1965-66 scored in 1964-65. This is necessary because in the year preceding service, the boys in the fraternity during the service year might have been:

1) in the serviced fraternity (service years 1966-67 and 1967-68)

2) in the same fraternity before service started (Service year 1965-66)

3) in some other fraternity never serviced

4) in no fraternity at all.  

Pre-Comparison Year

The pre-comparison year, as the label suggests, is the year preceding the comparison year. The pre-comparison year is therefore 1967-68. Data for this period reflect performance of the members of the control group in the year 1967-68. Data for pre-comparison years was obtained only for the total year.

In certain cases, a prior year, service year, pre-comparison

8Because of the inability to determine club participation in the past, it is impossible to investigate the effect of "joining" the fraternity independently of the application of service. A similar problem exists in the control group. Through their method of selection, it is known only that each boy in the control group was not a member of any serviced fraternity from 1965-68. He might, of course, have been in some other (not-serviced) fraternity in the school.
year, or comparison year score was unavailable. In this case, the score of the period to be compared was dropped, eliminating that person from inclusion in the group. For example, if the prior year score was not obtainable, although the service year score was obtained, the boy's record was not included in the group performance score for either period.

**Indicators Of School Performance**

In the general hypothesis (p. 70 of this chapter), it was maintained that service would have the effect of improving school adjustment of the fraternity boys and that this improved adjustment would appear on standard school performance measures. By "standard school performance measure" is meant an indicator used to evaluate student school performance that is applied by regular school personnel to all students during the course of usual school operation. For this study, it was also necessary that the results of these measures be systematically and easily available in school records. For this study, four such indicators have been constructed to utilize information available in records about a student's academic grades, conduct, attendance, and tardiness.

**Academic Performance Score**

School records include the academic grade made by the student in each subject, by six-week periods and for the complete year. These grades are recorded in letter form: A, B, C, D, and F. From this  

\[9\] As contrasted, for example, with personal recollections of teachers and/or administrators about students--data which would be useful for in-depth case studies.
information, a grade-point average\textsuperscript{10} was calculated for each student for his "final" grades.\textsuperscript{11} The grade-point average is termed the "academic performance score." The academic performance score for a group is simply the mean of all members' academic performance scores.\textsuperscript{12}

**Conduct Performance Score**

School records include a conduct grade assigned to the student in each course for the year and for six-week periods within that year, and a summary conduct grade for each six-week period and for the entire year. These grades are recorded in letter form: A, B, C, D, and F. The summary conduct grade for the complete year and that for each six-week period\textsuperscript{13} was given a number by the researcher.\textsuperscript{14} This number was the student's conduct score for the period. The conduct performance score for a group is equal to the grade-point average.

\textsuperscript{10}The calculation performed by this writer is as follows:

1) Let: A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, and F = 1.

2) \((A's \times 5) + (B's \times 4) + (C's \times 3) + (D's \times 2) + (F's \times 1)\)

Number of courses

is equal to the grade-point average.

\textsuperscript{11}For the service years, this average was also calculated for each six-week period within the year.

\textsuperscript{12}\(\sum \frac{\text{Academic Performance Scores}}{\text{Number of group members}} = \text{Group Academic Performance Score}\)

\textsuperscript{13}Six-week periods only for comparison years and service years.

\textsuperscript{14}A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, F = 1.
performance score for the group was the mean of conduct scores made by all members.¹⁵

Rate of Absences

School records include the number of days present and days absent for the entire year and for each six-week period. By adding these counts we obtain the number of days of school on which each boy could attend. By summing the number of days of school and number of days absent for all boys in a group we obtain a group sum. For each group and for each period,¹⁶ a rate of absence was calculated.¹⁷

Rate of Tardiness

School records include the number of times tardy for the entire year and for each six-week period. For each group, the number of times tardy was expressed as a percent of the number of days present.¹⁸ This

\[
\text{Rate of absences} = \frac{\text{days absent}}{\text{days of school}} \times 100
\]

Since 6th graders received no conduct grades, it was necessary to eliminate all seventh graders in Service Years and Comparison Years in the analysis to follow. Group Conduct Performance Scores therefore include scores made by 8th and 9th graders in the group.

¹⁵ \[\frac{\sum \text{Conduct scores}}{\text{Number of group members}} = \text{Group Conduct Performance Score}\]

¹⁶Entire year for all periods, six-week interim intervals for the Service Years and Comparison Years.

¹⁷The intent here was to express the tardies as a proportion of opportunities to be tardy. Since a person could not be tardy on a day he was absent (if records were kept accurately and consistently), tardiness was related to days present rather than total days of school.
is the rate of tardiness, and was calculated for each year period
and—for the service year and comparison year—by six-week periods.

Restatement Of The Hypothesis

To analyze the relative performance of fraternities and control
groups and the effect of treatment, three sets of alternative or
research hypotheses will be established. Since the general hypoth­
thesis holds that: 1) fraternities, being problem groups, will be
poorer performers than their control group prior to service, the first
set of hypotheses will compare fraternities in prior years with the
control group in pre-comparison years, 2) service will result in
improved school performance, the second set of hypotheses will compare
fraternities in service years with the prior year scores by that
fraternity, and 3) service will result in school performance by the
fraternities becoming more similar to control group performance, the
third set of hypotheses will compare fraternities in service years
with the control group in the comparison year.

If we let subscripts represent:

1 = comparison of controls in pre-comparison year with
   fraternities in prior years

2 = comparison of fraternity in the prior year with the
   fraternity in the service year

3 = comparison of controls in comparison year with the
   fraternity in the service year

19 There is not complete agreement in the use of terms to refer
to the hypothesis set up in opposition to the null hypothesis. Siegel
refers to this hypothesis as the alternative hypothesis. See: Sidney
Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company,
hypothesis.
and:  

A = Academic performance score  
C = Conduct performance score  
Ab = Rate of Absences  
T = Rate of Tardiness

and a, b, c, . . . r the specific groups and time periods, e.g.,

a = Control P and "Rams-" 1st Service Year  
b = Control P and "Rams-" 2nd Service Year  
c = Control P and "Rams-" 3rd Service Year  
d = Control S and "Knights-" 1st Service Year  
e = Control S and "Knights-" 2nd Service Year  
f = Control S and "Knights-" 3rd Service Year  
g = Control SP and "Chiefs-" 1st Service Year  
h = Control SP and "Chiefs-" 2nd Service Year  
i = Control SP and "Chiefs-" 3rd Service Year  
j = "Rams-" Prior Year and "Rams-" 1st Service Year  
k = "Rams-" Prior Year and "Rams-" 2nd Service Year  
l = "Rams-" Prior Year and "Rams-" 3rd Service Year  
m = "Knights-" Prior Year and "Knights-" 1st Service Year  
n = "Knights-" Prior Year and "Knights-" 2nd Service Year  
o = "Knights-" Prior Year and "Knights-" 3rd Service Year  
p = "Chiefs-" Prior Year and "Chiefs-" 1st Service Year  
q = "Chiefs-" Prior Year and "Chiefs-" 2nd Service Year  
r = "Chiefs-" Prior Year and "Chiefs-" 3rd Service Year

then the general hypothesis can be restated as follows:

1. If the fraternities are poorer school performers, in the prior year their academic performance scores and conduct scores will be
lower, and their rate of absences and rate of tardiness higher, than
the control groups in the pre-comparison year. Specifically:

\[ H_1^{Aa,b,c...i} : A(\text{fraternity}) < A(\text{control}) \]
\[ H_1^{Ca,b,c...i} : C(\text{fraternity}) < C(\text{control}) \]
\[ H_1^{Ab,a,b,c...i} : Ab(\text{fraternity}) > Ab(\text{control}) \]
\[ H_1^{Ta,a,b,c...i} : T(\text{fraternity}) > T(\text{control}) \]

2. If service is effective, performance of the fraternity in the
service year should exceed that of the fraternity in the prior year.
That is:

\[ H_2^{A\text{J},k,l\ldots r} : A(\text{fraternity--prior}) < A(\text{fraternity--service}) \]
\[ H_2^{C\text{J},k,l\ldots r} : C(\text{fraternity--prior}) < C(\text{fraternity--service}) \]
\[ H_2^{Ab\text{J},k,l\ldots r} : Ab(\text{fraternity--prior}) > Ab(\text{fraternity--service}) \]
\[ H_2^{T\text{J},k,l\ldots r} : T(\text{fraternity--prior}) > T(\text{fraternity--service}) \]

3. If service is effective, fraternity performance in the service year
will match or exceed that of the control in the comparison year. That
is:

\[ H_3^{A\text{a},b,c...i} : A(\text{fraternity}) \geq A(\text{control}) \]
\[ H_3^{Ca,b,c...i} : C(\text{fraternity}) \geq C(\text{control}) \]
\[ H_3^{Ab\text{a},b,c...i} : Ab(\text{fraternity}) \leq Ab(\text{control}) \]
\[ H_3^{T\text{a},b,c...i} : T(\text{fraternity}) \leq T(\text{control}) \]

The next chapter presents the analysis of data in test of these
three sets of alternative hypotheses.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter presents the analysis of the data. Three sets of comparisons are: 1) the fraternities in year prior to service and the control group in the pre-comparison year, 2) the fraternities in the service year and in the prior year, and 3) the fraternities in the service year and control group in the comparison year. Each set of comparisons involves the four performance indicators: academic performance, conduct, absences, and tardiness.

Differences Between The Control Groups And Fraternities Prior To Treatment (H₁)

It was hypothesized (See Chapter IV, pp. 81-82) that the fraternities, being defined as problem groups, would be achieving poorer scores than their control group on the four performance indicators. Specifically, each fraternity would have lower academic grades, lower conduct grades, a higher rate of absences, and a higher rate of tardiness than its control group. To test this hypothesis, scores made by each control group during the pre-comparison year were compared with the prior year score made by the serviced fraternity, for each of the three service years. Were the fraternities poorer performers than their control group in the time prior to service?
Academic Performance Scores ($H^a_{1A}, b, c ... i$)

Academic performance scores for each group for each of the pre-comparison years and prior years are shown in Table 3, p. 85. It can be seen from Table 3 that, in every case, the academic performance score of the fraternity during the year prior to the service year was lower than the score for its control group during the pre-comparison year. This is the case for each service year and for each fraternity. Differences between the scores of a control group and its fraternity range from .13 ("Rams-" Service Year I--$H^a_{1A}$) to .90 ("Chiefs-" Service Year II--$H^a_{1A}$). The "Chiefs" were consistently poorer academic performers relative to their control group than either the "Rams" or "Knights."

To test the significance of these differences, a 1-tailed t-test was run for each comparison. Table 4, p. 86, indicates the t-value, degrees of freedom, and significance or non-significance of each comparison. As Table 4 indicates, the fraternities' academic performance scores are, generally, significantly different at the .01 level from the scores of the control groups. This is the case for the "Chiefs" in all three service years and the "Knights" in the first and second service years. The "Rams," however, achieved an academic performance score significantly different from Control P only in the second service year.

---

### TABLE 3

**ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE SCORES FOR THE CONTROL GROUPS IN THE PRE-COMPARISON YEAR AND FRATERNITIES IN PRIOR YEAR PERIODS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>First Service Year</th>
<th>Second Service Year</th>
<th>Third Service Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control P.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot;</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control P - &quot;Rams&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .13</td>
<td>+ .69</td>
<td>+ .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot;</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control S - &quot;Knights&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .62</td>
<td>+ .84</td>
<td>+ .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.P.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot;</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control SP - &quot;Chiefs&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .78</td>
<td>+ .90</td>
<td>+ .81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.00 = C
TABLE 4
T-VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRE-COMPARIISON YEAR AND PRIOR YEAR PERIOD COMPARISONS IN ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FOR ALL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities and Service Period</th>
<th>Control Group P.</th>
<th>Control Group S.</th>
<th>Control Group S.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t-value df</td>
<td>t-value df</td>
<td>t-value df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year (H_{2A}^a)</td>
<td>.5682 57 n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year (H_{1A}^b)</td>
<td>4.0343 62 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year (H_{1A}^c)</td>
<td>1.8214 53 n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year (H_{1A}^d)</td>
<td>2.7090 52 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year (H_{1A}^e)</td>
<td>2.4490 43 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year (H_{1A}^f)</td>
<td>1.3336 43 n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year (H_{1A}^g)</td>
<td>2.4924 39 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year (H_{1A}^h)</td>
<td>3.5487 44 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year (H_{1A}^i)</td>
<td>3.0436 43 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test: 1-tailed
Conduct Performance Scores (H_{1C,a,b,c...i})

Conduct performance scores for each group for the pre-comparison years and prior years are shown in Table 5, p. 88. The conduct performance scores of the fraternities in the years prior to service were lower than the control group score in each case except one. In the year prior to the "Knights" second service year (H_{1Ce}), the "Knights" score exceeded that of Control S by approximately one-half a grade point (i.e., .55). As in the case of academic performance score comparisons for this point in time, the "Chiefs," were poorer performers in conduct relative to their control group than either the "Rams" or "Knights." The "Knights" were most like their control group in conduct, differing by only two-hundredths of a grade-point in the period prior to the third service year (H_{1Cc}), and thirty-eight hundredths of a grade point in the period prior to the first service year (H_{1Cd}). In the period prior to the second service year (H_{1Ce}), the "Knights" exceeded their control group in conduct performance score.

To test the significance of the differences in conduct, a 1-tailed t-test was run for each comparison.\(^2\) Table 6, p. 89, indicates the t-value, degrees of freedom, and significance or non-significance of each comparison. As can be seen in Table 6 no significant difference exists between the "Knights" and Control S for any prior-to-service period (H_{1Cd,e,f}). As Table 5, p. 88, indicated, the difference between the "Knights" and Control S was in the direction hypothesized for the periods prior to service year one (H_{1Cd}) and service year three (H_{1Cf}), but the difference in conduct

\(^2\)Ibid.
TABLE 5

CONDUCT PERFORMANCE SCORES FOR THE CONTROL GROUPS IN THE PRE-COMPARISON YEAR AND FRATERNITIES IN PRIOR YEAR PERIODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>First Service Year</th>
<th>Second Service Year</th>
<th>Third Service Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control P.</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot;</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control P - &quot;Rams&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .35</td>
<td>+1.16</td>
<td>+ .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot;</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control S - &quot;Knights&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .38</td>
<td>- .55</td>
<td>+ .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.P.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot;</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control SP - &quot;Chiefs&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .97</td>
<td>+ .84</td>
<td>+ .79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.00 = C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities and Service Period</th>
<th>Control Group P.</th>
<th>Control Group S.</th>
<th>Control Group S.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t-value  df</td>
<td>t-value  df</td>
<td>t-value  df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year (H1C)</td>
<td>1.3545  49  n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year (H1C)</td>
<td>4.4872  52  .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year (H1C)</td>
<td>.8621  46  n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year (H1C)</td>
<td>1.2324  48  n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year (H1C)</td>
<td>1.3474  40  n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year (H1C)</td>
<td>.0482  40  n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year (H1C)</td>
<td>1.7611  31  .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year (H1C)</td>
<td>1.9999  36  .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year (H1C)</td>
<td>1.7545  35  .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**test:** 1-tailed
scores for service year two ($H_{1C}e$) was opposite to the direction hypothesized. Referring again to Table 6, it can be seen that, comparing the "Rams" to Control P, the "Rams" conduct score for the period prior to the second service year ($H_{1C}b$) was significantly different at the .01 level from the score of Control P. The conduct scores for the "Chiefs" were significantly different at the .05 level from the scores of Control SP for each period in question ($H_{1C}g,h,i$).

**School Attendance ($H_{1Ab}a,b,c...i$)**

To compare school attendance of the groups, for each group the number of days absent was expressed as a per cent of the total number of days of school on which group members could attend. Table 7, p. 91, gives this information for all groups. It was hypothesized (See Chapter IV pp.81-82) that members of the fraternities would more frequently be absent than boys in the control group ($H_{1Ab}a,b,c...i$). Table 7 indicates that the absence rate for the groups ranges from 3.4 to 7.7 days absent for every 100 days of school. No consistent pattern emerges when the absences of the fraternities are compared to those of the control groups for the periods in question. The "Rams" were better attenders (i.e., their rate of absence was lower) than Control P for periods prior to the first ($H_{1Ab}a$) and third service years ($H_{1Ab}c$), and their rate of absence approximated that of Control P for the remaining second-period ($H_{1Ab}b$). The "Knights'" rate of absence evidenced the opposite pattern--exceeding that of Control S for the periods prior to the first ($H_{1Ab}d$) and third service periods ($H_{1Ab}f$), while their absence rate was less than Control S for the period prior to the second service year ($H_{1Ab}e$). The "Chiefs'" attendance followed the same pattern
TABLE 7

DAYS OF SCHOOL, DAYS ABSENT, AND PER CENT OF TIME ABSENT FOR CONTROL GROUPS IN PRE-COMPARISON YEAR AND FRATERNITIES IN YEAR PRIOR TO SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Days of School</th>
<th>Days Absent</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control P. Pre-Comparison Year</td>
<td>6183</td>
<td>320.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3420</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>4069</td>
<td>232.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S. Pre-Comparison Year</td>
<td>6952.5</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year</td>
<td>2951.5</td>
<td>197.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.P. Pre-Comparison Year</td>
<td>5763</td>
<td>273.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with respect to Control SP as did the "Knights" and Control S, the main
difference being the approximately equal rates of absence for Control
SP and the "Chiefs" during the period prior to the second service year
\( (H_{1Abh}) \).

To test the significance of these differences, a difference of
proportions test (1-tailed) was performed, following the procedure
described by Blalock,\(^3\) for each of the comparisons. Table 8, p. 93,
gives the \( z \)-scores and significance or non-significance resulting
from these tests. As can be seen from Table 8, no significant dif­
ference in attendance exists between the fraternities and their
control group for any of the periods prior to treatment.

**Tardiness (H\(_{1T\alpha,b,c...1}\))**

To compare the tardiness of the groups, for each group the
number of times tardy was expressed as a per cent of the total oppor­
tunities to be tardy (i.e., the number of days present in school).
Table 9, p. 94, gives this information for all groups. Table 9
indicates that the control groups were tardy 0.8 to 0.9 per cent of
the time. It was hypothesized (See Chapter IV, pp. 81-82) that the
fraternities would be tardy more frequently than their control groups
in this period \( (H_{1Ta,b,c...1}) \). No difference in the tardiness rate
exists between Control P and the "Rams" prior to the first service
year \( (H_{1Ta}) \). In all other cases, the fraternities were tardy
approximately two and one-half to four times as frequently as their
control group.

---

\(^3\)Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., *Social Statistics* (New York: McGraw-
TABLE 8

Z-SCORES AND SIGNIFICANCE RESULTING FROM THE DIFFERENCE IN PROPORTIONS TEST IN SCHOOL ATTENDANCE FOR CONTROL GROUPS IN PRE-COMPARISON YEAR AND FRATERNITIES IN YEAR PRIOR TO SERVICE

| Fraternities | Control P. |  | Control S. |  | Control S.P. |  |
|--------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------|
|              | Z-score    | Significance P <              | Z-score    | Significance P <              | Z-score    | Significance P < |
| "Rams" Prior to 1st Service Year (H_{1Ab}^{a}) | 0.3300 | n.s. |  |  |  |  |
| "Rams" Prior to 2nd Service Year (H_{1Ab}^{b}) | 0.0834 | n.s. |  |  |  |  |
| "Rams" Prior to 3rd Service Year (H_{1Ab}^{c}) | 0.2857 | n.s. |  |  |  |  |
| "Knights" Prior to 1st Service Year (H_{1Ab}^{d}) |  |  | 0.0705 | n.s. |  |  |
| "Knights" Prior to 2nd Service Year (H_{1Ab}^{e}) |  |  | 0.5376 | n.s. |  |  |
| "Knights" Prior to 3rd Service Year (H_{1Ab}^{f}) |  |  | 0.0425 | n.s. |  |  |
| "Chiefs" Prior to 1st Service Year (H_{1Ab}^{g}) |  |  | 0.0945 | n.s. |  |  |
| "Chiefs" Prior to 2nd Service Year (H_{1Ab}^{h}) |  |  | 0.0140 | n.s. |  |  |
| "Chiefs" Prior to 3rd Service Year (H_{1Ab}^{i}) |  |  | 0.3797 | n.s. |  |  |

*test: 1-tailed*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Days Present</th>
<th>Times Tardy</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control P. Pre-Comparison Year</td>
<td>5862.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>3836.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>2605.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S. Pre-Comparison Year</td>
<td>6520.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year</td>
<td>2680.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>1302.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1238.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.P. Pre-Comparison Year</td>
<td>5489.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year</td>
<td>923.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>2059.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To test the significance of these differences, a difference of proportions test (1-tailed) was performed for each of the comparisons. Table 10, p. 96, gives the z-scores and significance or non-significance resulting from these tests. Despite the fact that the tardiness rate of the fraternities commonly exceeds that of their control for these periods (Table 9, p. 94 above), Table 10 indicates that no statistically significant difference in tardiness rate exists between the fraternities and their control group for any of the periods prior to treatment.

**Differences Between The Fraternities Prior To Service And In The Service Year (H₂)**

It was hypothesized (See Chapter IV, p. 82) that the service provided the fraternities would affect their performance on the four performance indicators. Specifically, each fraternity's academic performance score and conduct score would increase and its rate of absence and rate of tardiness would decrease as the result of effort by the workers. Did scores on these indicators move in the expected direction? To test these hypotheses, the performance score of the fraternity the year prior to service was compared with the score of that fraternity for the service year, for each of the performance indicators \( H_{2A,c,Ab,T,j,k,1,...r} \).

**Academic Performance Scores (H₂A,j,k,1...r)**

Academic performance scores for the fraternities for both the year prior to service and the service year are shown in Table 11, p. 97.

\(^4\)Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities</th>
<th>Control P.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control S.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control S. P.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z-score</td>
<td>Significance P &lt;</td>
<td>Z-score</td>
<td>Significance P &lt;</td>
<td>Z-score</td>
<td>Significance P &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year (H_{1T}^a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year (H_{1T}^b)</td>
<td>.6956</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year (H_{1T}^c)</td>
<td>.5633</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year (H_{1T}^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4858</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year (H_{1T}^e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3381</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year (H_{1T}^f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3147</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 1st Service Year (H_{1T}^g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5555</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 2nd Service Year (H_{1T}^h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4986</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; Prior to 3rd Service Year (H_{1T}^i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

test: 1-tailed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-Comparison Year</th>
<th>Comparison Year</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior Year (1)</td>
<td>Service Year (2)</td>
<td>(2) - (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control P.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>+.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>+.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.P.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>+.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.00 = C
Table 11 also indicates the academic performance scores for the control groups in pre-comparison and comparison periods. Table 11 indicates that, generally, academic performance scores declined during the periods in question. This movement is opposite to that hypothesized ($H_{2A}$). All three control groups evidenced a slight (from .05 to .14 grade-point) decline in academic performance. The "Rams" academic performance declined in all three service years ($H_{2A}j,k,l$), .03, .10, and .21 respectively, although in the first and second service years these declines were less than the .14 decline in Control P. In the first and second service years, the academic performance of the "Knights" increased, as hypothesized ($H_{2Am,n}$). This increase was .11 for the first service year and .39 for the second. In the third service year, their score declined by .31 grade-point. The comparable decline for Control S was .05. The academic performance score of the "Chiefs" declined during the first service year by .07 ($H_{2Ap}$). This was identical to the decline of Control SP scores. In the second service year, the score of the "Chiefs" increased, as hypothesized ($H_{2Ar}$), by .08, but in the third service year ($H_{2Ar}$) it declined by .04. In short, in only three of nine cases did the academic performance scores move in the expected (hypothesized) direction.

To test the significance of these differences in the fraternities' academic performance scores, a 1-tailed t-test was run for each comparison. To test the significance of these differences in the fraternities' academic performance scores, a 1-tailed t-test was run for each comparison. Table 12, p. 99, indicates the t-value, degrees of freedom, and significance or non-significance of each comparison. The procedure used was that described in Wilfrid J. Dixon and Frank J. Massey, Jr., Introduction to Statistical Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957), pp. 125-27.
As Table 12 indicates, no statistically significant differences in academic performance are apparent when prior year scores are compared with service year scores. This result obtains for each fraternity and every service year.

**TABLE 12**

**T-VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PRIOR YEAR AND SERVICE YEAR COMPARISONS IN ACADEMIC SCORES FOR THE FRATERNITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year (H2Aj)</td>
<td>-.0111</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year (H2AkJ)</td>
<td>-.0290</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year (H2A1)</td>
<td>-.1381</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year (H2Am)</td>
<td>.0549</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year (H2An)</td>
<td>.2266</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year (H2Ao)</td>
<td>-.2441</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year (H2Ap)</td>
<td>.0444</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year (H2Aq)</td>
<td>.0313</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year (H2Ar)</td>
<td>-.0488</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test: 1-tailed

Conduct Performance Scores (H2CJ,k, l...r)

Conduct performance scores for the fraternities for both the year prior to service and the service years are shown in Table 13, p. 100. Table 13 also indicates the conduct scores for the control
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Pre-Comparison Year</th>
<th>Comparison Year</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior Year</td>
<td>Service Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2) - (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control P.</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>+.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>+.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>+.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>+.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.P.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.00 = C
groups in the pre-comparison and comparison periods. Table 13 indicates that, generally, conduct scores declined during the periods in question. This movement is opposite to that hypothesized for the fraternities (H_2C). The conduct scores for Control P and Control S increased by .12, while the score for Control SP declined by .13 during the periods in question. With one exception ("Knights" in the year prior to the second service year--H_2Cm), the conduct scores of the fraternities were poorer (lower) in the prior year than scores of the control groups in pre-comparison years (Column 1). In all cases, the service year conduct score of the fraternity was lower than the comparison year score of the control group (Column 2). In only two service years ("Rams-" second service year--H_2Ck--and "Knights-" first service year--H_2Cm) was the conduct score for a fraternity higher than their score for the related year prior to service. In the "Rams'" third service year (H_2C1), no change in conduct score from that prior year is detected. In other cases (six of nine comparisons) conduct performance in the service year declined compared to conduct performance in the year prior to service. In these cases, movement is in the direction opposite to that hypothesized, and little support can be found for the hypothesis in these data.

To test the significance of these differences in the fraternities' conduct scores, a 1-tailed t-test was run for each comparison. Table 14, p. 102, indicated the t-value, degrees of freedom, and significance or non-significance of each comparison. As Table 14 indicates, no statistically significant differences in conduct

6Ibid.
performance are apparent when prior year scores are compared with service year scores. This result obtains for each fraternity and every service year.

TABLE 14
T-VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PRIOR YEAR AND SERVICE YEAR COMPARISONS IN CONDUCT SCORES FOR THE FRATERNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities and Service Year</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year (H₂C₁)</td>
<td>-.0768</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year (H₂C₂)</td>
<td>.1427</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year (H₂C₃)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>no difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year (H₂C₄)</td>
<td>.0405</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year (H₂C₅)</td>
<td>-.3549</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year (H₂C₆)</td>
<td>-.0599</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year (H₂C₇)</td>
<td>-.1417</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year (H₂C₈)</td>
<td>-.0438</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year (H₂C₉)</td>
<td>-.0375</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

test: 1-tailed

School Attendance (H₂Aᵣj,k,l...r)

To compare the school attendance of the fraternities in the year prior to service with attendance in the service year, for each group the number of times absent was expressed as a per cent of the
total number of days of school on which group members could attend. Table 15, p. 104, gives this information for all the fraternities. It was hypothesized (H_{2Ab}) that, if treatment were effective, the rate of absence of the fraternity would be less during the service year than in the year prior to service. As can be seen in Table 15 in every service year but one ("Rams," second service year), the rate of absence in the service year (Column 6) exceeded that of the prior year (Column 3), i.e., the rate of absence increased (Column 7). In short, in eight cases movement in rates of absence was opposite to that hypothesized. The rate of absence for the "Rams" declined from prior year to the second service year, but by only .1 per cent.

To test the significance of these differences, a t-test, 1-tailed, was performed for each of the comparisons.\(^7\) Table 16, p. 105, gives the t-values and significance or non-significance resulting from these tests. As can be seen from Table 16, the decline in the "Rams" rate of absence for the second service year was not statistically significant. In five of the other eight cases, the increase in rate of absence for the service year was not statistically significant. The increase in the "Rams" rate of absence in the third service year and in the "Chiefs" rate for the second service year was significant at the .01 level. The increase in the "Chiefs" rate of absence for the third service year was significant at the .05 level. These changes, found statistically significant, are in the direction opposite to that hypothesized.

\(^7\)As described in Blalock, op. cit., pp. 179-81.
## TABLE 15

DAYS OF SCHOOL, DAYS ABSENT, AND PER CENT OF TIME ABSENT FOR THE FRATERNITIES IN THE PRIOR YEAR AND SERVICE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity and Service Period</th>
<th>Days of School (1)</th>
<th>Days Absent (2)</th>
<th>Per Cent (3)</th>
<th>Days of School (4)</th>
<th>Days Absent (5)</th>
<th>Per Cent (6)</th>
<th>Change in Per Cent (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3420</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3281</td>
<td>209.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>4069</td>
<td>232.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4010</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>2951.5</td>
<td>197.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3058</td>
<td>228.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>+3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>166.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>+3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 16
T-VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRIOR YEAR AND SERVICE YEAR COMPARISONS IN ATTENDANCE FOR THE FRATERNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities and Service Period</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance P</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year (H_{2A_bj})</td>
<td>1.6319</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year (H_{2A_bk})</td>
<td>- .2522</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year (H_{2A_bl})</td>
<td>3.1435</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year (H_{2A_bm})</td>
<td>1.1472</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year (H_{2A_bn})</td>
<td>1.7584</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year (H_{2A_bo})</td>
<td>1.6785</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year (H_{2A_bp})</td>
<td>1.2065</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year (H_{2A_bq})</td>
<td>2.9726</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year (H_{2A_br})</td>
<td>2.7356</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

test: 1-tailed

Tardiness (H_{2T_j,k,l...r})

To compare the tardiness of the fraternities in the year prior to service and the service year, for each group the number of times tardy was expressed as a per cent of the number of days present in school. Table 17, p. 106, gives this information for all the fraternities. It was hypothesized (H_{2T}) that, if service were effective, the rate of tardiness of the fraternity would be less during the service year than in the year prior to service. As can be seen in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity and Service Period</th>
<th>Days Present (1)</th>
<th>Times Tardy (2)</th>
<th>Per Cent (3)</th>
<th>Days Present (4)</th>
<th>Times Tardy (5)</th>
<th>Per Cent (6)</th>
<th>Change in Per Cent (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3071.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>3836.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3784</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>2605.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2500.5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>2680.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2668.5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>1302.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>+5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1238.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1140.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>923.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>991.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>+4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>2059.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1939.5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17, in every service year, the rate of tardiness in the service year exceeded that of the prior year, i.e., the rate of tardiness increased (Column 7). In short, in all nine cases, movement in rates of tardiness was opposite to that hypothesized.

To test the significance of these differences, a t-test, 1-tailed, was performed for each of the comparisons. Table 18, p. 108, gives the t-values and significance or non-significance resulting from these tests. As can be seen from Table 18, the increase in tardiness was statistically significant in four service years: "Rams" (third service year) and "Chiefs" (second and third service years) at the .01 level and the "Knights" (second service year) at the .05 level. These changes, found statistically significant, are in the direction opposite to that hypothesized.

Differences Between the Control Groups and Fraternities During Service (H3)

It was hypothesized (See Chapter IV, p. 82) that, if service were effective, performance scores made by the fraternities during the service year would match or exceed those of the control groups in the comparison year. Specifically, each serviced fraternity would have an academic and conduct score equal to or greater than its control and an equal or lower rate of absence and tardiness than its control. To test these hypotheses, scores made by the fraternities in the service year were compared with scores made by the control group in the comparison year. Comparison involved all four of the performance
indicators. Were the fraternities, after service was applied, equal in performance to their control group?

TABLE 18

T-VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRIOR YEAR AND SERVICE YEAR COMPARISONS IN TARDINESS FOR THE FRATERNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities and Service Period</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance P &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Year (H2Tj)</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Year (H2Tk)</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Year (H2Tl)</td>
<td>3.3621</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Year (H2Tm)</td>
<td>.5566</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Year (H2Tn)</td>
<td>2.9709</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Year (H2To)</td>
<td>.9978</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Year (H2Tp)</td>
<td>.6288</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Year (H2Tq)</td>
<td>2.9329</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Year (H2Tr)</td>
<td>3.2887</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

test: 1-tailed

Academic Performance Scores (H3Aa,b,c...i)

Academic performance scores for each group for each of the comparison years and service years are shown in Table 19, p. 109. It can be seen from Table 19 that, in every case, the academic performance score of the fraternity in the service year was lower than the score for its control group during the comparison year, although the
## TABLE 19

**ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE SCORES FOR CONTROL GROUPS IN THE COMPARISON YEAR AND FRATERNITIES IN SERVICE YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>First Service Year</th>
<th>Second Service Year</th>
<th>Third Service Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control P.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot;</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control P - &quot;Rams&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .02</td>
<td>+ .65</td>
<td>+ .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot;</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control S - &quot;Knights&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .46</td>
<td>+ .40</td>
<td>+ .72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.P.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot;</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control SP - &quot;Chiefs&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .78</td>
<td>+ .75</td>
<td>+ .78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.00 = C
difference in the case of the "Rams" in the first service year and Control P is only .02 grade-point. In every other case the control group score exceeds the fraternity score by at least .40 grade-point. As in the prior year period (See Table 3, p. 85) the "Chiefs" were consistently poorer academic performers relative to their control group than either the "Rams" or "Knights." It is clear, then, that--except for the "Rams" in service year one (where there was little difference)--the fraternities in the service year did not meet or exceed their control group in academic performance. That is, the fraternity scores were lower than the control group scores.

To test the significance of differences between fraternities and control in academic performance after service had been provided the fraternities, a 1-tailed t-test was run for each comparison.\(^9\) Table 20, p. 111, indicates the t-value, degrees of freedom, and significance or non-significance of each comparison. As can be seen from Table 20, the academic performance scores of the fraternities are generally significantly different at the .01 or .05 level from the scores of the control groups. This is the case in all three service years for the "Chiefs" and two of three service years for the "Rams" and "Knights." "Success" criteria for service in this case, as hypothesized, would be achieved if these differences in academic performance were \textit{not} statistically different, i.e., the scores were substantially the same or very similar. This is not the case in seven of nine comparisons.

\(^{9}\)Edwards, \textit{loc. cit.}
TABLE 20
T-VALUE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COMPARISON YEAR AND SERVICE YEAR COMPARISONS IN ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FOR ALL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities and Service Period</th>
<th>Control Group P.</th>
<th>Control Group S.</th>
<th>Control Group S.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t-value df Significance</td>
<td>t-value df Significance</td>
<td>t-value df Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year (H₃Aa)</td>
<td>0.0901 57 n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year (H₃Ab)</td>
<td>3.6494 62 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year (H₃Ac)</td>
<td>2.1181 53 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year (H₃Ad)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9406 52 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year (H₃Ae)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1310 43 n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year (H₃Af)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0333 43 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year (H₃Ag)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2676 39 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year (H₃Ah)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7788 44 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year (H₃Ai)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6953 43 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

test: 1-tailed
Conduct Performance Scores (H3a,b,c...i)

Conduct performance scores for each group for each of the comparison years and service years are shown in Table 21, p. 113. It can be seen from Table 21 that, in every case, the conduct performance score of the fraternity in the service year was lower than the score for its control group during the comparison year. In every case the difference is at least .29 grade-point, with one case showing a 1.26 grade-point difference. It is clear then, that, after service was provided, the fraternities' conduct scores did not match or exceed the scores of the control group. That is to say, the conduct scores of the fraternities were lower than those of the control group.

To test the significance of differences between fraternities and control groups in conduct performance after service had been provided the fraternities, a t-test, 1-tailed, was run for each comparison. Table 22, p. 114, indicates the t-value, degrees of freedom, and significance or non-significance of each comparison. As can be seen from Table 22 the conduct performance of the "Chiefs" in each service year is significantly different than that of Control SP. No significant difference exists between the conduct performance of the "Knights" and Control S, while the differences between the "Rams'" conduct performance and that of Control P is significant at the .01 level for service year one and two, and not significant for service year three. "Success" criteria for service here, as hypothesized, would be achieved if these differences in conduct performance were not

---

10 Ibid.
TABLE 21

CONDUCT PERFORMANCE SCORES FOR CONTROL GROUPS IN THE COMPARISON YEAR AND FRATERNITIES IN SERVICE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>First Service Year</th>
<th>Second Service Year</th>
<th>Third Service Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control P.</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot;</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control P - &quot;Rams&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .82</td>
<td>+ .68</td>
<td>+ .96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot;</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control S - &quot;Knights&quot;)</td>
<td>+ .33</td>
<td>+ .71</td>
<td>+ .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.P.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot;</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Control SP - &quot;Chiefs&quot;)</td>
<td>+1.26</td>
<td>+ .90</td>
<td>+ .76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.00 = C
TABLE 22
T-VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COMPARISON YEAR AND SERVICE YEAR COMPARISONS IN CONDUCT PERFORMANCE FOR ALL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities and Service Period</th>
<th>Control P.</th>
<th>Control S.</th>
<th>Control S.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year (H₃Cₐ)</td>
<td>3.4208</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year (H₃Cₐ)</td>
<td>3.2387</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year (H₃Cₐ)</td>
<td>1.1528</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year (H₃Cₐ)</td>
<td>1.0506</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year (H₃Cₐ)</td>
<td>1.6064</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year (H₃Cₐ)</td>
<td>.6710</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year (H₃Cₐ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year (H₃Cₐ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year (H₃Cₐ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

test: 1-tailed
statistically different, i.e., the scores were substantially the same. This is not the case in five of nine comparisons.

School Attendance (H_{3Ab}a,b,c...i)

To compare the school attendance of the groups, for each group the number of days absent was expressed as a per cent of the total number of days of school on which group members could attend. Table 23, p. 116, gives this information for all groups. It was hypothesized (H_{3Ab}) that, after service was provided, the absence rate of the fraternities would be equal to or less than the rate for the control group. Table 23 indicates that in no case is the absence rate for fraternity equal to or less than that of its control, although the rate for the "Rams" in the third service year approximates that of Control P. No support for the hypothesis can be found in this data.

To test the significance of these differences, a difference of proportions test (1-tailed) was performed for each of the comparisons.\textsuperscript{11} Table 24, p. 117, gives the z-scores and significance or non-significance resulting from these tests. As can be seen from Table 24 no significant difference in attendance exists between the fraternities in the service year and the control group in the comparison year.

Tardiness (H_{3Ta,b,c...i})

To compare the tardiness of the groups, for each group the number of times tardy was expressed as a per cent of the number of days present in school. Table 25, p. 118, gives this information for all

\textsuperscript{11}Blalock, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 176-78.
### Table 23

DAYS OF SCHOOL, DAYS ABSENT, AND PER CENT OF TIME ABSENT FOR CONTROL GROUPS IN COMPARISON YEAR AND FRATERNITIES IN SERVICE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Days of School</th>
<th>Days Absent</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control P.</td>
<td>6661.5</td>
<td>356.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3281</td>
<td>209.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>3362</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.</td>
<td>6982</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3058</td>
<td>228.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S. P.</td>
<td>5936</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>166.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was hypothesized ($H_{3T}$) that, after service was applied, the tardiness rate of the fraternities would be equal to or less than the rate for the control group. Table 25 indicates that in no case is the tardiness rate of the fraternity equal to or less than that of its control, although small difference exists between the "Rams" in the first service year and Control P. The rate for the "Knights" for the first service year is approximately two times that of Control S. In all other cases, the fraternity rate of tardiness is at least two
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity</th>
<th>Control P</th>
<th>Control S</th>
<th>Control SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year (H_{3Ab}^a)</td>
<td>.1678</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year (H_{3Ab}^b)</td>
<td>.2250</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year (H_{3Ab}^c)</td>
<td>.0443</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year (H_{3Ab}^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2103</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year (H_{3Ab}^e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3534</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year (H_{3Ab}^f)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2728</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year (H_{3Ab}^g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year (H_{3Ab}^h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year (H_{3Ab}^i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.6405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*test: 1-tailed*
times greater than that of its control. Greatest difference exists in the case of the "Chiefs," with their rate from seven to ten times that of Control SP. Clearly, tardiness rates for the fraternities after service was provided still greatly exceed that of the control. No support is found for the hypothesis in these data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Days Present</th>
<th>Times Tardy</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control P.</td>
<td>6305</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>3071.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>3784</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>2500.5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.</td>
<td>6563</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>2668.5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1140.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control S.P.</td>
<td>5652.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>991.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>1939.5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the significance of these differences, a difference of proportions test (1-tailed) was performed for each of the comparisons.12

12Ibid.
Table 26, p. 120, given the z-scores and significance or non-significance resulting from these tests. As can be seen from Table 26, no significant difference in tardiness rate exists between the fraternities in the service year and the control group in the comparison year.

**Trend Of Scores By Six-Week Periods Within The Service Years**

A score was calculated for each group on each indicator for six-week periods within the service and comparison years. These scores have been plotted on figures (appearing as Appendix IV of this dissertation). Inspection of these figures can provide additional information as to the possible effect of service provided.

**Academic Performance Scores**

Figures 1, p. 253, 2, p. 254, and 3, p. 255 indicate the academic performance scores of the fraternities and their control group for six-week periods within the service year. Figure 1 compares the "Rams" and Control P. During the first service year, the academic performance score of the "Rams" exceeded that of the control group at each six-week period. After an increase from period 1 to period 2, the scores for the "Rams" declined slightly with each subsequent six-week period until the last, when a very slight increase can be observed. The "Rams" score did more closely approximate the Control P score in the last six-week period than in the first, as hypothesized, but their performance relative to Control P was not as hypothesized in terms of their initially higher score than Control P. In the second and

---

No six-week academic scores were obtained for the control groups. The comparison year final score was used for comparison at each six-week period, and therefore the control group curves appear as a horizontal straight line.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity</th>
<th>Control P</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control S</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control SP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z-Score</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Z-Score</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Z-Score</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>.1087</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>.6540</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>.7520</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>.3286</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>.9779</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>.5263</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>1.1774</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>.9832</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>1.1909</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

test: 1-tailed
third service years, the "Rams'" scores were consistently lower than those of Control P and generally showed a decline from period 1 to period 6. In none of these cases do the data support the hypothesis.

Figure 2 indicates the academic performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Knights" during the service years and Control S during the comparison year. In each service year, the academic scores of the "Knights" were poorer than that of Control S. If treatment had had the effect hypothesized, the lines representing the scores of the "Knights" for each service year would be upward in slope moving from period 1 to period 6. As can be seen in Figure 2, the line for service years I and III are generally downward in slope. Differences between the "Knights'" scores for service years I and III and that of Control S increased during the course of the year. No support is found for the hypothesis in this information. In the second service year, however, after a decline in score through period 3, the movement in scores for the "Knights" was upward. Their score at the end of the set of periods more closely approximated that of Control S than at period 1. For this service year, data are in support of the hypothesis.

Figure 3 indicates the academic performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Chiefs" during the service years and Control SP during the comparison year. In the case of the "Chiefs" as well, their academic performance scores were poorer than that of Control SP. If treatment had had the effect hypothesized, the lines representing the scores of the "Chiefs" for each service year would be upward in slope moving from period 1 to period 6. As can be seen in Figure 3, the line for all service years tends downward, consistently so in the first and second service years. The line representing the scores in
service year two tends downward except for a sharp rise from period 3 to period 4. After period 4 the decline is resumed, although the score does not again reach the low point reached at period 3. No support is found for the hypothesis in this information.

**Conduct Performance Scores**

Figures 4, p. 256, 5, p. 257, and 6, p. 258 indicate the conduct performance scores of the fraternities and their control group for six-week periods within the service year. It can be seen from Figures 4, 5, and 6 that the conduct scores for the control groups all show a general downward trend from beginning to end of the year. Figure 4 shows the trend in conduct scores for the "Rams" and Control P. Figure 4 indicates that the "Rams'" scores in each service year were lower than those of Control P and remained lower throughout the year. During the first four six-week periods in each year, the scores of the "Rams" moved in a downward manner similar to the line depicting the score for Control P. Whereas the score for Control P improved at period 5, the "Rams" in service years one and three showed their lowest conduct performance in this time period, improving during the last six-weeks. In short, for the hypothesis to be supported, the lines for the conduct scores of the "Rams" should converge on the line for Control P. These lines do not show that movement, but parallel the downward movement of the scores for Control P, only in a more extenuated fashion. The data here do support the hypothesis.

Figure 5 indicates the conduct performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Knights" during the service years and Control S during the comparison year. The line for Control S shows a general
downward trend, with slight improvement in scores for period 4. The scores for the "Knights" in each service year approximate those of Control S at period 1 and 6, but diverge from the line for Control S for most of the year period. All three service years see a generally downward movement of scores for the "Knights," with the exception of an upward movement for the "Knights" during periods 4 and 5 of the third service year and during period 6 of the first and second service years. This information, aside from the exceptions mentioned above, offers little support for the hypothesis.

Figure 6 indicates the conduct performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Chiefs" during the service years and Control SP during the comparison year. In each service year, the conduct scores of the "Chiefs" were substantially lower than those of Control SP. The line indicating the scores for Control SP shows a slight downward movement throughout the year. The scores for the "Chiefs" during the third service year show a similar general movement, yet with greater fluctuation. The line representing these scores diverges from the line for Control SP. For the first service year, the scores of the "Chiefs" show a precipitous decline from a score proximate to Control SP in period 1, with slight upward resurgence late in the year. The data depicted by these two lines are not in support of the hypothesis. For the second service year, however, the conduct scores of the "Chiefs" remained stable throughout the first three periods, after which an increase at period 4 was negated by a decline at period 5 to the level maintained in the first periods. Upward movement to period 6 can be noted. In general, this line indicates some improvement in scores for the "Chiefs" and movement converging on the line
for Control SP at the end of the year. Data for the second service year, therefore offer weak support for the hypothesis.

School Attendance

Figures 7, p. 259, 8, p. 260, 9, p. 261 indicate the rate of absence, by six-week periods, of the fraternities during the service year and the control group during the comparison year. From these figures it can be seen that, for the control groups, the rate of absence increased toward the middle of the year and declined at the end of the comparison year. Figure 7 compares the "Rams" and Control P. In service years one and two, the "Rams"' rate of absence, although increasing from periods 1 to 3, was less than that of Control P at period 1 and remained less through most of these time periods. In service year three the rate of absence for the "Rams" was slightly higher at period 1 than that of Control P. Although increasing in subsequent periods, it dropped below that of Control P and remained below until period 5. In period 6, the rate of absence for the "Rams" in all three service years was higher than that of Control P, although the difference was relatively large only in service year two. To support the hypothesis, the lines representing the "Rams"' rate of absence would, toward the end of the year, be below that of Control P. The opposite is the case, and therefore, the data here do not support the hypothesis.

Figure 8 indicates the rate of absence, by six-week periods, for the "Knights" during the service years and Control S during the comparison year. During service year one, the line indicating the rate of absence for the "Knights" paralleled that of Control S, but exceeded
the latter at every period. Difference between the two was greater at the end of the year than at the beginning. No support for the hypothesis is found here. In service year three, the rate of absence for the "Knights" showed a precipitous drop from an exceedingly high rate in period 1 to a rate much lower than the control by period 3. In this year however, the rate increased from period 3 through period 6 and was higher than that of Control S in periods 5 and 6. The decline early in the year supports the hypothesis, movement from period 3 to 6 does not. In service year two, the absence rate for the "Knights," after increasing to a peak in period 2, declined substantially from that point to the end of the service year. The line for this service year and that of Control S did substantially converge, with the rate of the "Knights," although still higher than that of Control S in period 6, being much closer to the control rate then than at early periods within the year. Data for service year two, therefore, support the hypothesis.

Figure 9 indicates the rates of absence, by six-week periods, for the "Chiefs" during the service years and Control SP during the comparison year. For service year three, the line for the "Chiefs" is similar to that for Control SP but the rates for the "Chiefs" during this year remained substantially higher than those of Control SP. During service year one, the "Chiefs'" rate of absence was less than that of Control SP for periods 1 and 2, but exceeded the latter substantially during periods 3 and 4. From period 4, the rate for the "Chiefs" in this year approached that of Control SP in period 5, but diverged from the latter in period 6. The rates for the "Chiefs"
in service year two remained above those of Control SP except for period 4, closing the year at a greater difference from that of Control SP than at periods 1, 2, or 3. Little support for the hypothesis is found in these data.

**Tardiness**

Figures 10, p. 262, 11, p. 263, and 12, p. 264 indicate the rates of tardiness, by six-week periods, of the fraternities during the service years and the control groups during the comparison years. From these figures, it can be seen that, for Control S and SP, the rate of tardiness remained low and relatively constant throughout all six six-week periods. The rate of tardiness for Control P was low and relatively constant through periods 1 to 5, but increased sharply in period 6. Figure 10 compares the "Rams" and Control P. Figure 10 indicates that, for service year two, the line representing the tardiness rate of the "Rams" parallels in movement that of Control P while remaining above the latter in all periods. No support for the hypothesis is found here. For service year three, the "Rams'" tardiness rate, while remaining higher than that of Control P, does more closely approximate the latter in periods 5 and especially 6 than it does earlier in the year. This change does lend support to the hypothesis. In service year one, the tardiness rate of the "Rams" is below that of Control P in periods 1 and 2, exceeds the latter in period 3, is proximate in period 4, exceeds it again in period 5, and moves below Control P in period 6. These fluctuations do not permit a statement in support of or refutation of the hypothesis for service year one.
Figure 11 indicates the rates of tardiness, by six-week periods, for the "Knights" during the service years and Control S during the comparison year. In service year three, the line for the "Knights" more closely approximates that of Control S from period 1 to 3, but diverges from that point due to a large increase in the "Knights" tardiness rate. This movement during periods 3 to 6 is opposite to that hypothesized. In service year two, the tardiness rates for the "Knights" converge upon the line for Control S from period 1 to 2 and 4 to 5, but diverge due to a large increase in "Knights" tardiness rate from period 2 to 4. Tardiness rates for the "Knights" in this service year remain substantially larger than those of Control S in each period. It is apparent, therefore, that little support for the hypothesis can be gained by inspection of data for service years two and three. In service year one, however, a different movement is seen. The rate of tardiness for the "Knights" is virtually identical to that of Control S in periods 1 and 5, and very similar in period 6. It is larger than the rate of Control S in periods 2-4 due to an increase in tardiness among the "Knights" in these periods. Movement of these rates early in this service year does not support the hypothesis. The downward trend from period 4 and the convergence between lines for the "Knights" and Control S does lend support to the hypothesis.

Figure 12 indicates the rates of tardiness, by six-week periods, for the "Chiefs" during the service years and Control SP during the comparison year. As Figure 12 indicates, all three service year tardiness rates show a general divergence from those of Control SP. Tardiness rates for the "Chiefs" in all three service years remained
higher than Control SP at all periods. Some convergence is apparent from period 1 to 3 in service year three and from periods 2 to 4 in service year two. The weight of evidence, however, does not support the hypothesis.

**Summary Of Findings**

Hypothesis $H_1$ (See Chapter IV, pp.81-82) states that each fraternity in the prior year will have lower academic grades ($H_{1A}$), lower conduct grades ($H_{1C}$), a higher rate of absence ($H_{1AB}$), and a higher rate of tardiness ($H_{1T}$) than its control group in the pre-comparison year. Table 27, p. 129 summarizes the findings of these comparisons. As Table 27 indicates (Column 1), the academic performance scores of the fraternities are lower than their control in every case, although the difference in scores is statistically significant ($P < .05$) in only six of the nine cases (Column 2). With one exception ("Knights"-2nd year (e)), the fraternity conduct scores are lower than their control (Column 3), although the difference is statistically significant ($P < .05$) in only four of nine cases (Column 4). In attendance, the rate of absence for the fraternity exceeded that of the control in five of nine cases (Column 5), but none of these differences is statistically significant (Column 6). The rates of tardiness of the fraternities exceeded, with one exception, that of the control (Column 7). None of these differences is statistically significant (Column 8). In sum, fraternity performance in prior year periods was poorer than that of the control. Some support can be found for Hypothesis $H_1$ in the direction of differences in scores of fraternities
TABLE 27
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF COMPARISONS OF CONTROL GROUPS IN PRE-COMPARISON
AND FRATERNITIES IN PRIOR YEARS ($H_1$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Designation of Groups Compared (See Chapter IV, p. 81)</th>
<th>Academic Performance ($H_{1A}$)</th>
<th>Conduct Performance ($H_{1C}$)</th>
<th>Attendance ($H_{1Ab}$)</th>
<th>Tardiness ($H_{1T}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction Significance with P &lt; Hypothesis</td>
<td>Direction Significance with P &lt; Hypothesis</td>
<td>Direction Significance with P &lt; Hypothesis</td>
<td>Direction Significance with P &lt; Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No +n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Yes .01</td>
<td>Yes .01</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Yes .01</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Yes .01</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Yes .01</td>
<td>Yes .05</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Yes .01</td>
<td>Yes .05</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Yes .01</td>
<td>Yes .05</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
<td>Yes n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = no difference
and controls, although--generally--the differences are not statistically significant.

Hypothesis $H_2$ (See Chapter IV, p. 82) indicated that the service provided the fraternities would improve their school performance. Specifically, when service year was compared to prior year, each fraternity's academic performance score and conduct score would increase and their rate of absence and rate of tardiness would decrease. Table 28, p. 131 summarizes the findings of these comparisons. As Table 28 indicates, academic performance scores did improve in three of nine cases (Column 1), although none of these differences is statistically significant (Column 2). In conduct performance scores, the "Rams" in the first service year ($k$) and the "Knights" in the first service year ($m$) improved their scores (Column 3), but with neither change statistically significant (Column 4). In the other seven cases, conduct scores declined from prior year to service year. None of these changes was statistically significant.

In only one service year was either the rate of absence or rate of tardiness less in the service year than in the prior year ("Rams"--second service year ($k$)), and this decline in absence was only 0.1 percent (See Table 15, p. 104). In all other cases, the rate of absence and rate of tardiness increased from prior year to service year.

In sum, there is little evidence that, during service, the school performance of the fraternities improved. The weight of evidence is for the rejection of $H_2$. In fact, the increase in rate of absence was statistically significant in three cases and in rate of tardiness was statistically significant in four cases.
### Table 28

**Summary of Findings of Comparisons of Fraternities in Prior Year with Fraternities in Service Year ($H_2$)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Designation of Groups Compared (See Chapter IV, p. 81)</th>
<th>Academic Performance ($H_{2A}$)</th>
<th>Conduct Performance ($H_{2C}$)</th>
<th>Attendance ($H_{2Ab}$)</th>
<th>Tardiness ($H_{2T}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction Significance in accord with Hypothesis</td>
<td>Direction Significance in accord with Hypothesis</td>
<td>Direction Significance in accord with Hypothesis</td>
<td>Direction Significance in accord with Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>+n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

++ = no difference
In addition to year-end scores, the fraternity and control performance scores were compared by six-week periods in Figures 1 through 12. Although the movement of these scores during the year does not permit clear and simple description, in general it can be said that little support for Hypothesis $H_2$ is found in these figures.

Hypothesis $H_3$ (See Chapter IV, p. 82) states that fraternity scores during the service year would match or exceed those of the control group in the comparison year. That is, the fraternity academic ($H_{3A}$) and conduct ($H_{3C}$) scores would be equal to or greater than that of the control, while the fraternity rate of absence ($H_{3Ab}$) and rate of tardiness ($H_{3T}$) would be equal to or less than that of the control. Table 29, p. 133, summarizes the findings of these comparisons. As Table 29 indicates, none of the fraternity academic performance scores was equal to or greater than that of the control (Column 1). Seven of the differences between fraternity and control score remained statistically significant (Column 2).

What of the change in difference in academic performance? Was the difference between the fraternity service year score and control comparison year score less than the difference between the fraternity prior year score and control pre-comparison year score? Using data previously presented in Tables 3, p. 85, and 19, p. 109 Table 30, p. 134 presents the directional change in differences in academic performance of each fraternity and its control group in the relevant time period. As Table 30 indicates (Column 3), in six of nine cases the difference between the fraternity after service had been provided and control group was less than between the fraternity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Designation of Groups Compared (See Chapter IV, p. 81)</th>
<th>Academic Performance ($H_{3A}$)</th>
<th>Conduct Performance ($H_{3C}$)</th>
<th>Attendance ($H_{3ab}$)</th>
<th>Tardiness ($H_{3t}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction Significance with Hypothesis</td>
<td>P &lt;</td>
<td>Direction Significance with Hypothesis</td>
<td>P &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No .01</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>No .01</td>
<td>No .01</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>No .05</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>No .05</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>No .05</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>No .05</td>
<td>No .01</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>No .01</td>
<td>No .05</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>No .01</td>
<td>No .05</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
<td>No n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
prior to service and the control group. Therefore, although academic performance of the fraternities after service did not match or exceed that of the control group, some relative improvement is indicated by a decline in difference in six of nine cases.

**TABLE 30**

CHANGE IN DIFFERENCES IN ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF EACH FRATERNITY AND ITS CONTROL GROUP IN THE GIVEN TIME PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity and Service Year</th>
<th>Difference Prior Year (1)</th>
<th>Difference Service Year (2)</th>
<th>Change in Difference (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Year</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Year</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Year</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>+.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Year</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Year</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Year</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>+.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Year</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Year</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Year</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31, p. 135 indicates from data previously presented in Tables 4, p. 86 and 20, p. 111, the statistical significance or non-significance of the differences in academic performance score between the fraternities and their control in prior service and service periods. Since Hypothesis $H_1$ indicates that the fraternities will be
TABLE 31
SIGNIFICANCE OR NON-SIGNIFICANCE IN DIFFERENCES IN ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE SCORES FOR THE FRATERNITIES AND THEIR CONTROL IN THE GIVEN PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity and Service Year</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Service Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

significantly different in performance than the control prior to service and Hypothesis $H_3$ indicates that the fraternities will not be significantly different in performance from the control after service is provided, it might be argued (since all differences in prior year periods find the scores of the fraternities lower (significant or not) than the controls) that movement from a significant difference in prior period to a non-significant difference in the service year can be seen as evidence in support of the treatment hypothesis. As can be seen from Table 31 in only one case--"Knights" in the second service year--is such change evidenced. In two other cases ("Rams" in the third
service year and "Knights" in the third service year) change in the opposite direction is found. In the remaining cases the difference in academic performance scores between the fraternity and its control were either statistically significant or statistically non-significant in both periods.

Referring to Table 29, p. 133 again, it can be seen that none of the fraternity conduct performance scores was equal to or greater than that of the control (Column 3). Five of the differences between fraternity and control score remained statistically significant (Column 4).

What of the change in difference in conduct performance? Was the difference between the fraternity service year score and control comparison year score less than the difference between the fraternity prior year score and control pre-comparison year score? Using data previously presented in Tables 5, p. 88 and 21, p. 113, Table 32, p. 137 presents the directional change in difference in conduct performance of each fraternity and its control group in the relevant time period. As Table 32 (Column 3) indicates, in only three of nine cases the difference between the fraternity after service and control group was less than between the fraternity prior to service and the control group. Therefore, relative conduct performance declined in two-thirds of the cases.

Table 33, p. 138, using data from Tables 6, p. 89 and 22, p. 114, indicates the statistical significance or non-significance of the difference between the conduct performance scores of the fraternities and their control for each of the fraternity prior years
TABLE 32
CHANGE IN DIFFERENCES IN CONDUCT PERFORMANCE OF EACH FRATERNITY AND ITS CONTROL GROUP IN THE GIVEN TIME PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity and Service Year</th>
<th>Difference Prior Year (1)</th>
<th>Difference Service Year (2)</th>
<th>Change in Difference (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Year</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>+.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Year</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Year</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>+.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Year</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Year</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>+1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Year</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>+.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Year</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>+.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Year</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>+.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Year</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and service years. Since Hypothesis $H_1$ indicates that the fraternities will be significantly different in performance than the control prior to service and Hypothesis $H_3$ indicates that the fraternities will not be significantly different in performance after service is provided, it might be argued (with the exception of the "Knights" in service year two since this score exceeds that of the control) that movement from a statistically significant difference in prior year to a non-significant difference in the service year can be seen as evidence in support of the treatment hypothesis. As can be seen from Table 33, no
movement in this direction can be found. In the "Rams" first service year, movement is from non-significance to significance at the .01 level. All other cases are either statistically significant or statistically non-significant in both periods.

TABLE 33
SIGNIFICANCE OR NON-SIGNIFICANCE IN DIFFERENCES IN CONDUCT PERFORMANCE SCORES FOR THE FRATERNITIES AND THEIR CONTROL IN THE GIVEN TIME PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternity and Service Year</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Service Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rams&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Knights&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 1st Service Year</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 2nd Service Year</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chiefs&quot; 3rd Service Year</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referring again to Table 29, p. 133 it is indicated that, although none of the differences between the fraternity rate of absence and that of the control was statistically significant (Column 6), in no
case was the fraternity rate of absence equal to or lower than that of the control (Column 5).

It can also be seen from Table 29 that, although none of the differences between the fraternity rate of tardiness and that of the control was statistically significant (Column 8), in no case was the fraternity rate of tardiness equal to or lower than that of the control (Column 7).

In sum, in none of the indicators of school performance did we find the fraternity performance in the service year matching or exceeding the performance of the control group. The weight of evidence is for rejection of $H_3$.

In summary, what can be said about the school performance of these groups? The fraternities prior to service were poorer performers in school than the control. The application of service did not appreciably improve school performance of the fraternity in the service year compared to prior year performance. Furthermore, the service year performance of the fraternities remained poorer than that of the controls in the comparison year.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Was the service provided the fraternities effective? It is clear from the preceding analysis that, using the selected indicators of school performance, data generated in their application do not show improvement in school performance during the time of service.\(^1\) This finding is common in the literature on the evaluation of delinquency prevention programs.\(^2\) Does this finding show that the Pilot Project was ineffective? The answer must be--not necessarily. This evaluation study was directed at a specific level of evaluation. As Spergel points out, programs such as this may be evaluated in terms of: 1) the effectiveness of the total program, i.e., is the agency achieving its goals? 2) analysis of specific techniques used in treatment, and 3) evaluation by experimental design. Evaluation may also include the following measuring devices: 1) systematic recordings of efforts judged by the workers themselves as successful or

\(^1\)"Researchers are chary of speaking of effects or results of treatment. Instead they speak of changes occurring concomitantly or associated with the receipt of service." Ann W. Shyne, "Evaluation of Results in Social Work," _Social Work_, VIII (October, 1963), 31.

unsuccessful, 2) examination of selected social characteristics of delinquents at intervals during service and after its termination, and 3) reports on the progress of delinquents by independent observers, such as teachers, police, and personnel of other agencies.  

The study described in this dissertation was designed to utilize the third type of evaluation and the second kind of measuring device.

The project may have been effective in ways not indicated by measures of school performance. School performance might not have been a proper behavioral area for evaluating the Pilot Project, even though Cicourel and Kitsuse and Koval and Polk find school adjustment as the key to delinquent involvement and Miller, in an evaluation of a street gang work project found that "of the fourteen behavior areas, only one ( 'school-oriented behavior' ) showed a statistically significant reduction in disapproved actions." The wrong indicators of behavioral change may have been selected, therefore

---


"the fault may well lie in the measures of change rather than in the effectiveness of the service." \(^7\) For example, Klein, in a study of one large detached worker program, \(^8\) found that the program had no measurable effect on officially recorded "low-companion" offenses (school violations and malicious mischief) but was associated with a "considerable increase in high companion offenses" (e.g., assaults, auto thefts). In short, as Hackler cautions, "it would be ill-advised to label any program a failure if it fails to make changes which can be measured by one of the crude yardsticks devised by social scientists." \(^9\) As Shyne adds:

Social workers have a long way to go in devising reliable measures that are sufficiently sensitive to reflect accurately the effectiveness of service. \(^10\)

One of the Pilot Project goals, according to Worker L., was "to see if we could relate to these groups." \(^11\) As Mitchell states:

Two criteria can be used to evaluate the success or failure of the workers: 1) effectiveness of worker's approach in gaining acceptance by the group, 2) effectiveness of the worker in effecting changes in group behavior. \(^12\)

---

\(^7\) Shyne, op. cit., p. 33.


\(^10\) Shyne, op. cit., p. 33.


\(^12\) Roy Mitchell, "Capturing Boys' Gangs," Human Organization, X (Summer, 1951), 30.
evident and pronounced. The Project has certainly killed the old underground, secret fraternity type movement. Because of the Project, many illegal or secret groups are being exposed because of the "attention seeking" aspect of all groups. This knowledge is in itself very important to me in the administration of my school. I feel that the quality or high type of student is getting interested. . . .

Elsewhere in this report, an unidentified parent is quoted as writing:

> In . . . my opinion we appreciate very much your interest and work with these boys. We know that your presence is a good restraining influence on the boys as well as your guidance and sponsorship. These young people need and will seek social activities and fellowship by being recognized as a member of a group, whether it be sponsored or otherwise, and the school teachers seem so reluctant to devote any time to these there [sic] is a real need for persons such as yourself as a guideline to their activities.\textsuperscript{16}

This same parent, astutely recognizing that effects upon the boys may be long-term and need not be immediately noticeable adds:

> "Sometimes the real value of such guidance and sponsorship is not immediately recognizable, but takes years before it really comes to light."\textsuperscript{17} One unidentified member of a fraternity, in his evaluation, states:

> I feel that the YMCA Pilot Project is an unbelievably [sic] good thing for it fills the gap between the adult world and the High School age world wonderfully. Before the project there was no communication between these two levels, but now there is a middle man who helps both worlds immensely to understand the other.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 7.
\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 18.
\textsuperscript{17}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{18}Quoted in Ibid., p. 13.
Another is reported as stating:

I feel that the YMCA Pilot Project is a step in the right direction to bring the "unlawful clubs" and the community back together. I believe that through this project everyone will get a better look into what the club offers to the individual as well as what the possibilities of the club are to improve (not bring down) the community. I believe that the club plays an important part in forming character in young men, but I also believe that it must be properly guided - as I believe the Pilot Project is doing. I was a member of a totally unsupervised club . . . and I saw boys change for the worse without any respect for authority. There are times when it is important to have the guidance of a more experienced person to help or prevent the club from making a foolish judgment. I hope that the Pilot Project is continued and that more programs like it are started to bring the club and community back together again.19

In sum, in learning more about the fraternities through contact with the workers, school administrators' attitudes towards the clubs may have become less negative, enabling school officials and fraternities to work together more effectively. The school-oriented behavior of the fraternities may or may not have changed, but the feeling on the part of school administrators that it had could very well be a benefit resulting from the Pilot Project. In general, if the Project gave "comfort" to participants and community members, this "feel-good" effect is not without benefits to a community. As Caplan, et. al., point out in their evaluation of this kind of a program:

The workers seem to express the belief that the main significance of their work rests upon their effectiveness in establishing a prosocial influence relationship with their boys. Two years of close observation and study, however, would lead us to doubt such an assumption. It is our belief that, by and large, the more significant target population changes have not been due to direct work with the boys themselves, but due instead to the

19Ibid., p. 17.
worker acting, on behalf of the boy, as an intermediary with social institutions such as the school and law enforcement agencies.\textsuperscript{20}

In addition, the Project's service might have forestalled the more serious involvement in delinquency that might have followed had service not been provided. It has been shown that delinquent involvement of male youth increases with age through the early teen years and then, for most, declines with further maturation.\textsuperscript{21} Such a supposition as stated above is impossible to test under the limitations of this study, but this possibility cannot be discounted. Possible long term effects were not pursued because there was no way, under the limitations of resources in this study, to follow the boys in the fraternities after service and to control for variable situations which might affect behavior. For example, after the service year, the boys might have: 1) left the school system, 2) transferred to a school where records were not available to this writer, 3) remained in the fraternity which was then serviced by a different worker as the Pilot Project continued, 4) remained in the fraternity which then did not receive service, 5) graduated to a high school where he might: a) join a high school fraternity, or b) belong to no high


\textsuperscript{21} See: Malcolm W. Klein, "Juvenile Gangs, Police, and Detached Workers Controversies About Intervention," \textit{Social Service Review}, XXXIX (June, 1965), 184-185. Klein points out that in the U. S., delinquency increases with age until it peaks at age 16 or 17, adding that "this fact must be separated from any analysis which attempts to pinpoint the effectiveness of a detached worker."
school fraternity. These factors could not be controlled nor the necessary information obtained to ascertain which situation the boy was in, therefore no analysis of "post-service" periods was performed. On the other hand, Caplan feels that post-service period measures may not be indicative of program effect because:

most typically, instrumental changes initiated in the program setting have little or no survival value when the subject is no longer in the "power field" of the worker.22

It is possible that the research design of this study might have been improved by the construction of better control groups. Thought was given, for example, to using non-serviced fraternities in the same school, with records taken for the same year, as controls for the serviced fraternities. This approach was discarded because of the difficulties of ascertaining membership of the non-serviced fraternities. The workers could not provide accurate lists of members of these fraternities and it is likely that the fraternity either would not have such a list because of shifting membership or may refuse to divulge their membership because of a desire to keep members' names a secret. Furthermore, because of shifting alliances among all fraternities it can not be argued that the workers had no influence upon the non-serviced fraternities.

It is possible that positive effects of the Pilot Project program were hidden because of the operation of other factors. For example, an increase in conduct performance resulting from worker

efforts might have been negated by a maturation effect which dropped conduct performance from one year to the next. It is also possible that behavior changes in a positive direction brought about by the worker may have been negated by a decline in performance resulting from joining the club. That is, among those not in a serviced club the prior year, joining the club may have had a detrimental effect upon school performance sufficient to negate any possible benefits service might have had in improving school performance. The increases in rates of absence and tardiness and decrease in academic and conduct performance of the fraternities from prior year to service year, although generally not statistically significant (See Chapter V, pp. 95-107 of this dissertation), may indicate that factors such as these were operating. Or, in the case of attendance, absence could have been the result of genuine illness rather than a desire to "cut school," only the latter influencable by worker treatment effort. As Brown and Dodson point out, with an ex post facto research design "it is assumed that all factors other than those being compared are equal." This, of course, may not be the case. Caplan summarizes well some of the problems of this type of research in a field setting:

---

23See, for example: Frederic M. Thrasher, "The Boys' Club and Juvenile Delinquency," American Journal of Sociology, XLII (July, 1936), 77. He states: "it seems probable that delinquency in this area was a function of age rather than club membership and, therefore, that club membership has had no effect in decreasing delinquency rates."

A major problem in the investigation stemmed from the fact that the study was conducted in a field setting where social reality did not necessarily coincide with nor could be bent to suit ideal research requirements; there simply is no way to control the stream of everyday events and non-experimental influences for the purpose of conducting such an investigation. Also, because the researchers had no control over action arrangements, there could be no predetermined or fixed ratio scheduling of program input.25

In short, as Shyne argues: "studies must be preplanned if one is to be sure that all the necessary 'before' as well as 'after' data are available."26

Why might the service provided in the Pilot Project be ineffective in altering school performance? Possibilities include:

1) contact with the fraternities might have been too infrequent.

McCord and McCord, for example, in evaluating the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study, found that the "intensity" of treatment was related to behavior change in the target population.27 One dimension of intensity is frequency of contact, 2) service, which was suspended during summers, might have had greater influence at this time of year.

Thrasher, in commenting upon the curtailment of Boys' club activities during the summer, argues that club activities should be more effective during the summer, since this is a time when boys are "subject to the demoralizing influences of the streets,"28 3) the service

---

25Caplan, op. cit., p. 70.

26Shyne, op. cit., p. 33.


28Thrasher, op. cit., p. 70.
effort may have been self defeating in that, through recognition of
the group, it helped to create a more cohesive group. Some argue
that "sponsored" gangs create more trouble than "unsponsored" gangs,
and that sponsorship, by increasing the solidarity and cohesiveness
of the group, makes the group more immune to influence by pro-social
agents. A lack of directed treatment effort focused upon school
behavior per se may have negated the chance of behavior change show­
ing up on school performance indicators. Of course, the adult role
model approach as treatment technique may be inapplicable to these
groups or generally ineffective for this kind of purpose. As Shyne
argues, "evaluation of results has as its prerequisite specification
of social work methods . . ." The treatment effort of the Pilot
Project was not "specified." As Caplan, et. al., point out:

A fundamental prerequisite for the proper evaluation of a
social change program is, of course, the identification
of the treatment variable actually employed to alter some
behavioral characteristics in a chosen target population.
Unless these treatment variables can be properly determined
or described, the interpretation of the effects cannot be
legitimately attributed to those aspects of the program
which are presumed to be responsible. Such effects may be
the consequence of incidental or peripheral factors, espe­
cially in a program designed to bring about change in a
natural social setting where variability from a number of
intervening sources could seriously affect the degree of

29See the discussion of this point in Klein, "Juvenile Gangs,
Police . . ." pp. 184-87. See also: Howard L. Myerhoff and Barbara
G. Myerhoff, "Field Observations of Middle-Class 'Gangs,'" Social
Forces, XLIII (March, 1964), 328-36.

30Malcolm W. Klein, Street Gangs and Street Workers

correspondence between the prescribed program and its implementation.32

5) the Pilot Project goals may have been too diffuse. As Meyer, Borgatta, and Jones point out in their discussion of the Girls At Vocational High project, "when the goals of treatment or of services are themselves so unclear, how can the criteria of success be specified?"33 6) factors influencing school-oriented behavior may not be peer group factors but might stem from such variables as individual psychological factors or intra-family relationships. The Pilot Project left these type of factors largely untouched, and 7) the total complex of factors influencing adolescent behavior may be too much for the street group worker to handle. As Klein points out, it is questionable that:

we can bring about a significant change in the cognitive structures of these youngsters, that we can change attitudes, values, and perceptions which a) have been a decade and a half in the making and b) receive constant reinforcement from the current environment. We place one adult in the gang setting, arrange matters in such a way that he has an average of only a few minutes of contact per week with each boy, and expect him to perform miracles.34

In sum, the Pilot Project, like other programs of its type, suffered from problems of specification of technique, establishing


33Meyer, Borgatta, and Jones, op. cit., p. 210. In her critique of this project, MacDonald states that these workers paid "little attention either to establishing explicit treatment goals or to standardizing procedures." Mary E. MacDonald, "Reunion At Vocational High: An Analysis of Girls At Vocational High: A Experiment In Social Work Intervention," Social Service Review, XL (June, 1966), 178.

34Street Gangs and Street Workers, p. 153.
and maintaining intensive contact with the target population, specification of goals and the relationship of technique to these goals. More important, no theoretically based model of the intervention program was articulated. As Klein points out, this type of program is "theoretically eclectic": "the theoretical parochialism that often hampers other welfare agencies is seldom manifest in a detached worker group."\(^35\) Klein sees this as a strength of this type of effort. On the other hand, unless attention is given to the theoretical basis of the adult role model approach to intervention by relating theory, program goals, and techniques in an intervention model, these programs are likely to remain hazily articulated and extremely difficult to evaluate in terms of effects.

In conclusion, although this analysis of school performance of serviced fraternity groups did not indicate any appreciable difference in school oriented behavior when these groups were compared to control groups, the Pilot Project was not without its benefits to the community in which the project was undertaken. Several of the goals of the Pilot Project were realized. Rather than fault the effort for what it apparently did not do, the achievement of some goals in an admittedly "exploratory" effort demonstrates partial success. As Hackler states:

To expect a complete solution of all major problems is obviously ridiculous; it is reasonable, however, to see if intermediate goals have been achieved.\(^36\)

\(^{35}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 149-150.}\)

\(^{36}\text{Hackler, loc. cit.}\)
The Pilot Project may have broken new ground for the local YMCA and the effort may lead to new directions in community service—directions, in the current vernacular: more "relevant" to the community. As Reed points out, traditionally "group work agencies are not in general identified closely with the underprivileged and insecure elements in the population, nor with the age groups among which delinquency is most prevalent."\(^{37}\) The Pilot Project did not select as a target population the "underprivileged and insecure" elements in the local secondary school population. However, by establishing a service program working outside the agency and with problem groups in the community, this YMCA drew away from what Powers identifies as "major programs of the 'Y's'. . . counseling, camping, physical education and training, and group activity meetings."\(^{38}\) Powers could say about conventional "Y" programs:

As delinquency prevention organizations, the "Y's" and the C.Y.O., as well as the other national church groups . . . cannot justify the value of their programs. Their purpose gives evidence of the valuable contribution that can be made for the protection of individual youths, and for the upgrading of the institutions of society. But their purpose has little relevancy in the subculture of delinquency.\(^{39}\)

By taking the YMCA service "into the field" in an attempt at working with problem youths—no matter how tentative an attempt the Pilot

\(^{37}\)Ellery F. Reed, "How Effective Are Group-Work Agencies in Preventing Delinquency?" Social Service Review, XXII (September, 1948), 348.


\(^{39}\)Ibid., p. 112.
Project is, and no matter what its demonstrable results—the YMCA of Greater Miami has moved outside the bounds of its conventional programs. This writer feels that the effort is commendable.

The field of delinquency prevention is an area of study where much is being done to close large gaps in our understanding of the variables of delinquent behavior. Much needs to be done in an area broad in scope. As the late Joseph D. Lohman stated:

On the one hand, delinquency relates to long established local conditions and relationships; on the other hand it relates to the stresses and strains which are accompanying basic transformations in the redistribution and resettlement of the population on a national scale. It is to these facts, conditions, and relationships that any bona fide effort in the control of juvenile delinquency must be addressed.40

The writer hopes that this dissertation will make a contribution—no matter how modest—to our understanding of delinquency prevention and control.

40 Joseph D. Lohman, "Foreward" to Amos and Wellford, op. cit., p. xv.
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APPENDIX I

THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OF THREE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL FRATERNITIES

There is need for descriptive analytical studies of the social structure of delinquent groups. Albert Cohen, one of the leading students of the subculture of delinquent groups, argues:

It would be desirable to continue and expand research on delinquent groups as social systems, that is, research whose object is the structure, the process, the history, and the subculture of the group as such rather than the delinquent individual.\footnote{Albert Cohen, Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955), p. 173.}

Such research, he continues:

should investigate systematically the origin and dissolution of these groups, their status systems, their spirit and ideologies, their systems for control and maintenance of morale and their attitudes toward and interaction with other agencies and groups in the wider community. It should investigate the processes of mutual exploration and tentative interaction between the gang and non-gang members and how they lead to recruitment, rejection, or withdrawal.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 173-74. See also: Charles J. Browning, "Toward a Science of Delinquency Analysis," Sociology and Social Research, XLVI (October, 1961), 62.}

The overwhelming majority of studies of delinquent groups investigate delinquency in a lower socio-economic setting, but
increasing attention is being paid to the phenomenon of "middle-class
delinquency."^{3} Shanley, et. al., point to a "continuing need for
additional studies descriptive of varied patterns of middle-class
delinquent behavior and of the social setting in which these delinquent
acts occur."^{4} Gandy indicates:

> While there is an abundance of literature on work with
delinquent gangs in very disorganized communities, little
attention has been paid to work with marginal groups in urban
areas in which there is some strength and vitality in the
social fabric.\(^5\)

Appendix I and Appendix II describe the structure and process of
the male adolescent peer groups studied in this dissertation. Data
for this portion of the dissertation consist of the continuing case
records, termed "Journals," prepared by each of the group workers.
The material which follows reflects an analysis of some 250 typed
single-spaced pages which comprise the three case reports, or Journals.
The Journals cover the first two years of the Pilot Project: 1965-66

---

^{3} Whereas American studies of the subculture of lower class
delinquency date to the mid 1950's and early 1960's, the first volume
devoted exclusively to middle-class delinquency was published in 1967.
See, for example, as major examples of the former: Albert Cohen,
op. cit.; Richard R. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Delinquency and
Opportunity (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960), and Walter B. Miller,
"Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency,"

The volume on middle class delinquency is Edmund W. Vaz, ed.,

^{4} Fred J. Shanley, D. Welty LeFever, and Roger E. Rice, "The
Aggressive Middle-Class Delinquent," Journal of Criminal Law,
Criminology and Police Science, LVII (June, 1966), 152.

^{5} John M. Gandy, "Preventive Work With Street-Corner Groups:
Hyde Park Youth Project, Chicago," Annals of the American Academy of
Political and Social Science, CCCXII (March, 1959), 111.
Internal Organization of the Groups

Formal Structure of Offices and Membership Status

Each club established a formal structure of elected offices. Elections were held twice yearly and terms of office were for one school semester. Each club had a President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Sergeant-at-arms, Sweetheart and two sponsors. The Sweetheart and sponsors were girls. In addition, the "Rams" and "Chiefs" each had a Secretary, the "Knights" and "Rams" a Chaplain, while the "Rams" also had a Parliamentarian, Historian, and Pledge Master.

Although the structure of offices developed prior to YMCA sponsorship, during the workers' effort with the club the "Knights" and the "Rams" formalized their purpose, structure, and procedure by preparing a "Constitution." The Constitution describes the structure of offices and the roles of each officer. It also served as a normative reference for group decision-making. For example, at a "Rams" meeting the boys:

were discussing where they would have the party, . . . W. said if the party were at D.'s home, they could drink as his Mother didn't mind. F. said forget it as there was no drinking at "Rams" parties. J. said this wasn't correct that the Constitution read no drinking at parties unless specified--what if they wanted to have a keg party? . . . T. got his Constitution from his notebook, and J. read it to the club--it said no drinking at "Rams" parties, so the matter was dropped and there was no more discussion.

6This constitution is reproduced as Appendix III of this dissertation. Thrasher found what he termed the "conventionalized type" of gang often adopted a constitution and by-laws, and provided for the election of officers, payment of dues, and observance of rules of order. See: Frederic M. Thrasher, The Gang, (Abridged edition; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 52.

7Worker A., "'Rams' Journal," (YMCA of Greater Miami, n.d.), p. 95. (Mimeographed.)
When it suited the boys' purposes, the Constitution was ignored, and the "Rams" "amended" their constitution to limit the role of sweetheart and sponsors, but only after extensive consideration and debate.

The Duties of Each Office

A brief description of the duties of each officer is contained in the "'Rams' Constitution" (See Appendix III). The structure of offices in the other fraternities is similar. The Presidency was clearly the key leadership post in each club. The President usually served for two semesters, being reelected during January of the school year. Rarely did the President act in an autocratic or dictatorial manner, and his leadership was apparently never directly challenged. Presidents took the lead in establishing group norms and decisions, yet most such conclusions were the end result of group consensus established through discussion. The consensus, however, was usually of a temporary nature. Even decisions to establish "Constitutional" rules did not establish principles which were applied unquestionably. For example, the "Knights" had established a general rule against drinking at social functions at which girls were present. Nevertheless, the issue of drinking arose again and again through this year and the next, forcing the boys to fit a decision to the particulars.

8Ibid., pp. 80-84.


See also James F. Short, Jr., and Fred L. Strodtebeck, Group Process and Gang Delinquency (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 196 for an explanation of this. They refer to it as the "quickened tempo of testing of leadership."
of the situation. There seemed to be no established principle that
the boys carried through from like situation to like situation, nor
was a President's recommendation automatically affirmed. On many
occasions the group was hard pressed to come to a consensus.

Each club had a sweetheart and two sponsors. The "Rams'"
Constitution does not specify their roles, but an account by Worker L.
indicates some of the more informal requirements of the sponsor role:

P. then asked if they were going to elect sponsors. Y. said
he thought they ought to wait. He said that "Lenore," their
present sponsor, would not let P. put his arm around her and
he didn't think she should be sponsor if she weren't going
to flirt with all of the members. P. said she needed to
loosen up a little. Y. appointed N. to tell "Lenore" that
she would have to flirt with all of the members and not
just E. G. asked about buying a sponsor pin for "Lenore,"
and Y. said to wait until they could see how "Lenore"
reacted.10

Other "Special" Membership roles

The "Rams" and the "Knights" established the role of "mascot."
The mascot, a younger boy, shared some of the rights of full member­
ship. Worker L. writes:

K. said G. [the mascot] had no right to ball anyone. He had
ten licks coming. Others expressed themselves and the focus
was on G. G. was sent out while the group decided what to
do. K. said he ought to be a member and get initiated. R.
said to let him remain a Mascot. . . . The majority decided
G. would remain a Mascot and could not vote on members, but
could vote on ideas (parties, etc.). G. could administer
only one-half the licks designated at tee offs.11

10 Worker L. , "'Knights' Journal," (YMCA of Greater Miami, n.d.).
p. 58. (Mimeographed.)

11 Ibid., p. 11. See: Lloyd T. Delany, "Establishing Relation­
ships With Antisocial Groups and Analysis of Their Structure," British
Journal of Delinquency, V (July, 1954), 34-45. Delany finds this role
in vertically organized "anti-social structure." He states: "a
particularly popular member of one of the younger divisions may become
the 'mascot' of an older division." P. 37.
The "Knights" established the position of "Honorary Sports," granted to boys with needed athletic abilities. Worker L. clarifies this role:

... a boy can be brought up for Honorary Sports. This means that the boy can play with the club during football games and that he can attend club parties, but cannot come to the club meetings. An Honorary Sports gets 10 licks.12

Former members of clubs were known as "alumni."13 They were permitted to attend club functions. Although not having full membership status, alumni could participate in discussions and other group activities. Alumni were often viewed as disruptive by current members but alumni participation was a traditional right. Worker A. states:

The boys and girls were having a wonderful time when from all directions, front door, back door, appeared the alumni and their dates. Some of the alumni had been drinking... Here, I gather, is real conflict. The alumni are invited and have been historically to all function of the "Rams"--initiations, hazing and parties. I believe the boys themselves would rather not have them but don't know what to do about the situation. In talking to the boys individually, they felt it was the right of the alumni.14

Selection of Officers

Election of all officers took place twice yearly. In addition, special elections were held to fill vacancies which developed. Procedure was similar in all instances: nominations were placed before the assembled members, those nominated left the room, discussion took

12"'Knights' Journal," p. 50.
13Clubs studies by others also have "alumni." See, for example: Schumach, op. cit., p. 66.
14"'Rams' Journal," p. 4. Walter Miller, "The Impact of a 'Total-Community' Delinquency Control Project," Social Problems, X, No. 2 (1962), 168-91, found the groups he studied to be "inheritors of a gang tradition." He adds that these traditions in some cases extended 50 years into the past.
place, and the vote followed. Worker A. indicates the process of selection of several officers:

The next item was criticism of Secretary W. for his failure to call the boys which was the Secretary's job. They then discussed reelection of officers. All of the members wanted H. to continue as President. They then elected J. Vice-President. Then they came to Secretary and decided to give W. another chance, particularly since no one else wanted the job, and a lot of them could not call because their folks did not know they were in [the club]. They were happy with P. as Sergeant-at-arms and S. as Treasurer. The Historian, Parliamentarian and Chaplain remained the same. They elected D. Pledge Master. The election was real interesting because many of the newly elected officers had several running against them. They would send the boys out of the room and vote. When they were electing the Pledge Master, it looked as though B. would be elected, then H. spoke up for D. He said D. had been a loyal member of "Rams" for a long time and his Mother had baked cakes for them. When the vote was taken, D. was elected, and I think he was pleased.15

The election process was occasionally confused by informal arrangements made between officers: Worker A. states:

Originally R. was defeated for Treasurer by D. but D. would rather be Pledge Master, so the two swapped jobs. This created quite a bit of confusion but everyone wound up with the job they wanted.16

A small ritual follows the election process:

As evidently is customary, each officer is allowed to give a lick to the incoming individual who is to hold the same office.17

Sponsors were "chosen" rather than elected. Worker L. describes the "Knights" selection of sponsors:

J. said they were going to begin choosing sponsors for the club, and the girls were brought in one at a time and asked several questions some of which were: What can you do for the club? Can we drink at your house? Can we meet at your

16Ibid., p. 39.
17Ibid., p. 73.
house for parties? Which club is best? Will you clean up the house after the party? One of the "Knights" asked the first girl what her measurements were, and she said it was none of his business. . . . The first girl went back to the car and began crying. After all of the girls were questioned one at a time, J. said that the club would not vote on the girls until the next meeting.18

Financing Club Activities: Dues and Assessments

Each club provided for the collection of dues. The "Rams" Constitution set dues at 50c per week for each member, but this sum was altered to meet financial exigencies. For example, in late fall:

The "Rams . . . " agreed not to collect any more dues until after the first of the year for they will need their money for Christmas presents.19

A year later the "Rams" set dues at $1.00 per meeting in order to accumulate enough money for the Valentine's party. The "Chiefs" set their dues at $1.00 per week for each member. Worker L. describes the collection of dues by the "Chiefs":

Dues were collected by calling out each boy's name. and one at a time they brought their dollar and put it in a shoe. If the member did not have his dues, he was given three licks.20

The clubs were hardly "poverty stricken." Shortly before the start of the second year of sponsorship, the "Rams" Treasury contained $183. This sum was not viewed as sufficient to permit the "Rams" to give a social function, so they levied an assessment upon each member:

18"'Knights' Journal," p. 45.
The first item of business was the collection of $10.00 from each member, and this brought about a great deal of discussion as to how the $10.00 per member was going to be used. H. said it was going to be used for an Open House the latter part of September. G. raised the question as to whether the club shouldn't vote on whether to have an Open House, and the decision should be made before the $10.00 were collected. W. suggested collecting the money first and then decide. By vote, it was decided to discuss the matter first and then collect the $10.00. . . . The discussion of the Open House lasted almost three-fourths of an hour, and they finally voted on it, the President, of course, not voting. The club was unanimous, with one exception . . . , in voting not to have an Open House. . . . They then proceeded to call the roll, and each boy came in and gave his $10.00. They collected $180.00.

Procedural Matters: Coming to a Decision at Meetings

Most major decisions were made after lengthy discussion at club meetings. The process is largely as follows: The President ran the meeting and in order to speak, each member raised his hand. The President, or presiding officer would then call on the individual. Those out of order were sanctioned by the Sergeant-at-arms. Most meetings were orderly, providing for exchange of views. Some members thought them to be too tame:

A. brought up that the members ought to be able to curse at meetings, using small curse words like Hell and shit. H. said that they should keep the rule of no cursing at meetings.

21"Rams' Journal," p. 79.

22The groups in this study maintained greater order than apparently did many of this age category. For example, Walter B. Miller, Hildred Geertz, and Henry S. G. Cutter, "Aggression in a Boy's Street Corner Group," Psychiatry, XXIV, No. 4 (1961), 284-98, found that "a persisting pattern of mutual teasing, insult interchange, chasing, and rough housing was a constant concomitant of this group's usual interaction." P. 292. The group in question was in the 13-15 year old age category. Miller, et. al., add that the group spent a high proportion of their time keeping order. The groups studied in this dissertation spent a high proportion of their time at meetings coming to decision, the process being reasonable orderly. Miller, et. al.'s group was lower class.
A. said it was hard for him to express himself without cursing. L. said there might be cursing just at certain times like when they were asking the pledges questions. The club finally voted there would be no cursing during meetings--everyone voted in favor of this except A.23

On another occasion, dispute between 9th graders and the rest of the "Rams" brought on a "filibuster." Worker A. relates the following:

They then brought up other names for pledges, and J. said the 9th graders should not vote since they would be out of the club and the decision about new members really ought to be left to the 7th and 8th graders. This irked the 9th graders--G. got the floor and began a filibuster in which he was joined by the other 9th graders. This brought laughs from everyone. They read from books, math formulas, about Abraham Lincoln, told stories, etc., and finally, because of the lateness of the hour, J. had to adjourn the meeting so there was not [sic] vote on new pledges.24

The President, as indicated above, was the actual effective leader in shaping decision. Worker L. indicates how Y., the "Knights" President led the decision about one pledge:

Y. moved to blackball S. because he did not show up for his pledging. There was some hesitation here by G. and R., but Y. talked a little more and everyone voted "Blue" which meant he was balled.25

On another occasion, the "Knights" discussed which of two boys to visit. Each of the two had been in the hospital after an accident. According to Worker L., "Y. wanted to see A., and this seemed to settle the Matter."26 Yet, the President did not always lead the club his way. Worker L. describes an incident involving R., the "Knights" President prior to Y's incumbancy:

24"'Rams' Journal," p. 70.
26Ibid., p. 41.
R. did not want to practice football this coming Sunday afternoon, but the group voted to practice and R. consented.27

Each group closed their meetings with recitation of The Lord's Prayer. Worker A. describes the "Rams" version of the ceremony:

... the meeting was adjourned with the "Rams" gathering in their traditional circle and being led in prayer by their Chaplain, ... H. reminded them this was the one serious part of the meeting and there had better not be any fooling around or there would be some licks. G. asked that the Lord help the "Rams" have a good year, and this was followed by the Lord's Prayer.28

**Factionalism And Internal Dissention**

All groups experienced internal dissention. The "Rams" suffered this problem the least. Their major dissention occurred as the result of a fight between two members.29 Worker A. describes the discussion of this fight when the club next met:

The next item for discussion was the fighting between L. and G. Each was called to the front and told to tell his version of what happened. G. became so upset that it looked as though he was going to fight L. right there. J. spoke about brotherhood. R. suggested the whole matter be dropped. W. took L.'s side and the club seemed pretty well split. B. said that while brotherhood is ideal, there will always be guys in the club who don't like each other, so what could you do about it. The club decided to do nothing about it and let the matter drop but they seemed to feel, I believe, that these two boys are still going to tangle and that it will have to be brought up again. They didn't feel the issue was closed, as there seems to be real resentment by each boy toward the other. . . .

---


28"*Rams' Journal*," p. 81.

29Some students of the male adolescent peer group have found aggressive actions by group members are predominantly internal, rather than directed against outside persons or other objects. See, for example: Walter Miller, et. al., *op. cit.*, p. 286.
The Constitution calls for 20 licks to be given to brothers who have been fighting but the club voted to waive the rule this time.\(^{30}\)

Rivalry between boys of different grades also appeared in the "Rams":

All of the rushes recommended by the 8th graders were balled by the 9th graders, and there was quite a lot of discussion on this subject. There seemed to be general agreement that when the next semester began the 9th graders wouldn't vote on new members of "Rams" but up until that time they could.\(^{31}\)

Of the three clubs, the "Knights" were most ridden by internal dispute. Worker L. describes the situation at the mid-point of the first year of YMCA sponsorship:

At the next few club meetings there seemed to be growing dissension within the group. At our last meeting . . . [three members and two sponsors] resigned. "Tess" and "Doris" wrote letters giving their resignations, saying that the "Knights" had not been courteous to the "Gammas" and they felt they were not wanted in "Knights" . . . . B. [one of those resigning] said he wanted to ball at least four members and knew he could not get enough members to back him up. A. said that B., the boy who had recently quit "Dashers" and joined "Knights" was trying to run the club. K. said it might be better for the club if they quit because there were certain members they didn't like. T. did not say much. . . . The "Knights" have just elected new officers, and this may be the cause of part of the dissension. K. mentioned that the club never did anything but was always arguing. . . . Two new members, . . . were elected as officers while some of the older 9th Grade boys; . . . were not elected to office.\(^{32}\)

Further dissension developed at the close of the first year of sponsorship. Worker L. states:

. . . L. raised his hand and . . . said he wanted to bring up Y.'s name for blackball. L. said Y. borrowed money from him and did not pay it back. He said Y. gave his "Knights" honor to pay it back but did not. K. supported L. and said that Y. was always pushing him around. Y. defended himself

\(^{30}\)"'Rams' Journal," p. 46.  
\(^{31}\)Ibid., p. 114.  
saying that L. had also broken "Knights" honor and that K. was always causing trouble. Y. said that everyone in the club had broken "Knights" honor. K. and R. said this was not so. S. said Y. owed him money and wouldn't pay it back. G. indicated Y. owed him money. Y. was asked to leave while the club voted. Some of the boys were concerned that Y., being a large 8th grader, would quit the "Knights" and join "Dashers." P. said if Y. quit, the "Knights" would not have a good fighter in the club next year. Only a few voted to ball Y. When Y. came back in, he made a motion to ball L. When L. went out, no one voted to ball him. The question then came up as to what would be done to Y. for breaking "Knights" honor and for bad brotherhood between Y. and L. R. stated that 10 licks should be given to each of the two. Y. said that he would trade 10 licks with L. K. and P. said that according to the Constitution, the licks should be given by the Sergeant-at-arms. Y. said he would give the licks left-handed but would not take any licks from the Sergeant-at-arms. W. asked Y. why everything had to be done his way. P. asked Y. if he were to quit, would he join the "Dashers." Y. said no that he was tired of clubs. When Y. insisted he would not take the licks from the Sergeant-at-arms, R. indicated he would bring his name up again for blackball. Y. said that he quit, and with that, he left the club meeting.33

At the end of the following year dissension seemed to crystalize around factions: those in the seventh and eighth grade vs. ninth graders:

... a special "Knights" meeting ... was being called. Quite an argument began between ... [several of the "Knights"]. E. and D. took the lead saying that since G. and J. had quit the club they could not get back in unless they were voted on by the members. Y. argued that he was only kidding when he said he had quit. G. pointed out how Y. had built up the club during the year. ... E. said Y. should not get back into the club and that he was pushy toward the members. E. was quite emotional when saying this, and this is the first time he has argued with Y. E. is a slightly built, ... boy in the 8th Grade. Most of the boys present are in the 8th Grade. Y. said it should not be left up to 8th Graders to determine what was to happen to 9th Graders. D., who is in the 9th Grade, said this was not true that it was a club decision. G. and Y. finally said that they quit. One of the boys asked if they wanted the club to vote on them. Y. and G. got together for a few minutes and then said to go ahead and vote. The 9 boys huddled together so no one could see how they voted. They then told Y. and G. they had been balled. The two boys said they had already quit. As Y. walked away

33Ibid., p. 31.
from the group, I could see he was hurt and he expressed to the boys that he hoped the "Knights" had a good club next year. I could hardly believe what I saw, but it seemed to be a power play between the 8th Grade boys and the 3 or 4 9th Graders.34

**Group Culture: Artifacts, Symbols, and "Honor"**

Group tradition included identifying signals and artifacts.

Early in his sponsorship of the "Rams," Worker A. observed:

I am still amazed at how highly organized the entire situation is. Each group has its own hand-shake, each group has its own identifying horn blast and recognition signals of all kinds.35

The "Rams" prepared a name plate for Worker A.'s car:

J. and B. had . . . made at school in shop a wooden front name plate for my car which they call "Rammobile." It seems to be beautifully made--they had bought letters with the "R" being large and the rest small. They still have to paint the "Rams" insignia, and they will shortly install it on the front of my car.36

The clubs also had their own pins and key chains, and the "Rams" and the "Knights" had club T-shirts. In addition, the "Knights" had a paddle signed by each member, and a large club symbol.

Club identification could be used to indicate a derogatory view of another club. This also might be viewed as a challenge. The boys termed this "bopping" another club. Worker A. describes:

34Ibid., pp. 65-66.


I likewise learned that if you "bop" someone, you can do it by saying, "'Dasher' bop, bop" or any other club, or you can do it by your horn signal, which is the signal of the particular club plus two blasts at the end of it.37

Honor, or reputation, was a matter of some concern, although evidently not of the intensity found in the lower class delinquent gang. Worker A. describes an instance where a "Ram" criticized his brothers for being cowardly or—as the boys termed it—"candy":

W. then spoke at length about the "Rams" being "candy"—they wouldn't fight and were getting a bad reputation for being so "candy." He said he realized a lot of them don't fight and have never been in a fight but it wouldn't hurt them, just be sure to get in one good lick and this would protect the image of "Rams." H. said . . . they shouldn't always back down—it was a matter of honor. Both H. and W. told the members about how many fights they had to have when they were in the 7th Grade and commented that little A. would fight if necessary—he wasn't "candy . . . ."38

Internally, giving club "honor" was often a means of attesting to a truthful statement and served to settle a dispute:

They talked about a new boy coming into the club. E. said he had talked with him Saturday but he had not yet decided to leave "Dashers." F. said he had talked with the boy and he told him he was not going to leave "Dashers." E. said, "You're a liar." F. stood his ground and said, "E., nobody is going to say 'no' to you because you would beat him up, but they would give me an honest answer." E. still insisted F. was lying. F. stated on his "Rams" honor this was true and gave the "Rams" handshake to the President—this satisfied E.39

---

The Provision For New Members: Pledging And Initiation

New Members were introduced into the clubs through a process involving several identifiable stages. The stages were: nomination

37 Ibid., p. 11.
38 Ibid., p. 93.
39 Ibid., p. 16.
as "rushes," a questioning period by club members, a "tee off," a pledge period, and finally, the "hell night" or initiation. Although these stages were generally common to all clubs, their implementation varied as to details of the ritual (e.g., how many "licks"--strikes with a paddle or substitute object--could be given at tee off), and some stages of the process were omitted in special cases.

The Nomination of New Members

Nomination of new members was a casual process. Little indication is found in the journals that present members actively recruited prospective members, despite a shortage of members among the "Chiefs" and the "Knights" at one point. The "Rams" were the only club to formalize the idea of "rushing." They held "Rush Parties." Worker A. describes the rush party and the boys rationale for these "tests":

The club . . . decided they would have a Rush Party and each member could bring two boys. They would have lunch and then play football with them afterwards on the golf course and in that way they could find out if they liked the boys; also they would make it real rough for them in football to see if they could "take it." Evidently this seems to be one of the requirements for membership--the ability of the boys to "take it."

40 This process is similar to that found by others, although the identification of "stages" varies. For example, Thrasher, op. cit., p. 58, cites one gang boy relating that his group "acquired all the elaborate formulas that characterized the high-school fraternities--pledging with a period of probation, a pin, and a ritual of initiation." Furthermore, the initiation consisted of questioning, a solemn ceremonial with presentation of a pin, and a "roughneck" initiation.


41 "Rams' Journal," p. 15.
Prospective members came to club meetings where they were questioned one at a time by the brothers. Worker L. describes this process at a "Chiefs" meeting:

There were four pledges waiting about 50 yards from where the club was meeting. . . . the boys were brought to the group one at a time and asked why they wanted to join "Chiefs." One question put to them was: "Which comes first--your girl or your club?" The RIGHT answer was "My Club." One pledge was blackballed, and the other three began taking their tee off, which consisted of 10 licks from each member.42

Worker L. indicates a second example of the "Chiefs" actions at this stage:

Toward the end of the meeting two pledges were introduced to the club. F. asked one of the pledges if he could bring a pair of girl's pants to the club. He also asked one of the pledges if he had gone all the way with a girl. K. asked if the pledge became a member, would he attend every meeting. One of the boys asked one of the pledges if they could have a party at his home and the pledge agreed. One of the boys asked if they could pay the $5.00 entrance fee and they both said yes. They asked why they wanted to get into "Chiefs" and they responded they thought it was a good club. The pledges were then asked to leave, and the boys voted on each one individually. If a boy receives two negative votes, he is automatically not given a bid. Both pledges were unanimously accepted.43

Little is found in the journals about the criteria utilized in the decision to accept or "ball" a prospective member. Some inferences can be made that these decisions reflected both the groups' assessment of the prospective member and the groups' assessment of its own needs.

Worker A. describes an instance of the former:

Somebody brought up the O. brothers' names for membership. One boy evidently is in 9th and his brother in 7th. When they voted one of the boys was blackballed and the other was accepted as a pledge. I do not know whether it was the

43Ibid., p. 27.
older or younger one that was accepted. K. brought up L.'s brothers name for membership. There was a violent reaction on the part of L. L. said if his brother became a member, he would quit. He said all his brother would do would go home and tattle-tale to his Mother everything that happened. C. wanted a boy in the 7th grade as a rush. Nobody knew him, and they voted against him, which made C. real mad because the members were voting against someone they didn't even know.44

A second instance describes the latter point:

They then discussed a Rush Party and names were presented, many of those presented being balled, and I think they wound up with about four names. Some of the 7th Grade boys were really concerned because they said the 9th Grade boys were only interested in getting 9th Graders, and unless they got some boys of good size, how were they going to play football next year. It seemed as though every name presented someone wanted to ball immediately, and they decided to ask S. to find some boys from [a neighboring junior high] as possible pledges.45

Size was also a stated criterion in the "Chiefs" "balling" of 4 of 5 prospective members because the four were "too small." The "Rams" balled a prospective member because they felt he was "chicken." Only one hint is found in the journals of the play of religious or ethnic criteria in member acceptance:

A Jewish boy was questioned today about getting into the club. When he was asked if he were Jewish, he said yes, and D. asked if he were rich. He said no. Someone else said he thought all Jews were rich. "Rose" who is Jewish and is a "Chiefs" sponsor, began laughing and said that she was Jewish but she certainly was not rich. When another question was asked about the boy being Jewish, Pam, another sponsor, said that the club ought not to make fun of a person's religion. . . . The boy was not given a bid, and "Rose" said in a half-kidding manner she hoped he would get into the club so she would have a friend.46

Discussion of new members occasionally became heated, with group


pressures evident. Worker A., in describing the "Rams," states:

They discussed at length two prospective pledges. First one of the boys was balled, but after a heated discussion the boys who balled him withdrew their votes. Pressure was very evident.47

The process of accepting new members was occasionally complicated by the interlocking ties between "brother clubs" and shifting membership:

When one of these two boys came into the group to be interviewed, K. asked him if he were willing to take 100 licks from each member and two months pledging. The boy said he would if that was what it took to get in. B. of "Knights" said this guy at one time wanted to get into "Knights." A. asked the boy to leave while they discussed the matter, and the club decided he must be two-faced if he wanted to get into both clubs. There seemed to be a feeling here of the "Chiefs" trying to accommodate the "Knights" and also a feeling this boy wanted too much to be a member. . . .

They asked the other boy, J. to join the group, and the first question always asked is why the pledge wants [sic] to join the club. J. was eyeing the "Knights" members and said he thought the "Chiefs" was a good club. The "Knights" members said this same boy took the tee off from the "Knights" and quit. K. and J. had to quit because his Mother found out and made him. A. asked if J.'s Mother would make him quit this time, and he said she wouldn't find out. . . . The club finally voted J. in, and he took his tee off--3 licks from each member. There were about 25 boys present. Because they were guests of their brother club, the "Knights" got to give 1 lick each.48

Initial Acceptance: The "Tee Off"

The acceptance of a prospective member into pledge status was signaled by the "tee off." The "tee off" consisted of each member whacking the pledge over his backside a certain number of times per member. This was termed "giving licks."49 In certain cases, but

49 Weinstein found this to be such a common part of high school fraternity process that he refers to the "inevitable paddling." George
rarely, the application of other techniques of symbolic degradation was found, apparently when the pledge was viewed as not highly desirable. Worker A., encountering a pledge at a "Rams" tee off, describes his observations:

He looked like a creep, long hair, no sign of personal pride that I could see. He did not seem to be hurt too badly, though he was feeling sick. They had smeared some eggs on him. E. had brought a full jar of vaseline and had rubbed it all over him and then made him roll in the sand. He looked horrible... E. then left him lying on the bank, and the boys seemed to ignore him all during the day with no feeling for him whatsoever. I gathered none of the boys liked him, particularly G., for G. finally got him to quit.51

In cases where a pledge was disliked, the club members would use a greater degree of physical force in the tee off and would at times add additional "testing." Worker L. describes one instance:

Two boys were at the meeting, outside. One of the boys the "Knights" liked, the other one they didn't like. They said they would give both boys tee off, and if the boy they did not like couldn't take it, he would not get in... it seemed the boys strictly wanted to have the boy they didn't like go through tee off just to beat on him. Yet during the tee off, I could see that this boy was starved for attention, and this was giving him attention. I asked the boys before the tee off why they wanted this pledge to go through this if they didn't like him. C. said if he could take it, they [sic] he could be a member. R. said the "Knights" were desperate for members, as they will have only about three members left after graduation. The "Chiefs" were allowed to participate in the tee off but only after the "Knights" had given their licks. The boy they liked was not paddled as hard as the boy they did not like. Each member was to give three licks, and they were not as hard as I have seen them. After they had given two licks each, P. suggested the last lick be waived and the boys go

---

See also: "Gang Busters," Time, January 17, 1949, p. 46.

through a "bull run." R. intervened and said no, but P. and some of the other members insisted on the "bull run." R. said there would be no hitting above the belt line and that they could only use belts not sticks. The two boys went through the "bull run" but the tee off did not end there. C. hit the boy the "Knights" didn't like on the head and the boy began to cry. A. hit him in the stomach and at this point, the boy fell to the ground and seemed to gasp for breath.\textsuperscript{52}

The determination of the number of licks and the strength of their application was usually established by group discussion and "fit" to the given situation. In the following example, the size of the pledge appears to be the main consideration:

J. had given D. the first lick and had given him a hard one. Being such a small boy, he had knocked him over. He immediately gave out the rule no more than two licks for D. and make them light. He said D. did not get more than 5 hard licks. However, K., being a bigger boy, really got it. I could see that K. was hurting, but he seemed real proud he had gone through it.\textsuperscript{53}

Clubs needs were also a consideration:

M. had been asked to stand away from the group until this time. They called M. over and asked him why he wanted to join the "Knights." M. said he thought it was a good club. They talked to him a few minutes and then sent him away. The boys began deciding what M.'s tee off would be and his pledge period. J. said that they ought to go light on M. since they needed more 8th graders in the club. I said that since the club was small, it would seem to me that we should use discretion in our paddling because some of the prospective members had quit after tee off. J. said the word discretion was a good word. The boys discussed this and said that the tee off should be 3 licks per member, using discretion. J. said that during M.'s two-week pledge period he should not have to do anything at school that would get the club into trouble. . . . M. did not know he was going to get tee off, but he consented when the boys gave the impression of not

\textsuperscript{52}"Knights' Journal," p. 34.

\textsuperscript{53}"Rams' Journal," p. 63.
"really going to hurt him." This was as mild a tee off as I have witnessed.\(^{54}\)

The process also appeared to be adjusted to the class standing of the pledge, with 9th graders excused from certain requirements:

They told G. to sit in the car until they talked about his coming into the club. The group decided to give G. 5 licks each, and since he was in the 9th grade, he would get no pledging and no hell night.\(^{55}\)

The object with which the licks were applied was a fraternity paddle. On many occasions, paddles were not present at the time of "tee off." Other objects, such as tree limbs, belts or boards were used. The "Rams" found it necessary to limit the object used:

H. emphasized again the only thing they could use to give licks was a paddle, flat wood board or belt. There would be no tree limbs, logs or anything of that kind used. If they did not bring their own equipment, they could not give licks.\(^{56}\)

The "Knights" found the ritual object itself to be overly formidable:

J. warned about using the thick paddled [sic] they had--said it hurt like a S.O.B. I supported J. in this but Y. said that this was part of getting into the club. . . . After the licks, they wanted G. to take off his pants to see the damage they had done.\(^{57}\)

Expecting physical punishment, some pledges came prepared with devices to mitigate the severity of the blows. Worker L. describes such an instance:

The licks given by A., J., and H. were pretty hard. Z. did not seem to be hurt, and I learned later that he had on two pairs of underwear, a sock in each pocket, among other things.\(^{58}\)


\(^{55}\)Ibid., pp. 43-44.

\(^{56}\)"Rams' Journal," p. 96.

\(^{57}\)"Knights' Journal," pp. 43-44.

The number of licks was also adjusted to externally imposed contingencies. For example, the "Rams" attempted to limit the number of licks given at tee off after the Mother of a new pledge complained about the physical condition of her son after the tee off.

A Period of Testing: Pledging

After the "tee-off," a prospective member "pledged" for a period generally two-weeks in duration. During this period a pledge would do the bidding of members. What actions a member could legitimately command a pledge to take were often adjusted by discussion:

Considerable discussion was held about what you can do to a pledge. A number of the boys took issue with X. about slapping a pledge publicly; also, they took issue with G. about telling a pledge at the bus station to "fall on his head." It seemed to be general agreement that any individual had the right to make a pledge do anything asked, but not to do it publicly or to his embarrassment.59

This "agreement" was often violated by requiring certain actions of a pledge in public:

One of the boys . . . who was taken in and had his tee off was at the Burger King, and they were having him act as a gunner in an airplane, making various noises like a gun shooting down the enemy. This was part of the initiation procedure, and all of the other people at Burger King were watching in amazement.60

Pledges were also commanded to do various tasks at parties:

The pledges were working real hard opening doors, passing out food, doing various bids and commands of the brothers, but all in good fun and no one was being hurt. They would make them do push-ups and things like that.61


60Ibid., p. 17.

61Ibid., p. 86.
The Rite of Passage: Initiation

After successful pledging, the prospective member was accepted at an initiation the boys called "hell night." Except in rare instances, "hell night" took place in the afternoon. It's occurrence in daylight hours was a matter of concern to the "Rams":

C. said when we have Hell Night it ought to be at night not during the day as it is much scarier.

Some weeks later the matter arose again:

Quite an argument was held around Hell night, [several boys] wanting it held at night because it was more scary. E. and G. were opposed to it--E. thinking the police would catch up with them and he didn't want to go to jail--G. saying when you had it at night, no one came.

Hell nights were apparently scheduled as frequently as there was someone to initiate. Often they were scheduled for only one initiate. Hell night ritual always included the giving of licks and


63"Rams' Journal," p. 11.

64Ibid., p. 42.

often also involved the application of some substance to the initiate.\(^66\)

Exactly what was to occur was established by group discussion:

Most of the "Rams" were assembled with their paddles, eggs, and what have you. . . . M. said . . . he wasn't going to join "Rams" as he wasn't wanted. He had already been through Tee Off and had served as a pledge for two weeks. . . . G. very vehemently opposed M. coming into the club. Evidently he had been beating on M. trying to get him to quit, because G. does not like him. There was quite a bit of discussion concerning the Constitution and the fact that it would take two-thirds now to ball M. They did not agree on this and said any two members could ball him, if that was what they wanted to do. A number of the "Rams" stuck up for M., and finally when the vote was taken, M. was balled by G. and R. This created quite a bit of bad feeling toward R. They asked him why he balled M., and G. prompted him saying he didn't have to give his reasons. R. replied that if they would remember, he had continuous [sic] balled him and hadn't changed his position. . . . They also decided not to accept S. since this was the second Hell Night he had missed.\(^67\)

---

\(^{66}\)Observers of the secondary school fraternity and sorority often find this a part of initiation. See: Raymond A. Green, "Secret Societies: The Case Against High School Fraternities and Sororities," National Educational Association Journal, XXXIX (May, 1950), 338-39; and Weinstein, op. cit., p. 47.

The initiation rituals of the groups studied in this dissertation were hardly as severe as some described in the literature. For example, note this description of a Portland, Oregon high school fraternity initiation:

"On 'Hell Night' he had been taken to a faraway golf course 'where the cops can't hear you yell,' forced to drink a mixture of a searing hot sauce compounded with pepper and garlic, and ordered to smoke a handful of cigars, inhaling every puff. After he vomited, the 'hackers' went to work, whacked him 50 times with an inch-thick paddle."

Note also the description of a newly initiated member by that member's mother:

"He hardly looked human. He was covered with blood, molasses and sawdust, and was shaking with spasms. . . . He was covered with red marks across his back and buttocks, the latter broken in many places and swollen. . . ."


A. R. Crane, "Pre-Adolescent Gangs: A Typological Interpretation," p. 115, calls this sort of task an "ordeal by indignity," and cites as an example the rolling of a pledge in wet cow manure.

A priority was established to indicate the order of giving licks:

H. indicated the priority of the members in giving licks with the officers being first, then those who had been members longest and finally the most recent members.68

Hell nights were not without injury,69 but for the most part the ritual degradation involved less hazardous experiences. Worker A. describes two hell nights that so indicate:

When all had gathered, they decided they were going to have hell night for the two pledges, . . . the pledges had brought other clothes with them. They broke off tree limbs, branches of various sorts and sizes, picked up sticks and paddles (some had paddles) and took off for the woods behind the Lab school. . . . When I saw them reassembling under the trees, I knew hell night was over and went back and joined them. The two now new members were sitting on the ground, both of them soaking wet, as evidently they had been made to jump into the pond behind the Lab School.70

The club then decided they would go to the W. house and have hell night on the golf course. The only activity up until now was tomatoes smeared over the S. boy—he seemed all right. . . . X. had some eggs and some Tabasco sauce to feed the pledges.71

A Functional Substitute for Tee Off or Hell Night: The "Bull Run"

When pledges balked at taking licks in the Tee Off or Hell Night ritual, the boys often established an alternative or

68Ibid., p. 80.

69The activities described here are similar to other incidents within the county in which these clubs are located. For example, a description of a local high school student's initiation reached print in one local newspaper. The student "said he was blindfolded, taken to woods near the Cutler power plant last Sunday, beaten with an inch-thick wooden paddle until it broke, and made to eat hot sauces and onions for 45 minutes." "Palmetto Probes Fraternity Beating," Miami News, September 29, 1967, p. 11-A.


71Ibid., p. 88.
supplementary test: the "bull run." Worker L. describes this test:

One pledge could not take the licks, and they seemed to hurt him considerably. He walked away from the group but G. went after him and after some talking persuaded him to go through a "bull run" instead of taking licks. This consisted of the boys lining up on two sides—each boy had either a belt or long switch and the pledge ran through this "bull run" three times. 72

The test was the same by each of the other clubs, although the objects used and the number of run-throughs in the bull run varied. Worker A. describes the "Rams" version:

One of the boys who had been pledging, . . . showed up, and they decided to give him his hell night. . . . They gave him quite a number of licks and then made him run four times through what they called a "bull run." Each member tore off a small branch from the trees and as the pledge ran through the bull run they would lash him. . . . The girls seemed quite upset because the boy's back was covered with welts, . . . They said the boys really seemed to enjoy this and they couldn't understand it. I saw the boy's back, and it was pretty welted but not bleeding. 73

Finally, Worker L. describes the "Knights" use of the bull run:

The boys then brought in the new pledge and asked him several questions. They asked him to leave and decided to give him 6 licks by each member and that the "Chiefs" present could give one lick. J. said he should have only 3 days of pledging since he was in 9th grade. . . . The boys then took the pledge, . . . and J. began to hit him with a paddle which was about five feet long. After J. had hit him three times, N. said to change paddles because the long one really hurt. J. did so but continued to hit very hard. . . . At one point the pledge was going to quit but the boys talked him into running through a bull run instead of taking the licks. The boys lined up in two rows with sticks, paddles and belts, and the pledge ran down the middle three times. 74


74"'Knights' Journal," p. 45.
Providing for Re-Entry: Licks or the "Round Robin"

Each club provided for re-entry of members who had left the club of their own volition. Often this was by administering licks after a period of questioning. Worker L. describes one re-entry:

D. was getting back into "Chiefs." . . . The club questioned D. as to why he had quit "Chiefs" and he said it was because the West Miami group was trying to take over the club. K. asked if it weren't also because H. was going to bring his name up for blackball, and D. said that had something to do with it. N. asked if D. would quit again if he got back into the club, and he said he didn't know the answer to that question. He said he probably would quit if he got mad enough. A., who was acting President since L. was not there, gave D. 20 licks, and D. is now considered a member of the club again.75

The "Rams" also established an alternative they called the "Round Robin." Worker A. describes this process:

The first item of business had to do with bringing back in an old member who had been out of "Rams" for a year or more. J. reminded them that he was to receive 20 licks. The boys argued with J. as to who was to give the 20 licks and wanted to have a round robin. J. agreed to this--every member would be allowed one lick with the Sergeant-at-arms administering the difference between the number present and 20. The boys immediately tore off limbs from trees and then called S. over. They line up in order of rank and in order of their getting into "Rams." They had all agreed that all of the licks should be real hard. S. bent over and G. held him. J. did not give any licks--the first one was B., Vice-President. B. gave a pretty good lick. G. asked B. to give his for him and please give a real easy one, which B. did. E. then administered 5 hard licks with a belt. The boy began to cry. He would rub his rear and then get ready for the rest. Most of the boys gave real hard licks, . . . R. came over to me . . . and said now watch the new members, they will give easy licks because they will feel sorry for him, . . . As I watched, this was true, . . . the last one, . . . was H.--they were all hooting for him to hit real hard. Though I don't think he wanted to, the pressure of the group was such that he gave a pretty good one. While the licks were being given, the boy cried out several times. Immediately following the licks, the boy was crying--all of

75"'Chiefs' Journal," p. 25.
the "Rams" went up to him, gave him the "Rams" grip and welcomed him back into the club. Amid tears you could see real joy at being back in the club and the real pleasure of the "Rams" in having him back in. 76

Sanctions and Their Use

The fraternities developed three primary formal sanctions: the "lick," fines, and "balling." The "lick" was applied as a stroke of a paddle or substitute object across the backside of a member. Licks as sanctions for misbehavior were applied by the Sergeant-at-arms, usually away from the meeting itself. Officers were often immune to having the sanction applied. Since the Sergeant-at-arms was one of the bigger and more aggressive boys, licks were not always accepted docilely:

J. was ruled out of order by the President, and the Sergeant-at-Arms [sic] E., took him outside. There was no paddle so he used a tree limb and broke it over his posterior. J. came in and sat down. Later in the meeting, J. was out of order again, and the President ruled another lick. J. pleaded couldn't he pay a 50¢ fine--evidently he was real scared of E. The President insisted he have a lick and out they went. J. would not stay still, and E. had to call for help, and you could hear J. saying, "No, No." There was much laughter on the part of the "Rams" and all crowded to the edge of the screen enclosure, all laughing at J. Finally B., K. and R. went out and held J. while the lick was administered. J. talks a lot, but from that time on, he stayed quiet. 77

In the absence of a paddle, substitute objects were used to administer licks. In addition to the tree branch, mentioned, above, Worker A. says:

Quite a number of licks were given to those who owed money

76"Rams' Journal," p. 70.
77Ibid., p. 15.
for missing meetings. Since there were no paddles around, licks were administered by E. with a school book.78

Licks were applied for a variety of actions which disrupted meetings, such as being out of order, cursing or speaking out of turn, arriving late, and "foolishness" or not saying the Lord's Prayer promptly at the close of meetings. "Breaking club honor" was a more heavily sanctioned offense, as was "fighting among brothers." Licks were also applied for failure to pay dues on time and for failure to pay dues after a promise to do so. Each of these offenses was moderately sanctioned. Licks were also established to encourage attendance at club activities. A number was set, and often applied, for missing meetings, football or softball practice or games, and being absent from hell night without an excuse. Also sanctioned by licks were violative acts involving members and the school or community, i.e., being truant, being involved in a car theft, being drunk at a social function, and not attending a school-sponsored "dress-up day."

The number of licks would vary, but not according to a systematic predetermined quota for a given offense, despite group discussions about fixing the penalty for given acts. More often, the group considered a specific incident and in discussion established the number of licks to be given for an offense:

K. said V. should get only two licks for getting drunk. P. and F. said he should get 10. R. said that "all of us drink a little." M. said V. puked in the yard. F. said no one but V. got drunk. They called V. in. R. asked everyone to be quiet. He asked V. to explain himself. . . . V. stammered and answered a few questions. . . . P. took V. and gave him ten licks.

78Ibid., p. 65.
F. said they were not hard enough. V. rubbed his butt and seemed back in good graces again.79

The symbolic function of the administration of licks seemed more important than any physical discomfort produced. Most of those who functioned as Sergeant-at-arms--permanant or temporary--did not hit hard when applying licks. Furthermore, licks were not always applied to all violators or in all instances of violation.

Fines

Fines were used infrequently. The "Knights" fined each of two girl sponsors 25c for talking during a meeting. This behavior by boys was punished by licks. Girls were not paddled. In addition, fines were also combined with licks for certain offenses, usually late payment of dues or missed meetings.

Black-balling

Black-balling, which the youths termed "balling," was the most severe sanction utilized by the groups. In addition to its use in disqualifying prospective members, balling was used to expell members and/or sponsors from the group. On occasions this sanction was applied for what appears to be a minor offense, e.g., the "Knights" expelled a member because he had missed a previous meeting without an excuse, and the "Rams" expelled a member for failing to attend club functions. Actually, balling was usually the culmination of growing disfavor with a particular member. Worker A. describes the mechanics of this process, and the passage indicates also the persistence with which the boys attack a member in disfavor:

79"'Knights' Journal," p. 11.
The first item of business was a discussion about balling M. In order to ball someone, you have to have two-thirds of the total club membership. When they arrived at two-thirds of 16, it took at least 10 balls to get rid of M. Since there were only 10 members present, if anyone voted against balling him, that meant he could not be excluded. They took a vote and R. and P. held out. This brought on quite a discussion about M., including that he had been fighting with "Chiefs," went to the "Dashers" party, etc. After a lot of pressuring, they tried again for a vote and still could not get enough votes to ball him. They then said they would consider it during the meeting and vote again at the end of the meeting.

Again they brought up M. Now the discussion got hot. They voted again and still didn't have enough balls. H. announced they wouldn't vote again until next week. Someone brought up the idea of letting the girls vote and this would give them enough balls. N. said the girls could not vote on pledges or rushes so how could they vote on balling someone. H. said the new Constitution said the club itself could decide if the girls could vote and that it would just take a majority. So they voted and it was decided the girls could vote. Again a vote was taken on M. Two girls voted for balling him and one voted against it so they were not any better off than before. But they were not to be denied. N., P., and B. had voted not to ball M., and now every pressure was put on them to change their vote. They said if M. heard about it, he would quit "Rams" and that would make the club look bad. Another vote was taken, and H. said this would be the last one—this he had said seven times previously. Again they didn't get enough balls, and there were some who abstained from voting. They had a long discussion about this. More pressure was applied. Finally amid great dissatisfaction by some individuals they changed their vote, and they finally got M. balled.

Social Sanctions

The threat of invoking the black-ball was also used as a sanction. In addition, the boys used persuasion, name-calling, and attempts to shame as social sanctions:

The boys met some girls and asked them if they wanted a ride home. . . . J. rode with his arm around one of the girls. After the girls got out, A. said that J., as Vice-President, should not have his arm around such a slut. J.  

said that he did not like the girl, but the girl liked him. What should he do? He thought he should be nice to her. ... A. protested and said that J. should not be nice to a girl with such a reputation by putting his arm around her.81

Also:

They asked P. if he were willing to take the tee off. He said he did not think so. A. said it would prove he was a man. M. said R. and T. and others went through the same thing. They asked if he were chicken. They called him candy and chicken. A. told him to go pack to Israel (he is Jewish). The boy slowly walked away.82

An Assessment of the Function of Paddling

The "licks" served as a test of physical endurance and "toughness" of prospective members. Worker L. often queried the boys about why they paddled. Responses varied, but most signaled an inability to fully articulate the reasons for paddling.83 At times, the boys saw giving licks as establishing some sort of equity. For example, Worker L. states:

I asked [J.] what purpose it served. K. spoke up and said it was for initiation. I asked G. why he hit so hard, and he said it was because they hit him hard.84

Others might indicate that these endurance experiences make better members. Worker L. observes:

As the licks were being given, I noticed that most of the members only tapped the pledge but some of them hit quite

81"'Knights' Journal," p. 42.

82 Ibid., p. 10.

83 This was also found by Schwartz and Merton, op. cit., p. 1121. They state that respondents "were uniformly unable to offer even the most minimal rationale for the entire ritual complex, and they could not explain the significance of particular acts and symbols."

84"'Knights' Journal," p. 22.
hard. I noticed A.'s eyes got very big and stary when he hit a pledge real hard. I called him aside after his turn and asked him why he hit so hard. A. . . . said he did not like the boy. I talked with C., a High School boy and an alumnus, about hitting so hard. He said that the harder you hit the better member he makes. . . . It seems that if the boys generally like a pledge they will give licks in moderation but still test the pledge for his ability to take them.85

Some indicated that passing the test signaled qualities of manhood.

One "Knight" told Worker L. that if a pledge took the licks, "it would prove he was a man."86 Another responded to Worker L. in a similar manner:

I . . . asked them to help me understand why they paddled. A. said he wasn't sure if they (he) knew. P. said it was to see if they could take it. D. said if they could take it, they were a man--not cry--candy. I asked if crying meant you weren't a man. All said they had cried when they were initiated. Someone said that if it were hard to get in, the member would appreciate it more.87


86"Knights' Journal," p. 10. The literature is replete with statements about a concern for masculinity being a common trait among boys in male youth subculture. See, especially, Walter Miller, "Lower Class Culture As a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," 5-19. Albert Cohen, op. cit., pp. 158-68, attributes this trait to middle class males in youth subcultures too.

See also: David Matza and Gresham M. Sykes, "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values," American Sociological Review, XXVI (October, 1961), 712-19. They state: "the concept of machismo, of the path to manhood through the ability to take it and hand it out, is foreign to the average delinquent only in name." David Matza, Delinquency and Drift (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), p. 156, adds: "As compared to other youth, the adherents of sub-cultural delinquency are especially entranced by the time-honored precepts of manliness. Manliness is their special anxiety and obsession."

In addition, see: Talcott Parsons, "Certain Primary Sources and Patterns of Aggression in the Social Structure of the Western World," Psychiatry, X (May, 1947), 167-81.

Finally, Worker L. describes another answer, and gives his assessment of the function of paddling:

I asked W. why they paddled. He said that everyone was down on you all week and this was one way to get it out. I said, "On another boy." He said, "We all went through it." W. said he didn't cry until after forty licks. . . . I feel these boys see a man as one who takes licks without crying--does not show feeling--as one who fights--who is big physically. . . . They emasculate a pledge--he must be willing to suffer to be one of them. It is almost a religious rite. After the boys has [sic] suffered, he wears his pin with pride--he does not miss a meeting because he has put out to get in.88

88Ibid., p. 10.
APPENDIX II

THE FRATERNITIES IN COMMUNITY CONTEXT

In this appendix additional facets of club behavior are explored. Attention is given to the social context in which these behaviors occur.

Other Group Activities

Aside from club organization activities, such as meetings, hell-nights, etc., the fraternities engaged in a variety of activities, almost entirely of a recreational nature.

Fraternity Parties

The most common recreational activities were parties. Parties were held in homes of members, at a branch of the YMCA, the gym of a local church, a local VFW post, the hall of an adult fraternal organization, and in local parks. In many cases, attendance included high school boys and girls. Many took place without troublesome incidents.

On other occasions, parties were less troublefree. Worker A. gives an example:

The "Rams" party was held at the Southwest Branch of the YMCA... [Worker L.] took a bag containing some beer away from H. and put it in my car. By 9:00 PM, 150 or more had gathered, including "Rams," "Dashers," "Chiefs," "Knights," "Gammas," "Pikes," and many High School boys and girls. The police came around 9:00 PM saying the music was so loud it could be heard all the way to Miller Road and would have to be quieted down for if they received any more complaints, they would have to close the dance. The boys finally got the band quieted down a little.
During the evening two fights developed, one between J. and Y. of the "Dashers" and added to this was E. and S., President of "Dashers." I think the President of "Pikes" was also involved. This was broken up very quickly and this was the only fighting we observed. During the evening a boy from "Buffalos" arrived all upset. His younger brother had been beaten up at school by a member of "Dashers". . . . On the road, about 30 or 40 "Buffalos" gathered, together with some others, and I did some fast talking to keep them from going down to the pavilion where we could really have had some trouble. They finally left. 

Adults were minimally present at parties. Parents at whose home a party was held were often relegated to distant parts of the house by youthful pressure or at times left the premises, apparently with relatively little concern as to what would occur. Worker A. relates:

There was a party at a girls home . . . Friday night. . . . I took [several "Rams"] to the party. . . . By the time we arrived, there was quite a crowd gathered. I . . . waited while the boys went to see how the party was and decide if they would stay. . . . T. came out and said he wasn't going to stay, that there was a bunch of "greasers" present, that the band had left because there were no parents or adults present and there was no record player or radio in the house. Evidently the girl's parents had gone out for the evening and turned the home over to the daughter. . . . most of the boys were unhappy since there was no music and nothing to do as far as they were concerned. 

Yet despite a minimum of parental supervision at parties, on no occasion reported by the workers did these gatherings errupt into group conflict. Drinking by a few and the presence of high school age youths remained a "problem" to the workers.

Late in the first year of sponsorship, Workers took more active steps to assist the clubs in enforcing "no drinking at parties" rules. One way seen to assist in this was to exclude high school age youths

1Worker A., "'Rams' Journal" (YMCA of Greater Miami), p. 59. (Mimeographed.)

2Ibid., p. 64.
Worker A. describes one rather intense effort and the results:

[Worker L.] had obtained chains and locks so that all of the doors to the gym could be locked. We worked with the custodian of the Church and secured all doors with the exception of one entry way to the gym. . . . Two City of Miami policemen had been employed, one to work outside and the other to work with [Worker L.] at the door--I was to be around the dance floor itself.

Almost all of the "Rams" were present, and with the "Knights," "Chiefs," and "Pikes," we had around 200 young people during the evening. Since the clubs had made rules there would be no drinking, no one would be allowed in who was not a member or a date of a member, we were able to keep all High School boys and girls out. . . . As far as I could gather, no High School boys and girls were at the party. When they tried to get in and were turned away, the policeman outside made them move on and not linger or loiter around.

Since the ruling had been made that anyone with alcohol on his breath would be turned away and not allowed at the party, I, at least, did not come in contact with any alcohol at all during the course of the evening, nor did [Worker L.] or the police have to turn anyone away for this reason. 3

Dress at parties was discussed prior to the occasion and varied in formality. More "formal" attire was worn in what the "Rams" called a "coat and tie" party. Their conception of "semi-formal" attire is revealed in the following:

They next discussed the alumni party, which they agreed would be two days after school closed and would be semi-formal--just school clothes. 4

Aside from dress, the gatherings varied in their "formality". Worker A. describes one very "informal get-together":

At the request of several members of "Rams," I dropped in on an informal get-together at the home of one of the girl sponsors, . . . I arrived about 8:30 PM, and there

---

3 Ibid., pp. 76-77. This party is also described by Worker L., "'Knights' Journal" (YMCA of Greater Miami), p. 36. (Mimeographed.)

must have been 30 to 40 boys and girls gathered, in very informal clothes, no parents present at the home. Boys and girls were lying around on couches and chairs or on the floor. There were boys and girls in bedrooms, and these all seemed to be High School children. The windows were all closed so that the noise from the inside would not disturb the neighbors. There was no air conditioning, and the heat in the living room area was almost unbearable. It smelled like a stable with all of the sweating boys around. I felt like I was slumming.

Several comments from the "Rams" indicated their dislike of this type party, not for themselves so much as it seems the High School crowd always show up drinking and the sex and bedroom activities are not really to the Jr. High boys and girls liking, but they can't control the older boys.5

Parties were not without some expense. Clubs, for example, paid from $75 - $90 for a band for their parties. Another party was budgeted at $100, the "Rams" stating that the $100 had been given to them for the party. At joint parties, expenses were shared, apparently prorated on the basis of how much each club could afford at the time. Worker A. describes one instance of shared expense of no little sum for junior high school youths:

It was decided the "Rams" would provide $70.00; "Chiefs" $50.00; "Knights" $30.00 - $35.00; and they would ask the "Pikes" for $50.00 instead of their providing another band. The total cost appeared to be $90.00 for the band, $85.00 for the hall and $30.00 for the policemen, or a total of $205.00. With each club giving as outlined above, the club would have just enough money to cover the cost of the party.6

When club treasuries did not contain amounts sufficient to cover party expenses, clubs "assessed" members an amount sufficient to cover costs.

Despite the frequency of these parties, the youths never spent meeting time discussing the meaning of these gatherings. The closest they came to "analysis" of these parties was the reaction of several

5Ibid., p. 9.
6Ibid., p. 75.
"Rams" to the patterns apparently typical of club parties. Worker A. relates:

In the discussion of their parties, they said a lot of the members acted like a bunch of "jocks" with the boys all standing together talking about football and other things among themselves, and the girls all together talking about their hair-dos, dresses, etc.--when they had a party, everyone ought to dance--it was stupid to pay money just to talk to your friends.7

Picnics and Athletic Activities

Social activities were often tied to initiations, or "tee-offs."

These included a "Rams Outing" at which, in addition to the tee-off, the "Rams" engaged in boating and water skiing. The "Rams" also held co-ed picnics which combined dating, athletic games, and--on occasion--initiations. Worker A. describes a "Rams" picnic:

The "Rams" held their picnic at Matheson Hammock... there were about 15 girls present. The girls brought the food, sandwiches, potato chips, cookies, and the club supplied the cokes. The first part of the afternoon the boys played tackle football, and while they rested, the girls played. Later in the afternoon the boys held about an hour's practice on offensive formations and seemed to be getting things down real well... Following practice, the boys and girls played tackle football together and the picnic ended at 4:00 PM. All of the boys and girls seemed to have a very fine time together. No one disappeared from the party... There was no tee off or hell night.8

Of great enjoyment to the "Rams" was an evening of dinner and activity at the downtown YMCA. Worker A. describes this occasion:

The earliest arrivals came about 5:40 PM. They immediately took over the office,... Others went into the Board Room where we were to eat,... Most of them couldn't wait to go to the gym and look around. Others began drifting in, arriving upstairs and then disappearing... 

7Ibid., p. 103.

8Ibid., p. 104.
... I thought I had them all assembled when they started disappearing. Some of the boys had gone to the Weight Room and watched three or four good-sized men working out with weights. They came back and reported they had never seen such big guys and this produced a mass exodus to look at the men lifting weights. They then returned with many comments about the size of the men and their muscles and wondering if they couldn't get them to join the "Rams" to play football against the "Dashers."

We finally came to dinner. R. agreed to say Grace and led the group in the Lord's Prayer. D. must have been starved as I have never seen a plate so heaping full of food in my life. He had 7 pieces of chicken, potato salad, eggs--really stacked up--and he was the last to finish. Dinner was very orderly. . . . The girls helped scrape the plates and clean up. While this was going on, the boys again disappeared to the Weight Room to watch the men.

I told the boys the rules and regulation in the swimming pool--no running and no pushing anyone in. . . . there was a mass exodus to the gym. Many did not have shorts so we got shorts for them at the cage. . . . The boys had the guest locker room, and by the time I was dressed and upstairs, there [sic] were all over the place. Two or three wrestling, some were in the gym swinging on ropes, some running the track and others in the weight room lifting weights. I brought up four paddles, and the boys immediately wanted to play paddleball. We explained the rules of the game and also took them to the handball court and explained the rules, giving them gloves to play with.

At 8:00 PM it was time for them to go swimming. When they found out that at the "Y" you don't have to wear bathing suits, they seemed real excited and I gathered they never had the opportunity of swimming in the nude. They took their showers and went into the pool. A few men who were in the pool when the boys arrived quickly left. Some of the boys did not go swimming and wanted to continue playing handball and paddleball. Some went swimming, would get out put on their shorts and play in the gym, then come back to the pool. . . . At 8:30 we wound up the evening. 9

In addition to intra-fraternity athletic contests (See p. 228 of this Appendix) the boys also engaged in unorganized athletic activities. They held football or softball "practices," often in anticipation of meeting another fraternity in a game. On those occasions

9 Ibid., pp. 22-24.
when the practice did not involve preparation for group contests, attendance was often sporadic and many such practices had to be cancelled for poor participation. In other sporting activities, Worker L. accompanied several "Chiefs" or "Knights" on target shooting or hunting expeditions. The boys often went together as spectators to organized athletic contests in the community. Worker L. accompanied "Chiefs" on some occasions to watch local junior-college fraternities play football, and to several intercollegiate football games involving the local University. The "Chiefs" were fond of swimming in a local "rock pit." During the spring of the first year of sponsorship, Worker L. took six "Knights" and one "Chief" on an Easter weekend camping trip to the YMCA Camp Florida.

Types And Patterns Of Normative Violation

By far the most frequent type of norm violative behavior was the use and abuse of alcohol. Most frequently drinking behavior occurred at parties and typically involved the consumption of beer.  


See also: James F. Short, Jr., Ray A. Tennyson, and Kenneth I. Howard, "Behavior Dimensions of Gang Delinquency," *American Sociological Review*, XXVIII (June, 1963), 411-28. They found the use of alcohol the most common "delinquent" activity engaged in by gang boys. Use was reported by almost 90% of a sample of about 600 gang boys studied. In
Use and Abuse of Alcohol

The workers made a major effort to encourage the boys to lessen or prohibit drinking at parties. Rarely drunken "sprees," the parties usually involved some consumption of alcoholic beverages by some members of the clubs. Much of this consumption was covert, and the workers were not always able to ascertain the amount of drinking. On one occasion, Worker L. applied his own "measure of incidence," finding (perhaps to his surprise): "About 11:00 PM I went around the building to see how much drinking had occurred and I found one beer can."


Figures given by Short, et. al., supra, footnote 10, could be read to mean that drinking was supported by the subculture of the gang, particularly in view of the pattern of abstinence revealed in Coleman's sample of high school males, most of whom are not likely to be participants in gangs. See Coleman, supra, footnote 10. On the other hand, Maddox and McCall, loc. cit., found that youth culture support of drinking patterns is not apparent. The fraternities studied in this dissertation tended to condemn excessive drinking as they established group norms. Their pattern is not indicative of overt support for drinking, and approximates the middle class version of drinking patterns. See, for example: Bertram Spiller, "Delinquency and Middle Class Goals," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, LV (December, 1965), 463-78. Spiller states that the middle class "version of drinking is characterized by light to moderate consumption of alcohol in individual or group situations accompanied by a concern for concealment, disapproval of excessive, conspicuous drinking, and condemnation of violative behavior resulting from drinking." In contrast, he states that the lower class version is characterized by "open, conspicuous, even flamboyant, heavy to moderate drinking in a group or individual situation, accompanied by expressed or covert approval of drunkenness, violative behavior, inhibition release, and aggression." Both quotations from p. 466.

Worker L., "'Chiefs' Journal" (YMCA of Greater Miami), p. 16. (Mimeographed)
At some of the parties, the High School "crowd" was involved in the drinking behavior, with sponsored club activity in this area at a minimum:

The only member of "Rams" who left to get something to drink was M.--there was no evidence of drinking by any of the other "Rams" present. As usual with the High School crowd, there was drinking going on in the cars, . . . There were two fights during the course of the evening. . . . What started the fights I do not know, except that alcohol played a large part.13

Those excessively drunk would usually number only two or three, yet they became the focal point of Worker concern. Most often, the alcohol they consumed was obtained off the premises of the party, and they arrived drunk. Worker A. describes one such party:

[I went] to the "Rams party at the home of Dr. S., . . . The party was being held in the outdoor patio, . . . . . . the "Rams" were outnumbered by High School and College boys and girls. I would estimate between 200 and 300 boys and girls showed up . . . Dr. and Mrs. S. did not want any drinking at all, . . . I told Dr. S. we could not control the drinking in Coral Gables but would see that no beer or liquor was brought onto their property or in the dance area. Continuously during the evening we had to send boys back to their cars when they were carrying beer and told them they would have to confine their drinking, if they were going to drink, to their automobiles and not to throw their cans and bottles around.

K. said he had a quart of beer to drink, . . . During the evening, J. disappeared and returned to the party dead drunk. He passed out cold on the lawn, and the "Rams" picked him up and carried him like a sack into the house. Dr. S. got a cot out and put him on it. J. was real sick. I saw B. lug a bucket off to dump, and I remarked to B., "I hope you are enjoying yourself."

Around 10:00 PM E. arrived. He had been drinking and continuously would go off to one of the cars and get more to drink. Later that evening I saw him real sick under the trees. . . .

None of the crowd was so drunk they could not stand up, they would walk along the patio on the sidewalk, trying

---

13"Rams' Journal, p. 100.
to walk real straight but staggering at times. The party ended at 11:00 PM without any incidents at all, and I am glad it didn't go on until 11:30, for if it had, with the continuous drinking in the cars, it might have gotten out of hand.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite the passage of a club rule against drinking at their social functions, some "Rams" continued this behavior. Worker A. states:

I feel that while the "Rams" have the rule of no drinking at their parties, there is some under-current going on among the boys who do drink and I feel that... they may be planning [at the next party] to stash away some beer at the edges... I think one of the real drinkers in the club is N. because his nickname is "The Sponge."\textsuperscript{15}

Near the close of the first year of sponsorship of the "Chiefs," Worker L. asked several boys why they got drunk. He describes their answers:

K. . . . said drinking was fun. F. said you forgot your troubles. H. said every time he walked in the door at home there was one explosion after another. A. said it was fun being drunk. L. said he only got drunk about once a month but that he did not smoke. Several said there wasn't anything wrong with drinking. I said I was not talking about drinking but about being drunk... F. said if you were drunk, you could do things with girls easier and then the next day say that you were drunk. F. asked me what would you do if you didn't drink. I asked why they couldn't enjoy talking with each other like we were doing. I said if their personality had to depend on getting high, then they were in bad shape. I said I felt they were using drinking as a crutch and they were "candy" to get drunk. "Candy" is a word they use to indicate a sissy. K. said I had no right to say this since I had never been drunk and did not know what I was talking about. At one point I asked them why there was a law against minors drinking, and L. said it was because they did not know how to handle it. K. said it was a good thing there was a law because they had to get out of sight when they drank and probably would not drink as much. . . . F. said that in Cuba there was no law against minors

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., pp. 31-32.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 98.
drinking and that it was not a problem there like it was here.16

Sexual Activity

Some concern was manifest on the part of the worker as to the boys' sexual behavior. On various occasions, Worker L. suspected that one or another of the "Knights" was having sexual relations, although he never directly witnessed such activity:

Five of the "Knights," . . . wanted me to let them off at a certain home which I did not recognize as being the home of one of the members. K., G., D., P., and J. went into the house. As I drove away, I asked R. whose home it was and he said he didn't know. Things became quiet in the car, and it dawned on me possibly this was a girl's home. I went back to pick up some more boys and as we came back by the house, I asked R. if he minded if I stopped. He said no, and then asked me what I was going to do. I said I didn't know. I went into the home. Two Junior High School girls met me at the door and said the boys were helping them clean up the house. I walked into the living room where D. was smoking a cigarette, and I noticed his hand was shaking. P. was lying on the couch. I didn't know what to say and asked the boys if they wanted a ride home. G. went to the back of the house, opened a bedroom door where J. was. I did not walk back into the bedroom. The boys, led by P., said they would take a ride home. When they got outside and saw the car was crowded, they said they would wait. I told them I would be back. . .

I went back to pick up the other boys, and when they got into the car, J. asked me why I came back to pick them up and I said I was afraid they would "pump up" the neighborhood. P. laughed, and this helped to break some of the tenseness. I asked the boys what would happen if one of the girls became pregnant. G. said they weren't doing anything and that D. was the only one in one of the rooms with a girl by himself. D. said he didn't do anything. I tried to get into a discussion of sex and its normal expression. J. said he had known everything about sex since 4th grade.17

16"'Chiefs' Journal," p. 36.

17"'Knights' Journal," p. 22.
Worker L. queried the boys on their attitudes toward girls who were "easy marks" at their school:

B. talked about the different girls who were "sluts" at [School S]. B. and J. talked about this freely. At one point I asked what made a girl a "slut." Both boys said it was a girl who had sex relations with anybody and everybody. They mentioned several girls. B. said it was funny because one of the girls he mentioned was always talking about how she disliked "sluts." I asked B. if the girls realized they were being used. He thought they knew but that they didn't care. 18

Other Violations

There were several acts of normative violation which brought one or another group or some member in conflict with the law or some segment of the community. These acts ranged from serious violations of law to ones of "questionable integrity." Both such types of acts are indicated by Worker L. in the following passage:

J. mentioned that he was working during the Christmas holidays selling Christmas trees. I asked J. if he would sell his old advisor one at half price. He looked at me seriously and said he couldn't do that. I asked why. J. asked me in a serious way if I wanted him to switch tags on one of the trees. I laughed and laughed. J. said C. had quit "Knights" and had gotten into some trouble recently and was in jail. . . .

The boys talked about R. and how he was in on stealing the car for which C. was put in jail. R. said no one knew about that and asked the boys not to say anything about it to anyone else. 19

In addition the club members engaged in a variety of acts observers

18 Ibid., p. 55.
19 Ibid., pp. 54-55.
consider typical of male adolescent activity in favored economic circumstances.  

One of the most serious violations in which the "Rams" were involved concerned the theft of money from a parent at whose home a party was held. Worker A. states:

My phone rang at home about 7:00 PM. . . . It was F., and he was crying. He said he had to get out of "Rams. . . ."--in the background I could hear his Father and Mother saying to him, "Tell him why." He said he had to get out of "Rams" because at the party he had gone to (at Mrs. V.'s home), he had stolen $2.00. He also told me Mrs. V. said she was missing over $250.00 which she had left on her dresser. According to F., [several] other "Rams" [were] involved. . . .

The next evening:

Quite a discussion ensued about what had happened the night before. . . . M. said he had not taken any money--it might have been his brother. H. said he had been drinking and that he went into the bedroom looking for a dime for bus fare home, couldn't find one, so took $5.00. Said he was just borrowing it and had already returned it to Mrs. V. Said X. also took $5.00 and had returned it. R., . . . said he had not taken any. J. was indignant that Mrs. V. was blaming the "Rams" as it was just stupid individuals acting as individuals. Somehow or other I tried to get across the fact that if I did something wrong and was in Rotary, it would reflect on Rotary, regardless of whether I was acting as an individual. The boys do not seem to get this connection. K. said he knew some of the "Dashers" had taken money but he wasn't going to say who. Evidently the money was lying around on the dresser in the room where they left their coats and purses and came and went to the bathroom. R. told me some of the "Rams" had said to him, "Go on in and help yourself, everybody else is." When I asked F. why he took the money, he said he needed it for Christmas. . . . Evidently it was one of those "way out" parties. The boys said there were a lot of High School and College boys and

---


girls present, who were drinking a lot, and chances were a lot of them took money too. 22

The most serious incident involving the "Chiefs" as a group was the episode of the raffle tickets. Worker L. describes the incident:

The club decided to have a raffle. They will have printed on the tickets "Chiefs" and the numeral 2 and letter "B" which means two bottles of whiskey. They will sell the tickets for 25¢ each and give a book of 20 tickets to each member to sell.

We ordered the tickets, and the printer said that the word "contribution" would have to be printed on the tickets to make it legal. I said to L. and A. I wondered if I could talk them out of the whiskey as prize. L. gave me a funny look. I mentioned a surfboard. They seemed interested in this but said the cost was prohibitive. A. said he was concerned that they not sell the tickets at school because he would be the first one to be called down to [the Assistant Principal's] office.23

Worker L. describes the situation five days later:

A. called . . . and said that some of the "Chiefs" had been caught selling raffle tickets at school. He, L., H., and N. had been called down to [the Assistant Principal's] office, and a policeman was there. [The Assistant Principal] and the policeman indicated to them that they could be put in jail for illegal gambling, and that L. could be put in jail that day because he was 17. . . . [They] also indicated that the sponsor of the "Chiefs," meaning [Worker L.], could be put in jail for contributing to the delinquency of minors. I agreed that this was so and said that when the club agreed not to sell raffle tickets in the school I thought they meant it. . . . A. said [the Assistant Principal] did not know about the 2-B on the tickets meaning two whiskey bottles and asked me if I would tell [the Assistant Principal]. . . . A. said they were returning all of the money to the individuals who had bought tickets from them at school.24

22 Ibid., pp. 33-34.
24 Ibid., pp. 34-35.
Several "Knights" had experimented with "glue sniffing," but group pressures against this behavior were so strong that glue sniffing remained an isolated activity of only one or two boys. Glue sniffing behavior was the only use of "drugs" of one sort or another by club members mentioned in any of the three Journals. Marijuana was evidently not used nor did it become an issue of any sort. In two instances, some "Knights" reported encountering situations where drugs might have been in use, but showed no interest in involvement in this activity. In the first instance, three "Knights" related to Worker L. that they had attended a party where there were old women and teenagers all drunk. They also claimed that some of the teenage girls "were on dope." About the second instance, Worker L. states:

A. related to me about a man named Larry, who is about 25 years old and who was at the 8-Ball Pool Hall on Southwest 27th Avenue. This man offered A. and G. pep pills and dope. He had a woman in the car who was on dope, so A. said, and the man said he would allow the boys to have sexual intercourse with the woman for $10.00. A. said he and G. had no money. A. gave a full account of all the pills the man showed them.25

For these clubs, alcohol was the "prohibited" substance most commonly used. Drugs played little or no part in any use pattern. It should be noted however, that the mid-1960's, when the sponsorship occurred and the Journals were prepared, was more likely a time for these patterns than at present. At the time of this writing, marijuana use is alleged to be widespread not only among senior high schools of all socioeconomic levels in this county, but authorities are concerned about marijuana

availability and use filtering down to the junior high school level as well.

Destructive behavior at times occurred at parties:

There were 7 Jr. High School clubs plus 2 Sr. High clubs represented, . . .

After the party, we noticed some damage to the building; a plate glass was broken on the top of Mr. B.'s desk, wooden file cabinet was broken at the top, the floor was very dirty with coke stains, some bottles had been opened on the side of the wooden shelves. Mr. B. indicated later the "M" in the YMCA sign was missing and that he had had several complaints from the neighbors.26

At times, individual behavior of one member reflected upon the club. W. was frequently involved in illegal acts and aggressive fighting behavior which indirectly involved the "Rams." Worker A. relates:

W. and P. told B. they were fighting some University . . . boys, which B. couldn't believe, but he went along to see. Several fights ensued. T. was along but left, and when one of the professors caught W. and P., B. ran off . . . . From what I gather, W. and P. had been stealing colognes from Breedings Drug Store and selling them at marked down prices to University students. Also, during the fight they had broken one of the boy's glasses.27

Months later, during the Christmas holidays, W.'s friendship with Sal, not a member of any sponsored club, involved the "Rams" again in difficulty. Worker A. states:

While the "Rams" were not active as a club during the holidays, there were some instances of activity on the part of individual members. The police are presently trying to track down the boys who beat up a college boy at Pappy's Pizza Parlor. They have talked to W. about it, and he denies he had any part in it although he was present. I found out from W. that actually the boy who did it was a boy names [sic] Sal, an Italian boy whom W. has been palling around with. The police also called B.'s home to

27"Rams' Journal," p. 49.
find out if he were involved and were also trying to locate P. who has moved from the city. P., W., and B. were involved last year in fighting this boy on the University campus. . . . The police were at the school continuing their investigation.

Also during the holidays R., Sal and a couple of other boys who are in "Stallions" at Gables were involved in a burglary on New Year's Eve. Quite a number of items were taken and some damage done within the apartment. The owner . . . agreed if everything were returned and the damages paid for, he would not press charges. . . . From what I can gather at the moment, the items have all been returned and the damages are going to be paid for by R. W. disclaims any part in the burglary but says he could be called an accessory [sic] as he sat in the car but did not go up to the apartment. He said R. is a follower and not a leader and wants to get into "Stallions" next year, consequently he will do anything they ask him to do.

When I arrived home, . . . T. had called. . . . He asked about W., and I told him what W. had told me to which T. replied that wasn't right as W. was involved in the stealing.28

The boys were also involved in general rowdiness and boisterous activity. Worker L. states:

As I was driving members to different places after the meeting, . . . J. gave the finger to some adult in a car behind us. I asked J. to make his signs in his own family car but not in my station wagon. . . . Y. began hollering at girls and making obscene remarks.29

Another such incident involved Worker L.'s transporting some "Knights" in his car. He states:

As I was crossing an intersection. . . . a man behind me got out of his car and began shouting at me. I was in the middle of the intersection, drove across and stopped. The man followed me across. G. said he had accidentally flicked a cigarette on the man's car. The man came up to my car window and . . . asked me why I allowed G. to flick the cigarette on his car. I said he should talk to G. about this. . . . They had a few words and then the

28 Ibid., pp. 110-111.
29 "Knights' Journal," p. 65
man, . . . got into his car, and we drove on. As we drove off, I said "You guys almost got me in a fight." H. said, "Don't worry, . . . we were ready to jump him if he made a move."30

In addition, various boys were involved in running away from home, staying out all night because of difficulty with parents, a juvenile court appearance for breaking and entering, a near-drowning of a member who went swimming with the group after drinking heavily for two days, the theft of several tomato plants from a field adjoining where the "Chiefs" were target shooting, and miscellaneous fights. Smoking by the boys was also viewed a violative behavior by adults and school authorities. The Lab School Principal frequently cautioned the boys that he would not permit their smoking cigarettes on the school grounds. C., a "Knight," was suspended from school for smoking.

Finally, aside from actual involvement in disapproved behavior, the clubs were sufficiently well known to the community that the fraternities were "likely suspects" when vandalism was noticed. Worker A. relates:

I had a call from Mrs. K. regarding a meeting of a section of the PTA at [School P] with the bus people and [the Principal] regarding damage and writing on the [C. G.] buses. She said there had been an article in the [C. G.] Times about this, and I gathered the article mentioned the "Rams." However, later J. told me "Rams" were not mentioned in the article but it was directed at [School P] students in general. From this I gathered the PTA group felt the "Rams" and "Dashers" were responsible for the writing and damage to the buses.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

. . . I . . . asked them if they had any ideas how to control the writing and damage to the buses. They seemed

30 Ibid., p. 63.
to think the girls were more responsible than the boys but didn't have any ideas what to do about it. 31

Inter-Group Relationships

The fraternities interacted in shifting alliances and networks in social processes of cooperation, rivalry, and occasional conflict. The three sponsored clubs were commonly, although not continuously, alligned with one another and a non-sponsored group, the "Pikes," from another school. These four were usually opposed to the "Dashers" and at times the "Chi-phis." The "Dashers," particular rivals of the "Rams," were largely from School P. The "Chi-Phis" attended another school not involved in the Pilot Project. These patterns of relationship were observable in club athletic contests, social activities, and instances of collective group opposition the boys termed "rumbles." Alliances were often "formalized" by the establishment of "brotherhood"32 with one or more fraternities. Group relations were strongly tinged with the maintenance of "reputation" verbalized by the boys as matters of "honor."

Association and Disassociation in Social Events

Nowhere were the shifting informal and loose allignments among clubs more visible than in social events. Most commonly, a fraternity or sorority would hold a party for their own members and dates. In planning discussions much was made of limiting admission to members


32 Brother gangs were also found by Karacki and Toby in their study of the "Dukes," a gang of "average socio-economic status." See: Larry Karacki and Jackson Toby, "The Uncommitted Adolescent: Candidate for Gang Socialization," Sociological Inquiry, XXXII (Spring, 1962), 203-15.
of their own or perhaps brother clubs and thereby excluding groups
defined as "undesirable." At the parties, however, participants
often included members of many groups: brother clubs, rival clubs,
sororities, and even high school fraternity members.

That parties were a major concern is indicated by the amount
of time spent discussing these events in club meetings. Discussions
revolved around which clubs to invite (discussed by club—not by
individual) and more negatively, which to exclude. As might be expected,
brother clubs were most welcome, with chief rival clubs seen as undei­
sirable and potentially disrupting influences. In these discussions,
the "Rams" commonly expressed the feeling that "Dashers" were to be un­
welcome at their social events, although some "Dashers" often were
present when the parties took place. Rarely was the "Dasher" presence
at the party the cause of any disturbance. Major disturbances at
parties were rare. On occasion, fights broke out, at various times in­
volving members of the same club, members of two brother clubs, or
members of a club and some "rival group." These appeared to be more a
reflection of individual dispute often spurred by the consumption of
alcohol, than concerted rivalry or friction at the group level. More
concern was expressed by the workers over the consumption of alcoholic
beverages than concern over large-scale group conflict at these social
gatherings.

Informal networks of communication among the clubs were ef­
effectively established. Worker A. observes during his attendance at a
party:

The coming and going of the High School and College boys
and girls was interesting to watch. One bus came by and
at least 20 High School boys and girls got off. Girls would arrive in their cars. It is amazing how the word spreads if there is a party going on.33

Relationships among the clubs often produced attendance at social gatherings far in excess of expected numbers. Worker A. relates:

At the request of several of the "Rams," I agreed to go to the party with them . . . being given by the "Pikes," which is a fraternity group from [School S. M.] The Party was held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. E. . . . These are very lovely people but were completely naive about the fraternity and sorority situation which exists in the community. Their daughter was elected one of the sponsors of the "Pikes" and had asked to have the party at their home. They thought there would be 30 to 40 present and 100 to 150 showed up which virtually overwhelmed them. They had no knowledge of the interrelationship between the clubs. They were manfully trying to provide cokes and lemonade for the party, ran out within the first hour and were extremely worried. I assured them this happened all of the time. . . .

In cooperating to plan social activities, clubs at times established a clear division of labor. On one occasion the "Chiefs" planned an "open house" to be hosted jointly with the "Rams" and the "Pikes." It was agreed that the "Chiefs" were to arrange for police-chaperones, the "Pikes" to contract for the place in which to hold the gathering, and the "Rams" were responsible for arranging for the band.

Hewing to group boundaries often presented problems in planning for parties because of the interlocking nature of alliances. For example, the "Chiefs," in planning a party, decided to invite the "Gammas" (a sorority), but not the "Dashers." Since invitations to clubs included the club "sponsors," a problem resulted because some of the boy sponsors of the "Gammas" were "Dashers."

34Ibid., p. 57.
Inter-Group Athletics

Athletic contests were also a point of intergroup contact. Contests in the sport in season might involve two brother clubs, two sponsored clubs, or a sponsored club and some opponent. The latter type of pairing produced the most conflict. Note the "Rams'" anticipation of contest with the "Dashers" and the conflict developing during the game:

The next big discussion was playing the "Dashers" in football. The club agreed to play them [some four months later] during the Christmas holidays. They also decided they would practice football every other Sunday in order to get ready for the "Dashers." They asked me to coach them and perhaps get some other coaches.35

The "Rams"-"Dashers" game was held... at [School P].... the "Dashers" won 14-6. While the "Rams" were greatly out-weighed and much smaller in size, they played a good game and came out with dignity for the club even though they lost. I observed one time W. [a "Ram"] make a very clean tackle on E. to which E. responded by hitting W. and knocking him down. The "Dashers" quickly gathered around and started kicking W., but the "Rams" alumni and others quickly stepped in and the fracas stopped. Following the game, the "Rams" paid off their $10.00 bet to the "Dashers" and I saw no evidence of any further fighting on the part of the two clubs.36

Group Opposition: Rivalry and Conflict

Rivalry between the "Rams" and the "Dashers" was apparent to Worker A. at the time of sponsorship and continued to be a focal interest of the "Rams." Worker A. states:

E. asked me when I came down U. S. #1 in the morning and passed the Pancake House would I please "bop" "Dasher" with my horn and told me how to do it. I said, "No,

35 Ibid., p. 82.
36 Ibid., p. 110.
E., I don't want to 'bop' anyone." . . . He said he hates all "Dashers" and I told him the only "Dasher" I knew was M. and he seemed like a good guy. E. said that he was the only good one in it and why didn't I convince him to join "Rams." . . . you can convince him we are the best." 37

Later, the two fraternities engaged in a challenge reminiscent, as with many of their structured activities, of the college fraternity.

Worker A. describes the "Rams" meeting:

The first item of business dealt with the challenge issued by the "Dashers" to the "Rams" for a drinking bout. Each club was to designate three individuals and put up $20.00 from each treasury. The three that could out-drink the other three would be declared the champions and the money would go into the winner's treasury. . . . A great deal of discussion followed, and it was felt, . . . that they weren't about to be defeated in this and lose $20.00 from their treasury. When the vote was taken as to whether or not they would accept the challenge, there were only two votes for it, . . . the rest voted no. This closed the issue. There was no discussion about drinking as such, but simply a matter of not wanting to be defeated and their limited treasury. 38

Yet, shifting alliances at times produced unusual coalitions. For example, on one occasion the "Rams" and "Dashers" joined with each other in response to an alleged challenge from a group from another school. Worker A. says:

S. and E. asked me if I was going to the fight Thursday afternoon. They said both the "Dashers" and "Rams" were going to fight some group from [School S. M.] These boys were a bunch of "greasers" who had called the "Dashers" and "Rams" bad names. . . . Since then I found out the fight did not take place. They said the boys . . . came over and apologized. I wonder about this and if a lot of it wasn't just talk. 39

38 Ibid., p. 54.
39 Ibid., p. 8.
A later Journal entry clarifies the incident somewhat, and also indicates conflict between a "Ram" and a "Dasher":

L. was not at the meeting. He had been in a real fight with a ["Dasher"] . . . . The "Rams" were all discussing their trip to [School S. M.] where they had gone for a fight with some club at that school. They had heard this club had "bopped" the "Rams." E. evidently told them not to go for this wasn't true as he had talked with some of them Saturday night. However, they went just the same, and when they got to the 7-11 Store where this other group meets, the [sic] found 40 boys, plus alumni, all waiting for them. There could have been a real tough battle but the boys . . said they had not "bopped" the "Rams," so there was no fight. 40

The matter of "reputation" was a concern of each group. "Reputation" was easily lost by failing to fight when challenged or to retaliate when a member was "beaten-up," but the establishment of dominance by one group over another was rarely of any duration. There is some indication that the more aggressive group at a given time achieved a "bullying" dominance because of greater physical size. Larger, stronger boys were not only used to maintain internal order, but were viewed as useful in enabling the club to "hold their own" in inter-group encounter. The episodes of involvement with high school level groups often reflected a dominance of the latter due to physical size and prowess. For example, at a "Gamma" party:

The "Lords" arrived about 10:00 PM, caused quite a bit of disturbance, grabbed the microphone of the band and sang some dirty songs. The boys had had plenty to drink. . . . [The "Rams"] were greatly upset at the "Lords" but seemed to feel there was nothing they could do about them as they are so big and tough. 41

40 Ibid., p. 11.
41 Ibid., pp. 55-56.
"Conflict" Situations--The "Rumble"

At times rivalry between groups escalated into shifting, amorphous, group confrontations which the boys called "rumbles." Apparently serving functions of "reputation maintenance," these "rumbles" were often more form than substance, although limited physical conflict did break out. For example, Worker A. describes such a confrontation:

It looked like a rumble was developing . . . between the "Rams" and the "Chi-phis" . . . and the BRS's--this stands for Bird Road Stoolies, or something like that. Evidently this had gotten started at the "Pikes" party . . . when W. got into a fight with one of the "Chi-phis" and beat him up. Thinking W. was in "Rams," they were going to take on the "Rams."

The boys were really confused because they thought their honor was at stake, . . .

I told J. and B. my car was parked at the side of the school and for them to get the other boys the "Chi-phis" knew and I would take them away from the situation. Immediately following school, they piled in the car. As the "Rams" would come out of school, they would say, "Stay away from Burger King--the police are going to be there with paddy wagons." They sent boys down to tell the "Chiefs" to disappear. They wanted me to drive them by the Burger King, and they hollered out the window for everyone to get away from there. We started down the road in front of the school, and by this time cars were arriving in droves with boys from [C. G.], M., a "Rams" alumnus, "Lords," "Buffalos,"--all kinds--evidently the word was out all over the Gables that a rumble was developing. The boys would lean out the car, ask me to stop, holler at E. and others to get away from there as the police were going to pick them up, and then I drove the boys off. Further down the road we found J. hiding in the bushes--for the first time afraid for his life. . . .

I went back by the Burger King--the police were all over the place. I picked up C., P., and H., and took them home. . . . the rest of the crowd seem to have fairly well disbursed [sic]. I went back and picked up the boys at the Country

---

Club. They said some of the "Chiefs" had come by and were really mad at the "Rams" for not showing up at the Burger King, as evidently they had made a club rule that any person who did not show up would get 10 licks, so they were out in strength—said they were going to break brotherhood with the "Rams." I could see that J., B., and M. were really upset for they felt they had chickened out, and the boys really seemed to be in a dilemma about their honor. When I told them the "Chi-phis" and BRS's had not shown up, they seemed a little relieved.

I am sure the situation has been only postponed temporarily and it will continue to remain explosive until something is settled. I think the "Rams" are worried that if they do get in trouble, their friends won't show up next time.... There are only three or four in the total group who would fight in the first place but they have lots of friends who would do the fighting for them. All of the gang from the Gables would like nothing better than a good rumble.43

The Establishment and Disestablishment of "Brotherhood"

The establishment of "brotherhood" relations with another club was of importance to each club. "Brother clubs" more readily shared social activities and were expected to support each other in conflict situations involving non-brother groups. The criteria used to determine the suitability of establishing brotherhood were never clear to the workers. Evidently these alliances reflected the shifting emotions of the moment. In any case, "brotherhood" was frequently of rather short duration. Brother clubs were at the same age-grade level, often involving two clubs from the same school. YMCA sponsorship of the three clubs did not determine the shaping of brotherhood alliances. For example, for a period during the sponsorship, "Chiefs" (sponsored) were brothers of the "Dashers" (unsponsored), while the "Dashers" were chief rivals of the "Rams." The "Rams" (sponsored) were for some time

during sponsorship a brother club of the "Pikes" (unsponsored). These arrangements were not without some complexity. For example, Worker L describes how brotherhood alliances among several clubs developed at one point:

G., the [Chiefs'] President, spoke of the "Chiefs," "Rams," "Pikes," and "Knights" now being brother clubs. The "Rams" had voted the "Knights" in as a brother club at its last meeting, and since the "Rams" and "Chiefs," and "Rams" and "Pikes" are brother clubs, this made all four brother clubs. The "Rams" seem to be the pace-setters in organization.

The dissolution or "breaking" of brotherhood was affirmed by club vote. Such dissolution was often the culmination of a series of minor "falling outs" rather than a major incident.

Fraternity And Parental Relationships

After the initiation of YMCA sponsorship of the fraternities, the workers sent a letter to the parents of each of the boys in the sponsored clubs. The letters were to inform the parents of the new sponsored status of the club. To some parents the new "legal" status of the club relieved their doubt or opposition to their son's membership. To other parents, the letters made clear what they suspected but did not acknowledge or know with certainty—that their boys belonged to a fraternity.

The boys often were made uneasy about the prospects of their parents' learning of their membership. Many were sure their parents did not know and others belonged despite parental opposition. Some

---

44 "Chiefs' Journal," p. 3.

boys engaged in falsehood to deceive their parents as to their membership:

J. was at P.'s house. . . , J. did not know P.'s father didn't know he was in "Rams," so he said to P., in his Father's presence, "What did you think of the meeting this afternoon?" To which P. replied, "It will be interesting to see who will become the new officers of the school." J. caught the hint. P.'s father said to him, "Were you at a 'Rams' meeting this afternoon?" P. replied, "No." He then asked J. if there had been a "Rams" meeting, and J. said, "No, we meet tomorrow." Mr. P. told P. he had better not find out he was lying to him or there would be real trouble.46

Some parents fail to tell the truth to protect disclosure of knowledge of club activity. At a party at the home of B., the Worker:

went outside as the parents arrived to pick up their children and talked . . . with one Father who came to pick up his daughter. When he had left, Mrs. B. said she hoped I hadn't told him it was a "Rams" party as they had told him it was a birthday party.47

Other parents and sons engage in elaborate "games" to avoid acknowledging membership. Worker A. states:

I asked [H.] about his parents not letting him be in "Rams." He said he had given the grip to his Mother, and she almost slapped him. . . . I said, "H., do you mean to tell me your folks don't know you are in 'Rams?" He said I think they know but they don't say much about it except that I can't belong.48

Some weeks later the Worker pressed H. about his parents, and reports that:

he still doesn't see how he can tell his father and he still doesn't want me to call him. He thinks it is agreeable with his Mother but is quite worried about his Father's reaction

46Ibid., pp. 66-67.
47Ibid., p. 28.
48Ibid., p. 46.
since his Father's attorney, according to H., was instrumental in writing the law that outlawed the clubs.49

Some parents objected to their sons membership only after specific incidents. The father of one of the leaders of the "Rams" objected to the absense of the workers at "Hell nights." (The workers were not present at initiations since they felt attending would be interpreted by the boys as the worker positively sanctioning the paddling at these rituals.) The father claimed that if the workers continued "letting them hurt boys" he could not continue to permit his son's membership. The initiate carries visible bruises that at times trigger a parental response. Worker A. describes the action of one parent, Mrs. T.:

I received a call from Mrs. T. regarding her son, . . . who had gone through tee off with the "Rams" on Sunday. She was tremendously upset emotionally and very vindictive when she first started talking. . . . She said her boy was sick, black and blue from his beating, she was going to take him to the doctor, he couldn't go to school, and she was going to prefer charges. . . . She said . . . this was the first time anything had come between her and her son. . . . When she saw the beating he had taken, she asked him if he cried. T. said no and that for the first time he felt he was a man. He pleaded with his Mother not to talk [to] . . . me, and this has created a real rift between them.50

The incident stimulating the greatest parental concern was the theft from Mrs. V.'s home (See pp. 219-220 of this Appendix). F. was forced to drop out of the club after the incident of the stolen money. After the theft incident, M. told Worker A. he planned to run away from home if his mother "did not treat him right." He "said he had done this

49 Ibid., p. 65.
50 Ibid., pp. 17-18.
before and they had a State-wide alert out for him." Some weeks later M. again told Worker A. he was thinking of running away from home. After the V. incident, Mr. B. took active steps. He demanded that B. establish strict rules and regulations and present them to the club. Mr. B. was the instigator of the only concerted group effort by parents to meet and "do something" about the "Rams." He organized a "Parents' Meeting" attended by 10 parents and Worker A. Worker A. describes the meeting: Mr. B.:

opened the meeting by relating the call he had from Mrs. V. and stated he felt that standards should be established for the "Rams" and if they did not adopt standards, his boy could no longer be a member. He said the name of "Rams" should be changed, that cheating and drinking should be eliminated, that academic levels should be required, etc. Most of the parents took great issue with him regarding the V. incident stating it was Mrs. V.'s problem and not the "Rams." . . . Mrs. W. said it was Mrs. V.'s responsibility when she had parties to be present and know what was going on, that she should do like other parents and lock up liquor cabinets, valuables, etc. Mrs. D. said this was the third son who had been a member of "Rams" and she felt that under proper supervision, it was a constructive influence in their lives. Mr. K. . . . said he was not a joiner himself and that some of these gangs, if you wanted to call them clubs, the bad seemed to rub off on the good instead of the good on the bad.

All present felt the meeting was most worthwhile and suggested that other parents not present be called together to hear the total story, rather than being called by phone.

The parents agreed that their opportunities to talk with their children about values had been enhanced and that by urging their own children to adopt for themselves standards it would strengthen the relationship of the advisor to the club . . .

Apparently this collective reaffirmation of concern over their children

51Ibid. p. 34.
52Ibid., pp. 35-36.
sufficed to alleviate anxiety, for no other meeting or similar "effort"
was reported by Worker A.

Other parents approach the matter of club activities with lack
of concerned inquiry as to what was transpiring. Worker A. gives an
example:

Several of the "Rams" called me about taking them to a
party. . . . There was no band but a juke box had been pro-
vided, the Mother was present but the Father had gone out.
The Mother thought her daughter was just having a few friends
in. The young people began to arrive from everywhere, . . .
Many of the "bashers" had been drinking, . . . The Mother
would run out as the boys and the girls arrived and ask if
they were invited. Of course, the answer was yes, and they
went in. She would [sic] up with about 100.53

Parents were often generous in permitting the youth's use of expensive
equipment. Worker A. gives an example:

I went out boating Saturday with M. [and three other
"Rams"]. This was a rather harrowing experience in a 28
foot yacht powered by two 210-horsepower engines, with a 13
year old boy in command.54

Family yachts were used for club "outings":

This day was scheduled as a "Rams" outing, including tee
off at . . . Key Biscayne. They were to come by boat or
. . . Following that came the 28-foot yacht of the M.'s.
. . .55

Although no systematic measure of family structure was initi-
ated in this study, it is evident that a proportion of the boys of the
fraternities were members of broken homes. Worker L., in early stages

53 Ibid. p. 60.
54 Ibid., p. 49.
55 Ibid., p. 52.
of his sponsorship of the "Knights," concluded that broken homes among the "Knights" were pervasive:

All the boys' parents are separated, either by death or law. P. is the exception.56

Although this conclusion was probably an overestimate, examples of broken families were numerous. Consider, for example, that among the "Knights," these examples of family breakdown are evident:

[G. 's] parents are divorced, and he lives with his Uncle. . . . G. said he and his Uncle did not get along, and they had gone to Juvenile Court several times.57

[W. 's] parents . . . are divorced. He lives with his Dad . . . 58

[A. ] . . . has a generally negative attitude toward others his age. . . . I've heard his father beats him a lot--is drunk. His Mother is deceased.59

K. 's father was 71 or 72 years of age. His step mother was 28 and "is mentally retarded."60 K. has two brothers (15 and 16 years old) and a much older sister. His father has been married four times. His stepmother had disappeared, taking $100,000 while his Dad was in the hospital. K. was concerned because he did not know who his mother really was, and feared that after his Dad's stroke his father would die and he would be left alone. P.'s father left his mother to live with a younger woman. The mother of G., another "Knight," attempted suicide, while the father of S., a "Chief," had committed suicide after his divorce from S. 's mother.

57 Ibid., p. 9.
58 Ibid., p. 13.
59 Ibid., p. 5.
60 Ibid., p. 28.
Fraternity-School Relationships

Because the groups in this study—along with other fraternities—were viewed as problem groups by school officials, these officials readily cooperated with the YMCA effort. Both workers frequently communicated with school administrators, both in general discussions and with respect to specific incidents. By this effort the workers serve as mediators between their groups and the schools. This permitted widening channels of communication between the boys and school authorities. At the beginning of the project, the workers communicated with school officials at no small risk to their rapport with the boys. Each group was concerned that, through the worker, knowledge of their activities would become more widespread among school officials. The boys also feared that, in discussions between the worker and school officials, the latter would learn the names of all who were in the club.

At Worker A's initial meeting with the "Rams," he learned:

They all then agreed they would like to be legal, but did not want to be school related because of the membership requirements and [the Principal's] dislike of the "Rams." . . . They stressed they did not want me to see [the Principal] because they were fearful he would extract from me the names of the boys in the club.61

The "Chiefs" were reluctant to provide Worker L. with a membership list because the members from (School P.) were concerned over the Principal learning accurately who was in the club.

The "Rams'" fear of being identified to school officials as "Rams" remained for some time, but by this time, the workers and Principals had

exchanged information as to club membership and the workers had promised to provide Principals with copies of the Journals.

There is little evidence that fraternity boys participated in school sponsored clubs or organizations. Identified membership was incompatible with continued participation in school varsity athletics. Although the clubs often centered activity in sports, it does not appear that many boys took active interest in school intramural sports. The most noticeable exception to general non-participation in school organizations was the election of K., a "Knight," to the student body Presidency at (School S) during the second year of sponsorship of the "Knights." Another exception was the election of M., a "Ram," to the Student Council of (School P).

Probably because of their tenuous position with school authorities, the clubs often discussed "doing something for the school" in the form of a "service project." Worker A. states:

They . . . discussed giving a flag to the school, and the club after much discussion, agreed to buy one. H. and M. were to present it to [the Assistant Principal]. There was much discussion about where this flag would be placed, some thought [the Assistant Principal] would keep it in his office, and others thought it should be in the Cafeteria. They all agreed the school needed flags. One of the members suggested the flag be given with the provision that [the Assistant Principal] announce over the loud speaker that it had been given by the "Rams." This was defeated.62

Outweighing the infrequent, yet concerned, gropings toward establishing better relationships with the school were numerous

---

62 Three members of a fraternity in a local high school were dismissed from the varsity football team because of their club membership. 

accounts of difficulties with school officials which no doubt both
caxed the occasional verbalizations of need for better relationships
and undermined efforts to establish these. Many incidents involved
individuals of the groups rather than collective group activity.
Among the "Knights," for example, C. was expelled for smoking, and K.
complained on occasion to Worker L. that he, K., could not get along
with his teachers. Another "Knight," G. was experiencing school and
parental difficulty. An action of another "Knight" is of the type to
which psychiatrically oriented observers would be hard pressed to avoid
attaching symbolic significance. Worker L. states:

As some of the boys and I were riding by [School S].
. . ., W. asked to stop to get some of his books. While
he was on the second floor on the outside hallway, he uri­
nated and the janitor spoke to him about this. . . . W.
was concerned that the janitor might relate this incident
to [the Assistant Principal]. I told W. he deserved a
paddling and asked how he would like for someone to urinate
on his front porch. Later I learned that [the Assistant
Principal] did paddle W. and talked with him afterwards.

Another "Knight" was sent to the office because he protested when a
teacher demanded to look through his notebook. The "Knights" were also
held responsible for cleaning up "foul writing" on school fences:

B. said [the Principal] had asked him if they, . . .
had cleaned up the foul writing on some of the fences.
. . . C. said he had cleaned them up. B. said I will
tell [the Principal]. C. said, "When you do, give him
my shirt size for Christmas."64

64"Knights' Journal," p. 32. Despite proscriptions against
corporal punishment in the County school system, some teachers and ad­
ministrators used this type of response. The Assistant Principal in this
incident allegedly utilized paddling as a punishment on many occasions.
It would be interesting to speculate on the relationship between paddling
as a sanction applied by a "legitimate authority figure" and the boys'
use of paddling in initiation, tee off, and for social control during
meetings.

Among the "Rams" there were such incidents of individual school offense as "detention," a "suspension" from school because W. had been caught going through boys pockets trying to steal money, friction with and dislike of teachers, and being sent to the office for skipping class. Several boys were forced to quit the club or "go inactive" because of poor grades. Other minor trouble with the school is reminiscent of much male adolescent experience. Worker A. describes one such incident:

B. said the Coach told he he [sic] had to get 12 bars of Dial soap because he was throwing soap against the shower wall. He did not feel too good about this for he said . . . at least 15 to 20 boys had been throwing soap. . . . When the Coach asked the boys who had been throwing soap to step forward, only B. and one other boy did so--none of the other boys did. The Coach said each of the two boys was to bring 12 bars of Dial soap the next day. . . . [B.] said he didn't mind buying his share of soap but didn't think it was fair . . . because the other boys didn't own up to it.66

School officials attempted to keep club insignia from display in school. They were also opposed to the boys congregating at the same table in the cafeteria. School officials were adament about having fraternity activities take place elsewhere than on school grounds. This insistence was usually, but not always, complied with. Worker A. states:

[The Principal] called me . . . stating that the "Rams" had been active on the school grounds with their new pledges. Evidently one of the pledges had pinched a girl on her breast. The girl had reported it to [the Principal] and he in turn called in N. who said he had to do it because he was a pledge.67

67 Ibid., p. 119.
A result of this prohibition against holding club activities on school grounds was the use of the grounds of a nearby private school regularly for meetings and occasionally for initiations. Both the "Chiefs" and the "Knights" used this location. Their activities caused concern in the private school Principal. Most often this concern was manifested in remonstrations to the boys to stop smoking and "hazing" on school grounds. Of continuous concern to officials of (School P.) were acts of "vandalism." Many of these, such as writing on the buses of a local suburb and inscribing "foul" sayings on school fences were--rightly or wrongly--attributed to the clubs. Other "literary attempts" to advertise group identity were more surely the efforts of club members. It is not uncommon to see the group name sprayed in paint on walls of buildings or highway overpasses in the area. One similar attempt occurred at School P. Worker A. relates:

[H.] told me F. was in trouble--had carved "Rams" on a sewing machine table and the teacher caught him.68

As sponsorship proceeded, strong indications of changed relationships with school authorities were described in the journals. For example, one month into the second year of sponsorship, Worker A. reported on a conversation among the Principal, Assistant Principal (of School P.) and himself:

Both [the Principal and Assistant Principal] said there had been very little problem, if any, with the "Rams" at school this year, they showed a change of attitude and there seemed to be no tension between the club and school. The boys still

---

68 Ibid., p. 76.
gather in groupings in the cafeteria, particularly at lunch time. They had seen no sign of their insignia being worn at school.\textsuperscript{69}

Two months later, Worker A. describes a meeting of the Assistant Principal of School P., H., the President of the "Rams," and himself:

[The Assistant Principal] commented he thought H. was doing a good job as President of "Rams" and certainly the "Rams" were not nearly as much of a problem at the school as they had been in the past. He said the "Rams" could be helpful in the cafeteria, that he understood they liked to eat together, but that often the area where they ate was left in a sort of mess and their trays had not been returned. . . . he thought the "Rams" were having more influence on the school than the "Dashers" and "Chiefs." He thought it was a real fine group, but he emphasized to H. that if the boys got into difficulty because of their club affiliation in an activity such as fighting because someone had said something about "Rams," he would have to take disciplinarian measures \textsuperscript{sic} against that boy, or boys, but not the whole club. . . . He also stated he thought "Rams" could help their image with the school if they found "Rams" written on anything, they accept the responsibility of getting the writing off the wall or desk, even though they hadn't done it themselves.\textsuperscript{70}

The boys apparently responded positively to these expressions of support. Worker A. describes a subsequent club meeting:

A great deal of discussion centered around Dress-Up Day at [School P.], . . . some of the boys arguing that it surely would help if all of the "Rams" dressed up this year like the rest of the school rather than looking like tramps. . . . They finally decided that all of the "Rams" would dress up and support [the Principal and Assistant Principal] and if anyone looked rough and tough it would be the "Dashers" and not the "Rams." A dollar fine and 5 licks would be given to each one who did not dress up.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{69}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 90.

\textsuperscript{70}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 102.

\textsuperscript{71}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 106.
**Relationships With Other Authority**

Encounters with the police were infrequent and when they occurred were due to matters of minor seriousness. Court encounters were also apparently infrequent. Some appearances involved the process of adjudication while others reflected a boy's serving as a witness. Because of the apparent infrequency of contacts with the police and courts no attempt was made to ascertain, by check of official records, more precisely the boys involvement with these formal agencies of justice.

Aside from a few acts of detaining boys in the course of investigation, most encounters with the police involved police presence at parties and initiations. Apparently the police were familiar with the usual locales for initiations and made it a practice to make their presence known to the boys by patrolling these places at these times. Since fraternity parties often produced sufficient neighborhood noise to precipitate complaints to the police, police often checked these parties. Police also appeared at parties when no complaint had been received since the party noise was sufficient to call their attention to the activities. Most frequently, the police warned the participants to "quiet down," but on occasion they "ran off" alumni or uninvited outsiders. Occasionally, arrests were made. Off-duty policemen were often hired to "chaperone" parties. Their uniformed presence was useful

---

72 This assessment reflects this writer's analysis of the Journals and statements made to this writer in conversations with both workers.
as a visual deterrent, but frequently the boys preferred the off-duty 
police chaperones to dress in "plain clothes."

No apparent hostility toward the police was evident, and the 
boys did not seem to regard the police as either heroes or villains. 
The boys of one club did, however, seem to view as prestigeful the in-
volvement of one boy with the authorities. Worker A. states:

The M. boy, who had been in trouble in the past, was invited 
by the "Rams" to be present at the party. It seems there 
is a sort of hero worship for all the things he had been 
through. He spoke vividly to small groups of the "Rams" 
about his experiences with the police, being put in leg 
irons and the like. The boys listened very attentively as 
the adventure story unfolded.73

On the other hand, four fraternity Presidents, when planning their 
group party, decided they would rather have policemen than parents as 
chaperones at their parties.

Generally, the fraternities were known to various segments of 
the community and viewed negatively. A local PTA, concerned over 
vandalism of a local suburb's public buses, considered the fraternities 
likely suspects. A club member quit the club until after his court 
hearing on advice of his attorney that he would be better off if he 
were not in the "Rams" as the club had a "bad name." Local newspapers 
had occasionally described these and other fraternities--particularly 
their initiations--within a "problem" perspective. The "Knights" were 
incensed over one report in a neighborhood paper in which the reporter, 
they felt, had suggested that homosexual behavior occurred in club 
meetings or between club members. This reporter also described the

73 "'Rams' Journal," p. 5.
worker as an "investigator" of the group, investigating with the help of psychiatrists.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{74}The paper in question, a bi-weekly distributed free of charge in neighborhoods, expresses a consistently conservative political orientation. The reporter in question is consistently ultra-conservative in his view of the passing scene.
APPENDIX III

"RAMS" CONSTITUTION

I

The name of the organization [sic] shall be "Rams" Club of [School P].

II

The primary object of this organization [sic] shall be to unite the members in bonds of friendship, Brotherhood, and mutual understanding.

III

The qualification of the members shall be: A white boy of good character and standing, interested in the purpose of the Club, shall be eligible to membership in this Club.

IV

The affairs of the Club shall be managed by the elected officers of the Club, consisting of President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, Sargent-at-Arms, [sic] Chaplain, and Historian. Final approval shall be given by the balance [sic] of the club members. Such officers shall be elected on July 15, for first semester officers and January 15, for second semester officers.

BY-LAWS
ARTICLE I
Membership

Section 1. The members shall be in the 7th, 8th, and 9th grades inclusive. No boy may remain a member after completing the 9th grade.

Section 2. All efforts should be made to keep the number of members at 30.

1 The following document was prepared by the "Rams" and mimeographed by the YMCA. It is quoted in its entirety in this Appendix.
ARTICLE II
Election of Members

Section 1. New members may be elected at any meeting agreed on. The President may not vote.

Section 2. If less than two black balls are voted against a rush, the rush is elected to the club.

ARTICLE III
Meetings

Section 1. Meeting shall be held at least once a week. The President shall call the meetings.

Section 2. The President may not vote on any discussion, but if a tie vote is present he may vote. All other members shall have equal voting power.

Section 3. If a member is absent from two meetings in concession [sic], he shall have a $1.50 fine and five licks given at the next meeting [sic]. Only under special circumstances may this fine be nullified [sic] by the President.

Section 4. The President shall run all meetings. If the President is not present at a meeting the next highest officer shall take his place at that meeting.

Section 5. The Sargent-at-Arms [sic] shall call members out of order and must give that member one lick. If a member refuses to stay in order he shall be kicked out of that meeting by say of the President.

Section 6. Christmas Holidays and summer months shall not be considered part of the club year.

ARTICLE IV
Dues

Section 1. Dues shall be $.50 each meeting. An effort should be made to keep up-to-date on dues and pay them each meeting.

Section 2. Initiation fees shall be $2.50 and must be payed [sic] at the first meeting the new member attends. If he does not pay it he shall be given 10 licks by the Sargent-at-Arms [sic] and he must bring it to the next meeting [sic].
ARTICLE V
Officers

Section 1. The President shall preside over all meetings.

Section 2. The Vice President shall take the President's seat when he is absent from a meeting.

Section 3. The Secretary shall take roll at all meetings and take notes of all discussions at meetings. He shall keep all of this material in a notebook.

Section 4. The Treasurer shall collect dues at all meetings and must make an account of the Club's treasury. He shall have that material in a notebook.

Section 5. The Sargent-at-Arms shall call members out of order and must give them one lick at that time. He also must give licks to members that disobey the Club Constitution. The number of licks shall be given in the By-Laws.

Section 6. The Chaplain must give a Reverend prayer at the end of each meeting. Anyone out of order during this prayer shall be given 10 licks by the Sargent-at-Arms.

Section 7. The Historian must keep a scrapbook of all club activities.

ARTICLE VI
Club Sponsors and Sweetheart

Section 1. On the 4th week of September a special meeting shall be called. This meeting shall be for discussing and voting on club Sponsors and Sweetheart.

Section 2. Two girls of the 9th grade inclusive, shall be elected as "Rams" Sponsors.

Section 3. One girl, of the 9th Grade inclusive, shall be elected as "Rams" Sweetheart.

Section 4. These three girls must be respected by all "Rams" members. They shall have every club right except for voting.

Section 5. A party shall be given for them on a weekend of September. At this party the Sponsors and Sweetheart disks shall be presented to them by the last years Sponsors and Sweetheart.
ARTICLE VII
Amendments [sic]

Section 1. The Constitution and By-Laws may be amended by a two-third vote of all of the club members.

STANDING RULES

1. The two parties that must be given by the club are the Sponsor-Sweetheart party, a weekend of September, and the Alumni party, July 15.

2. Cutting down brothers is a 20 lick fine.

3. Breaking your honor is a 20 lick 5 dollar fine.

4. If you are late to a meeting you get a 1 lick fine.

5. Fighting with Brothers is a 20 lick fine for both members involved.

6. Reassessment dues may be called by the President at any time it is necessary.
APPENDIX IV

FIGURES COMPARING, BY SIX-WEEK PERIODS, THE SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SCORES OF THE FRATERNITIES DURING THE SERVICE YEARS AND THE CONTROLS
Fig. 1.--Academic performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Rams" during the service years and Control P during the comparison year.
Fig. 2.—Academic performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Knights" during the service years and Control S during the comparison year.
Fig. 3.—Academic performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Chiefs" during the service years and Control SP during the comparison year.
Fig. 4.--Conduct performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Rams" during the service years and Control P during the comparison year.
Fig. 5.—Conduct performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Knights" during the service years and Control S during the comparison year.
Fig. 6.--Conduct performance scores, by six-week periods, for the "Chiefs" during the service years and Control SP during the comparison year.
Fig. 7.—Rates of absence, by six-week periods, for the "Rams" during the service years and Control P during the comparison year.
Fig. 8.—Rates of absence, by six-week periods, for the "Knights" during the service years and Control S during the comparison year.
Fig. 9.—Rates of absence, by six-week periods, for the "Chiefs" during the service years and Control SP during the comparison year.
Fig. 10.—Rates of tardiness, by six-week periods, for the "Rams" during the service years and Control P during the comparison year.
Fig. 11.—Rates of tardiness, by six-week periods, for the "Knights" during the service years and Control S during the comparison year.
Fig. 12.--Rates of Tardiness, by six-week periods, for the "Chiefs" during the service years and Control SP during the comparison year.
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