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CHAPTER I

THE IDEA OF THE THESIS AND WORK DONE IN THE AREA

I. GENERAL IDEA OF THE THESIS

Approximately forty million people play bridge in the United States. They go on bridge tours to Europe, bridge cruises to the Mediterranean and Caribbean; they watch bridge programs on nationwide television and spend great amounts of money for bridge lessons. Many participate in tournaments all across the United States, Canada, Mexico, South America, and Europe.

Along with other so-called recreational activities, there has been a spectacular increase in bridge playing since World War II. This has been particularly true of duplicate bridge, the method which is used to conduct bridge tournaments. The American Contract Bridge League, which is the official organization for this group, now numbers about 115,000 members, as compared with 28,000 members in 1951.¹ There are 4800 affiliated and sanctioned clubs now, up from 500 in 1951. This represents almost a 400% increase in the last eleven years. The number of active clubs has increased

an astounding 960%. Even taking into consideration the rise of the general population, the greater availability of leisure time, the larger amounts of money being spent on leisure activities, and easier and more available transportation, it is obvious that greater numbers of people in our society are turning to this activity for a recreational outlet.

What has been the determining factor or factors which have caused this tremendous growth? Why do people spend a great deal of time and money to achieve no material reward? Some bridge experts claim that the average player spends $15,000 to become a "life master"—the highest official status in the bridge group. What fascination causes the chronic loser to remain active in the group when there is no reward in the form of group respect or in the form of "ego boost" one gets from victory?

These questions are answerable only in terms of the functions of the duplicate bridge group. Merton postulated that every group has two types of functions, manifest or conscious functions and latent or unconscious functions. In order to establish the reasons for the perseverance and growth of this group, it is necessary to determine what need the group fills in the adaptation of the individual

---

member; to accomplish this purpose, a functional analysis of the duplicate bridge group will be attempted. The analysis provides the basis for this research.

The basic hypothesis deals with the manifest function of the bridge group as a recreational outlet for those involved. The hypothesis can be stated formally as follows: The duplicate bridge group accomplishes its manifest function of recreation only to a limited degree, with its latent functions providing the more basic reason for the existence and perseverance of the group.

Recreation or entertainment is inherent to the "game" of bridge—whether "played" at home or in the more formalized atmosphere of the duplicate bridge group. The use of such terms as "game," "play," "Are you playing tonight?" etc., tend to indicate the conscious categorizing of bridge playing into the area of recreational activity.

Recreation, as we use the term in connection with games, has two integral parts to its definition. The first involves "play"—a general term for physical or mental exercise which is done for amusement. The second involves "diversion"—that which draws the mind from cares or study. With these factors in mind, we should expect a "recreational" activity to draw the participant's mind from everyday frustrations and thoughts and, either intrinsically or through the diversion process, amuse the participating
individual.³

The simple act of diversion cannot, of itself, constitute recreation. There must also be the factor of amusement involved. This definition of terminology leads to several important questions which should be investigated concerning the manifest function of the duplicate bridge group. Does the group accomplish "recreation" in its full sense or only in the sense of diversion (observation indicates that diversion is certainly present in the group activities)? Are such emotional states as anger and disgust, which are frequently displayed at the meetings of the duplicate bridge club, compatible with the concept of "amusement" involved in recreational activities? Do new emotional strains and frustrations created by the activities of the group negate or make impossible the fulfillment of the group's manifest function? What status does the manifest function and its fulfillment (or lack of fulfillment) have in the maintenance and continuance of group activities? Do the participants feel consciously that the goal of recreation is actually accomplished? If they do, how do they explain the sometimes harsh and unpleasant occurrences? If they don't, what keeps them coming back for more?

In order to test the manifest function of the group,

---
³These definitions were adapted from Webster's New International Dictionary, Second Edition.
several functions may be postulated which the writer believes the group performs without the conscious knowledge of the participants. These latent functions are phenomena observed over several years of intimate acquaintance with the duplicate bridge organization:

(A) The group acts as a socially approved outlet for repressed aggressions. This function can be noted in two ways: first, the group maintains an atmosphere of lowered inhibition to aggression, thus unconsciously encouraging direct aggression and open conflict; second, successful aggression in the form of defeating other members of the group is rewarded. The reward indirectly takes the form of "master points" which are recognized by the national group and directly appears in the form of grudging admiration by the peer group.

(B) The group acts as a microcosmic societal structure within which the individual may succeed without the advantage of money or social position. The tension within the social structure to succeed is particularly noticeable in the individual with a high degree of ability but a lack of the resources which are necessary for financial success. In the bridge group, however, such resources are usually relegated to the minor role and, due to the complexity of the game, mental dexterity determines success. There are those who "buy" their life master's card by hiring experts to play with them at large tournaments. These individuals, by their
ability to play in many tournaments with recognized experts, usually sacrifice the admiration they crave from the peer group. The normative behavior of the group is to win a position of esteem within the group by using the brain rather than the pocketbook. It may be noted that social position within the group does not seem to depend upon social position in the "outside world."

(C) Those who have been rewarded by the outlet of aggressive actions within the whole social structure often find the duplicate bridge group provides a place where that reward may be continued symbolically and in terms of the esteem of others. Athletes, salesmen, businessmen, etc., who have received rewards for aggressive actions, fulfill this established need within this group where aggression is rewarded rather than condemned. The competitive spirit finds a place where it may, indeed, indulge itself without public censure.

There are several other interesting factors concerning this group which would deserve note in a larger study. One interesting contention, for example, is that duplicate bridge is one of the purest forms of competition in our society, primarily because it does not offer a material reward. The uniqueness of this in our materialistic society is readily apparent. Another interesting thing about this group is the small number of people who actually make their living from the bridge group. In this line it is unusual to note
that the people who could logically be called professionals are allowed to compete on an equal basis with every other member of the group. It also seems probably that the duplicate bridge group draws its membership from a limited segment of our society.

II. PREVIOUS WORK DONE IN THE FIELD

Basic research about this particular group is completely non-existent, as far as it is possible to determine. Individual hobby-type activities such as stamp collecting and model building have been studied. These studies have not, however, been in any sense functional analyses to determine the reasons for the existence of this type of group. Therefore, most of the efforts in background research have been devoted to four basic areas: the background of functional analysis as a method of research; aggression in primitive cultures; frustration and aggression as a psychological and sociological concept; and group studies of aggression.

Functional Analysis as a Method of Research

According to Malinowski's Postulate of Universal Functionalism, all standardized social or cultural forms have positive functions. He advanced his idea possibly in its most extreme form:

The functional view of culture insists therefore upon the principle that in every type of civilization, every custom, every material object, idea, and belief
fulfills some vital function...  

Kluckhohn stated it somewhat differently, allowing for more variation than Malinowski but eventually agreeing with him on the functional value of culture patterns:

My basic postulate...is that no culture forms survive unless they constitute responses which are adjustable or adaptive in some sense.

Kluckhohn went so far as to state that the extra buttons on a man's coat served the function of "maintaining a tradition and preserving the familiar."  

It appears that these generalities are a convenient method to handle all cases without undue problem to the analyst. Using Kluckhohn's postulate, we can show that all established elements of culture which we loosely describe as tradition have the minimum, if not the exclusive, function of "preserving the familiar." It seems far more logical to accept Merton's provisional assumption that:

...although any item of culture or social structure may have functions, it is premature to hold unequally that every such item must be functional.

---


6Ibid., p. 47.

7Robert K. Merton, op. cit., p. 33.
Malinowski carried his thinking one step further and developed his Postulate of Indispensability. In several respects this statement is more ambiguous than his earlier thought:

\[\ldots\text{in every type of civilization, every custom, material object, idea, and belief fulfills some vital function, has some task to accomplish, represents an indispensable part within a working whole.}\]

In this statement it is not altogether clear whether he is indicating the indispensability of the function or of the item or both. It is possible that this could lead to the conclusion that certain structures within the society are irreplaceable and that our society could not have existed without the development of such structures. It is also equally possible that this is not the case in actual practice. Merton presents us with a more logical solution in the following statement:

\[\ldots\text{just as the same item may have multiple functions, so may the same function be fulfilled by alternative items.}\]

In a review of Malinowski's theory of functional necessity, Parsons lends weight to Merton's viewpoint in the following statement:

\[\ldots\text{wherever such uncertainty elements enter into the pursuit of emotionally important goals... functionally}\]

---

8 B. Malinowski, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

equivalent phenomena could be expected to appear.\textsuperscript{10}

The third of the early postulates was Radcliffe-Brown's Postulate of the Functional Unity of Society:

The function of a particular social usage is the contribution it makes to the total social life as the functioning of the total social system. Such a view implies that a social system (the total social structure of a society together with the totality of social usages, in which that structure appears and on which it depends for its continued existence) has a certain kind of unity, which we speak of as a functional unity. We may define it as a condition in which all parts of the social system work together with a sufficient degree of harmony or internal consistency, i.e., without producing persistent conflicts which can neither be resolved or regulated.\textsuperscript{11}

This reasoning seems to be fallacious in the sense that certain social usages which are functional for some groups will be intrinsically dysfunctional for other groups in the same society. Merton places a more logical light on the idea in the following passage:

...a theory of functional analysis must call for specification of the social units subserved by given social functions, and that items of culture must be recognized to have multiple consequences, some of them functional and others, perhaps, dysfunctional.\textsuperscript{12}  

Merton makes a case for the use of the functional approach from several angles. Historically, he points out that this method has a much earlier and extended use in a


\textsuperscript{12}Robert K. Merton, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 37.
great variety of other disciplines:

The central orientation of functionalism—expressed in the practice of interpreting data by establishing their consequences for larger structures in which they are implicated—has been found in virtually all of the sciences of man—biology and physiology, psychology, economics and law, anthropology, and sociology.\(^{13}\)

Mere prevalence certainly will not insure the method's scientific value, but it does indicate that research has forced this method on other disciplined scientists. It seems apparent that there has been relatively little done to standardize the method of functional analysis in sociology.

**Aggression in Primitive Cultures**

The handling of aggressive feelings in primitive cultures is interesting in connection with the study of a group in our society which appears to function as an aggression surrogate. Hallowell describes aggression among the Saulteaux Indians of the Lake Winnipeg area in Canada. These people are generally known for their exceedingly non-aggressive tendencies. They are known for their co-operation, laughter, harmony, patience, and self-control. There are no records of murder or suicide, and theft is a rare occurrence in the Saulteaux society. Hallowell found, however, that this was only the superficial picture, and that aggression actually exists, but is stimulated and channelled in

\(^{13}\)Ibid., p. 47.
two ways. The first is gossip. Unpleasant, scandalous, and even threatening things are said about individuals in this gossip, but nothing is ever said openly to the person involved, as this is not in the culture pattern. The other type of aggression is more covert and finds its outlet in sorcery and magic. This method is highly institutionalized, and it is permissible to attempt to injure another person through magic as long as the person is not sure of this aggression. If one is accused of sorcery by the intended victim, it is customary to turn and walk away because (1) to deny the allegation would be useless and unbelieved by the accuser, and (2) to admit the allegation would constitute an open threat--taboo in the Saulteaux culture. 14

In the Hopi Indian society Eggan found that discord was the rule rather than the exception. Friction and antagonism predominate in both interpersonal and intertribal relations. This aggression takes the form of endless argument, gossip, witchcraft, and an ethnocentric scorn for cultures other than their own. Open physical aggression is almost totally suppressed, however. Mrs. Eggan summarizes the forms of Hopi aggression by saying, "He learned, in short, that he must not engage in open conflict with another Hopi; but there remained another form of aggression open to him... with a tongue as pointed as the poison arrow of a Powaka

(witch) he carries on a constant warfare with his fellows.\textsuperscript{15}

The Ashanti, a fierce and warlike West African tribe, has been described in some detail by Captain Rattray. He indicates that extreme restrictions placed on the expression of aggression are necessary, due to the strong instigation to aggression. Acts containing a high component of aggression—treason (including surrender to any enemy), murder (including the killing of an enemy without the proper ceremony), suicide, adultery (with a pregnant woman, the consort of the King or other high official, or with a widow of less than a year), striking a high official, stealing—are regarded as an act of aggression against the state and are severely punished, sometimes with torture preceding death. Because of these harsh restrictions, several outlets for aggression are common with the Ashanti. War, usually to the death, is the prime outlet for these tendencies. During one eight-day portion of the year a feast is held at which it is permissible to tell anyone, even the King, what you think of him. Even some sexual license is permissible and no retribution is permitted after the feast is over. Public executions and punishments, punishment of children, story telling, and ridiculing others are all acceptable ways to express aggression.

Benedict relates the Kwakiutl culture to our own in terms of rivalry and its consequences with these words:

Rivalry is notoriously wasteful. It ranks low in the scale of human values. It is a tyranny from which, once it is encouraged in any culture, no man may free himself. The wish for superiority is gargantuan; it can never be satisfied. The contest goes on forever...In Kwakiutl institutions, such rivalry reaches its final absurdity in equating investment with wholesale destruction of goods. They contest for superiority chiefly in accumulation of goods, but often, also, and without a consciousness of the contrast, in breaking in pieces their highest units of value, their coppers, and in making bonfires of their houseplanks, their blankets and canoes. The social waste is obvious. It is just as obvious in the obsessive rivalry of Middletown, where houses are built and clothing bought and entertainments attended that each family may prove that it has not been left out of the game.17

She goes on to state that rivalry tends to lose the original purpose of the competition and, "...creates an artificial situation, the game of showing that one can win out over others."18

**Frustration and Aggression as a Psychological and Sociological Concept**

As with so many other concepts in the field of 

---


psychology, Sigmund Freud seems to have been the first to deal with the idea of frustration and aggression in his early work. In some of his early writings Freud regarded the tendency to seek pleasure and avoid pain as the primary mechanism of all mental functioning. Whenever behavior which was designed to seek pleasure or avoid pain was blocked in some manner, frustration occurred. The "primordial reaction" to this state of affairs was aggression directed at the persons or objects in the external world which were perceived to be the source of the frustration. When the individual was stopped from direct aggression by "anxiety" (threat of punishment) the aggression was "turned inward." This led Freud to develop the theory of displacement. Freud made extensive use of this principle in his later writings. For example, a woman patient came to him because of her wish to see her son dead. Freud postulated that the woman, frustrated by her husband, wishes the death for the child who represents this man. A business rival who imposes a frustration in killed in a dream.

---


20 Ibid., p. 21.


22 Ibid., p. 171.
Each of these is an example of the displacement of aggression to a substitute goal.

Jung discussed the frustration-aggression theory in terms of "anxiety states" in his work on dream analysis. He postulated that phobias, for example, were anxiety states which had been substituted for frustrated aggressive tendencies.\(^2^3\)

In a more contemporary sense Williams discussed the tendency to aggression in terms of "rivalry." He defined rivalry as, "the disposition to show superiority."\(^2^4\) Later in the book the idea of "reward" is discussed.

While rivalry is generally for things that satisfy other impulses also, the disposition itself is immediately satisfied not by things but by social recognition of authority. Wherefore, the rivalrous disposition seeks what will win recognition whether it has any other value or not. What is sought is the form or token of superiority that will gain social acknowledgment. The standards of superiority are, therefore, set by the group and must be unquestioningly, not intelligently, accepted. The entire process is impulsive, though great shrewdness and cleverness may be stimulated in the course of the rivalry. The social acknowledgment of superiority that is sought is an egoistic gratification.\(^2^5\)

Williams also noted the effect of success on those who exhibit a pronounced "rivalrous disposition."


\(^{2^5}\)Ibid., p. 18.
A sense of superiority and achievement has
a marked effect on those in whom the rivalrous
disposition is pronounced. Success eases the im­
pulse for superiority and gives a serenity and
complacency... Or superiority may result in the
smug, self-satisfied air of the successful but
still busy person.26

The general relationship between rivalry and conflict was
divided into three parts by Williams. He felt that conflict
resulted from rivalry because (1) rivalry fails to recognize
the annoyance of others, (2) it is never satisfied, and (3)
the tendency of rivalry is to maintain secrecy.27

Zander felt that aggression is a normal and healthy
adjustment to frustration, particularly when such action is
justified by the circumstances. He found, for example, that
children who react aggressively to frustration show fewer
neurotic manifestations than children who meet frustration
in other ways. He indicated that the person who reacts to
frustration with the most direct aggression is the person
who has the greatest self-confidence. On the other hand,
Zander felt that in our particular culture, substitute re­
sponses and goals occur much more frequently than direct ag­
gressive responses. In this same study he demonstrated that
there is a correlation between an individual’s ability to
stand large amounts of frustration and his general emotional

26 Ibid., p. 19.
27 Ibid., p. 21.
stability.\textsuperscript{28}

In another step forward in this experimental area, Doob and Sears have formulated the following principle:

"The frequency of substitute responses to aggression varies positively with the strength of anticipatory responses to punishment for being aggressive."\textsuperscript{29} These authors in an earlier work, and later in connection with a larger study, indicate a belief that the stronger the instigation to the frustrated goal response the greater will be the tendency to make a substitute response; and the greater the anticipated punishment, the more likely that less overt and substitute responses will be elicited.\textsuperscript{30}

Dollard discussed the social aspects of frustration, hostility, and aggression in an early study. In this connection he said, "repressed aggressive tendencies are therefore a standard feature of the life of every well socialized animal."\textsuperscript{31} Dollard felt that this repressed aggression stemmed from demands for satisfaction which had to be tabooed (neurotic type) and the desire to master and control other

\textsuperscript{28}A. Zander, "A Study in Experimental Frustration," \textit{Psychological Monograph} 56, No. 3, Whole No. 256, 1944.


\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Ibid}.

people. He indicated the societal patterns in handling these repressed aggressions in the following terms:

Each society standardizes its own permissive patterns and differs from the next in the degree to which hostility may be expressed. In our own society, we are allowed, for example, a limited right to compete for direct goals as by business manipulations, courtship, or sport. Those who have carried repression too far, by the way, are not able to make use of these opportunities to compete and they appear as our neurotic persons.  

Maslow wrote on the substitute goal-objects of this type of repressed aggression. He felt that substitute goal-objects for aggression had two actual meanings to an individual. First, it had an intrinsic value in terms of sensory satisfaction. He also indicated that it may also have a secondary, symbolic value.

Dollard and others, writing under the auspices of the Yale Institute of Human Relations, created the "classic" in this theory area. These men used the basic postulate, "aggression is always a consequence of frustration." They freely admitted their debt to Freud for the postulate, but they explored several areas and developed principles that present a background for this study. Briefly, these principles are as follows: (1) The strength of instigation to

\[32\text{Ibid.} \]

\[33\text{A. Maslow, "Deprivation, Threat, and Frustration," Psychological Review, XLVIII, pp. 364-366.} \]

\[34\text{Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears, Frustration and Aggression (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938).} \]
aggression varies directly with the amount of frustration. (2) The inhibition of any act of aggression varies directly with the strength of the punishment anticipated for the expression of that act. (3) The strongest instigation aroused by a frustration is to acts of aggression directed against the source of the frustration, and progressively weaker instigations are aroused to progressively less direct acts of aggression. (4) The inhibition of acts of direct aggression is an additional frustration and increases the instigation to other forms of aggression. There is a strong tendency for inhibited aggression to be displaced to different objects and expressed in modified forms which are socially approved. (5) The expression of any act of aggression is a catharsis that reduces the instigation to all other acts of aggression. (6) There is a functional unity represented by the phenomena of catharsis and displacement that justifies attaching the label of aggression to the variety of substitute responses. 35

Group Studies of Aggression

The greatest problem in the effort to uncover background research seemed to be in the area of relating frustration-aggression theory to the actual group situation. A survey of the journals and other sources revealed that

35 Ibid., pp. 37, 54.
relatively little has actually been done to test this relationship. Most of the work has been done on informal experimental groups or in a minor way as a part of a larger study.

Sears, Hovland, and Miller imposed frustrations on an informal experimental group of college students with the following results: (1) the randomly selected students formed an "in-group" under the pressure of induced frustration, (2) the group acted aggressively toward the experimenters (who were also the instigators of the frustrations) and as time wore on and the frustrations became greater, the number and overtness of the aggressive acts also increased. (3) The aggression was largely displaced from the experimenters (who were professors and thereby represented an inhibition to aggression) to other students, "psychologists" in general, or to other members of the experimental group. This aggression took the form of jokes, "wisecracks," and spontaneous aggressive drawings.36

Stotland found in his study of group attraction that persons with low self-esteem are more vulnerable to failure experiences so that they seek to withdraw from situations which involve such failure. On the other hand, persons with high self-esteem are much less vulnerable to perceiving

failure in themselves and thus can afford to remain in groups in which they objectively fail. He also found that subjects who succeeded on tasks within the group were more attracted to it than those who did not. Stotland's conclusions were that failure did not make a group less attractive to persons of high esteem and that need satisfaction in groups generates attraction to them.37

In the same general area Kelley observed that attraction to a group was lowest among members who were in danger of losing high status positions or who were not allowed to rise out of low status ones. These results may be interpreted to mean that there will be a decline in a member's attraction to a group if there is little chance of the group's satisfying the member's need for status.38

Cartwright and Zander corroborated these findings in a later study of the same phenomenon:

...the valence of a group will be increased by heightening the awareness of a member (or a potential member) that he can fulfill his needs by belonging to the group.39

The foregoing information indicates several concepts which are usable in a study of the duplicate bridge groups.


39Cartwright and Zander, Group Dynamics: Research and Theory (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1953), p. 78.
It appears that psychologists, both early and modern, have generally agreed that frustration and aggression are functionally related. They also seem to be in general agreement that in the face of high punishment for direct aggression a less overt substitute reaction usually occurs. Anthropologists indicate that even in primitive societies, and certainly in our own, there are definite punishments for expressed aggression against other members of the society, thereby necessitating symbolic or substitute goals for the repressed aggression extant within the society. Sociologists have (in a limited way) indicated that people affiliate themselves with groups and continue to maintain the affiliation only if the group serves them in some form of need satisfactions.

III. SCARCITY OF EMPIRICAL RESEARCH BEARING DIRECTLY ON THE PROBLEM

From the previous quotations it seems apparent that, although much speculation and theorizing has been done concerning related theory areas, little has actually been done to formally study the development and function of such groups in our society as the duplicate bridge group. The foregoing theorists lend weight to the investigations of such a hypothesis as has been advanced for this study. They do not, however, offer any empirical evidence which
bears directly on the group which is under scrutiny in this work.

Under these circumstances it becomes difficult to establish research design or to accurately predict the trend that the data will take. Cartwright and Zander perhaps sum up the situation when they state, "There is very little systematic knowledge about conditions which heighten cohesiveness, since few studies have been directly aimed at these problems."40

IV. IDEAS LEADING TO THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Since there is a dearth of applicable research, and particularly since there has been no study comparable to that suggested in this thesis, it necessitates the development of a pattern of research method.

As has been pointed out, Robert K. Merton has been a modern leader in the field of functional analysis. His terminology (especially that pertaining to formal, functional analysis, e.g., latent and manifest functions) is generally accepted in such studies. With this in mind, it seems appropriate to adopt the paradigm established by Dr. Merton. He expressed his purpose in setting up such a pattern in these words, "The paradigm brings these [vocabularies, postulates, concepts, and ideological imputations] together in

40 Ibid., p. 79.
compact form, thus permitting simultaneous inspection of the major requirements of functional analysis. In other words Merton's is a noble attempt to standardize work done by social scientists in the general research area of functional analysis. Briefly, the paradigm is stated in eleven concepts which functional analysis should embody. These are:

1. The item(s) to which functions are imputed
2. Concepts of subjective dispositions (motives, purposes)
3. Concepts of objective consequences (functions, dysfunctions)
4. Concepts of the unit subserved by the function
5. Concepts of functional requirements (needs, prerequisites)
6. Concepts of the mechanisms through which functions are fulfilled
7. Concepts of functional alternatives (functional equivalents of substitutes)
8. Concepts of structural context (or structural constraint)
9. Concepts of dynamics and change
10. Problems of validation of functional analysis
11. Problems of the ideological implications of functional analysis

Merton felt that a functional analysis should include as full and accurate description as possible as a prelude to

---

41 Robert K. Merton, op. cit., pp. 50-54.
42 Ibid.
the actual analysis. He sets up a descriptive protocol as a guide to this portion of such a study. It includes:

1. Location of participants in the pattern within the social structure—differential participation

2. Consideration of alternative modes of behavior excluded by emphasis on the observed pattern (i.e., attention not only to what occurs but also to what is omitted by virtue of the existing pattern)

3. The emotive and cognitive meanings attached by participants to the pattern

4. A distinction between the motivations for participating in the pattern and the objective behavior involved in the pattern

5. Regularities of behavior not recognized by participants but which are nonetheless associated with the central pattern of behavior

The paradigm and descriptive protocol are ideal constructs and as such will not necessarily fit each research project. Where it is possible, this study follows the foregoing outlines. In several respects, however, it was necessary to deviate from the paradigm. For instance, under concepts two and three, the investigator felt that it was necessary, because of the limited scope of this study, to postulate beforehand three of the probably latent functions of the group. With the tools used, it seemed far more probable to test these than simply to postulate several latent functions from the descriptive protocol. Under concept four it was considered not to be within the limits of this work to

\[43^\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 60.}\]
describe all of the range of units which might be subserved by the functions, but merely to study the individual in this particular group affiliation. Concept nine implies an historical approach which is not possible within the limits of the research method, time, and space. For the purpose of this study, the investigator is assuming no ideological position for this group. This concept (number 11) is more applicable to a study of religion or political function on a large scale. The descriptive protocol was found to embody generally the items in the descriptive pattern followed in this study.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

I. THE SAMPLE

For the purposes of this work, one complete unit of the American Contract Bridge League was chosen as the basic sample. This organization is the only formal bridge organization in the United States and is loosely affiliated with its counterpart in other countries throughout the world. The bridge "unit" is the basic structural block of this organization. Some units of this group draw membership from several communities, but the particular unit used for this sample is contained almost totally within the city of Missoula, Montana, and has a membership of 91 people. This limit on spatial area was very useful for purposes of a study project but created problems which are explained later under "Limitations." The unit was also particularly useful as a sample, since the secretary of the unit was able to provide a complete list of the names and addresses of the members.

The unit itself was composed of four smaller clubs. All unit members were free to participate in three of these clubs. The membership of these clubs was found to be largely composed of the same individuals. The fourth group was
the "junior club," a group limited to players with fewer than twenty master points. The younger people, both in age and in terms of length of membership in the bridge group, were generally found in this group.

The only basic requirement for inclusion in the sample was current membership in the unit. Several members of the individual clubs were not members of the American Contract Bridge League. These were not included in the sample.

II. THE STUDY TECHNIQUES

The purpose of the study being two-fold in nature (a sociological description of the item, coupled with an attempt to describe motivations and their objective consequences), it was necessary to employ three techniques of data collection. There were the questionnaire, the mass observation, and the interview.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was almost totally structured. It was generally concerned with the location of the individual within the social structure and within the duplicate bridge group. Some questions were devoted to acquiring the history of the individual. Others required a judgment of personal attitudes of other members of the group.

1See Appendix A, pp. 100-103.
The descriptive items fell into several categories, including (1) age, sex, and race distribution; (2) spatial location and mobility; (3) present and past occupation (the respondents were placed within a social stratum strictly on this basis); (4) marital and family status; (5) educational background; (6) family background (permanence); (7) group affiliation; (8) present and past involvement in recreational activities (to determine if a possible correlation exists between involvement in other aggressive activities and duplicate bridge); (9) past involvement in sales activities (to determine if a possible correlation exists between involvement in aggressive business activities and duplicate bridge); and (10) the respondents' official status in the American Contract Bridge League.

The subjective items called on the respondent to (1) draw a comparison of his own ability with the general ability level of the group (ego involvement), (2) make a judgment of the "best players," (3) indicate the most aggressive players, (4) assess his "reasons" for participating, and (5) indicate the percentage of very aggressive players in the group.

In order to avoid bias which could result from the knowledge that the study was, at least in part, an attempt to uncover "psychological" reasons for playing bridge, the study was simply introduced as a sociological description of the group. A few of the respondents inquired into the
meaning of this terminology, but usually it was accepted without question.

The original intention was to present each member of the unit with a questionnaire. The unit rolls showed a total of 91 members. Of this number, three had moved from the immediate vicinity. One individual had entered the unit so recently that she was unable to answer any questions requiring judgment of the group and was eliminated from the study on this basis. The timing of the study (summer) took further toll of the original sample. Sixteen members of the unit could not be located and were dropped from the sample. One member adamantly refused to fill out the questionnaire on the grounds that it was "too personal." This left a total of 70 persons who were presented with a questionnaire. Of these, 53 were returned to the investigator. This final sample represented 75.7% of the members presented with a questionnaire and 57.1% of the total unit membership. From this final sample of 53 members, the respondents were selected for interviews.

The Mass Observation

The observation situation. In an attempt to establish the extent of aggressive reactions in the actual group situation, a mass observation of the group was made. The observation was conducted at the monthly master point session of the duplicate bridge group. This event is a
relatively important one to the members of the group and is better attended than the usual meetings. At this particular meeting there were 9½ tables in play (38 persons). The fact that the observation was to take place had been previously announced, although several members of the group indicated that they were not aware that it was to occur.

Two extra chairs were placed at each table and, when the session was about to begin, sixteen observers took places at eight of the tables. This left three pairs without a direct observer. These pairs were under secondary observation (observers watching the other couple at the table noted on the coordinate pair observation sheet the behavior of the pair who had no direct observer) at eight tables by one observer, however. The reaction to the entry of the observers was varied. Only one pair made loud and adverse comment on the situation. Some were amused, some were interested in why they "were being watched," and others were nervous about the situation. On the surface the mood of the group seemed to be reserved about the observation, neither positively nor negatively valent toward the situation or the observers.

The observation schedule. The observation schedule consisted of four parts, (1) a check sheet to be used for observation of the pair assigned to the observer, (2) a similar but smaller check sheet to be given to the coordinate observer at the end of the round, (3) an unstructured
observation sheet on which the observer was to indicate behavior patterns after the session was over, and (4) a general comments sheet which was to be taken home by the observers and filled in at their leisure.

The primary pair check sheet^ was used to observe the primary pair throughout the nine rounds of play that occurred during the session. The primary pair was the pair of players assigned to the observer at the beginning of the session. This pair was under scrutiny by this observer for the entire session. The title of the coordinate pair was assigned to the opponents. The check sheet consisted of three major areas of aggressive reaction: criticism, aggression, and conflict. These general areas were subdivided into several categories. Criticism was subdivided into criticism directed toward self, partner, and opponents. Aggression was subdivided into two categories: aggression toward partner and aggression toward opponents. Conflict with both partners and opponents was to be noted. Incidents of aggression were to be marked with a check. An area at the bottom of the sheet was left for any amplification of the incidents involved or remarks of a significant nature made by the players.

This sheet was in use for nine rounds of play. Three hands were played each round, with a theoretical time limit

^See Appendix A, p. 104.
of seven minutes per hand. The actual time elapsed during this portion of the observation was 167 minutes.

The coordinate pair check sheet\(^3\) contained the same items as the primary pair check sheet but was to be filled out according to the actions of the coordinate pair (the opponents of the primary pair). This sheet was given to the coordinate pair observer at the end of each round of play. A comparison of items checked on this sheet with the items checked on the primary pair check sheet of each observer gives a reliability correlation between the two observers at the table. Since only 16 observers were available and 19 pairs were in play, this meant that twice during the session the North-South observer would have no coordinate observer. It also meant that during one session each East-West observer would have no coordinate observer. Since each East-West pair "sat out" one round because of an uneven number of pairs, it also left one observer free to talk to his primary pair for approximately 21 minutes. The coordinate pair check sheet allowed a reliability check of 80% of the total observations.

To find material for the post-session observation sheet,\(^4\) the observers were instructed to circulate among the group after the play was over. They were to note changes of

\(^3\)See Appendix A, p. 104.

\(^4\)See Appendix A, p. 105.
behavior patterns, relaxing of tensions, arguments continued from the session, and attitudes of the players as they found out their standing in the evening's play. This portion of the observation was completely unstructured, with the observer free to look for anything interesting which might provide material for the study.

The observers were to take the commentary sheet home with them. They were asked to comment on the general atmosphere of the group situation and any interesting behavior observed during the session. Comments on the observation experience were invited on this sheet. It was hoped that a summation of the experience by the observers would provide information that had not previously been noted in the observation situation.

The Interview

Selection of the interview sample. Ten members of the group were selected for a short interview. This constituted 17.9% of the 53 members in the final sample. Selection was made by random number sampling. The interview group was chosen from the members who had responded earlier by filling out a questionnaire. Of the ten original persons, two refused to be interviewed. The excuses given involved the lack of time and the advent of a vacation trip. Two new

---

5See Appendix A, p. 105.
members of the group were selected randomly to fill the vacancies in the interview group.

The interviewing. An attempt was made to make the interview as brief and informal as possible. The interviews were done strictly at the convenience of the respondent in order to achieve the greatest possible rapport between the interviewer and the respondents. This was not too difficult because the interviewer was acquainted in varying degrees with all members of the sample.

The interview itself took a minimum of 20 minutes and a maximum of 55 minutes. The amount of talk about the inter-items seemed to depend upon the personality of the respondents and not upon the structure of the interview schedules. In two cases the respondents may have shortened the interview due to press of time, but usually there was no hurry involved in completing the interview.

Since all other data collection had already been completed, the informant was told the real purpose of the study after the interview and was asked to comment on the interview or the idea of the thesis. Whenever comments were made, they seemed to be in general agreement with the investigator and in no way contradicted any of the interview results. The following expression by one of the interviewees perhaps sums up the general feelings of the group when they were told the real reason for the study: "I'd never thought of bridge as an outlet for aggression, but it certainly seems
like it could be." Another person said, "I go to bridge [duplicate club] to win—I can play bridge for fun at home."

The interview schedule. Because of the lack of previous empirical study in this area, the interview schedule was constructed by the investigator and was limited to his concept of the type of data necessary to give weight to the hypothesis. Since three latent functions of the duplicate bridge group were assumed for use as tools in this study, it was deemed necessary to attempt to test each of these in relation to the manifest function (recreation) of the group.

In order to test the aggressive tendencies of the interviewees, five hypothetical situations which frequently occur in duplicate bridge were presented. Situations which involve either an aggressive or non-aggressive reaction are difficult to develop. Therefore, the situations were such that an aggressive reaction would probably lead to conflict. If the respondent desired to avoid the probable conflict, there were non-aggressive courses of action open to him. Six possible courses of action were given to the respondent. Three of these were essentially non-aggressive, and three had an aggressive content. For instance, in a situation where the respondent was asked to decide what to do, he was given, among others, the choice of (1) calling in the director

---

6See Appendix A, pp. 106-111.
7See Chapter I of the thesis, pp. 5, 6.
and protesting the unethical play by the opponent (aggressive) or (2) politely informing the opponent that he should put the convention on his card but call no penalty (non-aggressive). The interviewer read the situation to the respondent and indicated the six possible reactions. The respondent was asked to select what course he would take and what course he would choose as an alternate method of approaching the situation. In order to limit bias, nothing was said as to the actual purpose of these five questions, and in no case was the interviewer quizzed on the reason for the questions.

Five questions were devoted to forced value selections of people from the group. (The respondents were asked to choose three people with whom they would choose to associate in five different bridge-social situations.) A list of 15 members was given to the respondent. These were selected from the final sample that had returned the questionnaire and were distributed throughout the occupational strata represented in the bridge group. This stratification was done according to the occupational index developed by Richard Centers, which allowed the investigator to roughly classify the members of the sample. From this list the respondent was asked to select three persons for each of five

---

separate questions, a total of 15 selections. The objective of this group of items was to correlate the value selections of the respondents with the social standing of the individuals being selected. The questions were designed to determine if standing in the community influenced standing within the hierarchy of the duplicate bridge group.

The last five questions were concerned with the value attached to the acquisition of real and symbolic rewards within the structure of the bridge group. In each case a hypothetical situation involving reward was described. The respondent was asked to choose between answers involving either real reward, in terms of money or property; symbolic reward, in terms of trophies, master points, or group esteem; or no reward at all. The object of the questions was to establish the role and importance that reward plays in the mind of the individual duplicate bridge player.

The interviews were conducted under favorable conditions with the full cooperation of the individual involved. Since the interview schedule was largely structured, with the respondent forced to select from a group of answers, it was felt necessary to include also any unstructured comments of the respondents. A space on the schedule was left at the end of each question for such comment, and the interviewer urged the respondent to comment on each situation after the choices had been completed. When the schedule had been finished, each respondent was told the exact purpose of the
study and was asked to make a general comment. (This was possible since all other evaluative procedures had been completed.)

III. LIMITATIONS

The research design suggests several limitations that the data will have for analytical purposes. These limitations fall into two basic areas: limitations inherent in the selection of the sample and limitations imposed by the study techniques used.

Limitations Inherent in the Selection of the Sample

Before any generalizations are made concerning the duplicate bridge group, it must be recognized that this sample of only one group can hardly be considered to be absolutely representative of all such groups. Several factors about this group do give some validation to the group as a representative sample, however. First, the sample was selected from a city of above average size in its general area—about 40,000 population. This places it third in size in the state of Montana. In the investigator's experience with the duplicate bridge group, he has noted that very small communities do not usually have such a group. Large cities, on the other hand, are usually broken up by the American Contract Bridge League into many separate bridge units. On written inquiry, a national director of the
American Contract Bridge League informed the investigator that bridge units run from about 50 members to the largest unit of several thousand members. He also indicated that the average unit has about 80 to 150 members. This places the unit studied in the "average" size group. Second, the unit has been in operation for over 12 years, which places it in the "not new but not old" category. Third, the number of players in each category of proficiency is about equal to other units in the state. For example, the sample unit has three "life masters" as compared with two in the Helena, Montana, unit; five in the Butte, Montana, unit; and four in the Billings, Montana, unit.

The investigator found this sample difficult to work with on the basis of familiarity. He had been a member of the sample unit for three years and had been involved in some of the activities of the group for three years before becoming a member. This intimacy created two problems. (1) It was necessary to eliminate himself from the sample, which might have affected some of the data. (2) The mixed valences toward the investigator might have affected some of the responses.

Limitations Inherent in the Study Technique

The lack of empirical research on duplicate bridge groups or even about related groups forced the investigator to develop a research design. Without previous data, it
was difficult to predict which techniques would be useful and which would not. It was perhaps even more difficult to predict what types of data would prove useful in connection with the hypothesis.

The research tools, however, proved to be the greatest limiting factor in the study. Although the investigator used tools commonly associated with sociological research, he found that they were generally inadequate in situations where emotions and attitudes were under investigation. It is relatively easy to select the general tools, but it is much more difficult to decide what items will produce significant data.

The technique most limited in this study proved to be mass observation. It was expected that the advent of the observers would create an abnormal situation which would gradually normalize. This did not prove to be the case, however. Extremely aggressive behavior patterns tended not to occur as usual. This remained true for the entire session, with only a minor degree of normative behavior occurring in later rounds. This may not have been due solely to the presence of the observers, however. At the time the observation took place, several of the better players were in Denver, Colorado, attending a large tournament. This may have tended to lessen normal reactions. Several players indicated this situation with their comments. In retrospect, it would seem more profitable, in terms of observed data,
to infiltrate the sample group over a period of several months with a small group of trained observers. This technique was not possible in this case because of the limited scope of the study. It might also be noted that the relatively untrained observers did not see many of the obvious occurrences which would have attracted the eye of a more trained individual. The graduate students of some maturity seemed to do a fairly adequate job of observation, despite the limited situation, while the younger observers generally became bored and unobservant as time progressed.
CHAPTER III

THE DATA

Three types of data were acquired in the course of the study: factual data concerned with the description of the sample group, observed data concerned with the actions of the group, and data concerned with attitudes and motivations of group members. For clarity and conciseness, the data have been divided into these three major categories, with subdivisions where appropriate.

Descriptive Data

Age distribution. The age distribution of the group showed wide variation. The mean age of the 49 respondents who answered the questionnaire was 52.15 years. The extremes were 26 and 80 years, respectively. Although the variation between the age extremes was 54 years, a closer examination indicated the great majority of the group fell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Extremes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>26-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and % in Each Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into the 40-70 age group (70%). The 60-70 age bracket contained the greatest number of respondents, 14, which constituted 26.4% of the sample.

**Sex distribution.** Females outnumbered males substantially in the sample group. Of the 53 respondents, 38 were female, which was 73.6% of the group. In the whole unit the majority of females was not so pronounced, with the ladies constituting 65.9% of the total.

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX DISTRIBUTION OF FINAL SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. in Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Permanence and spatial mobility.** The group as a whole seemed to be a well-established group in the community. The mean number of years of residence was 21.7 years, with extremes of two and 63 years. In terms of spatial mobility,

**TABLE III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANENCE AND SPATIAL MOBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. in Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the respondents averaged 1.8 changes of residence outside of Missoula and 2.6 moves since coming to Missoula. One very
mobile person reported 20 changes of residence within the community, or the average on the latter figure would have been considerably lower.

**Occupational status.** As already indicated, the occupational status of the respondents was judged on the basis of Centers' Occupational Index. The sequential arrangement of the index is as follows: (1) Large business (2) Professional (3) Small business (4) White-collar workers (5) Farm owners and managers (6) Skilled workers and foreman (7) Farm tenants (8) Semiskilled workers (9) Unskilled workers and farm laborers. ¹

No respondents fell into either the "farm owner" or "farm tenant" category. This seems to indicate that the duplicate bridge group is highly urban. No respondents fell

### TABLE IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Title</th>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>No. in Occupation</th>
<th>% in Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Large Business</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Small Business</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. White Collar Workers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Farm Owners &amp; Managers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Skilled Workers &amp; Foremen</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Farm Tenants</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Semi-skilled Workers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unskilled Workers and Laborers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Undetermined</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹R. Centers, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-51.
into the less esteemed job categories of "semiskilled workers" and "unskilled workers and farm laborers." Actually, only four respondents (7.5%) fell into any labor category (skilled workers and foremen). The largest single category was the "white collar" group with 20 respondents, a total of 37.7%. Of the remainder of the sample, 20.8% were involved in "small business," 7.5% in "large business," 17% fell into the "professional" category, and 9.4% could not be classified.

Previous occupations and occupational mobility. A classification of previous occupations allowed a comparison to be made which would indicate occupational mobility. In 11 cases a previous occupation was not indicated and mobility could not be determined. Of the remaining 42 respondents, 20 indicated some upward occupational mobility. This was 37.7% of the total sample. The remaining 22 respondents showed no change of mobility. There were no cases of downward occupational mobility. In eight of the 22 cases of upward mobility, however, the jumps in job status occurred because of marriage. In each case a female married a male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>Unable to Determine</th>
<th>No. Indicating Upward Mobility</th>
<th>No. Indicating Downward Mobility</th>
<th>No. Indicating No Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>11(20.2%)</td>
<td>20(37.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22(42.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with a higher job classification. Eliminating these eight cases leaves a total of 22.7% of the group which has accomplished personal upward occupational mobility.

**Marital status.** Perhaps as a further indication of the stability of the group, the responses indicated that all members of the group were, or had been, married. In seven cases the respondent was widowed, a total of 13.2%. Only one respondent reported being divorced (1.9%). The remaining 45 informants were currently married. Of these 45, only 22, a total of 48.8%, reported that their spouses also played in the duplicate bridge group. Some of these indicated that their spouse participated only to a limited degree.

**TABLE VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. in Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status of the family.** The informants were asked to indicate the number of children in the family and the number presently living at home. The average number of children

**TABLE VII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. in Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
per family was 1.94. The average number of children living at home was .72. The relatively high age level of the group was perhaps responsible for the latter figure.

Educational level. The overall educational level of the group proved to be quite high. This may be accounted for on two bases. First, the group draws its membership from portions of our society where education is valued and necessary for success. Second, the complexity of the game demands intelligence for success. The average number of grades of school completed was 13.92. In other words, the average member of the group has virtually completed the sophomore year of college. Out of the 53 respondents, 20 have received college degrees (37.7%). Three respondents have an M.A. degree, and one holds the LL.B. Only two informants reported not going to high school. Ten other respondents indicated that they had graduated from high school but had not attended college. The remaining 21 individuals had attended college for one to three years but had not graduated.

TABLE VIII
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>Number Finishing</th>
<th>Mean Yr. of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immigrant background. Only five members of the group are native to Missoula, Montana. Twelve others were born in
Montana. This constitutes 32.1% of the sample. Only three respondents (5.7%) were born outside the U. S. Two of these were born in Canada. The respondents were also asked to indicate the country in which their parents were born. Seventeen reported that one or both parents were born in countries outside of the U. S. In nine of these cases, at least one parent was born in the U. S. It would appear, taking into consideration the age level of the group and relative youthfulness of the area in terms of length of settlement, that this group is not predominantly foreign born or of foreign-born parentage.

**TABLE IX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMMIGRANT BACKGROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. in Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Church preference.** As in most groups in this area, the white Protestant was most prevalent. The group was 70% Protestant (37 respondents), 11.3% Catholic, and 1.9% Mormon (1 respondent), while 17% claim no religious affiliation.

**TABLE X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH PREFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. in Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other affiliations. The sample members tend to affiliate themselves frequently and with a varied selection of organizations. Over 57% of the respondents said they played in less formal, private bridge groups. The number of these groups attended ranged from one to four. Several informants simply indicated the frequency of such affiliations with such words as, "several" and "frequently."

Only 15 respondents, a total of 28.3%, indicated that they did not belong to any formal organizations outside of the duplicate bridge group. The other 71.7% had a total of 47 fraternal group affiliations, five business group affiliations, three were in political clubs, 16 indicated activity in professional organizations and alumni groups, four belonged to athletic associations or groups, seven were members of service clubs, five were active in church groups, one was a member of an art study club, and one respondent was in the rose society. This was a total of 99 group affiliations, or a mean for the entire sample of 1.87 affiliations. Of the 38 respondents who were actually affiliated with outside groups, the average was 2.61 affiliations. Fourteen respondents indicated membership in the country club (26.4% of the sample). Three of these were members of over 20 years standing. The other 11 were younger people who had only been in the country club for one to five years.
TABLE XI

AFFILIATION WITH OTHER GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>Bridge to Private Mean</th>
<th>Belonging to Other Groups Mean</th>
<th>Belonging to Country Club Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking within the categories of proficiency. The American Contract Bridge League has several rankings of proficiency for its members. These rankings, with the necessary master point holdings, are: Life Master—300 master points, 50 of these to be won in regional or national tournaments; Advanced Senior Master—200 to 300 master points with 10% won in regional or national competition; Senior Master—50 to 100 master points; Full Master—20 to 50 master points; and Junior Master—1 to 20 master points. The distribution of respondents in these categories was relatively normal, with the Junior Master category having a larger percentage, and the Advanced Senior Master category a smaller percentage than the other levels. The great

TABLE XII

A.C.B.L. RANKINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>No Rank</th>
<th>Junior Master</th>
<th>Full Master</th>
<th>Nat'l Master</th>
<th>Senior Master</th>
<th>Adv. Senior Master</th>
<th>Life Master</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distances from Montana to the sites of regional and national
tournaments might supply the reason for the fewer numbers in
the more advanced categories. The distribution of the re-
spondents in the various categories was as follows: Junior
Master--13 (24.5%), Full Master--10 (18.8%), National Master--
8 (15%), Senior Master--16 (30.2%), Advanced Senior Master--
1 (1.9%), and Life Master--3 (5.7%). Those who had no rank-
ing constituted 3.8% of the sample, a total of two respon-
dents.

Participation in sports and other aggressive activi-
ties. The informants were asked to indicate what sports and
other aggressive activities they participated in, either as
an active participant or as a spectator. In order not to
miss any pertinent data, they were also asked to indicate
other games in which they now participated and sports in
which they had formerly been active competitively. If such
activity had produced any special rewards, the respondent
was to list them.

Out of the sample group, only four indicated no inter-
est in such activities on any basis. The other 49 respon-
dents listed 72 sports activities in which they were present-
ly active and 54 sports activities in which they were in-
volved as spectators. Other card games were most generally
listed as "other games" in which the respondents partici-
pated,

When responding to the question involving former
competitive sports activity, 22 informants said they had not participated in competitive sports. The remaining 31 respondents reported that they had participated in 58 such activities. A total of 34 high school or college "letters" had been won by this group. One respondent reported that she had captained and played on a state champion baseball team, and another indicated playing on a state champion girls' basketball team. One informant was and is renowned as one of the great football stars at Montana State University. This same individual later became the successful coach of a state championship high school football team.

In all, it would appear that this group is presently active in aggressive activities such as athletic activities. It would also seem that the group has been active in sports activities in younger days, receiving varying amounts of reward in connection with these activities.

**TABLE XIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Participation</th>
<th>Former Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. in Sample</td>
<td>No. of Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggressive vs. non-aggressive reasons for participation. The informants were asked to choose one or more of six reasons for participation in duplicate bridge. Three of the
six reasons had an essentially non-aggressive content having to do with the recreational aspects of duplicate bridge. For example, the informants were asked if they played "for enjoyment," "for diversion," or "as a social interest." Three had an essentially aggressive content. The aggression-centered choices were "for the competition involved," "for the satisfaction of winning," and "for blood." The respondents checked the responses in numbers varying between one and six responses. As was expected, a substantial number of responses (79) on the non-aggressive side were marked. It may be noted, however, that even though the reasons listed on the opposite side were written in very aggressive language, the respondents indicated 63 of these responses as their reasons for playing in the duplicate bridge group. Of the entire sample, 54.7% indicated both aggressive and recreational reasons. Another 13.2% indicated only aggressive reasons for their participation.

When asked in an unstructured item for any other reasons for playing duplicate bridge, three people mentioned the mental stimulation involved. Another three indicated that they liked the "challenge" in the game. The relative inexpensiveness of the game attracted two other informants.

Playing for blood. The terminology "for blood" is generally recognized by bridge players as meaning to play to win at all costs. Players who take advantage of all situations and opponents are "blood" players. It does not
necessarily mean that the individual does anything unethical to win, but it sometimes implies that meaning.

The respondents were also asked to say whether this attitude was or was not desirable. Eleven members did not answer the question. Of the remaining group, 17 said yes and 25 answered no. It would appear that the group itself is divided in its attitude toward "playing for blood." The mere vulgarity of the terminology may tend to create some aversion to this question as is evidenced by the number of refusals to answer. Despite this, 32% of the respondents felt that this was a desirable attitude.

Establishment of a hierarchy within the bridge group. In order to determine whether a hierarchy exists within the bridge group, the respondents were asked to name the five "best players" in the group. From the votes, it seems apparent that such a hierarchy does exist. Only 44 persons answered the question. When a reason was given for not answering, it usually was, "I don't want to indulge in personalities."

Of the 44 persons who did answer, 43 voted for one individual (he did not vote for himself or it would have been unanimous). Another player received 40 votes. The next player in line received 29 votes. These three players seem to constitute the elite group. It might also be noted that these players are the three "Life Masters" in this unit. Following this group were eight players who received from
five to 14 votes apiece. Sixteen more players accrued from one to four votes each. This leaves 60 members of the unit

**TABLE XIV**

**OUTSTANDING PLAYERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Playing &quot;For Blood&quot;</th>
<th>Best Players</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Player</strong></td>
<td><strong>No. of Code No. Votes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3747</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0714</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7381</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6370</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3347</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3547</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2336</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3247</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0414</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8192</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9303</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7081</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8292</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4358</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2136</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7581</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6470</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9103</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7781</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5269</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9503</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0514</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5169</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3447</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4458</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
who received no votes and constitute the large average and below average group of players.

To correlate with the foregoing structure, the respondents were also asked to name the five players that they felt were most noticeable for "playing for blood." An even larger group (22) refused to answer this question.

There were, however, more people named on this ballot than on the previous one, 32 as opposed to 27 on the "best players" question. The two lists corresponded rather strikingly. Of the 32 people named on the best player list, 19 were also on the "for blood" list. The three highest vote-getters were the same on both lists. It would seem that the players considered most aggressive are also considered most successful by the group members.

Data Obtained from the Mass Observation

The objective data obtained in the mass observation falls into three broad categories dealing with criticism, aggression, and conflict. The general atmosphere of the group and the attitudes of the players also will be discussed.

Criticism. A total of 125 incidents of criticism were noted by the observers on the primary pair check sheet.2 Of these incidents, 71 (56.8%) were described as self-criticism, 42 (33.8%) were criticism of partner, and 12 (9.4%) were

---

2See Appendix A. p. 104.
criticism occurring within each observed pair for each round of play. On the coordinate pair check sheet \(^3\) 112 such occurrences were observed. Briefly, this means that 90% of the incidents observed by the prime observer of each pair were also observed by the coordinate pair observer.

**Aggression.** Aggression, in this instance, was defined to the observers as being generally more overt than criticism, usually involving a display of anger. A total of 12 such incidents of open aggression were marked by the observers. Nine (75%) of these occurrences were directed toward partner, and the remaining three (25%) toward the opponent. This was an average of .08 such incidents per pair for each round of play. In this case 19 such occurrences were recorded by the coordinate pair observer. The discrepancy might be explained on the basis of the different interpretation of each incident by various observers. What one observer saw as criticism might have been viewed as aggression by another observer.

**Conflict.** Conflict was defined for the observers as any situation where aggression or criticism toward partner or opponents was met by returned aggression or criticism. A total of 18 such incidents were indicated by the primary observers. Of this total, 10 (55.6%) of the conflicts were between partners and 8 (44.4%) were between opponents.

\(^3\)See Appendix A. p. 104.
TABLE XV

PRIME PAIR OBSERVATION REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Criticism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of Partner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of Opponent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression to Partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression to Opponent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with Partner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with Opponent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Incidents: 155

COORDINATE PAIR OBSERVATION REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Criticism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of Partner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of Opponent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression to Partner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression to Opponent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with Partner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with Opponent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Incidents: 150

This number was a mean of 0.13 such happenings for each pair of players each round. The coordinate observers reported the occurrence of 19 such incidents, or 10.56%.

In summary, the prime pair observers noted a total of 155 incidents with noticeable aggressive content. At the same time the coordinate pair observers indicated 150 such occurrences.

The subjective data obtained from the mass observation
was written on the post-session observation sheet and the commentary sheet. These observations fell into three general categories: (1) observations about the general atmosphere extant within the group during and after the session, (2) the attitudes and mannerisms of the players, and (3) the valence displayed toward the observers, the investigator, and the observation situation.

**General Atmosphere.** Most of the observers commented on the tenseness displayed by the group during the play. Several noted the business-like quality of the situation. Several examples are listed below:

...I came to the conclusion that the atmosphere was a tense one, and that bridge is not a form of recreation that is relaxing.

Tension was evident and seemed to flow up and down... during the playing of some hands and the compilation of points.

Through the middle rounds there was an obvious increase of tension.

...there was complete concentration and no time for a friendly greeting or a little gossip.

No talk or discussions on other subjects than bridge was observed. It appeared that this game is strictly business to them.

It was very apparent that this was no social affair—it was all business.

This general tension was expressed in a number of habits and physical mannerisms. Chain smoking was mentioned by several
observers.

A very large majority, both men and women, smoked incessantly...

There seemed to be a much greater amount of smoking than seems normal...

Other observers indicated physical mannerisms which denoted tensions.

...a tendency to "grab" the cards in order to get a "head start."

...physical tension was obvious in the man, e.g., strong exhalation, sighing, and the clicking of tongue against cheek.

One observer remarked that, although he knew nothing about bridge, he could tell how the pair were doing by the manner in which one of the players chewed his gum.

Virtually all of the observers felt that there was a general lessening of tension as soon as the session was over. This seemed to be temporary, as noted by the observers' comments listed below:

A general lessening of tension was observed immediately after completion of the games....As scores are completed, tension mounts...

A new mounting tension occurred during the compiling of scores after a let-down from the actual playing.

As the above observations indicate, most players showed a marked interest in the results, with the "women showing greater interest than the men," as one observer noted. An observer perhaps summed up the general atmosphere of the group with this statement, "This highly competitive atmosphere reminds one of a gambling room."
Attitudes of the players. The bridge enthusiast seems to be very serious about his approach to the game. As the previous data suggest, he tends to be highly critical of himself and his partner. Several observers stressed this attitude in their commentary. Some of these observations appear below:

The players observed were, on the whole, very serious about their bridge playing. They seemed quite business-like in their attitudes toward the opponents.

...devoted players who take their game seriously and play to win.

Both players took their game seriously and enjoyed winning from their opponents.

Along with this critical attitude, several observers commented on the apparent desire of the individuals involved to improve their ability. One observer wrote, "It seemed as though each player was involved in a type of learning process." Another indicated the same process in this way:

There was a rehash of almost every play after the hand was finished. They all seemed to attach importance to learning to correct mistakes.

According to the observers, the players seemed to feel strongly about following the rules and ethics of the game. Most criticism of opponents seemed to stem from infractions of the rules, or at least diversion from the ethics which are considered normative within the group. Several observations which stress this factor are listed below.

...taboos are centered around the suspicion of cheating and conduct outside of the agreed group mores.

...pronounced the word "pass" in a very affected way and she was immediately taken to task by another matron.
This upset my player and she showed signs of embarrassment. She stirred around on her chair, sat up erect, and concentrated furiously on her game.

...a revoke resulted in some sharp remarks.

The most frequent argument in the group seemed to arise over the rules or plays of the game.

Another comment made by several of the observers was concerned with the great desire of the bridge player to win. The words "play to win" were found on nine of the commentaries. One enthusiastic observer claimed, "They don't play for money, prizes, companionship, or conversation, only to win." Another commented, "A seemingly sweet, gentle, little woman said in a solemn voice, 'It's the competition that makes it interesting—to beat the other guy.'"

Valence displayed toward the observers. The reaction to the observers was mixed. One observer remarked, "The couple I observed offered no awareness of my presence." On the other end of the scale, one observer heard, "How can you play well with two of them at every table? Two of them!"

The most aggression was displayed toward the investigator, however. One comment picked up by an observer was, "What does that Jack Stephens think he is doing, anyway!"

Interview Data

Aggressive and non-aggressive reactions. In the five hypothetical situations established in the questions one through five on the interview schedule, the informants were
to select a first and second choice from six possible reactions. The respondents, therefore, made a total of 100 selections. Of the total, 77 of the selections were essentially aggressive. The other 33 were essentially non-aggressive reactions. In the case of first choices, 39 (78%) were aggressive and 11 (22%) were non-aggressive in nature.

Most of the informants commented on the situations outlined by the investigator. Several indicated that the situations were not unusual and did occur in the group.

I had this called on me. A good player shouldn't make such errors.

When this happened to me, I called the director. In master point play, it's for blood!

As was also noted in the observation reports, most of the interviewees seemed quite vociferous about following the ethics and rules of the game. One man insisted. "Rules should be enforced. I insist others follow the rules because I do." Another player identified with the situation involved to the extent of becoming angry:

This irritates me no end! I try to play an ethical game, and so should everybody else.

Most of the interviewees voiced some aggression in their comments on the situations. A few examples are listed below:

...I'd be sore about the situation.

I used to let them pick them up, but no more! They don't give me any breaks!

I would make damn sure that the unit committee forces the director to make some sort of decision.

I wouldn't let them get by without some sort of penalty.
Play according to the rules or quit! Why play if you can't win within the rules?

One informant seemed to sum up the general feeling when he stated, "I come to win--nobody takes advantage of me!" 6

Value selections of group members. In an attempt to find out if standing in the community affected the importance of the individual within the duplicate bridge group, the 10 respondents were asked to make forced value selections from a list of 15 members of the sample group. These items were not only involved with the ability of the individuals as bridge players, but also with the standing of the individuals socially within the group. The most votes were garnered by two men, one in the "large business" category (a young banker) and the other in the "professional" category (a lawyer). Of the next three largest vote getters, two were in the "white collar" group and the other was in the "small business" category. The four persons receiving the fewest selections fell into three of the four categories represented in the duplicate bridge group.

The selections in this portion of the interview seemed to be relatively random, having little correlation with occupational status. Although two people in highly valued occupations in the community received the greatest number of votes, two others of equally high occupational

status received only two votes each. The same randomness seems to hold true in other categories as well. A correlation may be drawn, however, with the list developed in the "best players" question on the questionnaire. Four of the first five vote-getters on this value selection also received a large number of ballots as "best player."7

TABLE XXI

VALUE SELECTIONS OF GROUP MEMBERS
(QUESTIONS 6-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Members</th>
<th>Occupational Status</th>
<th>Number of Value Selections on Each Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0714</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9803</td>
<td>Large Business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8092</td>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3747</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6670</td>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125</td>
<td>Large Business</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8192</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9503</td>
<td>Large Business &amp; Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8792</td>
<td>Large Business</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9103</td>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0614</td>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4258</td>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8592</td>
<td>Skilled Worker</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of reward. These five questions were designed in an attempt to evaluate the importance of reward in connection with this aggressively oriented activity.

When the respondents were faced with the choice of a

7See Table XIV, p. 57.
symbolic reward (a trophy) as opposed to a material reward (either money or merchandise), six of the 10 interviewees (60%) selected the symbolic reward. The other four respondents were split equally between the other choices.

TABLE XXII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION OF REWARD: MATERIAL VS. NON-MATERIAL REWARD (QUESTION #11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Reward</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Non-material - trophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Material - money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Material - merchandise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of this symbolic reward, in this case "master points," was further substantiated in situation three, where 60% indicated that it would be better to cancel a tournament in which master points would not be given. Only 40% voted to hold the tournament and give cash prizes. Again in question 15, some 40% of the respondents voted to suspend play in the duplicate bridge group if master points could not be

TABLE XXIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE OF SYMBOLIC REWARD TO THE SUCCESS OF DUPLICATE BRIDGE (QUESTION #13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cancel tournament if no master points can be given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Give cash prizes in lieu of master points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
awarded. Another 50% indicated a desire to continue to play with cash awards for the winners. Only one person (10%) said to go ahead and "play for the fun of it."

TABLE XXIV

IMPORTANCE OF REWARD TO THE PERSEVERANCE OF THE GROUP
(QUESTION #15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>No. of Selections</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Play for &quot;fun of it&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Give cash prizes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Suspend activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the selection of reasons for the growth of duplicate bridge, 30% selected the awarding of master points as being of prime importance. Six of the respondents (60%) said that there is more interest in competitive games, and one informant felt that there were simply more people playing bridge.

TABLE XXV

IMPORTANCE OF SYMBOLIC REWARDS TO THE GROWTH OF THE DUPLICATE BRIDGE GROUP (QUESTION #14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>No. of Selections</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greater interest in competitive games</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Awarding of master points at the local level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Simpler bidding systems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More people are playing bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only in one instance did reward suffer appreciably. When asked to choose between the possibility of reward (good chance of winning at a tournament) and offending the local partner, only 50% said that they would select the chance of winning at the risk of offending partner, and three (30%) indicated that they would undertake such action with misgivings. Some degree of loyalty to closely allied members of the local duplicate bridge group seems to be normative behavior in the group.

**TABLE XXVI**

**SELECTION OF POSSIBLE REWARD AT THE RISK OF OFFENDING LOCAL PARTNER (QUESTION #12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>No. of Selections</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Play with better partner, accepting possible reward with no misgivings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Play with better partner, accepting possible reward with misgivings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Play with local partner—giving up possible reward</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In connection with the importance of symbolic reward, the investigator obtained a number of comments which bear on the situation. Several discussed the value of master points. ...most people are playing for points. There must be some reward.

There's no percentage in playing for money or just for fun.

Out-of-towners would be disappointed if they couldn't play for master points.
Others commented on the importance and esteem attached to the winning of trophies. One woman remarked, "You can always get $10.00, but not a trophy." Another woman said, "You always have the trophy--it's for pride's sake." The people who indicated no interest in trophies invariably already had several:

...I've lugged around golf trophies for years. I'll take the cash!

I'd take the certificate and save for a bigger prize. I've got lots of trophies.

If I had trophies of that magnitude, I'd take the prize.

Those who were willing to give up a possible reward in order to play with their local partner explained the situation in the following statements:

...besides, I feel indebted to my local partner.

I have to play with her twice a week, every week. I wouldn't want to hurt her feelings.

I wouldn't offend partner that way, and I don't like to play with strangers.

There seems to be some possibility that this worry about offending the local partner is merely part of a fear of losing reward over a period of time to gaining great reward for a short time. This was expressed by one person who said, "I might lose my regular partner if I did something like that."
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The analysis of the data presented in the previous chapter will be given in the form of the paradigm on page 25, with the modifications mentioned on pages 26 and 27. The value of the paradigm lies primarily in its use as a standardized form for analyzing data to determine the functional and dysfunctional factors inherent in the activities of the group.

The Item(s) to Which Functions are Imputed

In order to systemize further the collection and use of data, a descriptive protocol was presented (p. 26) within which the investigator has grouped the data for presentation here.

Location of the participants in the pattern within the social structure—differential participation. The data have indicated several important factors which seem useful in placing the members of the duplicate bridge group within the social structure. (1) The group derives its membership from a residentially stable portion of the society. The relatively high mean age of 52.15 years combined with the average of 21.7 years of residence in the community substantiates the
permanence of those involved in the avocation. The low mean number of residential changes, both outside and within the community, gives further weight to this conclusion. (2) The group draws its membership from a limited segment of the society as determined by Centers' Occupational Index. Since none of the respondents fell into the lower three categories of the Index, four respondents fell into the "skilled workers and foremen" category, and no respondents were placed in the "farm owners and managers" category, it is apparent that, in this group at least, 92.5% of the membership is derived from the top four categories of the Index. Of these categories, the "white collar," "small business," and "professional" groups have the large majority of members (85%). Although the group draws a small portion of its membership from the more skilled labor category and the large business group, it is primarily dependent upon the people involved in business and professional occupations. It also appears that the group is not highly mobile in occupation, with less than one-fourth of the group moving to a higher job classification. (3) The educational level of the group is quite high, with the majority of the group having attended college. A substantial percentage of the group (37.7%) indicated they had completed at least a bachelor's degree. (4) The study sample had a small family on the average. Of the mean of

\[ \text{1See p. 46 for an outline of the Index.} \]
1.94 children reported, only .72 of these children presently are living at home. The high average age of the group probably accounts for this, since most of the members are old enough to have children who are adults and have left the home. These factors might be explainable on the basis that people who are older, retired or only partially occupation­ally active, and have grown families, are the people who have the time to be most active in a group that takes one or two evenings a week. (In some cases more time than this is devoted to duplicate bridge.) (5) The sample group turned out to be highly urban in nature. They lived wholly within the city limits of their community or in portions of the city immediately adjacent to the city limits. One member of the group lives in a small town seven miles from Missoula, Montana. In this case, however, the individual was associated with a large lumber firm in the small community, and the firm provided him a residence. It can be seen from the map on page 116 that the majority of the members of the group live within a few blocks of Higgins Avenue, the main North­South street in the community. Further it can be seen that many of the people in the sample group live relatively near the main downtown area. A substantial number live in what is called the University district, an older residential area characterized by large homes built early in the history of the community. With these factors in mind, it appears that the group is not only urban, but prefers to live fairly
close to the downtown areas. The newer subdivisions of the community such as areas C, D, and F are only sparsely represented on the map. It also appears that area G, an area generally "near the tracks," characterized by lower class dwellings, is not preferred by any of the group. This follows from the generally more valued occupational status of the group. (6) The members of the group do affiliate themselves with other organizations in the community. The greatest number of such affiliations were in the area of fraternal and lodge groups. Some members also were interested in alumni and professional organizations, and a few others indicated affiliation with various other groups in the community. Over one-fourth of the group were members of the country club.

Alternative modes of behavior excluded by emphasis on the observed pattern. Several patterns of behavior which might logically occur within the group seem to be excluded by the normative behavior patterns presently established within the group structure.

In support of the hypothesis advanced for this study it would appear that a highly business-like attitude pervades the duplicate bridge group in action. Most of the observers indicated this pattern in some form or other. This highly business-like atmosphere, in turn, excludes the usual gossip and amusement which often characterizes the playing of card games in other circumstances. Such terms as, "This
game is all business to them," used by the observers tend
to give weight to the idea that the normative behavior pat-
terns of the group are not bent to the end of creating amuse-
ment for the participants.

The large number of incidents of self-criticism and
criticism of partner appear to be normative patterns within
the group. Most of the observers indicated noticing this
type of criticism frequently during the group activities.
This type of behavior seems to exclude the more normal be-
havior of displacing blame to other sources. The extreme
identification with partner stems primarily from the fact
that the fortunes of the individual depend on partner as
much as himself. In this sense, at least, criticism of part-
ner seems to amount to one of two things, self-criticism
through identification, or guilt transference to partner.
In either case the fortunes of the partnership are the pri-
mary cause of the criticism.

The incidence of conflict, although apparently norma-
tive within the group, appears abnormal in terms of the
American society generally. Observed behavior such as swear-
ing at partner and accusing an opponent of unethical behav-
ior would probably not be normative for other group situa-
tions in which these people might be involved. The high
percentage of aggressive answers to interview questions which
have to do with situations involving ethics and rules, indi-
cate that situations involving these types of normative
behavior are structured in such a way as to lead to a high incidence of aggression and conflict. These types of aggressive action seem, in themselves, normative within the group.

The hierarchy established within the duplicate bridge group appears to have no basis in the social structure of the community as a whole. This perhaps excludes behavior patterns which are often followed in other groups which draw membership from the same segments of society. Those in high prestige occupations were selected about as often on the value-selection portion of the interview as were those who were in less prestigeful occupations. The fact that a higher correlation can be drawn with the selections of "better players" indicates that the hierarchy is drawn upon lines of ability and success within the group rather than ability and success in the community as a whole.

A departure from normative behavior in society as a whole can be seen in the area of selection of reward. The master point and the trophy, both non-material as far as intrinsic monetary value is concerned, were generally selected in preference to money or merchandise awards. A material reward was chosen in preference to no reward at all, although some felt that money rewards were "bad" or seemed like "gambling" and would prefer to suspend the group rather than offer such rewards.

The emotive and cognitive meanings attached by participants to the pattern. When asked to indicate the reasons
for participating in duplicate bridge, the majority of players indicated at least one of the choices involving recreation (manifest function). It was true, however, that almost an equal number of choices involving aggression were also made. This would seem to indicate that although most players attach open importance to the game as a recreational outlet, they also recognize that an aggressive element inherent within the avocation appeals to them. This recognition tends to be well hidden in the sense that the group refuses to admit to the pattern, preferring to claim recreation as the sole reason for participation. In some cases the rejection of the dimension of aggression appears to relegate it to the subconscious level. In a Freudian sense we could possibly state that it has been "repressed" as a motive.

Only one commentary from a female participant seemed to the investigator to indicate that the participation was almost wholly on the basis of enjoyment. This individual was also an infrequent player.

A number of players mentioned "mental stimulation" as a subjective reason for participation. This same feeling was expressed by one respondent with the term "mental challenge." The learning process and the complicated, puzzle-solving aspects of the game have a definite appeal to individuals in the group. The observers noted several instances where players were most desirous of seeing their errors and attempting to correct them.
The prestige value of winning, as exemplified by the high status of symbolic reward, was pointed up in all phases of the investigation. The observers, almost as a body, suggested that the participants were there to win. The heightened tension which occurred at the time the results were given out would seem to substantiate this idea. Such comments as, "There has to be some reward," which were made by the bridge players in the course of the interview point out the importance attached to winning.

Winning also seems to determine the position of the individual in the hierarchy of the group. Those who have attained "life master" (a symbolic award) status within the group were selected almost universally on both the "best players" list and the value selections in the interview. The esteem of the group, the winning of status in the group by increasing official status in the American Contract Bridge League, and winning in each session of participation, all appear to be part of the emotive patterns of the participants.

This, in turn, leads to the question, "Why do those who do not win continue to participate?" This seems partially explainable on the basis of the desire of the group members to improve, as well as their desire to defeat the better players. Self-esteem can be won by the individual on the basis of winning in the group as a whole and in defeating the better players at any given point in the activities.
The investigator has noted that it is important for the individual to defeat a "life master" on a given hand, regardless of the overall outcome. Two observers noted comments made by persons who were "gloating" over having been successful against people considered to be good players. It would appear that a varied degree of reward satisfies the participants. The occasional reward seems to satisfy the person of known lesser ability, whereas the better players are unhappy with anything but first place. Defeating each individual appears to be equally important to those who consider themselves the better players.

A distinction between the motivations for participating in the pattern and the objective behavior involved in the pattern. The most logical distinction can be drawn between the recognized motivation of the participants to achieve "recreation" and the actual objective behavior observed within the group. As earlier noted, the observers felt that the players were very business-like in their approach to the game. This objective behavior seemed to be obvious to observers not familiar with the group, despite the great number of respondents who checked the answer, "for enjoyment" when asked why they participated in duplicate bridge. Other objective behavior such as the high incidence of criticism of self, partner, and opponents, appears to be inconsistent with the idea of enjoyment.

The number of people who identified with the
situations in the interviews involving ethics and cheating seems to indicate that these situations do occur. The fact that the respondents were quick to appeal to authority (the director) or take other aggressive action against the offender would seem to point out the distinction between the motive "recreation" and the actual behavior of the group which often leads to conflict. This same type of conflict is generally felt to be undesirable in other portions of our society.

Regularities of behavior not recognized by participants but which are nonetheless associated with the central pattern of behavior. The behavior patterns which, from this investigation, appear to be normative and unrecognized in the activities of the group fall into five categories.

(1) The dependence on ethics and rules. The respondents indicated on the interview section of the study that there was a general feeling of dependence on the rules established for operating the activities of the group. The same dependence was indicated by the observers to a large degree. When situations involving ethics were hypothesized, the respondents indicated immediate concern and wanted to see the situation resolved—usually through the intervention of the director, who has the position of immediate authority.

2 The term unrecognized is used here to indicate the fact that the overall patterns are not seen by the members of the group as being of primary importance to the behavior of the individuals involved or the group as a unit.
Several informants indicated that the individuals involved should play within the rules or not play at all.

(2) Self-criticism as a pattern of behavior. Included in this category was also criticism of partner, since such criticism seems to indicate some criticism of self. This pattern of criticism was made quite apparent by the data gathered by the observers. Of the incidents recorded, the vast majority seem to be of this type. This pattern seems intimately tied up with the desire to improve and win at the duplicate bridge club.

(3) Competitiveness and aggression. Even the most mild appearing respondents on the various steps involved in the study mentioned the importance of competition. Several indicated that other bridge events (not duplicate bridge) had become of little importance because this type of competition was lacking. As a meek little woman said to one of the observers, the important thing was, "to beat the other guy!"

(4) The development of the hierarchy. This pattern of behavior seems to be only dimly recognized by the participants. Instead of the usual "pecking order," an almost reverse order develops. The more esteemed the individual becomes, the more desirable it is to defeat him. It seems to be somewhat like the children's game "King of the Hill," with all of the members on the lower levels attempting to unseat the "life masters" in the esteem of the group.
(5) The reward pattern. An intricate pattern of rewards has developed within the group, both locally and nationally. In this pattern very definite norms have been established in order to define levels of achievement and group esteem. The master point has gained tremendous significance to the group as the delimiting measure of ability. The accumulation of master points, of "regional red points," and "national points" has assumed an aura of importance which supersedes any possible valuation that these symbols might have to others not in the group. In fact, one observer commented in a surprised manner on the value attached to these "apparently unimportant devices called master points." It is the success of the individual within this reward pattern which gives him status in the group locally and nationally.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

In Support of the Hypothesis

As a basis for the hypothesis the investigator began this study with the element of "recreation" used as the manifest purpose for the existence and perpetuation of the group. That the people involved in the group activities believe this assertion to be true is amply supported by the data. That this belief on the part of the group members is the sole reason for their participation, was not, however, supported by the data. On the contrary, the participants themselves indicated an almost equal number of aggressive reasons, not at all associated with the concept of recreation, when asked why they participated. A considerable amount of data was accumulated which does not support the former conclusion but, on the contrary, gives weight to the hypothesis that the primary cause for the existence, perpetuation, and growth of the duplicate bridge group lies in the latent functions which were postulated for use in this study (pp. 5 and 6).

Several factors have become apparent in the analysis of the data which belie the conclusion that the duplicate bridge player participates for amusement. The business-
like attitude of the participants in the actual "playing" situation, the sharp and immediate aggressive reactions to the described situations in the interviews, and the continual guarding against being "taken advantage of" in the playing situation all indicate motivations other than that of recreation or amusement. The data appear to support the latent functions hypothesized by the investigator and also suggest that several other such functions may be operating in the dynamics of the group action. In the following paragraphs the conclusions reached from the data have been grouped in order of the hypothesized latent functions to facilitate reading.

(A) The group acts as a socially approved outlet for aggression. The extreme competitiveness of the group members was noted in nearly every phase of the study. The aggressive reactions of the respondents on the questionnaire, in the observation, and particularly in the interviews, indicates the willingness of the participants to take aggressive actions which tend to lead to conflict. Conflict, in general, seems to be far more desirable than giving an opponent any "edge" in the course of the play. On the other hand, the fact that the group members were more than willing to take any advantage of the opponents within the rules—and sometimes outside of the rules—further indicates a "win at all costs" philosophy, which gives added weight to the concept of a latent function operating at the cost of nullifying the
manifest function of recreation and amusement. A consideration of the data, particularly in the observation comments, leads to the conclusion that participation in this group is a highly business-like affair, with winning assuming a place of great importance to people on all levels of expertise. If such is the case, then it is logical to conclude that the individuals involved must have a need for the outlet of such aggressive feelings or else they would not continue to participate—and most of them participate quite frequently and with a great deal of dedication. It is not the idea in this study to locate from what sources these needs obtain, although this area might appear to be a fertile one for investigation.

(B) The group acts as a microcosmic societal structure.
The duplicate bridge group has a formal organization determined by the dictates of its parent organization, the American Contract Bridge League. In this area it appears to function as a reflection of other groups in the macrocosmic society. It is in the area of informal organization where a significant departure is made. In the sense that the internal, informal hierarchy is not dependent on the outside society for its structure, the group acts as an entity which is not the reflection of the macrocosm.

Evidence for this conclusion was obtained particularly from the selection of the "best players" in the questionnaire and from the value selections in the interviews.
Comparing the individual selections made by the interviewees on the value selection portion of the interview schedule with the occupational status of the people selected provides an insight into the hierarchical structure of the group. Such a comparison appears to be absolutely random in terms of any relationship between occupational status and number of selections. For example, the person generally considered to be the wealthiest member of the group was selected only twice on the value selections. One of the individuals selected most often was a white collar worker, the lowest major classification found in the bridge group. By comparing the persons selected on the value selections and those selected on the "best players" list, a high correlation appears to be the case. From these data, the investigator concludes that the individual takes his position within the hierarchy of the group primarily on the basis of his ability to play bridge rather than on any standing or prestige he may hold within the community.

(C) The group provides a continuation of reward achieved by aggressive activities. The importance of reward in the patterns of behavior of the group became quite apparent in the interviews. Most of the interviewees indicated a decided interest in achieving the rewards offered by the group, even though these rewards were of little or no monetary value. The most significant fact which evolved
from this portion of the study was that people will go to
great effort and spend a great deal of time and money in the
pursuit of a non-monetary goal. The dynamics of this latent
function are not readily apparent and the study did little
to unearth them. On the whole, however, little evidence was
found to support the latent function hypothesized by the in-
vestigator in this instance. It can be concluded that a
number of individuals in the group had in the past received
varied degrees of reward for aggressive activities. Because
data were not available on either the amount of previous ag-
geressive activities or rewards in other groups in the commu-
nity, it was impossible to determine if a significantly higher
ratio of such activities and rewards exists within the dupli-
cate bridge group than exists in other groups organized for
other purposes.

Ideas Which Could Lead to Further Study in the Area

The first logical area for further investigation
must surely be in the area of substantiation of the demo-
graphic data about this group which has been secured in this
study. Whether any generalizations to the entire population
of duplicate bridge players is possible from this work de-
pends on the accumulation of more complete data on the larg-
er population. Such a study was suggested to the investiga-
tor by one of the members of the board of directors of the
American Contract Bridge League. At this time it was
suggested that one or two pages of *The Bulletin*, the organization's official monthly magazine, might be used to get a questionnaire response from thousands of members of the group across the country. Another conversation with one of the nationally-known directors of the league led to the discovery that he had been keeping records on the league and its members for years and that these records would be made available for any research project. It seems certain that cooperation can be obtained for a larger scale study of the group.

Other theory areas offer possibilities which could provide interesting studies of this group. For example, the typical functional equilibrium model supposes that any social system operates in equilibrium with changes occurring only when the status of the system must shift in order to compensate for changes which have thrown it out of equilibrium. How does the aggressive pattern exhibited by the duplicate bridge group fit this concept? Does it perhaps act as a balancing mechanism for the overall society (along with other aggressive outlets) in order to structure aggression and the resulting conflict in such a way that it is socially approved and controlled? Another interesting possibility lies in the area of progression or succession of group members to higher status positions in the formal and informal hierarchy of the group. Beshers has postulated that each hierarchical level maintains a body of "invisible
symbols" which are given to the new initiate in some sort of rite of passage.\(^1\) These symbols are necessarily visible to the levels above but cannot be seen by the people in the lower levels. Do some invisible forms exist on the various levels of prestige in the bridge group? It is possible that these rather invisible forms might be given to the lower levels "at a price," that of buying the book of the current recognized champion(s). Another possibility exists in the study of how these champions retain enough secrets to remain on the top rung, or whether the secrets given out to the lower groups are only fragmentary or merely deceptions used to "feather the nests" of the top group. It might be possible by studying this completely artificial social system to gain a further understanding of the dynamics which exist in the progression and succession of persons on the structural levels of the macrocosmic society.

Another possibility for study lies in a content analysis of the literature associated with the bridge group. Besides the monthly magazine published by the national group, there are numerous other magazines and scores of books devoted to the methods of play and the general dynamics of successful participation in the activities of the group. Some of the social as well as technical aspects of group membership are included in this literature. Such a content

analysis could best be done by precoding factors and levels of factors so that the actual analysis could be programmed into an electric computer.

Correlational studies with other groups and with other social dimensions are another possibility. Data from such correlational work could be used to substantiate some of the more indefinite conclusions reached in this study as well as substantiate overall theory. For instance, a study which correlated the business activities of the members with activities in the bridge group might give some insights into the reasons for the participation of the business-oriented individual in various avocations. This, in turn, could lead to some valuable conclusions concerning what leisure activities tend to complement the tense activities of a business career.

It is likely that a more complete study of the emphasis placed on the reward system could produce information that would allow the sociologist to examine the dynamics involved in group reward selection. Since financial or other material reward does not appear to be of real or symbolic value to the bridge player, further study in this area might tend to locate what psychological motivations do operate in the need to achieve reward. Many of the rewards found in various avocations do not produce significant material rewards; a study of the reward system in the bridge group could provide background for general theory in this
The effect of constant and prolonged participation in the activities of the bridge group on the families of the participants could provide some insights into the effect of such participation on the primary social relationships of the devotee. It is often, not so jokingly, said that heavy participation has led to divorces. If so, what function served by the activity is more important to the individual than the dysfunction of the trouble caused within the family group? Another problem in this same area is that of the husband-wife partnership. Few such partnerships are successful, either on the basis of success within the group or on the level of husband-wife social relationships. In the husband-wife combinations within the group, the marital partners play bridge with other individuals—excluding persons of the opposite sex.

The role of the differences in sex within the group appears to be somewhat unusual. Although a large majority of the players are female, the greatest players are usually men. Only one or two women are consistently mentioned when lists of the best players are drawn. Is there some factor in the background of the different sexes which leads to greater or lesser success at the game? Does the male have more of the "killer instinct" generally conceded to be necessary in the great player, or does he merely have more of the stamina necessary in a grueling tournament which lasts eight...
or nine days? This unusual sexual differentiation carries over to the relationships between the sexes at the local bridge game and at the tournaments. The investigator's experience has been that there has been virtually none of the sexual byplay between male and female which exists in other social situations. It is not considered unusual for a man to call a married woman to play bridge with him. It is quite the custom for mixed groups to attend tournaments together with little or no social stigma attached to the action. What factors about the game situation or the group itself lead to this situation which is quite different from the social system as a whole?

Possible Improvements in the Study Design

In a real sense the techniques used to gather data for this study tended to be cumbersome as well as too numerous. By concentrating on the questionnaire and interviews it is possible that more data of a significant nature could have been collected. The observation lacked validity in two ways: (1) an abnormal situation was created which did not allow the observers to get a true picture of the group in action, and (2) the collection of the data by the observers was not as reliable as would be necessary for a good statistical evaluation. In the second case an attempt was made by the investigator to obtain the greatest possible reliability by the use of an observation schedule and dual observation as
a reliability check. The problem turned out to be a lack of uniformity among the observers as to the degree of the phenomena they were observing. It became the same problem that has faced test makers in the use of essay type questions—the reliability of raters or judges was very low, not in quantity but in quality. To use this method with any adequate reliability would necessitate the development of a concise and highly inclusive set of categories in the manner of Bales and his Categories of Human Interaction.\textsuperscript{2} On the positive side, however, a number of the observers made comments showing some important insights into the motivation of the group members.

While the interviews appeared to have content validity in the sense that the interviewees recognized the situations described and reacted to them readily, the small sample precludes any adequate statistical measure. A Chi Square run on the data with correction for small sample turned out to be so highly significant that it indicated spurious results, probably caused by low cell frequencies and perhaps question bias. A better method would be to have the situational questions suggested by interested, and hopefully unbiased, bridge players. The sample size should also be enlarged in order to eliminate chance differences. As

was previously said, the interviews which seemed so fruitful should have been given a larger share of the total time and effort.

**Contribution of the Thesis to the Field of Knowledge**

Although it would be presumptuous to assume that a limited study of such a preliminary nature would revolutionize functionalism as a school in Sociology, it is reasonable to postulate that it may have added to it or detracted from it in a substantive way. In the sense that the Mertonian conception of manifest and latent functions seems to operate in a very real manner in the duplicate bridge group, the study supports the functionalist position. In the sense that functional analysis is an adequate method for studying groups, the study indicates that the method is cumbersome and inadequate in its methodological precepts.

The modern functionalist theories proposed by Merton, and more particularly by Parsons, attempt to explain **ALL** about society. In the mere width of such a position lies its weakness. Merton's paradigm for doing a functional analysis is not based on any empirical methodology which allows for the evaluation of a small group. Rather, it is designed for the use of broad terminology such as exigencies, institutionalization, legitimation, etc. As a measure of differences in attitudes, interests, and motivations it has little empirical use. It would appear that this small
study has shown its empirical weaknesses and the need for a more concise approach to the gathering of data and the measurement of human group interaction.

In a more specific way, this thesis has shown that the duplicate bridge group does allow for the open demonstration of hostility and aggression in a social situation—which does not appear to happen in other social situations. Although the data is highly substantive, it may be possible after further study to generalize this finding to other avocational groups. If such groups do, indeed, exist for the outlet of hostility and aggression, it would not be a tremendously greater step to assume that such groups operate as a sort of "balance wheel" for the entire society. It is obvious that this particular study did not provide a real basis for such generalizations, but it has posed the problem of the existence of such groups. Hopefully, it will provide the incentive for other research in this general area. As Karl Popper said recently in a speech at Purdue University, "Good social research starts with a problem and ends with a problem. Any theory that develops must come between those two happenings." As an end result this study has posed a number of problems; let us hope that with further development some reasonable theory may also result.
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APPENDIX A
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in this questionnaire as accurately as possible. You will note that your name is not used or requested on this form. As far as this study is concerned you will not be personally identified. Your anonymity will be preserved by a coded set of numbers in the place of names. If you cannot answer the questions accurately, fill in answers which approximate the true answers as closely as possible. On the second page the questions call for your opinion on several areas concerning the duplicate bridge club. Please answer these to the best of your knowledge. Please exclude the investigator, Jack Stephens, from any of the answers. Your cooperation will be appreciated, since it will make it possible for me to complete a rather detailed study of the bridge group.
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12. If married, does your spouse also play bridge in the duplicate club? ______

13. Number of children ______ Number of children living at home ______

14. Education: Indicate the last grade completed in school by circling the correct number.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 M.A. Ph.D.
Grade School High School College Grad. Work

15. Place of birth ________________________________________

16. Place of parents' birth (country) ________________________

17. Church preference (Protestant, Catholic, No Affiliation, etc.) ________________________

18. Do you play in less formal private bridge groups? ______ Number ______

19. Name any other organizations or clubs with which you are affiliated. ________________________

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________

20. Are you a member of the Missoula Country Club? ______ How long? ______

21. How do you feel that you rate as a bridge player in comparison to the group? (Check one) Below Average ______ Average ______ Above Average ______ Superior ______

22. Name five people that you feel are the best players in the unit: ________________________

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________

23. What is your A.C.B.L. ranking (Full Master, Senior Master, etc.)? .................................................................

24. Indicate what sports are of interest to you; also indicate your type of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Actively engaged?</th>
<th>Spectator?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. What other games do you participate in frequently?

________________________________________________________________________

26. Have you been actively engaged in sports at some earlier time? Indicate what sport and your judgment as to your success in the activity. (Did you win a letter, were you on a successful team, etc.)

________________________________________________________________________

27. Indicate the reason you play bridge by checking one or more of the following: for enjoyment ____ for diversion ____ as a social interest ____ for the competition involved ____ for the satisfaction of winning ____ "for blood" ____

28. If you feel you have some other reason for entering into this activity, write it in the following space.
29. What percentage of the players in the duplicate bridge group do you feel play "for blood"?

10% ____ 20% ____ 30% ____ 40% ____ 50% ____
60% ____ 70% ____ 80% ____ 90% ____ 100% ____

30. Do you feel that this attitude of playing "for blood" is desirable? Yes ____ No ____

31. Name five persons you feel usually are most noticeable for playing "for blood." ____________________________
______________________________
COORDINATE PAIR CHECK SHEET

ROUND _______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self, Partner, Opponent</td>
<td>Partner, Opponent</td>
<td>Partner, Opponent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

---

PRIMARY PAIR CHECK SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Part. Opp.</td>
<td>Partner Opponent</td>
<td>Partner Opponent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Round 1 | | |
| Round 2 | | |
| Round 3 | | |
| Round 4 | | |
| Round 5 | | |
| Round 6 | | |
| Round 7 | | |
| Round 8 | | |
| Round 9 | | |
| Round 10 | | |

Comments:
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POST-SESSION OBSERVATION SHEET

After the session please circulate among the players. Note any easing of tension, changing patterns of behavior, and comments or interesting remarks that occur during this time.

COMMENTARY SHEET

After the observation, at your convenience, please write any remarks that you would like to make on the observation situation as a whole. Comment on the people, the patterns of behavior and your reaction to the experience.

(Note: The instructions for the Post-Session Observation Sheet and the Commentary Sheet were given at the tops of separate sheets of paper so that the observers would have adequate space to express their observations and opinions.)
THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The respondent was asked to give two answers to each question, a first and a second choice.

1. You are playing in the state championships. You are the declarer at a difficult contract of 4 Hearts. After winning the opening Heart lead and drawing trumps, you are faced with the possibility of losing two Clubs, a Diamond, and a Spade for down one. There are two possibilities of saving the situation: a spade finesse may be made by leading the doubleton Jack toward the Ace-Queen-Small in your hand, and the other is to give up the two Clubs, hoping to set up a Club for a sluff of the Spade on the board. Since the odds seem poorer for setting up the Club, you tentatively lead the Jack of Spades and watch the right hand opponent. He hesitates for several seconds and plays a small Spade. You decide that his only problem in the play can be if he has the King—consequently you finesse. The finesse loses to the King, and it turns out that the right hand opponent held only three very small cards in the suit. More perturbing than this, it turns out that had you not finessed, you would have made the contract. You have been "coffee-housed"! What would you do?

1. Nothing
2. Call the director and protest the unethical play by the opponent.
3. Speak sharply to the opponent about the play.
4. Say nothing but tell your partner, after you had left the table, why you played as you did.
5. Tell your partner why you had played as you did—indicating openly, while still at the table, that your opponent had "coffee-housed."
6. Ask your opponent politely if he had intended to hesitate, afterward explaining the situation to him.

Comment:
2. It is the local master point session. You are playing the Howell movement, with each pair striving to win only one master point. You have been playing fairly well and feel that one or two good boards will allow you to win. Your opponents are good players who might be in contention to win. In the course of the play your right hand opponent, who is defending against your doubled contract, drops a card on the table accidentally when he is playing another card. He immediately picks the card up. You see that if you force him to leave the card as an exposed card, it will allow you to make an otherwise impossible contract. You also know that this opponent is the sort to make a fuss over enforcement of such rules. What would you do?

1. Nothing
2. Call the director and ask for a ruling.
3. Tell him to replace the card as an exposed card.
4. Tell the opponent that he may pick up the card without penalty.
5. Remark on the fact that when a card is exposed it should remain so.
6. Indicate that you know the error was committed but that you will not call a penalty.

Comment:

3. You are playing in the Open Pairs, a Sunday two-session event. The opponents' cards are blank as far as conventions are concerned. Your partner opens the bidding, and the right hand opponent overcalls One No Trump. You hold eight points and pass. The right hand opponent bids two Spades, which is passed around to you. You would like to double or bid three of partner's suit, but the strong hand to your right deter you—and you pass. The lead is made and the No Trump overcaller lays down a hand with only twelve points. When you inquire why this weak overcall is not on the convention card, the opponent tells you that they always use the weak No Trump overcall, and nobody ever fills out their card anyway. You can see that you are destined for a bottom board. What would you do?

1. Nothing
2. Call the director and protest the unethical play by opponents.
3. Politely inform the opponent that he should put the convention on his card but call no penalty.
4. Speak sharply to the opponent about his unethical play.
5. Tell your partner why you had not bid—indicating the unethical bid by the opponent—after you had left the table.
6. Tell your partner, while still at the table, what the situation was, inferring to the opponent that his bid was unethical.

**Comment:**

4. In the above situation you decide to call the director, who seems not to be able to make a ruling and finally tells you to go on without imposing a penalty. In recapping the score, you find that you have received a bottom score on the board. It is also obvious that if you had received a half on the board, you would have been first instead of third, a difference of several master points and a trophy. What would you do?

1. Nothing
2. Protest the situation formally to a protest committee.
3. Tell partner that these are the breaks and go home.
4. Complain to the director on the ruling or lack of it.
5. Say nothing rather than create an incident.
6. Tell the people in the local club that you would not play in such an unethical group again.

**Comment:**

5. One member of the duplicate bridge group cheats much of the time. He/She is noted for hesitating with nearly biddable hands and then passing, peeking at other people's hands, listening to the talk at another table about the hand he/she is about to play, having private understandings with his/her partner, and other things generally considered to be unethical. What do you think should be done about this person?

1. Nothing
2. The club should warn him/her against such tactics.
3. It is someone else's responsibility.
4. You should report him/her to the ACBL.
5. A talk campaign should be started to let this person know you are on to him/her.
6. Tell his/her partners in the hope that he/she will stop the unethical play.

Comment:

(A list of 15 names, selected from various occupational classes represented in the duplicate bridge group, appeared in this space.)

6. You are in charge of the nomination committee to get new officers for the group for next year. You realize that in order for the group to flourish, interested people with a stake in the group activities should be appointed. From the above-named group, select three you believe have such qualities.

7. You are looking for three people to play in an inter-city match with you against Butte. What three would you select from the group above?

8. Select the three people you would most like to play with at the Calgary Regional.

9. Most of the group is driving to a large tournament. You are taking a car and have room for three people. You know that bridge will be the topic of conversation, and you hope for an enjoyable trip. What three people in the list above would you invite to ride with you?

10. You are inviting three people in for a bridge game. From the list above, select the three you would invite.
The informant was asked to make one response to each question.

11. You have just taken first in the Open Pairs Event at the state championships. Besides the Master Points, you are offered these choices:

1. A trophy inscribed with the event and your name.
2. A merchandise certificate at a store of your choice for $10.00.
3. A certificate for an ACBL prize worth $10.00.

Comment:

12. You are planning to attend the regional at Calgary. A very fine player from another town has offered to play the Open Pairs (4 sessions) with you. You feel that you have an excellent chance of placing or winning with this partner. Your local partner, a much poorer caliber player, also asks you to play this event. What would you do?

1. Tell your local partner that you already had agreed to play with someone else.
2. Tell your local partner that you are sorry and offer to play a less important event with him/her.
3. Play with your local partner.

Comment:

13. A knockout team tournament has been planned and advertised by your local unit. Due to a misunderstanding with the ACBL, you are informed that a mistake has been made, and the sanction for the tournament is not approved. This means that no Master Point awards can be made. What would be the best course of action:

1. Cancel the tournament at the last minute, notifying all of the surrounding cities.
2. Offer cash prizes in lieu of Master Points

Comment:
14. Duplicate bridge playing has increased substantially in the last 10 years. How do you account for this?

1. A greater interest in competitive games.
2. The awarding of Master Points at the local as well as the tournament level.
3. Newer and simpler bidding systems.

Comment:

15. A decision has to be made on what basis your local club should continue play during the summer months. The ACBL has declined to allow the group to give Master Points during the summer months because of lowered attendance. There are three possibilities.

1. The club can continue to play "for the fun of it."
2. The club can continue to play with each person contributing toward a "pot" which would go to the winners.
3. The club can suspend play until fall.

Comment:
APPENDIX B
### TABLE XVI

**ACTIONS SELECTED IN UNETHICAL PLAY
NOT COVERED BY RULES**
*(QUESTION #1)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nothing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Call director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Speak sharply to opponent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explain to partner, after leaving table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Explain to partner, before leaving table</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Politely inquire reason for opponent's action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggressive: 16
Non-aggressive: 4

### TABLE XVII

**ACTIONS SELECTED
WHEN OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF OPPONENT OCCURS**
*(QUESTION #2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nothing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tell opponent to replace card</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Call director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Call no penalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Infer to opponent to follow rules</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Call no penalty but indicate this to opponent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggressive: 18
Non-aggressive: 2
TABLE XVIII

ACTIONS SELECTED IN UNETHICAL PLAY COVERED BY RULES (QUESTION #3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call director</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call no penalty, informing opponent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak sharply to opponent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain to partner, after leaving table</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain to partner, before leaving table</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-aggressive</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XIX

ACTIONS SELECTED IN CONTINUATION OF UNETHICAL SITUATION IN TABLE XVIII (QUESTION #4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest to a formal protest committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell partner that these are the breaks and go home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complain to director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say nothing rather than create an incident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complain to players in local club</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-aggressive</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XX

ACTIONS SELECTED IN SITUATION INVOLVING PLAYER WHO CONTINUOUSLY CHEATS (QUESTION #5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nothing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The club should warn the offender</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is someone else's responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Report offender to A.C.B.L.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Start talk campaign against offender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tell offender's partners in hopes cheating will stop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Aggressive | 13 |
| Non-aggressive | 7  |

20
Dots indicate the residences of the sample members.