

Zelda F. Gamson
Center for the Study of Higher Education
and The University of Michigan

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the effects of different relationships between subgroups (student voluntary organizations) and their larger organizational environment (the university) on internal group processes. The analysis is guided by the assumption that the ways subgroups are related to their organizational environments will be reflected in the ways they recruit and integrate members, in the norms and values which develop within the groups, in the kinds of relationships which form among members. The aspects of group functioning which will be explored are the extent to which groups exert normative pressure on their members, especially with respect to the sharing of values. Normative pressure on members will be related to two subgroup-organizational relationship variables: degree of congruence between the subgroup and its organizational environment and degree of permeability between the subgroup and the organization.

The larger organizational setting in which this question will be investigated is a large, complex university; the subgroups are different types of formal student organizations. Historically, studies of the impact of college on students have viewed the total institution as the relevant environment for all students, with little attention to internal variation.¹ Partly in reaction to

this simplistic view of the institution and the lack of clear impact of the total institution, researchers turned to looking at students in various subgroups or subcultures. Often, it was found that the extent of change in students' attitudes and values was greater and the types and directions of change different for subgroups of students (Huntley, 1965; Selvin, 1963; Siegel and Siegel, 1957). The pendulum swung in the other direction, to the point that subgroups or subcultures came to be viewed as the relevant environment for students, almost in total isolation from the larger setting in which they formed. They were viewed as "ways of life" into which students were differentially socialized in what just happened to be the same organizational setting. Within these groups, certain types of students were seen to be associated in certain ways with each other, to spend their time in distinctive ways, to share given responses to the academic and other demands of the larger institution.

When we introduce the notion of responses to the larger institution, we return partially to the earlier conception of the whole college or University as a relevant environment. In the study reported here, we have re-introduced this notion in a modified form: we see the University as having a certain character and as representing certain demands which are differentially perceived and accepted by the various parts of the whole. The variation, however, is not random, but is conditioned by the groups' perceptions of and relations with the larger institution.

Our approach is based on the assumption that subgroups develop in ways that are "appropriate" to their position and stance within the larger organizational structure. So, for example, in this study of student organizations and their relationships to the University, we look at "extremist" groups-- in a University which many students agree is liberal and moderate²--as facing different problems and as developing different modes of attracting and integrating members than

*This paper was developed out of research supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant GS-1849) and the Committee on Basic Research in Education, National Research Council (Project #0-0806, Contract #OEG-0-71-0572(508)). For a full description of the methods used and other findings, see Zelda F. Gamson (1972). The author is grateful to Gerald Gurin for comments on early drafts of this paper and for his encouragement throughout this project. She also wishes to thank Dorwin Cartwright, William Gamson, Stanley Seashore and Robert Zajonc for helpful suggestions.

moderate groups. Extremist groups tend to see themselves as set against or beset by the liberal, moderate University. They tend to develop norms and values which rationalize their differences with the University and to show patterns of internal relationships centered around protecting and maintaining their differences. They develop strategies of relating to the University which protect their uniqueness--in some cases, by seeking to influence the environment; in other cases, by withdrawing. Indeed, one of the most interesting problems raised in the literature, but not answered, is the delineation of the conditions under which groups in a hostile environment increase their interaction with or withdraw from interaction with their environment.

Several Relevant Literatures

This paper falls into several traditions in sociology and social psychology. Relations between organizations and their environments, as well as types of inter-organizational relationships, have been receiving increasing attention in recent years in studies of complex organizations.³ We are interested particularly in studies which indicate that the degree of communication between an organization and its environment and amount of environmental support for the organization have significant impacts on organizational goals, structures and processes (Blau and Scott, 1962; Clark, 1956; Brown, 1966; Thompson, 1967; Aldrich, 1971).

Several studies of voluntary associations lead to a similar conclusion. Simpson and Gullely (1962) found that the range of environmental pressures to which an organization was exposed affected centralization, communication and concern with member involvement. Arnold Rose (1955), in a study of 91 voluntary organizations, concluded that groups faced with opposing groups were more active, more complex and more flexible than groups which did not have to cope with opposition. Although not conceptualized in terms of group-environmental relationships, the series of instrumental vs. expressive voluntary groups (Babchuk and Edwards, 1965; Gordon and Babchuk, 1959; Jacoby, 1965; Jacoby and Babchuk, 1963; Marcus, 1960; Warner and Miller, 1964; Warriner and Prather, 1965) can be viewed as reflecting the effects of different degrees of communication with and support by the environment on group structure. In general, the conclusion emerges from this body of literature that instrumental organizations, perforce in greater interaction with their environments, have more problems and undergo more change and turbulence than expressive groups, which appear to be more static and simple in their structures.

This conclusion can be understood in terms of the tension between adaptation and integration in social systems (Katz and Kahn, 1966; Parsons, 1960; Bales, 1965). The need to balance adaption with integration is

particularly pressing in ideological groups, which in varying degrees exist to challenge generally accepted values and therefore must come into some communication with "the outer situation." On the other hand, ideological groups must also maintain high internal integration to protect their values from too much external influence (Wilson, 1959).

In a brilliant paper, James D. Thompson (1960) has analyzed the mechanisms employed by ideological groups to prevent the subversion of organizational objectives by the environment: homogeneity of members, distinctiveness of group values and styles, restriction of members' exposure to the environment, limited boundary roles with strict staffing and rotation rules. Both Wilson and Thompson, and more recently, Aldrich (1971), have emphasized the protective functions of withdrawal from environmental contact in times of challenge, especially among normative organizations. But some groups move to increase communication with the outside world.

Case studies of apocalyptic groups by Festinger, Riecken and Schachter (1956) and by Hardwyk and Braden (1962) suggest conditions under which such groups communicate or withdraw from the environment when their prophecies fail. Increased communication (in these cases, proselytizing) appeared to be both a consequence and a cause of internal weakness: the greater the environmental communication, the less the internal integration; and the less the integration, the greater the environmental communication. Aldrich (1971) has pointed to the degree of organizational control over movement across its boundaries as another condition affecting withdrawal vs. communication.

The processes underlying the tension between communication and integration in ideological groups can be partially understood with reference to the literature on deviance. By definition, deviant groups are identified by their relationship to the surrounding dominant culture, and this relationship shapes the norms and values within deviant subcultures (Cohen, 1955; Yinger, 1960). Research in experimental social psychology has shown some of the mechanisms through which the environment may shape group norms and values. Minority group status leads to a greater need for group support. There is greater pressure for uniformity within minority groups. Such pressure is reinforced by rejection, especially from a cohesive majority (Festinger, 1954; Gerard, 1953; Schachter, 1951). Cartwright and Zander (1968) have suggested that communications are more often directed to a deviant if the sender of the communication perceives that there is a reasonable probability of changing the deviant. If this is not the case, such as when there is minimal consensus on values and norms (Seiler, 1963), the amount of communication declines markedly (Sampson and Brandon, 1964). And the greater the reduction in the amount of communication, the greater the withdrawal, which promotes

further isolation (Cartwright and Zander, 1968, p.146; Hiermann, 1963). Isolation tends to strengthen group norms and member commitment and, by means of a process of polarization, members' attitudes will converge on a more extreme position (Moscovici and Zavalloni, 1969 and Doise, 1969).

But subgroups in larger organizations are not completely isolated from the superordinate unit, nor are they able to escape completely some of the organizational requisites which made them parts of the whole in the first place (Samuel, 1972). The crucial issue here, as it has been in both the natural and experimental groups reviewed, is the nature and extent of the subgroup's ties to the whole. In a recent attempt to systematize the relations between small groups in larger organizations, Golembiewski (1965) presented a model of the small group in a macro-system in which he looked at the effects on output and satisfaction of high and low normative consensus between a small group and its larger organizational setting, high and low structural integration of the small group into the organization, and high and low congruence between group norms with formal policies and procedures. Especially interesting, as Golembiewski noted, is the effect of hostile relations between subgroups and the macro-system on group cohesiveness. In one of the rare studies which looked directly at this question, Seashore's (1954) research on work teams in a manufacturing firm showed how perceptions of the environment as threatening or supportive affected levels of productivity in cohesive groups.

In general, groups in larger organizations, like groups of delinquents in a ghetto or student peer groups in high schools (Coleman, 1963), form because their members have similar relationships to the immediate environment (Wheeler, 1966). When these relationships become problematic for some reason, the group provides values, attitudes and norms of behavior which aid individuals to deal with the problems confronting them as actors in a larger setting. They may not perform better in the larger setting--as Seashore and Coleman have shown, they may perform less well--but the group provides an alternative source of rewards and a rationale for poor performance and minimal participation when members feel alien in the larger setting (Burns, 1956).

Theoretical Framework and Variables

Even so brief a review of the literature has unearthed a plethora of variables pertaining to environment-subgroup relationships and internal group processes, and only a limited number will be explored in this paper. Two key variables relating subgroups to the University are the extent to which groups differ or resemble the University in values and atmosphere--a congruence dimension--and

the extent to which the groups see themselves as both being influenced by and influencing other groups at the University--a group permeability dimension. We can treat these two dimensions as having high and low values, and, cross-cutting them, generate the following four types of relationship with the University. (See Table 1.)

Groups which are incongruent with the larger environment can either engage in low levels of interaction with that environment (withdrawal groups) or show high levels of interaction (challenging groups). Groups which are congruent with the larger environment may also differ in their degree of interaction. When congruence is high and interaction is

Table 1 - Four Types of Subgroup Relationships with the University

Permeability of the Group	Congruence Between Group and University	
	Low	High
Low	"Withdrawal" Pattern	"Conformity" Pattern
High	"Challenge" Pattern	"Integration" Pattern

low, groups are essentially passively fitting into the larger University environment, a pattern we will call conformity. Congruent groups which engage in high levels of interaction with their environment exhibit a pattern we call integration. These four types of relationships with the larger setting lead to certain hypotheses about internal group processes. Some hypotheses postulate the direct effects of congruence, some the direct effects of permeability, and some the interaction between consensus and permeability.

The main dependent variable to which these different group-environment interactions will be related is the degree of normative pressure on members in the group, a process that has been of great interest to social psychologists in a wide variety of studies of cohesiveness. (Cartwright and Zander, 1968; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Schachter, 1951) as well as to students of ideological groups (Nahirny, 1962; Wilson, 1959; Festinger, Schachter and Riecken, 1956; Kardwyk and Prader, 1962).

We will be addressing three major questions:

1. To what extent are congruence and permeability related to normative pressure?
2. How do congruence and permeability interact to produce different levels of normative pressure?
3. How are these relationships modified or mediated by group values and goals?

A major hypothesis to be tested with these data is based on the findings from several

studies (Hardyk and Braden, 1962; Gerard, 1953) that the less support a group gets from the environment, the more likely it is to seek value uniformity from its members. Thus, group-University congruence will be inversely related to normative pressure.

Permeability as a variable in this study has the interesting status of being both a dependent and an independent variable. Higher interaction with the environment is seen as an alternative to normative pressure under conditions of low congruence--that is, it is a dependent variable. It is also viewed as an independent variable which will interact with congruence to produce different levels of normative pressure. Thus, the response to difference with the environment--whether in the direction of withdrawal or in the direction of high interaction--mediates normative pressure on members. Groups which respond to their difference with the environment by withdrawing from contact will show the highest normative pressure (withdrawal groups), while groups which respond by increasing their interaction (challenging groups) will show lower, but not the lowest, levels of normative pressure on their members. The rationale for this hypothesis is that challenging groups, by entering into interaction with the larger environment, cannot exert the degree of value pressure on their members which withdrawal groups can achieve by virtue of their isolation from competing values. Challenging groups, however, must exert moderate levels of normative pressure to maintain members' commitment to the groups in a non-supportive environment.

THE STUDY

The data for this analysis are drawn from a questionnaire study conducted in 1966 of twenty-seven formal student organizations in a large, complex, state-supported U.S. University. There were three types of organizations--political groups, religious groups, and fraternities and sororities, with a range of groups within each type. The four political groups included the Young Republicans, the Young Democrats, Young Americans for Freedom and Students for a Democratic Society. The five religious groups spanned a range from a fundamentalist Bible study group to a liberal multi-denominational discussion group, with a conservative evangelical group, a Catholic group and a Methodist group in-between. The nine fraternities and nine sororities varied in prestige, size and religious preference. Thus, there was variation not only on group goals but also in size, composition of membership, ideology, values and prestige.

Questionnaires were distributed to all members, as defined by the groups' membership lists. We were interested in getting a range of representation of members in the groups, and insisted that the lists include

old and new, central and peripheral, highly involved and highly uninvolved members. The return rates were variable, with the lowest rates found among the more avant-garde, liberal and radical groups, which also tended to show a pattern of low member participation in organizational activities and low effectiveness. These groups, particularly SDS, pull down the return rate to a median of 71%.⁴ This is a respectable return rate, given the difficulty of gaining the cooperation of scattered, marginal members who had perhaps attended one or two organizational functions. The total sample of respondents is 1900; the number of groups is 27; the average group N is 69, with a range of 34 to 128.⁵

The questionnaires were in two parts: A group questionnaire which focused on the respondents' relationships to and perceptions of their groups (recruitment, participation, informant questions on group interests, values, effectiveness, conflict, leadership, etc.) and a background questionnaire with biographical questions, experiences within the University, and attitudinal and personality measures. All questions were phrased in such a way as to be applicable to all types of groups. In addition, key informant interviews with at least two active members and current or past officers were conducted throughout the data collection period.

The data reported in this paper are drawn completely from the group questionnaire. The units of analysis are the student organizations, for which individual measures were aggregated to produce a group average. Each member was weighted equally. As Aiken and Hage (1969) point out, aggregating individual measures to indicate group properties presents methodological problems which have not yet been solved.⁶ For example, an argument can be made for assigning different weights to individuals according to social position, degree of involvement, or length of membership. Aiken and Hage assigned greater weights to staff members higher in the chain of command, which made sense for the types of organizations they studied. However, student groups and voluntary organizations more generally do not have many hierarchical levels. Weighting by degree of involvement was another option, but it was felt that the assumptions implied by such a procedure--that more involved members were more "representative" of the group or more "influential" in affecting the group--might skew the variables unduly in one direction. Our aim was to work with group variables which would represent the range of members, from the most involved to the least involved, from those most "representative" of the group to those least "representative." Weighting members equally made sense conceptually, although methodological problems remain with this procedure as well.⁷

In any case, Aiden and Hage (1969) found high correlations between their differential weighting procedure and equal

weighting of respondents, from which we derive some measure of confidence in our simpler approach. Aside from the problems of weighting, using aggregated measures to depict the characteristics and processes of each group as a whole brings us closer to a sociological level than employing the individual as the unit of analysis.⁸

Measurement of the Variables

Congruence Between the Group and the University. All members were asked to use a five-point scale to rate their groups on twelve value and atmosphere items (politically conservative vs. liberal; unconventional vs. conventional; intellectual vs. non-intellectual; accepting vs. rejecting of traditional religious beliefs; pro- vs. con- the war in Vietnam; closed vs. open; absorbed vs. not absorbed in social life and dating; absorbed vs. not absorbed in studies and academic work; warm vs. cold; positive vs. negative toward fraternities and sororities; liberal vs. conservative sex standards; relaxed vs. tense) and, later, to rate the University on these same twelve items. Absolute differences were computed for each member's rating of the group and the University on each of the twelve items. The difference measure eliminates direction: a member who saw his group as two points more conventional than the University received the same score as a member who saw his group as two points more unconventional. Then, a mean difference score was computed across all of the items to produce a summary measure for each individual. This summary measure was averaged across the members of each group to produce an aggregate group-University difference measure. The group scores ranged from 9.2 to 16.3, with a mean of 12.4. It should be emphasized that, although the original question measured members' perceptions of their groups and the University, the difference variable was constructed by the researcher.

Degree of Permeability of the Group. We asked members to indicate the extent to which the faculty, administration, and various student groups influenced and were influenced by their groups.⁹ The question format was adapted from Tannenbaum's (Tannenbaum, 1961; Smith and Brown, 1964) perceived degree of influence questions. The decision was made to measure permeability by means of perceived influence to filter out the kinds of regularized, often required, communication between formal student groups and faculty sponsors, student services officers, student newspaper personnel and other student organizations. A mean score was computed for each member over seven items and an aggregate permeability measure was derived for each group from these means. Since four of the items asked about influence on the group, there is a somewhat greater weighting of

environmental inputs to the group.¹⁰ It should be noted, however, that we make no conceptual distinction in the direction of influence, whether from the group to the University or from the University to the group, since we were interested in interaction both ways across group boundaries.¹¹

Normative Pressure. Members were asked to indicate, on five-point scales, (1) the degree to which the group exerted pressure on them to share "the dominant beliefs and values" of the group; (2) whether anyone would let them know if they did not share these beliefs and values. They were also asked to check, on a four-point scale, (3) the degree to which the group was concerned with teaching or influencing new members and (4) the directness of this concern. The sum of each member's responses to these four items was computed, and an average scores assigned to each group.

Group Goals: Religious and political groups were combined and fraternities and sororities were combined.

Values: Group values were measured by a five-point item which asked members to rate their groups on political conservatism vs. liberalism (one of the twelve items used to develop the congruence variable).

RESULTS

We hypothesized that, at the zero order level, normative pressure on members' values would be inversely related to congruence. Table 2 shows that this is the case indeed, although the magnitude of the gamma between congruence and normative pressure is only moderate.

Table 2 - Gammas of Congruence and Permeability with Normative Pressure

	<u>Normative Pressure</u>
<u>Permeability</u>	-.09
<u>Congruence</u>	-.26

We also hypothesized different levels of normative pressure when congruence and permeability were combined at high and low levels to produce four group patterns. Withdrawal groups were expected to show the highest levels of normative pressure. Table 3 presents the mean normative pressure scores in each group pattern. We find, indeed, that the highest normative pressure occurs in the withdrawal groups. At the other end are the conforming groups which show the lowest level of normative pressure. The high permeability groups at both levels of congruence--the challenging and integrated groups--are moderate in the degree of value uniformity they demand from their members.

Table 3 - Mean Scores on Normative Pressure in Withdrawal, Challenging, Conforming and Integrated Groups

		<u>Withdrawal^b</u> (Low Congru- ence, Low Permeability)	<u>Challenging^c</u> (Low Congru- ence, High Permeability)	<u>Conforming^d</u> (High Congru- ence, Low Permeability)	<u>Integrated^e</u> (High Congru- ence, High Permeability)
Normative Pressure ^a	Mean	9.45	8.13	7.96	8.20
	S D.	1.29	1.42	1.09	1.59

^aWithdrawal groups against all others: $t = 1.86$; $p < .10$. In other comparisons, withdrawal groups are different from conforming groups at the .10 level.

^bIncludes fundamentalist religious group, evangelical religious group, Methodist group, YAF.

^cIncludes liberal religious group, S.D.S., two fraternities, and five sororities.

^dIncludes Catholic group, Young Democrats, Young Republicans, five fraternities and one sorority.

^eIncludes two fraternities and three sororities.

Group Goals and Values as Related to the other Variables

Although no hypotheses were offered with respect to group goals and values, we were interested in their associations with normative pressure as modifiers or mediators of the effects of interaction and congruence with the University. We suspect that the different patterns just examined can be understood to some extent in terms of the ideologies and goals of the groups in each of the four types. The withdrawal groups are all (political or religious) value groups, and three of them are the most traditional and conservative groups on the campus. The integrated groups include only social groups. There is more of a mixture of group goals and values among the challenging and conforming groups but, even with these, we expect that political ideology and group goals are affecting the relationships. Table 4 presents the relationships between group goals and political ideology and normative pressure.

Table 4 - Relationships of Group Goals and Political Liberalism with Normative Pressure

	<u>Group Goals</u>	<u>Political Liberalism</u>
<u>Normative Pressure</u>	Difference between means of Religious-Political Groups vs. "Greek" Groups, $t = 0.04$	Gamma = -.42

Normative pressure is unrelated to group goals but strongly associated with political liberalism. The most unexpected finding in Table 4 is the strong negative relationship between political liberalism and

normative pressure. Groups which were described by their members as being politically conservative were much more likely to put a great deal of pressure on their members for value conformity. Why is this? Is this a reflection of a general conservative ideology which may be mistrustful of value differences? Or does it have something to do with the position of conservative groups within this university environment?

One might expect that ideological groups in general, and groups at the extremes--both liberal and conservative--would subject their members to greater value pressure than groups in the middle. As we have seen, the religious and political groups as a whole do not differ significantly from Greek (fraternity-sorority) groups in this respect and conservatism is highly related to value pressure across all the groups. But perhaps there is a curvilinear relationship between political ideology and value pressure. Table 5 compares the mean normative pressure scores at three levels of political liberalism and shows clearly that the relationship between ideology and normative pressure is linear.

Table 5 - Mean Normative Pressure at Three Levels of Political Liberalism

	<u>Top Third Political Liberalism</u>	<u>Middle Third Political Liberalism</u>	<u>Bottom Third Political Liberalism</u>
Normative ^a $\bar{x} =$ Pressure	7.04	8.63	9.14
N =	9	9	9

^aDifference between Top Third and Middle Third, $t = -2.88$, $p < .02$

Difference between Top Third and Bottom Third, $t = -4.08$, $p < .01$

Difference between Middle Third and Bottom Third, $t = -0.878$, not significant

Still, even if the relationship is linear, it may be that the extreme groups at the radical end of the spectrum do exert high normative pressure but this effect is being diluted by combining such groups with less extreme liberal groups. We went back and checked the normative pressure scores of the left-wing group ranked sixteenth on normative pressure in the array of twenty-seven student organizations and seventh out of the nine religious and political groups. The right-wing radical group ranked eighth out of the twenty-seven groups and third of the religious and political groups, preceded in rank by the fundamentalist religious group and the evangelical group. Clearly, conservative groups exert more normative pressure on their members than radical groups in this university context.

But some conservative groups are more incongruent with the University surrounding them than others. Does congruence interact with political ideology to produce different levels of normative pressure? Table 6 presents

Table 6 - Relationship Between Political Liberalism and Normative Pressure at Two Levels of Congruence

	High Congruence	Low Congruence
Political Liberalism x Normative Pressure	Gamma -.41	Gamma -.49
N	13	14

the data on this question and shows that political ideology is negatively related to normative pressure at both levels of congruence, with a slightly higher relationship among high congruence groups.¹²

How does group type enter into these effects? Table 7 tells us that the inverse relationship between political ideology and normative pressure holds in both religious-political and Greek groups, although it is much stronger among the religious and political groups.¹³

Putting the results of Table 6 and 7 together, we should expect the greatest relationship between political ideology and normative pressure to be found in low incongruence, religious and political groups and the smallest relationship between political ideology and normative pressure in high congruence, Greek groups.

Table 7 - Relationship Between Political Liberalism and Normative Pressure Within Religious-Political Groups and Greek Groups

	Religious and Political Groups	Greek Groups
Political Liberalism x Normative Pressure	Gamma = -.61	Gamma = -.25
N	9	18

Table 8 shows the gammas between political liberalism and normative pressure for religious-political vs. Greek groups at different levels of congruence, and this is indeed the case.¹⁴ We can say with some confidence, then, that normative pressure on members is employed most by political or religious groups which are more conservative than the larger University environment.

Thus, group values, and, secondarily, group goals mediate and heighten the original moderate relationship between congruence and normative pressure on members. What about permeability, the other dimension of relationship with the larger environment? As we suggested earlier, increased interaction in a situation of difference is an alternative to increased pressure for internal conformity. We trace through these effects in the same manner as we just did with normative pressure. Table 9 presents the first-order gammas for congruence and goal groups and the second-order gammas for congruence and goals combined.

Again, group values and goals sharpen our perception of the original gamma between permeability and normative pressure. The relationships between political ideology and

Table 8 - Relationship Between Political Liberalism and Normative Pressure Within Religious-Political Groups and Greek Groups, High and Low Congruence

	Religious and Political Groups		Greek Groups	
	High Congruence	Low Congruence	High Congruence	Low Congruence
Political Liberalism x Normative Pressure				
Gamma =	-.33	-.47	-.14	-.27
N	3	6	7	11

Table 9 - Relationship Between Political Liberalism and Permeability at Two Levels of Congruence and Within Value and Social Groups

	High	Low	Religious- Political Groups	Greek Groups	Religious-Political Groups		Greek Groups	
	Congru- ence Groups	Congru- ence Groups			High	Low	High	Low
					Congruence	Congruence	Congruence	Congruence
Political Liberalism x Permeability								
Gamma =	-.04	+.26	+.37	-.09	-.33	+.60	+.24	+.04
N =	13	14	9	18	3	6	7	11

permeability are, however, the reverse of those we found for normative pressure. Religious and political groups that are more conservative than the surrounding environment are the least likely to engage in high levels of interaction with the environment, while religious or political groups that are more liberal than the surrounding environment have higher levels of interaction.¹⁵ Thus, normative pressure and interaction with the environment do appear to be alternative responses in incongruence. In groups differing from the University in the conservative direction, normative pressure is high and interaction with the environment is low. In groups differing from the University in the liberal direction, the opposite pattern occurs.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We began this paper by asking about the effects of different subgroup-organization relationships on internal group processes. The emphasis throughout has been on tracking down these effects, as they operate directly through normative pressure or indirectly through group values and goals. No claim has been made that normative pressure on members' values has been fully explained; indeed, it may be that factors such as size or the self-selected qualities of members explain more variance than group-University relationships. The concern of this paper has been, instead, to show (1) that group-University relationships do affect internal group processes, (2) that different relationship variables affect one aspect of groups, normative pressure, in different ways, and (3) that these effects are mediated by group values and goals.

Taking the lead from a wide variety of studies, we defined two group-University linkage variables: congruence with the University, which attempts to measure the actual difference between groups and the University, and permeability, which attempts to get at the degree of interaction between the groups and the wider setting. The

operationalization of these concepts is far from perfect, and the number of groups is too small to permit complex data analysis or definitive generalization. Yet interesting relationships do appear, and they often confirm the hypotheses with which we began.

Congruence with the larger environment has important effects on the degree to which groups pressure members for value conformity. The less the congruence, the greater the pressure. This relationship is, however, mediated by group values and, to a lesser extent, by group goals. Groups which differ from the University by being more conservative place their members under a great deal of normative pressure. This is especially true for religious and political groups.

Permeability functions in this analysis both as an independent variable which interacts with congruence, and as a dependent variable. In its role as an independent variable, low permeability combined with low congruence produces a group pattern we called "withdrawal," which is associated with high levels of normative pressure. In its role as a dependent variable, permeability appears to be a response to incongruence among groups which are more liberal than the University.

But why should conservative groups respond with insulation and liberal groups with interaction? We would expect a certain symmetry in response at both extremes, yet the groups on the Left are more open to being influenced and to exercising influence in the University than groups on the Right. Our measure of congruence indicates approximately the same degree of absolute difference from the University, so degree of deviance does not account for the difference. The content of the ideology may have something to do with the difference; liberal-radical values tend to be more open and tolerant of differences than conservative values. Yet we think the context is more important. Recall that the permeability measure was based on a series of items asking members to assess the degree to which their groups influenced and were influenced by different sectors of the University. The permeability measure has a strong efficacy flavor, and it is clear that members of groups which

are incongruent with the University at the liberal end feel that their groups have a higher level of efficacy than groups at the conservative end. Why do incongruent liberal groups feel more efficacious than equally incongruent, but conservative groups? The context, it should be recalled, is a University which is seen as moderately liberal. The University has been the scene of major left-wing activity, and the administration has been relatively tolerant of such activity. Liberal and radical groups have flourished in this environment. They have attracted large memberships; they have received editorial support from the student newspaper; they have sympathizers in student government. In other words, even though such groups are as far from the mainstream of the University as conservative groups at the other end, they operate in an environment which for them is more benign than it is for conservative groups. They also have access to more resources--people, media, influence.

The interaction response to difference implies some degree of anticipated or potential support. When such anticipated or potential support does not exist--as in the case of conservative groups at this University--insulation and withdrawal are more probable responses. The context is crucial. In a traditional, conservative institution, it is likely that liberal or radical groups are the "withdrawal" groups and that very conservative groups are the "challenging" groups. The point here is that ideology filters the effects of the environment in the direction of insulation or interaction as responses to difference, depending on the degree of potential support in the environment.

This analysis, it should be emphasized, is based on a study of a small number of groups in one organization. The groups were all student organizations which, although varied in terms of goals and activities, still are limited in their representativeness. Nevertheless, despite these caveats, we wish to underline the promise in our findings for other studies of subgroup linkages to their organizational environment.

Footnotes

1. Feldman and Newcomb (1969) give the best review of this literature to date.
2. A random sample of 1400 seniors graduating from the University during the period in which the data on student organizations were collected were asked to characterize the University as accepting vs. rejecting of traditional religion as politically conservative vs. liberal. On a scale running from 0 (traditional, conservative) to 4 (untraditional, liberal), 76 percent of the random sample rated the University as moderately to very untraditional on religion ($\bar{x} = 2.20$; standard deviation = .96) and 78 percent rated the University as

moderately to very liberal politically ($\bar{x} = 2.67$, standard deviation = 1.13).

3. For a review of both inter-organizational relationships and organizational-environmental transactions, as well as an excellent study of organization interdependence among health and welfare agencies, see Aiken and Hage (1968). Aldrich (1972) has reviewed the literature on inter-organizational relations, particularly with respect to voluntary organizations, as has Klomglan, (1973). Lawrence and Lorsch (1967 and 1969), Duncan (1972), and Negandhi and Reimann (1972) have offered analysis of organizational structure and process as largely determined by environmental pressures.

4. See Gamson (1972: Appendices) for a full description of return rates, assessment of bias, a detailed description of the administration of the questionnaires and group selection procedures, and copies of the instruments. Marginal members are under-represented in all groups, with the exception of SDS, where recent recruits were more cooperative than older members. The abysmal return of 39% from SDS makes us extremely cautious in interpreting results for that organization alone, but we are less worried when it is grouped with other organizations, as in this paper.

5. Sororities were the least variable in size and averaged 65 respondents across the nine groups. Fraternities came next, with an average of 58. Political and religious groups showed a greater size variation, with a range of 43 (fundamentalist group) to 128 (Catholic group) among the religious organizations and a range of 35 (Y.A.F.) to 118 (Young Democrats) among the political groups.

6. For discussion of the issues involved in individual and collective properties, see Selvin and Hagstrom (1966), Lazarsfeld and Menzel (1960) and Coleman (1964).

7. For instance, the problem of variance remains. If members do not agree about a particular characteristic of their group, it makes little sense to aggregate on that variable.

8. For a somewhat similar rationale, see Selvin and Hagstrom (1966). In their study of 20 women's residence groups, Selvin and Hagstrom factor analyzed aggregated characteristics in order to classify the groups into a smaller number of types, which they then related to individual member attitudes.

9. Other questions asked members the extent to which they saw the University as creating difficulties for the group or as being in opposition to the group. The lower the congruence between the group and the University, the greater the opposition perceived by group members (Gamma = .32) and the greater the difficulties presented for the group by the University (Gamma = .24).

10. The actual questions were:
 "In general, how much influence do you think the following groups or persons actually have in determining the policies and programs of your group?

1. Faculty or administration at the University (other than advisor)
2. Other organizations at the University like yours.
3. Those students active in student organizations, student government
4. The general student body

"Would you say that your group has had any influence on the..."

5. Faculty at the University?
6. Administration at the University?
7. Other students or student groups at the University?

11. Partial validation for this two-way measure of interaction is indicated by a gamma of +.42 between permeability and a 3-item index of perceived visibility of the group in the University.

12. The means on normative pressure for the congruence-liberalism groups are:
 High Congruence, High Liberal (N=10)=7.65
 High Congruence, Low Liberal (N=4)=8.96
 Low Congruence, High Liberal (N=4)=7.37
 Low Congruence, Low Liberal (N=9)=9.05

13. The means on normative pressure for the goals-liberalism groups are:
 Religious-Political Groups,
 High Liberal (N=5)=7.09
 Religious-Political Groups,
 Low Liberal (N=4)=9.71
 Greek Groups, High Liberal (N=9)=7.84
 Greek Groups, Low Liberal (N=9)=8.72

14. N's for means shrink, in some cells to one group per cell. However, the greatest normative pressure mean, 10.13, is found among the three conservative, incongruent value groups: Y.A.F., and the two traditional religious groups. The lowest mean normative pressure across all cells, 6.79, is found among the three liberal, incongruent value groups: S.D.S. and the two nontraditional religious groups.

15. The highest permeability scores are found among the Greek groups. Within the religious and political groups, the mean permeability score for the three incongruent conservative groups is 5.3 and for the three incongruent liberal groups, 8.5.

REFERENCES

Aiken, Michael and Jerald Hage
 1968 "Organizational Interdependence and Intra-Organizational Structure." American Sociological Review, 33 (Dec.):912-30.

Aldrich, Brian C.
 1972 "Relations between Organizations: A Critical Review of the Literature." International Associations, 24 (Jan.):26-29.

Aldrich, Howard
 1971 "Organizational Boundaries and Inter-Organizational Conflict." Human Relations, 24 (Aug.):279-94.

Babchuk, Nicholas and John N. Edwards
 1965 "Voluntary Associations and the Integration Hypothesis." Sociological Inquiry, 35 (Spring): 149-62.

Bales, Robert F.
 1965 "Adaptive and Integrative Changes as Sources of Strain in Social Systems," in A. Paul Hare, Edward F. Borgatta and Robert F. Bales, Small Groups Studies in Social Interaction. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Blau, Peter and Richard Scott
 1962 Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Brown, Warren B.
 1966 "Systems, Boundaries and Information Flow," Academy of Management Journal, 9 (Dec.): 318-27.

Burns, Tom
 1956 "The Reference of Conduct in Small Groups: Cliques and Cabals in Occupational Milieux," Human Relations, 8 (Nov.): 467-86.

Cartwright, Dorwin and Alvin Zander (ed.)
 1968 Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. New York: Harper and Row.

Clark, Burton
 1956 "Organizational Adaptation and Precarious Values." American Sociological Review, 21 (June): 327-36.

Cohen, A.K.
 1955 Delinquent Boys. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Coleman, James S.
 1964 "Research Chronicle: The Adolescent Society," in Phillip Hammond (ed.), Sociologists at Work. New York: Basic Books.

1963 The Adolescent Society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Doise, William
 1969 "Intergroup Relations and Polarization of Individual and Collective Judgments." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 12 (June): 136-43.

Duncan, Robert B.
 1972 "Characteristics of Organizational Environments and Perceived Organizational Uncertainty." Administrative Science Quarterly, 17 (Sept.): 313-27.

- Feldman, Kenneth A. and Theodore M. Newcomb
1969 The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Festinger, Leon
1954 "A Theory of Social Comparison Processes." Human Relations, 7 (May): 117-40.
- Festinger, Leon, Henry W. Riecken and Stanley Schachter
1956 When Prophecy Fails. New York: Harper and Row.
- Gamson, Zelda F.
1972 The Relations Between Student Organizations and the Wider University. Final Report, Project No. 0-0809, Contract No. OEG-0-71-0572(508), Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Division of Research.
- Gerard, Harold B.
1953 "The Effect of Different Dimensions of Disagreement on the Communication Process in Small Groups." Human Relations, 6 (Aug.): 249-71.
- Golembiewski, Robert T.
1965 "Small Groups and Large Organizations," in James G. March (ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Goodman, Leo and W.H. Kruskal
1954 "Measures of Association for Cross-Classifications." Journal of the American Statistical Association, 49 (Sept.): 732-64.
- Gordon, C. Wayne and Nicholas Babchuk
1959 "A Typology of Voluntary Associations," American Sociological Review, 24 (Feb.): 22-29.
- Hardwyk, Jane Allyn and Marcia Braden
1962 "Prophecy Fails Again: A Report of a Failure to Replicate." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 65 (Aug.): 136-41.
- Hermann, Charles F.
1963 "Some Consequences of Crisis which Limit the Viability of Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 8 (June): 61-68.
- Huntley, C. William
1972 "Changes in Values During the Four Years of College," in Kenneth A. Feldman (ed.), College and Student: Selected Readings in the Social Psychology of Higher Education. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc.
- Jacoby, Arthur P.
1965 "Some Correlates of Instrumental and Expressive Orientations to Associational Membership." Sociological Inquiry, 35 (Spring): 163-75.
- Jacoby, Arthur and Nicholas Babchuk
1963 "Instrumental and Expressive Voluntary Associations." Sociology and Social Research, 47 (July): 461-71.
- Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn
1966 The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Klontgan, Gerald E., Benjamin Yep, Charles L. Mulford, and Donald Dillman
1973 "The Nature and Impact of Interorganizational Relations," in David H. Smith (ed.), Voluntary Action Research: 1973. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company.
- Lawrence, Paul R. and Jay W. Lorsch
1967 Organization and Environment. Harvard University: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Lawrence, Paul R. and Jay W. Lorsch
1969 Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul and Herbert Menzel
1960 "On the Relation Between Individual and Collective Properties," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Marcus, Philip M.
1960 "Expressive and Instrumental Groups: Toward a Theory of Group Structure." American Journal of Sociology, 66 (July): 54-59.
- Moscovici, Serge and Marisa Zavalloni
1969 "The Group as a Polarizer of Attitudes." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 12 (June): 125-35.
- Nahirny, Vladimir C.
1962 "Some Observations on Ideological Groups." American Journal of Sociology, 67 (Jan.): 397-405.
- Negandhi, Arant and Bernard C. Reimann
1972 "A Contingency Theory of Organization Re-Examined in the Context of a Developing Country." Academy of Management Journal (June): 137-46.
- Parsons, Talcott
1960 "Pattern Variables Revisited: A Response to Robert Dubin." American Sociological Review, 25 (Aug.): 467-83.

- Pugh, D.S., D.J. Hickson, C.R. Hinings and C. Turner
1969 "The Context of Organizational Structure." Administrative Science Quarterly (Mar.): 91-114.
- Rose, Arnold
1955 "Voluntary Associations Under Conditions of Competition and Conflict." Social Forces, 34 (Dec.): 159-63.
- Sampson, E.D. and A. Brandon
1964 "The Effects of Role and Opinion Deviation on Small Group Behavior." Sociometry, 27 (Sept.): 261-81.
- Samuel, Yitzhak
1972 Social Consensus and Social Change: A Study of Groups in Complex Organizations. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Michigan.
- Schachter, Stanley
1951 "Deviation, Rejection and Communication." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46 (April): 190-207.
- Seashore, Stanley
1954 "Group Cohesiveness in the Industrial Work Group." Ann Arbor, University of Michigan: Survey Research Center.
- Seiler, John A.
1963 "Toward a Theory of Organization Congruent with Primary Group Concepts." Behavioral Science, 8 (July): 190-98.
- Selvin, Hanan C.
1963 "The Impact of University Experiences on Occupational Plans," in Kenneth A. Feldman (ed.), College and Student: Selected Readings in the Social Psychology of Higher Education. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc.
- Selvin, Hanan and Warren Hagstrom
1966 "The Empirical Classification of Formal Groups," in T.M. Newcomb and E.K. Wilson (eds.), College Peer Groups: Problems and Prospects for Research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Siegal, Alberta and Sidney Siegel
1957 "Reference Groups, Membership Groups and Attitude Change." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55 (Nov.): 360-64.
- Simpson, Richard L. and William H. Gullett
1962 "Goals, Environmental Pressures, and Organizational Characteristics." American Sociological Review, 27 (June): 344-51.
- Smith, Clagett G. and Michael E. Brown
1964 "Communication Structure and Control Structure in a Voluntary Association." Sociometry, 27 (Dec.): 449-68.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S.
1961 "Control and Effectiveness in a Voluntary Organization." American Journal of Sociology, 67 (July): 33-46.
- Terreberry, Shirley
1968 "The Evolution of Organizational Environment." Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (March): 590-613.
- Thompson, James D.
1960 "Organizational Management of Conflict." Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (Mar.): 389-409.
- Thompson, James D.
1967 Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Warner, W. Keith and Sidney J. Miller
1964 "Organizational Problems in Two Types of Voluntary Associations." American Journal of Sociology, 69 (May): 654-57.
- Warriner, Charles K. and Jane Emery Prather
1965 "Four Types of Voluntary Associations." Sociological Inquiry, 35 (Spring): 138-48.
- Wheeler, Stanton
1966 "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings," in Orville G. Brim, Jr. and Stanton Wheeler, Socialization after Childhood: Two Essays. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Wilson, Bryan R.
1959 "An Analysis of Sect Development." American Sociological Review, 24 (Feb.): 3-14.
- Yinger, J. Milton
1960 "Contraculture and Subculture." American Sociological Review, 25 (Oct.): 625-35.