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ABSTRACT

TOWARD A THEORY OF POSITIVE DEVIANCE

by

Druann Maria Heckert

University of New Hampshire, May, 1985

Although many studies have been conducted in regard to groups or individuals deemed to be negative deviants, there is a relative dearth of theoretical or empirical analysis of positive deviance. This dissertation attempts to theoretically analyze the concept of positive deviance.

The literature related to positive deviance was examined and categorized. Positive deviance was defined as behavior that people label (i.e., publicly evaluate) in a superior sense and behavior that usually results because the behavior departs from that which is considered normal or normative.

In addition, the previously postulated examples of positive deviance were utilized to form a typology of positive deviance. These types of positive deviance are the following: innovative behavior, supra-conforming behavior, altruistic behavior, possessors of innate characteristics, and charismatic behavior. Each type of positive deviance was then discussed in relation to literature from literature in sociology and other disciplines.
A further theoretical issue that was presented was that of the relativity of positive deviance. As is the case with negative deviance, actions or behaviors that are defined as positive deviance vary over time, across societies, and within societies. To demonstrate this point, a group of individuals originally labeled as positive deviance (i.e., Nobel Prize winners in science) were compared with individuals collectively designated to be negative deviants and then later elevated to a positive deviant status.

In addition, the literature (i.e., anomie, cultural support, societal reaction, and conflict) developed in the field of deviance (i.e., negative) was discussed in general and then examined to determine to what extent each could be applicable to positive deviance.

Finally, some future areas of research were suggested. In essence, this dissertation was conducted to attempt to achieve a step toward a theory of positive deviance.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1950, Sorokin (1950:3-5) recognized the need for a sociology of positive deviance, although he did not use the term at that point in time. Sorokin felt that at that time, Western culture was in a "declining sensate phase" and as such was very negatively oriented. He also felt that this attitude permeated the social sciences. As such, sociology concentrated on the negative elements in societies and cultures. As Sorokin (1950:4) stated:

For decades Western social science has been cultivating, urbi et orbi, an ever-increasing study of crime and criminals; of insanity and the insane; of sex perversion and perverts; of hypocrisy and hypocrites...In contrast to this, Western social science has paid scant attention to positive types of human beings, their positive achievements, their heroic actions, and their positive relationships. The criminal has been "researched" incomparably more thoroughly than the saint or the altruist; the idiot has been studied much more carefully than the genius; perverts and failures have been investigated much more intensely than integrated persons or heroes. In accordance with the total nature of our negativistic culture, our social science has been semi-blind about all positive types and actions and very sharp-eyed about all negative types and relationships. It seems to have enjoyed moving in the muck of social sewers; it has been reluctant to move in the fresh air of high social peaks. It has stressed the pathological and neglected the sound and the heroic...The result is that our social science knows little about positive types of persons,
their conduct and relationships. Not having studied these, it lacks also a more adequate knowledge of the negative phenomena: for a knowledge of the positive is necessary in order to have a full knowledge of the negative.

Another issue that could be pursued is why, specifically Sorokin, and then other theorists became interested in the issue of positive deviance at that particular time. Perhaps, this fascination with non-normative behavior stems from industrialization, or the transition from gemeinschaft societies to gesellschaft societies, as noted by Tonnies (1957). In other words, since gemeinschaft societies are inherently more homogenous, deviance is less common. In fact, about the preindustrial or gemeinschaft group of people (i.e., the Komi people of Russia) from which he emerged, Sorokin (1963:15) noted:

The morality and mores of the Komi peasant communities were well integrated around the precepts similar to those of the Ten Commandments and of mutual help. The houses of the peasants did not have any locks because there were no thieves. Serious crimes occurred very rarely, if at all; even misdemeanors were negligible. People largely practiced the moral precepts they preached. Mutual aid likewise was a sort of daily routine permeating the whole life of the community. Moral norms themselves were regarded as God-given, unconditionally binding, and obligatory for all.

Linguistically, in fact, according to the Oxford English Dictionary (1970:207), the word norm has only been commonly utilized since 1855, and the word normal, in the sense of "Constituting, conforming to, not deviating or differing from, the common type or standard; regular, usual" has only been a part of common usage since 1840. The first theorists (e.g., Lombroso) to systematically analyze the issue of some from of deviance in fact, wrote after this period of time (i.e., after
Various Western societies had begun the transition from preindustrial, or gemeinschaft societies, to industrialized, or gesellschaft societies. Along these lines, after having personally made the transition from a gemeinschaft to a gesellschaft society, Sorokin (1963:33) noted:

During the two world wars and two revolutions, I lived amidst and observed a gigantic explosion of human bestiality and hateful destructiveness of demoralized individuals and groups... Their catastrophic effects induced me to undertake a systematic study, on the one hand, of the role of a selfish, individual and collective "struggle for existence," violence, hatred, and cruelty and, on the other hand, of the role of the opposite forces of unselfish love, sympathy, mutual aid, and heroic sacrifice in human behavior and in sociocultural processes. As a result of my personal encounters with these "hate-powered" forces and of my study of their nature, sources, and effects, I became a convinced opponent of these forces in all their destructive manifestations in the forms of wars, bloody revolutions, and violent strife, and a firm proponent of the opposite forces of sympathy, mutual aid, and unselfish love.

In other words, personal experiences with various levels of human behavior caused Sorokin to become interested in both positive and negative deviance.

Nevertheless, the concept of positive deviance has been virtually ignored in the discipline of Sociology. This dissertation seeks to come to terms with this neglect in sociology; specifically, the lack of focus on the study of the positive in the sociology of deviance. As such, the purpose of the dissertation is to clarify the concept of positive deviance, based on an examination of the literature in sociology and other related disciplines. A model classifying types of positive deviance will be presented and other theoretical issues in regard to the nature of positive deviance will be addressed.
Many studies have been conducted examining groups or individuals that could be considered positive deviants (cf., Berry, 1981; Bullough and Bullough, 1971; Klapp, 1962; Schneider, 1938; Zuckerman, 1977; Faris, 1940; Goertzel and Goertzel, 1962; Terman and Oden, 1959; Weschler, 1969; Blake and Butler, 1976). Nevertheless, the literature in the area of positive deviance is sparse and at times, contradictory. In fact, some theorists deny the possibility of the existence of positive deviance, some define it in a specific manner as overconforming behavior (cf., Ewald, 1981), some define it as behavior that departs from norms (cf., Winslow, 1970), and finally others define it as behavior that a society has chosen to label as deviant (cf., Scarpitti and McFarlane, 1975). The definition utilized in this dissertation will seek to integrate the final two approaches: the norm violating and labeling traditions.

Regardless of how theorists have defined positive deviance, various diverse behaviors and/or actions have been postulated to be examples of positive deviants. Olympic champions (Scarpitti and McFarlane, 1975), Nobel Prize winners (Szasz, 1970), motion-picture stars (Lemert, 1951), exceptionally beautiful women (Lemert, 1951), Congressional Medal of Honor recipients (Steffensmeier and Terry, 1975), geniuses (Freedman and Doob, 1968) and saints (Scarpitti and McFarlane, 1975) are among those individuals collectively presented as positive deviants. All these divergent examples have been subsumed under the label of positive deviance. To elucidate this situation and group together similar types of actions and/or actors, a classificatory model will be presented. Consequently, the types of positive deviants that will be examined in this dissertation include the following:
1) Innovative behavior (e.g., Nobel Prize winners)
2) Supra-conforming behavior (e.g., saints)
3) Altruistic behavior (e.g., Congressional Medal of Honor winners)
4) Innate characteristics (e.g., geniuses)
5) Charismatic behavior (e.g., religious prophets)

In summary, a typology will be developed which hypothesizes various types of positive deviance, utilizing as a base, already existing literature from various paradigms within sociology and from other disciplines, including anthropology and history.

Another theoretical issue to be examined is the relativity of positive deviance. As is the case with negative deviance, in general, actions or behaviors that are defined as positive deviance vary over time, across societies, and within societies. Thus, a group of individuals originally labeled as positively deviant (i.e., Nobel Prize winners in science) will be compared with individuals collectively designated as negatively deviant and then later elevated to a positive deviant status (i.e., the French Impressionists).

The final phenomenon to be pursued is that of the applicability of the literature developed in the field of deviance (i.e., negative deviance) to the concept of positive deviance. Four major theoretical approaches (i.e., cultural transmission, anomie, societal reaction, and conflict) will be separately examined to determine to what extent each could be usefully applied to positive deviance.

Finally, based on the research, included in the conclusion will be an attempt to develop possible areas for developing hypotheses that could be tested in further empirical and verificational research. Thus, steps will have been taken in the direction of establishing a theory of positive deviance.
DEFINITIONS OF POSITIVE DEVIANCE:
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Various diverse definitions of positive deviance have been advanced. Some theorists even suggest that there is no such concept. In addition, many of these definitions conflict with other definitions. Considering the relative diversity of frameworks traditionally utilized to deal with deviance, this fact should be expected. The purpose of this chapter is to explore paradigmatic definitions of deviance in general and then to examine the specific definitions of positive deviance that have been offered by various theorists. Finally, a definition of positive deviance will be advanced.

Definitions of Deviance (i.e., Negative Deviance)

Obviously, deviance has been defined in a great number of ways. At the most general level, for example, the general public has chosen to name many unsimilar behaviors as deviant. Simmons (1969:199-200), for example, conducted a pilot study in which he asked respondents to name things or behavior that they considered deviant. Obviously, what is
considered deviant by a general public is time bound and culture bound. After the results were compiled, 252 separate acts (or types of persons) had made the list, including such interesting ones as the retired, girls who wear make-up, and perpetual bridge-players, in addition to the more common responses like drug addicts and prostitutes.

More specifically, this confusion also exists in the literature utilized in the sociology of deviance. Sagarin (1975:6) has noted that sociologists define deviance in, at times, disparate ways. Best and Luckenbill (1982:3) have very adequately summarized the predominant ways that sociologists have defined deviance. As such, deviance has been defined in some cases as violating social norms of whatever magnitude in a social system. On the other hand, deviance has also been defined in a similar manner, except for the fact that the norms must be important enough to elicit a strong reaction. In addition, some sociologists have extended the concept so that those characteristics which are considered discreditable, such as blindness and obesity, are considered deviant. Finally, adherents of the labeling perspective have examined deviance from the vantage point of understanding the reaction of various components of society to the behavior.

All in all, deviance has been defined in a myriad of ways. Perhaps, as suggested by Liska (1981:2-7), the major dichotomy existing in sociology at present is between those who define deviance as a violation of norms and those who define it in terms of the societal reaction.

Cohen (1966:12) is among those who focus on norms, succinctly stating that deviant behavior is "...behavior that violates normative rules." Furthermore, Cohen noted that deviance is ubiquitous in that all
societies have rules, which when violated will arouse condemnation.

On the other hand, labeling theorists have decided to focus their attention on the societal reaction to an action. Becker (1963:11) has most emphatically expressed the viewpoint that society creates deviance by stating:

Social groups constitute deviance by making rules whose infractions constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender." The deviant is one to whom that label has been successfully applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label.

Consequently, rather than focusing on etiological issues, which is the focus of those defining deviance in terms of norm violating behavior, labeling theorists have examined other processes, such as deviant careers.

Basically an interactionist, Lemert (1972:21-22) has nevertheless pointed out some interesting factors that can partially clarify this situation. Rejecting extremely relativistic tendencies of labeling theory, he noted that certain behaviors (e.g., incest, rape, theft) are disvalued in different manners in every society. Since there are limits on the interactions of people, not any significance is attachable to behaviors. Consequently, Lemert concluded that in the sociology of deviance, it would be more appropriate to examine etiological questions in relation to stable societies where norms and values are imbued with sacred significance. In societies characterized by volatile social change, examination of societal reactions are more pertinent. Thus, there can be an attempt to synthesize the two approaches. For example,
behavior that is reacted against strongly is very likely to become enmeshed in the proscriptive normative structure of a society. Thus, norms and societal reactions can both be important in the understanding of deviance. Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:12) have also proposed that there can be a synthesis of the normative and interpretative (i.e., symbolic interaction) paradigms. With the passage of time, interpretative patterns of interaction approach the normative. Also, since actors do not begin with a blank mind and instead there are shared views regarding roles, the interpretative process also is imbued with the normative.

The Debate Over the Existence of the Concept of Positive Deviance

Certain writers specifically deny the existence of the concept of positive deviance. For example, Best and Luckenbill (1982:3) have defined deviance as "...any behavior that is likely to be defined as an unacceptable violation of a major social norm and elicit strong negative reactions by social control agents." Thus, positive deviance does not exist according to this definition. Pointing specifically to the concept of positive deviance, as discussed by Wilkins (1964), Best and Luckenbill (1982:2) noted:

Raising one's life in battle to save one's comrades breaks the norm of self-preservation, yet it is considered praiseworthy. In contrast, deviant activities are unacceptable, seen as wicked or harmful.

Sagarin (1975:13) has suggested that deviance is simply behavior that violates social norms. Nevertheless, he has adamantly criticized the concept of positive deviance, especially as postulated by Wilkins.
(1965) and Freedman and Doob (1968), suggesting that rarity at the positive end of a continuum (e.g., a person with an exceedingly high I.Q.) will most often be praised even though in certain instances, criticisms might be invoked. As such, positive rare behaviors cannot be considered deviant. Neither rarity nor differentness is equal to deviance. As such, only disvalued behaviors or people should be included within the study of deviance. Although concluding that there is no positive deviance, at the same time, Sagarin (1975:20) did recognize the value of advancing such a study:

To determine why a few people do things that are not done by many is an interesting and worthwhile endeavor, and in such a study it would be perfectly logical and scientifically valuable, to bring together as a single group the socially condemned and the socially accepted (even adulated) unusual persons.

Nevertheless, for Sagarin, this study still would not constitute in any manner, a study of positive deviance.

Other sociologists of deviance, while never mentioning the concept of positive deviance, seemingly deny its existence by the definitions of deviance that they posit. Rosenberg, Stebbins, and Turowetz (1982:1), for example, stated that deviance can be understood as "morally condemned differences." Thus, by the very definition advanced, the existence of positive deviance is precluded.

**Discussions of Positive Deviance**

Nevertheless, various theorists have postulated that the concept of positive deviance is a valid and important one. Various definitions of positive deviance or of the concept of positive deviance while using another term, have been advanced. Definitions of positive deviance can
be separated into the following categories: early discussions of the concept while not utilizing the term, definitions adopting a norm-violation approach, definitions that advance a labeling or interactionist perspective, and definitions that are specific in that only one type of positive deviance is supported. The various definitions and discussions that have been utilized in regard to positive deviance will be discussed.

**Discussions of Positive Deviance**  
*(Using Other Terminology)*

Although there has been a relative dearth of conceptualization regarding positive deviance when compared to negative deviance, the phenomenon has been conceptualized in various ways. Interestingly, without using the terminology, Liazos (1975:11-13) alluded to a lack of information in relation to positive deviance. While noting that writers of deviance textbooks still are prone to succumb to various biases, he focused on the fact that deviance researchers had not sufficiently delved into those individuals in powerful societal positions who have engaged in covert institutional violence. However, he also cited the fact that Szasz (1970:xxv-xxvi) noted that Olympic champions, Nobel Prize winners, and other individuals possessing admired traits like vast wealth, are never discussed as deviants. Clearly, Liazos recognized the need for a sociology of positive deviance. Along these same lines, Simmons (1969:21) noted that, if among the various viewpoints available in deviance, the view of deviance as statistically rare behavior is pursued, then surely both Albert Einstein and Robert Frost must be considered deviants.
Along these same lines, while not yet utilizing the term, several eminent sociologists including Sorokin (1950), Lemert (1951), and Wilkins (1965) have more specifically recognized the importance of analyzing positive deviance.

In the first place, in a study about altruism which focused on American good neighbors and Christian-Catholic saints, Sorokin (1950) suggested that in so much as criminals are deviant, "good neighbors" are also deviant. As Sorokin (1950:81) explained:

If criminals are deviants falling below the legally prescribed norms of moral conduct, "good neighbors" are also deviants, but above the level of moral conduct demanded by the official law. As a rule "good neighbors" discharge not only the duties prescribed for and demanded from all, but something extra, above the minimum of social conduct required by the official law.

In this instance, no conflict is created between the good neighbor-deviant and the law. Nevertheless, there are many instances, such as a good neighbor not allowing himself to become a part of a witch hunt, when good neighbors experience conflict with the law that has been the similar experience for moral innovators and altruists, including M. Gandhi, Buddha, Socrates, Aristotle, and Jesus. Further explaining the concept of social deviance at the positive end of the continuum, Sorokin (1950:82) explained:

It is necessary to distinguish between two kinds of so-called "social deviants": the subnormal types-criminals, psychotics, and other pathological types, and the "supra-normal"-or the positive, creative innovators in all fields of culture and social life. Though both classes are deviants and both collide with existing laws and values, they are nevertheless, absolutely different kinds of deviants, much farther from each other than from "the bulk of law-abiding" mediocrity.
While not utilizing the specific term, positive deviance, Sorokin was obviously interested in the concept of positive deviance. All in all, it can be concluded that Sorokin basically viewed positive deviance in regard to a deviance as a violation of norms paradigm.

In addition, while also not using the name positive deviance, Lemert (1951:23-24) very clearly recognized the need to examine positive deviance by writing:

The aim is to study sociopathic behavior in the same light as normal behavior, and by implication with extensions or deviations of general sociological theory. By the same token, we hold that, with certain modifications in our frame of reference, variations from social norms in desirable and enviable directions should be explored as profitably as the more frequently studied sociopathic variations. The behavior of the genius, the motion-picture star, the exceptionally beautiful woman, and the renowned athlete should lend itself to the same systematic analysis as that which is applied to the criminal, the pauper, or the sex delinquent.

At that time, Lemert (1951:21) suggested that there was no really adequate term to label this phenomenon and offered "honorific behavior" or "emulative behavior" while still maintaining that these were not exactly the linguistic designations that he desired. In the following manner, Lemert (1975:34) also pointed out that it is more usual for sociopathic deviations than enviable deviations to be found in laws and in tribal codes, explaining the situation as follows:

The reason for this is that people can more easily agree upon minimum conformities and intolerable deviations than they can upon what constitutes ideal behavior. An additional reason for this difference is that societies and groups more often can afford to ignore behavior which surpasses its norms, whereas they seldom disregard sociopathic behavior.

All in all, it can be seen that Lemert advanced the conceptualization
of positive deviance by utilizing the labeling perspective.

Wilkins (1965) also made many interesting points regarding positive deviance while also not utilizing the term. Pointing out that deviance is often examined from the viewpoint that for a society conformity is functional, Wilkins (1965:45-47) suggested that certain forms of deviancy are functional for society. While the criminal is deviant, so are genuises, reformers, and religious leaders. Consequently, Wilkins (1965:46) viewed deviance as forming a continuous distribution ranging from bad to good. Normal acts constitute the major portion of the continuum. At the good end are saintly acts. At the most extreme end of the negative part of the normal curve are serious crimes. In regard to intelligence, for example, there tend to be a relatively small number of subnormal individuals as well as geniuses.

For Wilkins (1965:56-57), essential to the issue of what is considered normal is the ability of people to predict such responses. Deviant acts are acts that are not expected. As a result, rare acts, while perhaps eliciting a response of some nature, are not considered deviant unless there is an incongruity between the event and the situation.

Wilkins (1965:71) also noted the similarity between positive and negative deviants, and the way positive deviants are often treated as if they were negative deviants, when he wrote the following:

All societies tend to reject deviants. Both saints and criminals have been excluded from the cultures into which they were born, and the majority of saints have suffered exactly similar fates to the deviant sinners. Many saints were, in fact, defined specifically by their current society as criminals.

Due to governmental structure and the philosophy of a society, various
societies vary in the kinds and amounts of deviance which they can abide.

Another theorist, Katz (1972) has made some interesting comments about deviance at the positive end of the continuum, while still not labeling the phenomenon, positive deviance. Criticizing rule-breaking and the labeling approach to defining deviance as inadequate, Katz (1972:192) conceptualized deviance in the following manner:

Rather, the sociological existence of deviant phenomena is constituted by the imputation of deviant ontological status to human beings. The ontological status imputed to deviants is a negative essence which is analytically the mirror-image of imputing to human beings a positive essence, or charisma. The one is an imputation of subhuman nature, the other of superhuman nature. If logic requires a distinction between performance and "recognition" or rule-breach on the one hand, and imputation of deviant essence on the other, then a similar logic requires a distinction between performance and "recognition" or extraordinary superiority in terms of rule-standards on the one hand, and imputations of charismatic essence on the other.

According to Katz (1972:192) imputations of charisma, as for deviance, result at the individual level (e.g., when those in love find a "uniquely complementary essence" in their loved one), at an intermediate level (e.g., a prophetic social movement) and at a societal level (e.g., "creation of political or military leaders").

An interesting point that Katz (1972:193) made is that in many ways there has been a similar history in the scientific study of deviance with the scientific study of "genius" as a category of charismatic imputation. In the first place, similar to the study of Lombroso at the negative end of the continuum, was the study of intelligence done by Galton. In the next step, the collection of statistics in a new
non-biological attempt at explanation was deemed essential. For example, Faris (1940), in an article entitled, "Sociological Causes of Genius" utilized structural explanations. Finally, societal reaction as a theoretical stance became important. This stance permitted, for example, the study of the labeling of kids in schools and permitted the conclusion that the concept of genius can be highlighted by imputers rather than just being viewed as outstanding actors in regard to normative standards. As another example, the important point is not whether Bolivar actually performed outstanding acts, but that a multitude of people elevated his status.

According to Katz (1972:191-196), in the imputations of deviance (negative essence) and charisma (positive deviance), the labelers function to isolate the deviant and to allow the charasmatic individual to achieve a "transcendent status." Essences involve more than simply role identities (which involve performances). As such, essences are not able to be either proven wrong or right. Thus, the real self or a deviant or charasmatic individual cannot be shaken apart from the visible self. As Katz (1972:197) wrote:

The genius is in a constant state of tension with his work, laboring to validate the existence of an essence never quite equivalent to any act. In Promethian struggle, he is bound through hubris to an identity independent of his daily actors.

While the deviant is stigmatized, the individual viewed as imbued with charisma is judged to be above having sanctions applied and if permitted this indulgence, capable of achieving superior acts. At times, in fact, this freedom that is granted to the charasmatic individual, can be problematic for the imputer. For example, rights of habeus corpus have
been allowed to be ignored by Presidents, and prophecies have been made by leaders of social movements that have resulted in ostracism for all of his followers. Thus, it can be noted that Katz (1972) basically accepted a labeling approach to the study of positive deviance.

In conclusion, it can be noted that these above mentioned theorists, while advancing different ideas about the nature of positive deviance, have helped substantiate the importance of a sociology of positive deviance without using this term.

**Definitions of Positive Deviance (Using a Norm-Violation Approach)**

While not always explicitly expressing their adoption of a specific paradigm, some theorists have basically suggested that positive deviance could be considered to be a violation of normative behavior, in much the same way negative deviance can be viewed as a violation of norms. As previously discussed, Sorokin (1950) and Wilkins (1965) have basically supported the view of positive deviance as a violation of norms, although not using the term.

In addition, Winslow (1970) has also basically adopted this paradigm. After berating what he considered the almost exclusive attention that had been heeded to the anomie model of deviant behavior, Winslow (1970:112-120) suggested that there are various frameworks in deviance at this time, all presenting separate images of social change and social organization. According to Winslow (1970:121) deviance as a phenomenon that is "relative to statistical norms" is one of the perspectives from which deviancy can be examined. If deviancy is viewed as approximating a normal curve of conformity and deviance, normative acts are in the middle of this curve. One end of the curve, beyond the
tolerance limits, contains disapproved behaviors, which are considered deviant, such as crime, mental disorder, and suicide. Approved deviations, beyond the tolerance limits, include wealth, patriotism, health, wisdom, and virtue.

**Definitions of Positive Deviance**
(Using an Interactionist Perspective)

While some theorists view positive deviance as norm-violating behavior, other theorists tend to view positive deviance from a labeling perspective, while not all explicitly express their adoption of the paradigm. As previously discussed, Lemert (1951) basically supported a labeling perspective to analyze positive deviance, while not yet utilizing the term. Other theorists, including Freedman and Doob (1968), Steffensmeier and Terry (1975), Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975), Norland, Hepburn, and Monette (1976) and Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975) have also basically adopted this point of view.

While for all intents and purposes presenting a labeling approach, Freedman and Doob (1968:3-4) have examined positive deviance from a psychological vantage point. Noting that deviance can be an ephemeral characteristic varying by the situation in which a person finds himself, they explain deviance in relation to differences. Thus, myriad characteristics can be considered deviant if other people involved in a situation in which the actor is enmeshed do not share the same trait. Furthermore, it is not important whether the characteristic is assessed as positive or negative. As Freedman and Doob (1968:3-4) wrote:

"Gulliver was as deviant among the Brobdingnags when he was unimaginably small and weak then when he lived in Lilliput where he was fantastically big and powerful. The genius is as deviant as the idiot; the girl with a huge bust as the girl with no bust at all; the strong man who can bend steel bars as the weakling who..."
can hardly hold a pencil. It is perhaps remarkable that the term 'exceptional' children is used to refer not only to the unusually intelligent, but also to the mentally retarded, the physically handicapped, the emotionally disturbed and so on. Regardless of the content or valance of the critical attribute, deviancy consists simply of being different from surrounding norms.

Nevertheless, Doob and Freedman (1968:4-5) did contend that deviance should be viewed totally in a statistical light. As such, the reaction of other people is extremely important since some acts or attributes will require a significant difference from the norm to be judged deviant, while in other cases only a small variance from the norm will result in the assessment of deviance. The direction in which a person is considered deviant will be important, but not as much as the deviance, in and of itself. All deviants share much in common.

Freedman and Doob (1968:5) also conducted experiments in an effort to assess the impact of deviance on behavior and to examine differences between deviants and non-deviants. Consequently, subjects who had a series of personality tests administered to them, in which certain individuals were randomly assigned differentiated scores, were not made aware of how they were deviant and whether they were deviant in a negative or positive manner. Freedman and Doob (1968:148-150) made the following interesting conclusions. In regard to affiliation, if others are not aware of the deviancy, deviants try not to have social interaction. This is not the case if the deviancy is known by others. Deviants like being around other deviants, even if they do not share the same deviancy. In regard to the issue of aggression, deviants when they have a chance to behave aggressively towards an individual already selected, are more likely to act in a deleterious manner towards a
deviant who is like them than a nondeviant or a deviant who is not similar to them. On the other hand, if given an opportunity to pick a person to suffer from electric shock, nondeviants are more likely to choose deviants, while deviants choose nondeviants. Regarding social influence, it was found that the effects on social influence varied according to the situation and the kind of influence used. While deviants are less influenced, they also tried to prevent themselves from seeming publicly different.

Steffensmeier and Terry (1975) have also basically adopted a labeling perspective and made some astute observations about positive deviance. At that point in time, Steffensmeier and Terry (1975:4) suggested that while there had been some attention paid to the concept of positive deviance, often times this attention extended only to the point of the recognition that positive deviance did exist and no further attempts were made to analyze the concept. They also postulated that there was a dearth of concepts to deal with supra-conventional as opposed to sub-conventional behavior. Nevertheless, they noted that negative and positive deviance approximate each other to a great extent, since as a result of both there will be "changing expectations and obligations and differential responses." For example, they pointed to the case of a Congressional Medal of Honor winner who had to return to the military after an unbearable visit to his midwest hometown in which he found that his community behaved vastly different towards him than they did before his triumph. Consequently, they cited as examples of positive deviance a heavyweight champion, a pro quarterback, and an Olympic Gold Medal winner.
In regard to a definition, for Steffensmeier and Terry (1975:4), "Deviance consists of differentially valued phenomenon." Thus, Steffensmeier and Terry (1975:4-5) suggested that phenomena include acts and attributes, such as being deaf or stealing on the negatively valued end of the continuum or being beautiful or performing heroic deeds on the positively valued end of the continuum. Valued implies that the phenomena are judged (at which point they become deviant) on a scale from "optimally desirable" to "optimally undesirable." Finally, differentially alludes to the fact that phenomena must be distinguished as that which is viewed as needing attention. Some phenomena are inherently less difficult to point out than other phenomena. For example, heroism more readily lends itself to such labeling than do the components of upward mobility.

In addition, Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:59) also adopt what they consider a labeling approach, defining deviance in the following manner:

Deviance is that phenomenon which is perceived (i.e., recognized) as violating expectations held by participants to an event. Deviance is that which is seen as unexpected, out-of-place, strange, out of the ordinary—given the definition of the situation held by the witnesses to the event which includes contextually shared meaning of expected, in-place, not strange, ordinary.

Consequently, those actions or attributes which exceed expectations are also deviant. The genius, the movie star, a very beautiful woman or an exceptional athlete should be examined similarly to such negative deviants as criminals, while negative deviance refers to falling below what is expected, positive deviance refers to the exceeding of what is expected.
Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:66-67) also raised some interesting possibilities regarding positive and negative deviants. Noting that most empirical research has examined the effect on reactions to negative deviance, they suggested that this issue might also be pertinent for the explanation of positive deviance. Perhaps, the positive deviant also receives negative reactions and then attempts to appear more ordinary.

As Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:67) hypothesized:

Does the straight-A student respond to appellations such as "brow noser," "apple polisher," or "teacher's pet" by occasionally throwing an exam and getting a C to show he is human? Does the famous movie starlet seek a normal life, but find these activities blocked for her (and subsequently commit suicide because her life seems empty)? The labeling perspective makes the study of positive deviance possible, and theoretically links it to the more standard investigation of negative deviance.

Finally, experimental research about positive deviance has been conducted, using the labeling perspective, by Norland, Hepburn, and Monette (1976). Specifically adopting an interactionist point of view, an action that does not conform to the norm attains deviant status at the point when the deviant actor's interaction with others is mediated around the nonconformity. Thus, a positive deviant is labeled as an exceptional person; a person who is viewed positively. As Norland, Hepburn, and Monette (1976:84) wrote:

We prefer to theoretically conceptualize the moral dimensions of human behavior as a continuum including both negatively evaluated behaviors and attributes as well as positively evaluated behaviors or attributes.

Both public labeling by a person in authority and the consistent differentiation of behavior were proposed as important elements in their
experiments. Task performances, including thinking of uncommon uses for some items and a supposed test of perceptual abilities were utilized as the basis for consistent public differentiation by an authority figure. However, these results were randomly assigned. Basically, Norland, Hepburn, and Monette (1976:92) concluded that their subjects were not inclined to repudiate their positive deviance and instead attempted to offer that image and interact with others in that manner. This was most likely to be the case if there was a consistency to the positive performance. On the other hand, other actors usually tried to avoid conferring the positive status on the positive deviant.

Noting the paucity of theorizing existing in regard to the concept of positive deviance, Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:2-5) have presented what is perhaps the most comprehensive account of positive deviance. At the most general level, according to Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:5), "Social deviance includes those acts, attributes and beliefs which, when performed or made known about an actor, elicit an evaluative social sanction or sanctions from an observer." Thus, according to Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:6), positive deviance exists in the sense that evaluations occur on a continuum that ranges from good to bad, while sanctions range from positive to negative. In regard to negative deviance, criminal actions tend to be negatively evaluated and sanctioned which serves to decrease the occurrence of this behavior in the future. On the other hand, positive deviants, including intellectuals and saints, are among those who are positively evaluated and sanctioned which tends to increase the chance of this behavior occurring in the future. Since most behavior is normative, there are no responses or sanctions applied in those cases. Also, there is not a
discrete deviant-non-deviant categorization, since behavior falls on a continuum.

In regard to the positive deviants, as Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:28) explained the process, other actors interact with the positive deviant in a manner different from conforming members of society. As a result, the chance of more behavior along these lines is increased. For example, a beauty pageant winner is treated in a way that includes awe and jealousy. Consequently, the probabilities are enhanced that the young woman will behave as a beauty queen in the future. As a result, she has the opportunity to be ensconced in a social role that is inherently different from the social roles of other people.

Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:7,28) posited that acts, attributes, and beliefs can constitute deviance. Examples of individuals who engage in positive deviant acts are heroes and extremely hard workers. Positive deviant attributes, usually genetic in nature, include the very beautiful and the very intelligent. Among adherents of positive deviant beliefs are social idealists, extreme moralists and religious zealots.

More specifically, deviant acts refer to the reaction of others to the breaching of normative expectations, either through performance or the lack of such performance. Deviant attributes are those which do not adhere to that which is expected of the normal. For positive deviant attributes, Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:84) suggested, "...those attributes which are culturally defined as pleasing, enviable, or capable of enhancing the deviant's status within the society tend to be assessed positively." Deviant beliefs are often associated with religion or politics. Deviant beliefs, according to Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:136) refer to "...commitment to a conviction of the truth that
evokes evaluative attributes from others." While some deviant beliefs may be threatening to the normative structure of a society, some are deviant just because of values usually adhered to in a society. For example, due to the vows such as celibacy and poverty that a monk professes, these individuals are viewed as nonnormative by most. While respecting his commitment, the beliefs are still judged to be unacceptable for most people and nonnormative—albeit positively.

In regard to other issues, Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:9) offered an explanation as to the sources of labeling of deviance. Normative standards and social values are prevalent in virtually all societies, although they differ from society to society. Most often, these values and norms are believed in by those in power. Consequently, definitions emanate from these norms and values.

Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:11-22) have also examined frameworks for analyzing deviance. Noting that biological theories have been presented in regard to negative deviance, there has been no similar attempt to examine positive deviance. Furthermore, psychoanalytic approaches which have not yet been used to study positive deviance, might be an explanatory device. Very religious people, beauty pageant contestants, and self-sacrificing heroes could, for example, act from the same repressed attitudes that result from conflict and that also motivate negative deviants. Sociological approaches to deviant behavior are also useful in the explanation of positive deviant behavior. While the social context is an important explanatory device of the behavior of the young criminal, the social context of a monastery as a young man seeks to become a monk is essential to the understanding of the behaviors and attitudes of this type of positive deviance.
Deviant groups, for both positive and negative deviant actions, also exist, according to Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:31-32). Deviant groups can be an interacting group of individuals labeled as deviant. As a positive deviant group, the Mensa Society is composed of people who obtain extremely high scores on intelligence tests. Individuals in the Mensa Society can enjoy the interaction of people who also share the unique quality of extreme intelligence.

Sanctions, according to Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:185,261) play an important role in deviance. Sanctions, can be individual or group, and range from those which are overt to those which are more symbolic. Positive deviants more often receive more symbolic sanctions, such as praise than overt sanctions like prizes. Deviants that receive a more pronounced reaction (e.g., murderers or national heroes) tend to receive more overt forms of sanction than do deviants provoking less reaction (e.g., jaywalkers or county fair talent show winners). Thus, the county fair talent show winner will receive applause as opposed to the ticker tape parade bestowed upon the national hero. Since the reaction of others are often advanced from a stereotyped viewpoint, images can be significant in the way people react to the deviant. Usually, these images are more nebulous for positive deviants, such as heroes. As a result, not much information exists in the way in which sanctions can be used to induce positive deviance. Furthermore, although delabeling is possible, labels are very potent. This also holds true for positive deviants. A decade after his accomplishment, Bob Hays' label as the fastest person in the world was still used as his identification label rather than his subsequent actions.
Thus, it can be noted that utilizing the labeling approach, several theorists have delved into the issue of positive deviance and some of the ramifications of a theory of positive deviance.

**Definitions of Positive Deviance (Specifying One Type of Behavior)**

Finally, it must be noted that positive deviance has been defined in a very specific manner by Ewald (1981) and Buffalo and Rodgers (1971). In other words, in regard to the classificatory model that is being developed in this dissertation, deviance has been presented as only one type of distinct behavior (i.e., supra-conforming behavior).

In the first instance, Buffalo and Rodgers (1971:101-103) have used the term positive deviance in their study of delinquency. Their usage of the term, however, is definitely more specific than is the usage of the term by other theorists. Their research involved 170 adolescent boys at the Kansas Boys Industrial School. Their research arose from the contention that moral norms, or what is viewed as the proper or ideal behavior must be distinguished from behavioral norms, or what in reality is what people do. Accordingly, each boy was presented with three choices (i.e., a choice in which it is the norm that is socially picked, a choice in which the norm is in some ways violated, and a choice in which the norm is totally violated) to five situations. Then each boy responded with the answer in line with that which he felt that the majority of adolescent boys would pick, that which he would actually pick, and that which he felt he should ideally do. The results of the data indicated that, generally, the delinquents accepted the norms that were the socially approved ones. Yet, they viewed their peer group as abiding by deviant behavioral norms.
Based on the responses of the young boys, a typology of seven types of respondents was developed. Accordingly, Buffalo and Rodgers (1971:106) defined an extreme positive deviant in the following manner:

An extreme positive deviant is one who perceives the norm in question (whether peer behavioral norm or moral norm) as a complete violation of the accepted social norm and claims that he, himself, would conform to the social norm.

On a continuum, the positive deviant is similar to the extreme positive deviant, but not as extreme.

Thus, according to Buffalo and Rodgers (1971:109), an important distinction is recognized between those norms that are socially prevalent and those behavior patterns that are idealized in society.

In addition, Ewald (1981) also utilized the concept of positive deviance to only refer to over-conforming behavior. Ewald (1981) utilized the socialization to deviant subculture model, postulated by Becker (1963) to understand negative deviance (i.e., marijuana usage) to examine weightlifting and running as forms of subcultural positive deviance. As such, positive deviance is an example of extreme over-conforming behavior. Thus, Ewald (1981:30) wrote:

Positive deviance is where the relationship to societal norms is not one of blatant violation but rather extension, intensification, or enhancement of social rules. In this case, the zealous pursuit or overcommitment to normative prescriptions is what earns the individual or group the label of deviant. The individual or group is essentially true to the normative standards but simply goes "too far" in that plausible or actual results are judged inappropriate by the general culture.
As such positive deviance focuses on social process and structure. Ewald (1981:49-54,85) also suggested that the model of marijuana smoking as postulated by Becker is applicable to positive deviance. Using his examples of weight lifting and running, he suggested that these behaviors like other forms of positive deviance, when taken beyond the societal norm for these behaviors, are not viewed as pleasurable by society, since they are seen as so extreme. Since this perception is the case and since social support is missing, the model (i.e., experience, sensation, as enjoyment), as outlined by Becker and utilized by Ewald (1981), is a key to explaining the repeated origin and continuation of positive deviance. In his empirical study, Ewald (1981:130) found that while the Becker model applied to runners, the same was not true for weightlifters. As a result, he concluded that this discrepancy could be explained by the fact that weightlifting can be viewed as a subculture of work.

Thus, it can be concluded that the term positive deviance has been used in the following ways: from a norm-violation perspective, from an interactionist perspective, and as a specific type of behavior. An attempt will be made to define positive deviance as a step preceding the development of a classificatory model.

A Definition of Positive Deviance

St. Augustine offered the following definition of time, "I know it when you ask me not." (as quoted in Wechsler, 1969:124). Clearly, positive deviance is also a rather difficult concept to define in a simple manner. To reiterate, positive deviance, in fact, has been defined in various ways. As with the case of deviance, theorists have examined the concept as norm-violating behavior and as labeled behavior.
A resolution should be reached between these two types of definitions in regard to positive deviance.

Consequently, positive deviance will be defined as behavior that people label (i.e., publicly evaluate) in a superior sense. As such, that labeling will usually result because that behavior departs from that which is considered normal or normative in the particular case or behavior. In addition, as Thio (1978:23) noted, deviance can vary in the amount of public consensus garnered, ranging from higher-consensus deviance in which there is a maximum public consensus to lower-consensus deviance in which there is minimal public consensus. For example, Nobel Prize winners would be a higher consensus form of positive deviance and high school quarterbacks would be a lower-consensus form of positive deviance.

Additionally, as Schur (1971) discussed in relation to deviance, the labeling can occur at various levels of interaction (i.e., collective rule making, interpersonal relations, and organizational processing). In addition, an individual or behavior that is considered positively deviant in one group may not be considered so by the entire society. For example, as gays are considered normative by the gay subculture, but not by the entire society, so are scientific innovators (i.e., those who do not overturn completely entrenched paradigms) considered positively by the scientific community, but often not by the rest of the society (e.g., the labels "mad scientist" and "dork" or "nerd" come readily to mind). Thus, this group also tends to violate the normative assumptions of society. Thus, positive and negative deviants are relative labels, and as such can vary across groups within societies, across societies, and through time.
Finally, as is obvious from the number of diverse examples cited as positive deviants, there is more than one type of positive deviance and as such, a classificatory model will be advanced.
Chapter III

THE RELATIVITY OF POSITIVE DEVIANCE

One attribute commonly noted about deviance is that it is a very relative phenomenon. In other words, actions or behaviors that are defined as deviant vary over time, across societies, and within societies. In addition, what is considered positive deviance must also be considered to be very relative. An action or behavior that is so defined in one era, society, or group, is often defined as a normative behavior (i.e., in a neutral manner) or even as negative deviance by another era, society or group.

In an anecdotal manner, in his seminal Yankee City series, Warner (1959:15-16) has analyzed the life of one individual, who during the course of his life was deemed both a positive and a negative deviant. Biggy Muldoon was a politician in Yankee City who underwent a metamorphosis by the community in which he lived. At first, he was perceived only as a punk who was not raised in an optimal environment. At some point, he became converted in their collective minds to a symbolic hero, in the political realm, loved for being a defender of the common people. Nevertheless through a series of circumstances, the
community began to share the opinion that he was reprehensible, a fool or a villain. Warner (1959:16) explicitly expressed the view that Muldoon had not really changed, but that the symbols that the community had attached to him had undergone a transformation. In fact, Warner (1959:85) has noted that the role of the hero and the role of the villain are "dualistically conceived" in this culture. To appreciate one role is to appreciate the other role.

All in all, Warner, has sketched, through the life of Biggy Muldoon, the process through which deviant labels change over time. The community labeled Biggy in a neutral manner and then elevated him to the role of positive deviant and then later demoted him to a negative deviant. On the other hand, a negative deviant is often converted to a positive deviant.

Although not using the terminology, various theorists have pointed out that negative deviants can become positive deviants or that positive deviants can become negative deviants. Merton (1968:238) has explicitly stated that the rebel, revolutionary, nonconformist, individualist, or renegade of one era is often transformed into the cultural hero of another era. In fact, at times, their heroism is acknowledged due to the fact that the individual had the spirit and/or sagacity to deviate from the normative patterns of another era.

Coser (1967) has also discussed this phenomenon in relation to innovators. A society may define some innovative behavior as an undesirable departure from the norm and the behavior can then be negatively sanctioned. At another point in time, however, this same behavior may not be viewed from the same perspective and will be elevated. Consequently, if the innovator is still alive, his personal
status will be drastically increased and at times, the individual will be co-opted as a standard bearer for conformity. On the other hand, the innovator can become a "posthumous saint."

Dinitz (1969:12) has also substantiated this position. Like fashions, designations of deviance vary through time. Sinners, rebels, misfits, malcontents, aliens, outsiders and at times, criminals of their era may become heroes; even heroes that endure through time. On the other hand, different conformists and nondeviants can come to be regarded as deviants (i.e., negative deviants).

Various examples of this type of change in definitions have been examined. For example, Sagarin (1975:410) has pointed out that slave-owners in the southern part of this country were in their era and culture considered to be heroes. Obviously, this is not presently the case. Turner (1975:247) has noted how public disturbances can come to be defined as social protest.

Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:45) have offered the following interesting story which clearly explains the source of this change in definitions in one particular case:

Envision a primitive society where extreme violation of interactional rules are seen as signification of a link to the gods. The violator is seen as a prophet whose strange actions provide clues to the primitive religion. These prophets are consequently given high status in the tribe. Subsequently, this primitive society acquires a team of Christian missionaries and medical personnel. Through the civilizing process of Christianization, the natives are taught about false gods, and are told that the prophet's behavior is due to a sickness of the mind. The prophet's role is devalued. The missionaries as moral entrepreneurs have redefined the rule-violating behavior as mental illness and the prophet is stigmatized for his new disease and for the evilness of past rule-representative of a false god. It is to note that the behavior of the
prophet has not changed.

Becker (1978:13-14) has also demonstrated very convincingly, utilizing the labeling perspective, how collectively, geniuses were once very rigorously, with scientific evidence, defined as mad; as mentally ill members of society. Before this time, geniuses were viewed as sane and rational individuals. Beginning with the Romantic Era and the definition of the irrationality in the work of geniuses, the negative stereotyping, scientifically backed, became more virulent by the mid-nineteenth century and reached its peak during the period from 1880-1920. Thus, positive deviants became negative deviants. The collective opinion has again turned the other way in regard to geniuses, aided by the pioneering work of, among others, Terman (c.f., 1959) and his studies demonstrating that exceptionally intelligent children live and grow up to live otherwise normal existences.

In regard to our present society, Klapp (1962:157-159) has suggested that our era is characterized by an anti-heroism, a mockery of heroes. This anti-heroism can be traced to two roots. In the first place, there is a quixotic reason in that there are individuals with lofty ideals that are not fulfilled. Individuals accepting of modest ideals form another source of anti-heroism in this society. As quoted in Gurko (1953:21), a New York Post columnist, Samuel Grafton, perhaps succinctly summarized this attitude concerning the intellectual realm in this country: "America is the only country in the world where a man who uses a word that isn't understood by another man, is made to feel inferior to that man." A society characterized by anti-heroism would appear to facilitate the transformation of positive deviants into negative deviants.
To more fully exemplify the process of changing definitions of negative and positive deviance, two examples will be pursued. In the first place, a group of innovators that were defined in their subcommunity and in their society and in their era as negative deviants, but have come to be viewed as positive deviants will be discussed. In contrast, a group of individuals who are defined by their subcommunity and in their era as positive deviants originally will be examined. Hopefully, the contrasting examples will shed light on the processes involved.

The Transition from Negative to Positive Deviance:

The French Impressionists

One group of individuals who were originally designated as negative deviants by their subcommunity (the artistic establishment and their society were the painters known as the French Impressionists. This devaluation of their work, however, did not last long, since after a short passage of time, they were elevated to a very high position by the artistic community and by their society. Hence, negative deviants became positive deviants. Specifics of how they were actually negatively labeled will also be discussed.

For descriptive purposes, Impressionism will be briefly described. Impressionism served as the culmination of a nineteenth century naturalism and served as a bridge for the abstract art of the twentieth century (White, 1978:4). Stylistically, Impressionists were interested in producing the following elements: removing black and brown from their paintings, utilizing recently available chemically produced colors to
increase synthetic accents of greater strength, and producing paintings composed of clear colors and their mixtures (Mount, 1966:306). They also pursued a basic concern with natural settings and in freely capturing a moment as Craven (1931:45) noted when he wrote that Impressionism means "...an instantaneous vision of the world, or of that very small pocket of the world which may be grasped instantaneously, a glimpse of externals, a sensational record of appearances."

A premonitory event that shocked the entrenched art community in Paris even before the Impressionist movement of the 1870's were some paintings done by Manet. *Le Bain*, was a painting by Manet which was refused exhibition at the Salon, the official representative of the French art community. Instead this painting was presented at the Salon des Refuses which was initiated by the Emperor to appease various rejected artists. Besides displaying a nude accompanied by two young painters seated on the grass, the painting violated the predominant techniques of the established French art community, since it displayed clear tones rather than the differentiation between light and shade that was expected at the time. Additionally, the rejection by the Salon of the 1865 painting, *Olympia*, created quite a stir and destined Manet to be an unwitting leader of the then nascent Impressionist movement (Slocombe, 1969:36-42,53-56).

Around the same period of time, in 1862, the young artist, Monet was studying art at the Academy of Gleyre. Although he soon left it as he did not find the school to be suitable to his tastes, Monet met and introduced various new techniques to some other artists, including Renoir, Sisley, and Bazille. Besides adopting new techniques, this group, along with other artists such as Degas, Fantin-Latour, Pissarro,
and Cezanne became involved in the endeavour to support Manet and his disputes with the Salon. Meeting regularly at the Cafe Guerbois to discuss these matters resulted in the eventual establishment of the Societe Anonyme Cooperative des Artistes, peintres, sculpteurs, graveurs, etc. Because of the refusal of the Salon at their annual exhibitions of current paintings to recognize the works of these artists, the group eventually set up their own exhibition in 1874 which represented 165 paintings and thirty artists. The group held their final exhibition in 1886.

The labeling of these artists as negative deviants occurred at various levels. In the first place, the artists were defined disparagingly by the artistic community. As noted by Canaday (1969:878), besides being the heart of the art world, Salons, or official exhibitions were held annually and prizes were awarded. To start a career or to become established in the art world, it was necessary to be accepted by this system. The power of the Salon at the time was absolute. Additionally, according to Canaday (1969:879), during the second half of the nineteenth century, the following situation had emerged:

Human frailty had lowered the benevolent institution of official patronage in France to the level of organized favoritism, while the admirable academic intention of preserving and developing the best expressions of French creative genius had been debased into the enforcement of dogma...the whole system of instruction, patronage, and proselytization of art in France seemed directed toward the discouragement of any painter who applied his talent to anything better than the repetition of threadbare formulas, the pedants who had vitiated the system.

Thus, it would appear obvious that a group of artists who presented
drastically new techniques under these circumstances, would not be favorably received.

The Salon served as a labeling institution in several respects. In the first place, as Craven (1931:439) noted, Manet and the young Impressionist painters were continuously rejected. Considering the predominant position of the Salons in being able to keep new artists from starting their careers, this exclusion served as an ultimate negative sanction for presenting art in a new manner. Canaday (1969:885,900) reported that the Salon persecuted this group of artists, especially Manet.

Another source of labeling came from the art critics and the press, both of which exercised tremendous authority in Paris (Slocombe, 1969:5). Their scurrilous criticism attributed a myriad of features to these artists. For example, according to White (1978:5) even the popular usage of the term Impressionism originated as a derogatory comment. Upon viewing Monet's Impression-Sunrise, the art critic, Louis Leroy sarcastically commented in an article entitled "Exhibition of the Impressionists" in the April 14, 1874 edition of the Charivari:

Impression-I was certain of it. I was just telling myself that since I was impressed, there had to be some impression in it...and what freedom, what ease of workmanship! Wallpaper in its embryonic state is more finished than that seascape.

Their artistic techniques were also assaulted. For example, according to Reutersvard (1978b:45-46), the critic Cardon offered the following recipe for painting, Impressionist style:

Dirty three-quarters of a canvas with black and white, rub the rest with yellow, then dash on haphazardly green, red or blue spots and you will finally attain a true impression of spring.
Along these lines, according to Renoir (1962:161-162), these abilities were compared to that of children by *Le Presse* on April 29, 1874:

> For it is nothing less than the negation of the most elementary rules of drawing and painting. A child’s scrawls have a naiveté and sincerity as touching as they are amusing, but the excesses indulged in by this school are nauseating and revolting.

Among the more amusing, but still denigrating incidents reported by the critics of press are the following. According to Slocombe (1969:68), one critic compared the impression that these artists created to that of a cat walking across a piano or a monkey running away with a paint-box.

Also, Canaday (1969:901) noted that one cartoon presented a cop refusing to allow a pregnant woman to enter the Impressionist exhibit out of a concern for safeguarding her soon to be born child. Jansen (1973:492) pointed out the fact that various critics suggested that the sunlight depicted in a Monet painting was so intense that it hurt the eyes.

Finally, the most insidious of the criticisms directed toward the artists was that they were mad. For example, according to Renoir (1962:158-159) the critic Pierre Wolff from *Le Figaro* wrote the following piece after attending one exhibition:

> Some people are content to laugh at such things. It makes me sad at heart. These self-styled artists have assumed the title of Intransigents; they take canvas, paints and brushes, splash a few daubs of color about, and sign the result. The inmates of the Ville-Evrard Asylum behave in much the same way when they pick up little stones in the road and imagine they are diamonds. It is a horrible spectacle of vanity ending in madness. Just try to persuade M. Pissarro that trees are not purple, the sky the color of butter; that the kinds of things he paints cannot be seen in any country; and that no real intelligence could be guilty of such excesses. You would be wasting as much time...
trying to make one of Dr. Blanche's lunatics, who thinks he is the Pope, understand that he lives in the Baltignolles and not the Vatican...Try to explain to M. Renoir that woman's torso is not a mass of rotting flesh, with violet-toned green spots all over it, indicating a corpse in the last stages of decay. There is also a woman in the group, as in all famous gangs; her name is Berthe Morisot, and she is a curiosity. She manages to convey a certain amount of feminine grace in spite of her outbursts of delirium...this selection of vulgarities has been exhibited in public without thought for possible fatal consequences...Yesterday a poor man was arrested in the rue Le Pelletier, after leaving the exhibition, because he was biting everyone in sight.

To substantiate their mental disabilities, various critics pointed to tendencies for using blue, indigo, and violet, that was found among the Impressionists (Reutersvard, 1978b:39). Thus, as Reutersvard (1978a:4) noted, the critic Husymans found evidence of their "indigomania" and support from psychopathologists when he concluded:

Most of them in fact could confirm the experiments of Dr. Charcot on the alternatives in the perception of color which he noted in many of the hysterics at the Salpêtrière (home for the aged and mentally afflicted women in Paris) and in a number of people suffering from diseases of the nervous system. Their retinas were diseased. The cases certified by the oculist Galezowski and cited by Veron concerning the atrophy of several nerve fibers of the eye and notably the loss of the notion of green, which is the warning symptom of this type of ailment, were without a doubt like the cases of these painters. For green has almost disappeared from their pallettes, whereas blue, acting on the retina most freely and acutely, persisting until the end in this disorder of sight, dominates and drowns everything in their canvases. The result of these ophthalmics and nerve disorders was soon apparent. The most afflicted, the weakest of these painters have been overcome; others have recovered little by little and now have only rare recurrences.
Besides the Salon and the critics or press, however, the general public also negatively evaluated the artists and their art. They were probably very much influenced by the first two groups. In the first place, as Mount (1966:245) explained, although over 200 people came daily to the first public exhibition, none came to seriously examine the art. As Slocombe (1969:63) reported, these artists—especially Cezanne—soon came to be the butts of jokes on the streets and cafes and also were brought up in the songs of the chansonniers. Also, Renoir (1962:161) noted that a visitor spat upon a painting by Cezanne and comments overheard at their exhibit included "What Mugs" and "Where did he dig up those models."

All in all, it can be noted that there existed societal reaction at various societal levels, in that the art (i.e., actions) of the Impressionists was labeled as negative deviance. Additionally, due to their continuous rejection by the established art community, they were also negatively sanctioned. Perhaps, more clearly presented by the critics was the imputation of all types of derogatory traits to these artists based solely on one aspect of their total roles and attributes—their painting techniques. Thus, they were accused of being child-like, monkey-like, and suffering from physical abnormalities, and being mad. It can be seen that a master status was applied to these individuals. At a minimum, stereotyping was practiced against this group to a great extent. All in all, this group of artists became negatively labeled deviants.

However, this group of negative deviants—through the course of time—became accepted as a group of positive deviants. According to White (1978:4) the artists were not accepted or understood until the
1890's, when they were for the most part in their fourties and fifties. By that time, however, the movement was approved and adequate prices were paid for their art. At the present time, of course they are accepted as positive deviants, as having been artistic innovators.

**Positive Deviance as an Originally Applied Label:**

**The Institutionalization of Science**

To examine the process of positive deviance as an originally applied label, the structure of modern science—particularly in relation to Nobel Prize award winners—will be examined. Basically, in the classificatory model of positive deviance, both Nobel Prize winners and French Impressionists could be classified as positive deviants on the basis of their innovative behavior.

Barber (1962:539) has postulated that scientists resist discovery by their colleagues, and that this phenomenon is normative and common. Among those scientists who have encountered resistance, Planck recorded his frustrations in the following manner:

This experience [he said] gave me also an opportunity to learn a new fact—a remarkable one, in my opinion. A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it {Planck (1949:118) as quoted in Barber (1961:542-543)}. 
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Resistance, according to Barber (1962:543-555) has developed due to various factors, including "cultural blinders" that also affect scientists. Various types of cultural resistance to scientific discovery include, for example, that current substantive paradigms can become a foundation for resistance to scientific discovery. A second source of cultural resistance to scientific discovery is caused by methodological considerations. Finally, religious ideology provides another cause of scientific resistance to discovery. In addition to theoretical stances, other sources of resistance emerge from social interaction patterns that are maintained by scientists. The position of a scientist in the scientific hierarchy in regard to the following factors-professional standing, professional specialization and societies, "schools" and seniority-also affect to what extent a discovery is accepted or resisted by other scientists.

Nevertheless, the position advanced by Barber has been refuted. Cole (1970:303) has postulated that Barber's conclusions are not really that pertinent to the patterns of scientific structure at the present time. The twentieth century has in fact, witnessed a phenomenal change in the structure of science. Consequently, Barber substantiated his argument by relying too much on historical data. As an example, there are few Mendelian figures at present practicing science in remote monasteries. As Cole (1970:304) noted:

We would suggest that modern science gives such great indicators of universalism and rationality that the only cases today of important discoveries going unrecognized for more than a few years would be those cases of delayed recognition for truly intellectual reasons-that is, the discoveries that are truly ahead of their time.
The argument set forth by Barber substantiates the point of view that positive deviance in the guise of innovative scientific discovery, can go unrecognized (i.e., neutrally labeled) or be vituperatively greeted (i.e., negatively labeled) by scientific colleagues in the profession and therefore, ultimately by the society in general. This is similar to the situation in which the French Impressionists were enmeshed.

Nevertheless, the present structure of science as it is structured generally allows for the recognition of positive deviance. Recognition is established at various levels of the hierarchy with the ultimate pinnacle being the granting of the Nobel Prize. The structure of modern science and how the meting out of awards has been established will be discussed.

The organization of modern science can be considered to be a highly stratified system (Zuckerman, 1977) and characterized by an elaborate system of rewards (Reskin, 1976; Merton, 1973) and is consequently highly competitive (Hagstrom, 1974). Additionally, Coser (1965:296) has noted that innovation has become institutionalized in science. Not surprisingly, then, there are means existing in modern science for the recognition of positive deviants within a reasonable period of time.

Nevertheless, as Zuckerman (1977:42-48) has explained, there are members of the forty-first chair. Scientists who occupy the forty-first chair, are those scientists who are generally recognized in their field as being worthy of receiving the top award of the field, the Nobel Prize, but who have not won for various reasons. For example, certain specialized areas in science are less likely to have its leading innovators recognized by the Nobel Prize committee than are other areas.
Interestingly, the manner in which the Nobel Prize committee operates is such that there is a tendency to overlook a qualified contender rather than to award an unqualified scientist. In essence, then certain veritable positive deviants will be overlooked, but the structure of modern science is such that positive deviants have a good chance of being recognized.

According to Merton (1973:287-300) modern science presently has a highly structured honorific reward system. This system has been developing over the years and is at its most elaborate development at the present. Eponymy is seldom granted, but is the very highest pinnacle of the reward structure of science. At the very peak of the eponymy granting system are those scientists who have been credited with having significantly altered the course of the science in their era (e.g., Copernicus). Next in the rank of eponymy are those scientists who are deemed to have initiated the development of a new science or subfield of science (e.g., Pearson, Father of Biometry). At the next level, are the more numerous individuals who have had laws, theories, theorems, hypotheses, instruments, constants, and distributions named after them (e.g., Mosley's atomic number). The system of eponymy becomes uniquely suited to each science.

According to Merton (1973:300-301), eponymy is the most prestigious reward granted in science. Nevertheless, this type of honor is obviously granted to an imperceptible number of scientists over the course of history. Yet, a hierarchical reward structure is still present in modern science. Since eponymy is a status that is so infrequently granted, the Nobel Prize currently stands at the apex of the reward structure of modern science. Additionally, numerous other
medals and awards exist in science to honor top innovators in the various scientific fields. Finally, the honorific reward system also contains a level, whereby scientists are also recognized by being named members in various scientific academies (e.g., the French Academy of Sciences) and being granted fellowship status in various national and local societies of science. Reskin (1976:598) has also suggested that a postdoctoral fellowship, which can play a major role as a first career step, is often a prestigious reward granted for noticeable achievement at the predoctoral level.

In regard to quantitative analysis of the prestige structure, as Zuckerman (1977:10) analyzed the situation at that time, there were 493,000 individuals in this country who have reported themselves to be scientists. Of these people, 313,000 were members of the National Registrar of Scientific and Technical Personnel, which is prepaid by the National Science Foundation. At the next level, the American Men and Women of Science is populated by those scientists who have achieved a Ph.D. or an equivalent (i.e., there are 175,000 holders of earned doctorates in science or math). The 950 members of the National Academy of Sciences are granted a great deal of prestige. Finally, there were seventy two Nobel laureates. Outside this reward structure of present gratification, Merton (1973:301) has suggested that honorific rewards can be granted posthumously for accomplishments not originally recognized.

In summary, Merton (1973:302) has suggested that the institutionalized reward structure of science operates to strengthen and maintain the system and its normative emphasis upon originality. In fact, originality which is obviously intertwined with innovation, is the
ascendant value and/or goal of modern science. As Cole (1970:286) noted:

Progress in science depends upon the rate of discovery and the efficiency with which discoveries are evaluated, diffused, and incorporated into the body of scientific knowledge.

All in all, the reward structure of science seems extremely well suited to encouraging innovation.

To reiterate, as eponymy seems to be an honor rewarded only to the few greatest in history extraordinary positive deviants), the current apex of the institutionalized reward structure in science is the Nobel Prize. Zuckerman (1977:8-18) has written extensively about the Nobel Prize laureates. In the first place, it must be noted that scientists are already an elite in postindustrial societies. In the intensely stratified scientific structure based on constant collegial evaluation of professional performance, prestige or honorific reward largely rests on the amount that an individual scientist is judged to have augmented the development of scientific knowledge in a field to a far greater extent than on other professional activities, including teaching. The Nobel Prize represents the pinnacle of scientific ability. As such, it is the only award known by virtually all scientists and the only one that is also known to a considerable portion of the general public. The awards are granted based on the scientific work of the year before that represented advancement in the form of "discoveries", "inventions", or "improvements" (i.e., the award in each field utilized a different synonym signifying the same meaning) (Zuckerman, 1977:18).
According to Zuckerman (1977:11,48-52), the criterion for the award has remained static since nearly the inception of the award. Consequently, the award is seldom granted to those scientists who formalized principles or conceptions that often do much to advance science. Nevertheless, the stratified prestige structure of modern science, with the Nobel Prize at the apogee, does recognize outstanding scientific achievement. As such, the winners of the Nobel Prize become considered the "ultra-elite" of science. Thus, they are assessed to have the highest prestige in the scientific community, as well as considerable influence and power. While eponymy insures to a certain extent everlasting fame, the Nobel Prize at least grants ephemeral emminence.

Thus, in regard to innovators in the field of science, it becomes clear that positive deviance can be granted at that time of that innovation.

**Conclusions**

In summary, positive deviance can be attributed at the time of a certain behavior, or it can be originally recognized as neutral or negative, and then later elevated to positive deviance. The French Impressionists were a group of artists who were collectively treated in a negative manner when they first did their work, but were shortly thereafter, deemed to be positive deviants. On the other hand, Nobel Prize Laureates compose a group of innovators who are claimed at the time of their work to be positive deviants. This evaluation could change as the accumulation of knowledge in science advances. Furthermore, certain scientists, especially those engaged in more conceptual or theoretical research (Zuckerman, 1977:53) or more radical
paradigm shifting research (Kuhn, 1970), may not be recognized by the community of scientists and the larger general public, at the time in which they do their work. Nevertheless, in a later time period, they may be recognized and deemed positive deviants for their scientific achievements.

Seemingly, the type of positive deviance would affect the probability that definitions will be exceedingly or slightly malleable and whether or not definitions will tend to be originally of a negative, neutral, or positive manner. To illustrate the first point, for example, possibly, definitions of charisma will tend to be very changeable, since charisma implies some designation by a group that may be swept away by emotional responses, rather than analytical reasoning. On the other hand, possibly altruism, which involves self-sacrificing behavior on the part of the altruist, will tend to be less subject to changing designations on the part of a society.

Concerning the second point, the type of positive deviance will probably have an impact on whether the behavior (or individual) is originally labeled as positive deviance or negative deviance or not deemed to be either. For example, certain innovative behaviors may be more threatening to a society as a whole than would altruistic behavior, which can usually only be seen as beneficial to a society or a group. Consequently, there would be a greater tendency to originally label the innovative behavior as negative deviance and the altruistic behavior as positive deviance. As another example, since a supra-conformist adheres to the ideals of a society, there will probably be a proclivity to name this behavior as positive deviance, at first. All in all the type of positive deviance has an impact on the process of changing designations of deviance.
CHAPTER IV

A TYPOLOGY OF POSITIVE DEVIANCE

As previously noted, various behaviors and/or actions have been posited to be types of positive deviance. In fact, the following behaviors and/or actions have been referred to as examples of positive deviance: Nobel Prize winners (Szasz, 1970:xxv-xxvi), reformers (Wilkins, 1965:15), altruists (Sorokin, 1950:81-82), self-sacrificing heroes (Scarpitti and McFarlane, 1975:29), Congressional Medal of Honor winners (Steffensmeier and Terry, 1975:4), religious leaders (Wilkins, 1965:45-47), straight-A students (Hawkins and Tiedeman, 1975:67), zealous weightlifters and runners (Ewald, 1981), social idealists (Scarpitti and McFarlane, 1975:28), exceptionally beautiful women (Lemert, 1951:23-24), geniuses (Hawkins and Tiedeman, 1975:59), pro quarterbacks (Steffensmeier and Terry, 1975:4), superstar athletes (Scarpitti and McFarlane, 1975:28), and motion picture stars (Lemert, 1951:23-24). Obviously, these behaviors and/or actors have much in common since they are all positive deviance. As such, their behavior is such that people will label (i.e., publicly evaluate) the behaviors and/or actors in in a superior manner. In essence, the behavior will
usually depart from that which is considered normative in a society. As a result of the behavior being non-normative, several processes can emerge. For example, positive deviance is often originally defined as negative deviance. Also, even many actions that are considered positive deviance, often concomitantly, are also subject to negative treatment, in some respects. As an example, while the extremely intelligent are considered positive deviants, according to Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:28), often times, derogatory traits are often imputed to this group of people. Consequently, various types of positive deviance share many similarities. In many respects, positive deviants have more commonalities with negative deviants than with non-deviants.

Nevertheless, a problem still arises due to the diversity of actors referred to as positive deviance. After all, what do a Congressional Medal of Honor winner, a charismatic religious leader, and a beauty queen winner really share in common, other than the fact that they are positive deviants? To delve further into the nature of positive deviance, a typology of positive deviance would appear to be beneficial.

The following types of positive deviance have been advanced: innovation, altruism, supra-conformity, charisma, and innate characteristics. This typology was developed from the examples provided in the existing literature on positive deviance. Obviously, then, the typology may not yet be exhausted at this point; perhaps, other types of positive deviance could also be postulated at some future point.

Each type of positive deviance will be descriptively discussed, utilizing literature from various types of social science. Each chapter is intended only to be preliminary and to be descriptive of the concept in general and some factors that have been found to be associated with
these forms of positive deviance. Each type, obviously, could be analyzed to a greater extent as a form of positive deviance.

The first form of positive deviance is innovation. Nobel Prize winners have been discussed by Szasz (1970:xxv-xxvi) and reformers have been pointed to by Wilkins (1965:45-47). Basically, innovation refers to the combining in a novel manner of old cultural elements, or modifying an already existing cultural element to end up with a new one. As such, innovation can range from the abstract to the pragmatic, and from art to technology. Applications of innovations can range from the domestic level to the national level. Innovation is pervasive in the life of a culture.

The second type of positive deviance postulated is that of altruism. Sorokin (1950:81-82) referred to altruists in general (including good neighbors and saints), Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:11-22) pointed to self-sacrificing heroes, and Steffensmeier and Terry (1975:4) mentioned Congressional Medal of Honor winners. Altruism involves an act undertaken voluntarily to aid another person or other people without any expectation of reward. Rosenhan (1970:252) has subdivided altruism into normal altruism, which refers to acts such as donating small amounts of money and does not require much sacrifice and autonomous altruism, which refers to actors, such as abolitionists, who sacrifice and exert themselves to a much greater degree.

A third form of positive deviance is supra-conformity. Straight-A students have been pointed to by Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:67), zealous weight lifters and runners have been researched by Ewald (1981), and extreme moralists have been referred to by Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:28). Supra-conformity refers to behavior that is at the level of
the idealized within a culture. In other words, as Gibbs (1965:589) noted, collective evaluations refer to what behavior ought to be in a society, whereas collective expectations refer to what behavior actually will be. Thus, a supra-conformist is an individual who actually achieves behavior at the level of what is idealized within a society.

Charisma constitutes the fourth category of positive deviance. Sorokin (1950:81) discussed Gandhi and Jesus as examples, and Wilkins (1965:45-47) referred to religious leaders in general as positive deviants. A charismatic leader is believed in and abided by and adhered to by a group of followers. The followers attribute extraordinary qualities to the persona of the charismatic leader. In essence, the charismatic relationship is composed of two important elements: a situation in which there is a following that wants to be led and a leader who has the capabilities to respond to the unique needs of that following.

The final type of positive deviance postulated is that of innate characteristics. Innate characteristics referred to as types of positive deviance include beautiful women (Hawkins and Tiedeman, 1975:59; Lemert, 1951:23-24; Scarpitti and McFarlane, 1975:28-29), extraordinary intelligence or genius (Scarpitti and McFarlane, 1975:28; Lemert, 1951:23-24), superstar athletes (Scarpitti and McFarlane, 1975:28) and motion-picture stars (Lemert, 1951:23-24). The use of the terminology, innate characteristics, is actually not the best choice to describe this type of positive deviance. These traits are innate to a certain unspecifiable extent and to a certain extent modified by environmental conditions. Nevertheless, the characteristics which are viewed as important are culturally defined. Also, any of these
characteristics is in and of itself, culturally defined. All of these
traits are differentially distributed and acted upon.

An important point should be stressed. Various actions (or actors)
probably transcend more than one category. For example, a person such
as Mother Theresa who lives a life of altruism, (i.e., rather than
engaging in one dramatic altruistic incident) is also in many respects,
a supra-conformist, or a person who follows the idealized norms of a
society, rather than just the expected behavioral norms. Charismatic
leaders are often innovative and often possessors of positively valued
innate characteristics. For example, Dr. Martin Luther King was
primarily a charismatic leader. Nevertheless, he was innovative in that
he combined elements within the United States, by applying the
techniques of the nonviolent civil disobedience to the civil rights
movement. At the same time, with his specifically exquisite oratorical
skills, he fits into the fifth category of being a bearer of innate
characteristics. All in all, many actions (or actors) are explained by
more than one type. Nevertheless, the present classificatory model
seems to be the best way to categorize types of positive deviance.
Thus, each type can be considered to be an ideal type.

Hopefully, this typology can help clarify the concept of positive
deviance, or behavior that people label in a superior manner since it is
often non-normative. Yet, with this typology, various important issues
can be addressed. Are certain actions (or actors) more likely to be
positively labeled, negatively labeled, or neutrally labeled at first?
Perhaps, since innovation is often threatening to a culture, innovation
is more likely to be negatively labeled at first, while altruistic
behavior, because it involves self-sacrifice, is more likely to be
positively evaluated at first. Thus, a typology of positive deviance can help clarify certain issues in relation to positive deviance.

In conclusion, this typology acknowledges that there is more than one type of positive deviance. Each type needs to be examined—within a framework of positive deviance—as a unique entity.
Chapter V

INNOVATION AS A FORM OF POSITIVE DEVIANCE

One form of positive deviance that has been postulated is innovation. Various examples of innovative actors have been discussed as positive deviants by different theorists. Szasz (1970:xxv-xxvi) mentioned Nobel Prize winners and reformers were advanced as a form of positive deviance by Wilkins (1965:15). Nevertheless, innovation as a form of positive deviance needs to be more fully explained by examining the literature that discusses innovation in general.

**Innovation**

To start at the most general level, innovation has been discussed in terms of its place in sociocultural evolution by Lenski and Lenski (1982). According to Lenski and Lenski (1982:66), sociocultural evolution which occurs at the societal level and the world system level "...is the process of change and development in human societies that results from cumulative change in their stores of cultural information." Two components of sociocultural evolution are innovation, which refers to variations that arise, and selection, which refers to the acceptance or rejection of the innovations.
Along these lines, Ogburn (1964:23-31) has suggested that there are four factors that account for cultural evolution: invention, accumulation, diffusion, and adjustment. Invention is the most important factor accounting for cultural evolution and according to Ogburn (1964:23) refers to "...a combination of existing and known elements of culture, material and/or non-material, or a modification of one to form a new one." Invention is basically the same thing as innovation. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971:19) have offered a similar definition, concluding that, "An innovation is an idea, practice, or object perceived as new by an individual."

Innovation, which according to Lenski and Lenski (1982:60-62), results in "new cultural elements", can occur by fortuitous, serendipitous experiences; can emerge as the unplanned consequences of ordinary human interaction (e.g., changes in informal norms); or can result from intended attempts to produce change. Interestingly, planned change is viewed as so normative in industrial societies, that it is rather difficult for societal members to realize that change is important in innovation.

The process of innovation is an important issue that has been discussed by Linton (1936:304-305). Cultural change and expansion originally result from the processes of discovery and invention. As such, diffusion occurs between cultures and thus, the discovery or invention can occur in another country. Linton (1936:306) has defined discovery "...as any addition to knowledge, an invention as a new application to knowledge." It would appear that both could be subsumed under the term innovation since both result in the production of new cultural elements. Aceves (1974:236-237) in fact, has clarified this
point, suggesting that inventions and discoveries are both types of innovation. Basically, the definitions are the same. For Aceves (1974:237), an invention refers to "...any thought or action that is new because it is qualitatively different from existing things," while a discovery suggests "...the finding of something that has existed all along but was unknown to the discoverer." The processes of invention, discovery, and diffusion (or some mixture) explain social and technological change.

Thus, innovations have been defined as the production of new elements within a society. There are different kinds of innovation. According to Linton (1936:316) there are two types of innovations: basic inventions and improving inventions (i.e., inventions will be viewed as the same phenomenon as innovation). Basic inventions, which are produced by inventors who intended to make them, emerge through the usage of a novel principle or union of principles. As such, a basic invention can be the infrastructure upon which other inventions will be based. Improving inventions, which result either from inventors intending or not intending to create them, involve a minor mutation-for new applications or for increasing performance-of an element already present in the culture. Improving inventions, while less flamboyant, produce more change in a culture than do basic principles. However, diffusion, or borrowing innovations already existing in other cultures, produces the most change.

Another important point about innovations is that they are not specific to certain spheres of human action. According to Kallen (1964:427), innovations take place in all social institutions. For example, innovations, or changes in "rites, techniques, customs,
manners, and mores" occur in the following important areas of culture: food, clothing, shelter, defense, disease prevention, production, recreation, religion, science, thought, literature, and art. Thus, innovation is omnipresent in society and a fundamental factor in any society.

In essence, innovation in a society can arise in a variety of ways and can occur in all areas of human life.

One final conceptual note about innovation must be added. Merton (1968) has examined innovation in relation to deviant behavior. Specifically, innovation was advanced as one of the five responses to the existence of an anomie condition within a society, which tends to push people in the direction of non-conformist behavior. According to Merton (1968:185-186), the two important components of a society are the culturally defined goals of a society and the approved means for achieving those goals in that society. Merton (1968:185:186) was most interested in the situation where stress is placed on the goals, but not similarly on the means. Consequently, a disjunction can arise which results in a strain towards anomie. Merton (1968:193-195,203) hypothesized five modes of adaptation. The most pervasive manner of response conformity, occurs when both cultural goals and institutionalized means are accepted. On the other hand, innovation refers to that response which occurs when the cultural goals of society are accepted, but the institutionalized means of achieving those goals are not. This adaptation emerges particularly in the United States due to the great emphasis on wealth and monetary success found within this society. Thus, white collar crime is an innovative adaptation. Nevertheless, the greatest pressure for innovation will systematically
be placed on the lower class.

In conclusion, Merton has presented innovation in a somewhat different manner, by applying the concept directly to deviance.

Generally, Merton's paradigm is seemingly more applicable to the study of negative deviance. For example, white collar crime or robbery (i.e., forms of innovation to achieve monetary success) will in all likelihood be viewed as negative deviance. Nevertheless, if innovation is expanded to situations other than just obtaining pecuniary success and used separately from the concept of anomie, the possibility of an action being labeled as positively deviant increases. For example, an engineer in his occupation may accept the goal of his research and design team, but not the means. Consequently, some new technical apparatus may result—an innovation that has a greater possibility of being labeled as positive deviant behavior. Thus, the more specific utilization of innovation by Merton could be used to explain positive deviance.

All in all, innovation will be defined as the production of new elements within a culture.

Acceptance of Innovations

To more fully understand innovation in relation to positive deviance, the issue of the acceptance of positive deviance must be addressed. The amount of innovation that is present in a society varies greatly among different societies. Lenski and Lenski (1982:65-68) have postulated that the following factors are significant in affecting rates of innovation. In the first place, the amount of information available in a society greatly affects rates of innovation. In the cases of inventions basically resulting from mixing cultural elements already
present in a society, this factor is extremely pertinent. For example, the inventor of the car combined many cultural elements available in Western nations for a new application. Population size is a second factor that bears on rate of innovation, since for one example, in larger populations, more ideas will probably result. Next, the degree to which the environment of a society is stable or dynamic is pertinent, since the more the environment of a society changes, the more will be the necessity for cultural or social structural change. In the fourth place, due to the importance of diffusion, the amount of interaction a society maintains with another society plays an important role in determining the amount of social change. The biophysical environment is a fifth factor, since this can impact the opportunity for change in a society. For example, a society located in the arctic region will not be able to innovate in horticultural techniques. In the sixth place, "fundamental" discoveries and inventions available to a society greatly influence the rate of innovation. The reason is that there are a small number of important innovations that result in a myriad of other innovations. Finally, the attitude of a society toward innovation is a key explanatory variable as to the rate of innovation in a society. Generally, modern societies treat innovations in a more favorable light than do traditional societies. Also, the attitude of a society will depend on whether previous change has been helpful to the society. The view of change inherent in the ascendent ideology of a society affects the attitude of a society toward change (i.e., Confucianism stresses resistance to innovation, while capitalism and Marxism encourage acceptance of innovation).
All these various factors must be viewed as affecting the amount of innovation that a society is likely to accept. Nevertheless, as Holmes (1971:351) pointed out, even the most traditional primitive society is dynamic and not static. Primitive societies are more conservative than modern societies in regard to accepting innovation. There are variations among primitive societies regarding the amount of innovation that is tolerated. Resistance to innovation is greater, perhaps, in the most traditional societies. Linton (1936:308) suggested that periods of crisis result in the situation most conducive to inventors. Nevertheless, resistance is a fairly common phenomenon. As Linton (1936:308) suggested, typical individuals do not actually give much thought to their culture. Consequently, there will be a tendency to oppose and distrust departures. However, if apparent benefit is present in the innovation, this might not be the case.

To discuss societies that are not developing, Lenski and Lenski (1982:75) advanced the term societal stasis to account for societies where the development is minimal and societal regression for societies (e.g., Rome) where, among other factors, significant cultural elements are disappearing. On the other hand, in a changing society, novel cultural elements are being utilized. According to Ogburn (1961*: 38) a society will or will not facilitate inventions depending on the social valuations of that society. For example, in this country, there is a social value placed on development in commerce which would not be similarly found among many other groups.

People are very resistant to change. Bagehot (1873:169), as quoted in Rogers and Shoemaker (1971:226) perhaps best summarized the reason for this attitude:
One of the greatest pains to human nature is the pain of a new idea. It is, as common people say, so "upsetting"; it makes you think that after all, your favorite notions may be wrong, your firmest beliefs ill-founded... Naturally, therefore, common men hate a new idea, and are disposed more or less to ill-treat the original man who brings it.

Lenski and Lenski (1982:70-73) have suggested that there are various factors that lead to continuity, or the continuation of social and cultural elements. In other words, there are reasons that people resist change. These factors are the following: the awareness of the adaptive importance of the old cultural elements; old cultural elements allow for the maintenance of "standardized behavioral responses"; the costs inherent in change; the psychic price of change; the routine of aging which makes individuals resist change; socialization provides resistance to innovation since individuals are brought up to believe that their culture should be maintained; ideologies provide foundation for this attitude; and the systemic essence of societies resulting in the fact that change cannot singularly affect one area of life since it inevitably caused more change. Thus, these factors combine to cause resistance to innovations and consequently, innovators.

All in all, the resistance to innovation in a society is powerful and the reasons for this opposition are significant.

Yet, to reiterate, as Kallen (1964:428) suggested, "innovation may be slow or rapid, manifold or simple, but it is ineluctable." In fact, in many modern societies, innovation has not only become ineluctable, but also normative. Even fourty five years ago, Linton (1936:307) suggested that in the United States, invention was similar to any other industry. As such, the inventor is rewarded with money and honored with
status. In certain realms of modern life, this situation is even more exaggerated. For example, this fact occurs in modern science. Kallen (1937:427) has noted that, in all actuality, the scientific method consists of the "...process of deliberate innovation." Along these lines, Coser (1965:296) noted that in the case of science, similar to any American industry, invention and discovery have become routinized, just as among innovators in the religious realm, there is a routinization of charisma. Parsons (1969:19) discussed the fact that, unlike in the past, research serves to allow the cultural traditions to be developed in an "institutionalized dynamic factor."

While this phenomenon is most developed in the sciences, it does occur in other areas of modern life. For example, this planned innovation is also found in the role of the intellectual in modern life. As Coser (1965:274) explained:

An Edmund Wilson, a Harold Rosenberg, a Paul Goodman may still be highly creative and innovative, but even innovation has been successfully institutionalized in America, and the majority of his peers can now be found in the universities.

At the present time, the university is the institution that facilitates to the greatest degree, the innovation required of those who wished to be deemed intellectuals. Since intellectuals require both an audience and opportunities for contact with other intellectuals, the milieux for the institutionalization of the role of the intellectual in society did not occur until the modern era; until the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries (Coser, 1965:3-4).
A major factor that will further increase institutionalization of much innovation in modern society is probably the development of post-industrial society. As Bell (1973:Ch.1) has hypothesized, one of the five important dimensions of a post-industrial society is the centrality of theoretical knowledge, which can be used to plan innovation. Thus, innovation is and will increasingly be a very significant process in post-industrial societies.

In conclusion, various societies and in fact, various groups, within societies, react quite differently to innovation. Some groups and societies resist innovation to a great degree, while in other societies, innovation is even in some respects, encouraged. A modern society can be further divided along these lines. A research and development team of an industry will react differently to innovations (innovators) than will more traditional components of the society. Thus, the innovation (innovator) will obviously be accepted and treated in divergent manners.

Innovation and Innovators as Positive Deviance and Positive Deviants

As discussed, various societies and situations are conducive to innovation while others offer resistance to innovation. The society and the situation in which an innovator is enmeshed will determine to a great extent how he is treated. An innovator can be labeled as a positive deviant, a negative deviant, or in a neutral manner. In the main, an innovator has a greater possibility of being labeled as a negative deviant in a society or group where change is opposed, while an innovator will have more opportunity to be labeled as a positive deviant or in a neutral manner in a society or group where innovation is treated
in a receptive manner. Nevertheless, there are many examples of labeling an innovator as a negative deviant in the time framework in which he operates only to be later elevated to a positive deviant status, when the true impact of the innovation is realized. Thus, innovators will be examined from the vantage point of how society treats them and the various characteristics associated with them. Hopefully, this discussion will bear on the role of positive deviants in society.

In regard to the position of innovators in primitive societies, Holmes (1971:354) has offered some illuminating comments. Innovators are especially uncommon in more traditional societies since there is more intense pressure to conform and not to innovate in such societies than in more modern Western societies where progress is more generally accepted.

Nevertheless, Holmes (1971:453) did offer the following anecdote of an innovator/reformer in a primitive society:

Legend tells us that Hiawatha one day conceived of an idea whereby all the warlike Iroquois tribes could live at peace with one another. He foresaw a time when they could come together in a great league or confederacy whereby they might work together rather than fight among themselves. Tired by this idea, he is supposed to have spent years traveling from tribe to tribe until he finally succeeded in persuading the tribal chiefs to try his unique idea. The League of Iroquois, once established, lasted for more than four hundred years.

Thus, innovators have existed in preindustrial, or more traditional societies.

Kallen (1964:429) has noted the following about innovators:

Innovators are not necessarily rebels and the temper of innovation is not by any means the temper of revolt. Novelties, spontaneous deviations of the same energy, continually pour from the mainstream of custom and convention.
Nevertheless, Kallen (1964:429) has noted that innovators are usually coerced into a "combative" status, since the innovations they produce must compete with already established and perfectly accepted methods of accomplishing tasks. As such, innovators cause reorganization in "the distribution and organization of social forces" leading inevitably to opposition among affected individuals. Thus, it would appear almost unavoidable that innovators are often treated in a negative manner.

Linton (1936:307,322) has implied that how innovators are treated varies depending on the type of society in which the innovator is located. For example, in the aberrant case of the United States, where invention has become institutionalized, the inventor of an invention that succeeds will receive economic and status premiums. Even in our society, inventors in the religious and social realm are still not at this time, treated in a receptive manner. The situation of a positive acceptance of innovators, however, is not the case for most societies. As such, in most societies any invention that deviates much from the norm, will result in the conferring of derision upon the innovator. In fact, an inventor in a primitive society will only be greatly rewarded, most likely, at those unique times when the society realizes that there are woeful deficiencies in needs that should be corrected. The times when this type of crisis reaches its greater point will probably be when the society finds itself in danger vis-a-vis some other society.

As Linton (1936:309) noted, a society is more receptive of innovations and thus will treat the innovators better, in those areas defined as significant than in those deemed not as important. Inventors in areas judged as less essential to the society are more likely to be...
treated in a neutral or more negative manner.

As a result of the indifferent or negative manner in which most innovators (inventors) are treated, Linton (1936:310) suggested that there must be some factors, other than the yearning for material success or eminence that motivates an inventor. Linton (1936:310) has referred to this factor as an "inner urge" which accounts for the desire to create novel items. All in all, however, this individual is the atypical one. In fact, due to the agitation and the uncomfortable position in which the inventor finds himself, Linton (1936:310-312) has concluded that inventors are in actuality "maladjusted" individuals in society. This is especially the case for "conscious" inventors. Unconscious inventors, on the other hand, produce minor changes which are virtually imperceptible by their own account but are collectively of colossal impact. These individuals are those proficient craftsman who "play with their art." Thus, conscious inventors are maladjusted individuals, while unconscious individuals are contented. In conclusion, Linton (1936:322) has speculated that the life of an inventor is a hard one, both tedious and disheartening.

Innovators clearly deviate from the norm. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971:183) have categorized people, on a normal curve, to demonstrate the role of innovators (i.e., the acceptance of innovations in society). From the mean to one standard deviation above the mean, are the thirty-four percent of the population who are the late majority. Above one standard deviation are the sixteen percent of the population identified as laggards, in regard to adopting innovations. To the left of the mean to the point of one standard deviation are thirty-four percent of the people who are the early majority. From one standard
deviation to two standard deviations are 13.5 percent who are early adopters. Finally, beyond two standard deviations below the mean, are the 2.5 percent who are classified as innovators. This conceptualization is based on the occasion during which a person espouses an innovation. In this paradigm, while these individuals are not necessarily the same as those who create new ideas, since Rogers has suggested that they are not going to have to share the same roles, presumably, since they are the first to innovate in their adoption of new products, they should share characteristics with those who innovate in the development of new artifacts. In other words, innovators deviate from the normative.

Various traits have been associated with innovators. According to Rogers (1962:193), while innovators are the first to "adopt new ideas" they are not usually the most highly regarded individuals in a society. Consequently, they are usually individuals who prefer adventure to the admiration of society.

Rogers (1962:196-198) has suggested that laggards are highly deviant and that they are overconformers. Innovators, on the other hand, are highly deviant and underconformers to norms. To substantiate this belief, Rogers (1962:198-200) described research involving agricultural innovators in Ohio who adopted novel farm techniques. Those who were innovators felt that other farmers treated them in a deviant manner, especially when the technique was first utilized and before it has been proven successful. For example, Rogers (1962:200) noted that one farmer stated, "Fifty percent think I am crazy; the other fifty percent are sure I am," while another farmer stated, "The way I operate my farm is not the way to win popularity contests among my
neighbors." Furthermore, innovators also have self-definitions as deviants. In this study, ninety-eight percent of the innovators viewed themselves as deviants from norms.

Consequently, as innovators are not often well received by their group, it is not surprising that far more often than the common farmer, the innovators are more cosmopolitan in that their reference groups are scattered over a much larger area than is the case for the other farmers and in that they are more inclined to go to other places to become exposed to new techniques (Rogers, 1962:204-205). As a result of other reference groups, sustenance is provided to the innovators who are treated disparagingly by their own group.

Yet, while innovators are viewed as deviant by others in the population, Rogers (1962:200) proposed that the norms in regard to innovation of that particular population will affect to what extent the innovators are viewed as deviant. An innovator in a society or group with more modern norms about innovation will be treated as less deviant than in a more traditional society. Thus, in more traditional societies or components of a society, innovators are often viewed as negative deviants; in more modern societies or components of societies, they will be more likely to be viewed as positive deviants.

Coser (1967:Ch.6) has also proferred some revealing comments about innovators. Innovators performing in spheres where innovation is positively estimated, will be viewed as conformers of a distinctive type. Nevertheless, there may be some initial attempts to obstruct the innovation by established individuals. An innovator situated in populations were innovation is not accepted, however, is a veritable nonconformist. Nevertheless, the innovator is still in a position
different from a negative deviant, such as a criminal, since there will be various individuals that will define the innovator as attempting to do something of a positive nature. Consequently, conflict can emerge in these situations.

Interestingly, Coser (1967:Ch.6) has noted that certain positions in a social structure are conducive to the production of innovating behavior. For example, marginal individuals are located in a role that provides almost inherent motivation to innovate. The role of leader which necessitates flexibility, is also a position which promotes innovation.

As Palmer (1970:71) has noted, there is a relative dearth of studies dealing with innovation and invention due to the fact that the path to understanding innovation is filled with vicissitudes. Some of the literature that might possibly result in a better understanding of innovators has been done under the guise of creativity. Creativity and innovation are inextricably bound together since creativity is an inherent feature of innovative behavior. Ghiselin (1954:2-3) was aware of this amalgamation while also noting the disparaging treatment that innovators receive:

The creative process is the process of change, of evolution, in the organization of subjective life. The inventive minds through whose activity that evolution has been initiated and in large part accomplished have usually been the only ones much concerned with it. Their efforts have rarely been sustained by society, and have sometimes even been hindered. There is little comfort in reflecting that vital change has gone on despite all opposition of indifference, that the work of Galileo was done and put to use in spite of obstruction and that Bartok composed a great deal of music while enduring the neglect that left him in sickening poverty. Because every creative act overpasses the established order in some way and in some degree, it is likely at first to appear eccentric to most men.
An inventor ordinarily must begin in isolation and draw the group to himself only as it is discovered, sometimes very slowly, that he has invented some part of what they are in need of.

Ghiselin (1954:4) has suggested that for the creative process to occur, the creative individual must transcend the established order. Creation itself, usually commences from a "...vague, even a confused excitement, hunch, or other proverbial imitation of approaching a potential resolution." At times, in the process of creation, there is found an even more archaic stage of vacillation.

Ghiselin (1954:5-8) has noted that inventions may emerge as unpremeditated or impulsive acts, but when this is the case, it is usually only a vision of the final invention, not the entire package. Only very rarely, does creation emerge in its completed state as the result of this type of process. On the other hand, creation as the result of a "process of purely conscious creation" appears to be virtually nonexistent. Rather, the dialectic between the conscious and the unconscious seems integral. As Ghiselin (1954:8) wrote about inventors (e.g., artists, scientists, and "creative men of action"):

The restlessness of the inventor is unending because he is adept in realization, he has an inordinate appetite for discovery and the ability to satisfy it...He is drawn by the unrealized toward realization. His job is, as Wordsworth says, "the. widening the sphere of human sensibility,...the introduction of a new element into the intellectual universe." He works toward clarification, toward consciousness that opposition between the conscious and the unconscious activities in creation which we have noticed is only superficial, or rather is only initial. The new order which creation is concerned with has an affinity for consciousness.
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As Ghiselin (1954:9-14) noted, since the inventor must move outside the established order, the inventor must be a courageous person. Furthermore, the inventor cannot be a "faithful formalist", but rather must be willing to deviate to the extent of being eccentric. The inventor must also appreciate the value in his final goal. The motivation of the inventor must be true since hard and consistent work is necessary to achieve the final status.

Along these lines, Barron (1967:1) has hypothesized that a complete innocence of perception is necessary for creation, but not in the regressive sense of innocents, "...but upon progression, without loss, from the sense of awe and wonder and the natural spontaneity of childhood into integrated adult functioning with fine command of ways and means acquired through discipline and technique." Regarding intelligence and creativity, Barron (1967:2) has analyzed the situation in the following manner: highly creative people are most often found in the top ten percent or even five percent of the population in regard to I.Q. Nevertheless, within this top group, there is most often no correlation between tested I.Q. and creativity. Thus, while a certain level of intelligence appears necessary for creativity, beyond this point, intelligence is not the key variable. According to Barron (1967:4-7), the key variables are the following: perceptual rather than judgemental attitudes, intuitive rather than sense-perception attitudes, and a complexity-prone rather than simplicity-prone personality.

Conclusions

Thus, innovation must be considered a type of positive deviance. Innovation refers to the production of new elements in a culture or the alteration of an already existing element. Innovation can occur in all
spheres of a cultural life, from technology to art, and from the esoteric to the mundane.

As discussed, innovation is very differentially received within a society. More traditional societies, and more traditional components of modern society tend to be very resistant to change. On the other hand, modern societies tend to be more accepting of innovation. In fact, in some parts of modern societies (e.g., the universities), innovation is considered essential and normative. Consequently, seemingly, the definition of an innovation (innovator) will probably be originally deemed a negative deviant in the former circumstances, unless there is a crisis situation. On the other hand, in those societies, or those factions of society, where innovation is encouraged, an innovator will most likely be originally designated as a positive deviant. Thus, the designation of positive or negative deviance or neutrality will vary depending on the situational circumstances in which the innovation is produced and the innovator is enmeshed.

One interesting point must be raised. As previously discussed, innovators must often be willing to stand outside the lives of normal people, since the innovator is often reacted to in a negative manner. In other words, seemingly, a marginal individual would probably be an ideal innovator. Finally, the importance of creativity in the production of innovation cannot be underestimated.
CHAPTER VI

ALTRUISM AS A FORM OF POSITIVE DEVIANCE

A second type of positive deviance that will be advanced is altruism. Sorokin (1950:81-82) has discussed altruists in general and good neighbors specifically. Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:29) have pointed to self-sacrificing heroes as positive deviants. Along these lines, Steffensmeier and Terry (1975:4) have suggested that Congressional Medal of Honor winners are positive deviants. In relation to the classificatory scheme, it can be noted that Congressional Medal of Honor winners, for all practical purposes, are altruists. To understand altruism as a form of positive deviance, the literature related to the issue of altruism will be examined.

ALTRUISM

An Historical Note

Although the issue of altruism has been more thoroughly examined during the past fifteen years by psychologists, in fact, the term was first utilized by the then nascent sociologists. Auguste Comte was the first social thinker to utilize the word. Comte (1966), in his seminal
work, *System of Positive Polity*, advanced the idea that altruism can be seen as a diametrically different behavior than egoism. Advanced systems would nourish altruistic tendencies, which Comte viewed as being anatomically located in humans (Comte, 1966:569). Interestingly, Comte (1966:155) also felt that altruism is especially prevalent in domestic life and that altruism would be pervasive in a society if all physical needs were eliminated.

In addition to Comte, Durkheim, another eminent nineteenth century sociological theorist also delved into the issue of altruism—albeit in relation to the subject of Suicide. In his classic methodological work, *Suicide*, Durkheim discussed altruistic suicide as one of the four forms of suicide that he had postulated. Interestingly, his presentation of altruistic suicide contained its opposite in egoistic suicide. Durkheim (1951:217-221) suggested that altruistic suicide would occur when social integration was powerful; in other words, individuals would feel that it was an obligatory duty to a group to which that individual belonged. In fact, if this duty went unheeded, the person would be viewed as not honorable, and at times, would even be religiously sanctioned.

Thus, it is worth noting that the early usage of the concept of altruism was fostered by sociologists. In addition, Rushton and Sorrentino (1981:6) has suggested that during this century there has been some musing over the concept of altruism. In fact, altruism has been viewed from the following perspectives: biological (e.g., Darwin, 1871); developmental-psychological (e.g., Hartshorne, 1928); social psychological (e.g., Comte, 1966, McDougall, 1908).
Nevertheless, for the most part, for much of this century, the topic remained virtually ignored. Research into the concept of altruism really advanced during the 1960's, especially in the discipline of psychology. This increased focus into this area of thought can be traced to an overall increase in the research in the field of psychology (Rushton and Sorrentino, 1981:3) and to a desire to comprehend the 1964 slaying of Kitty Genovese in New York City in which 38 bystanders neglected to come to her aid (Latane and Darley, 1970:13).

**Definitions of Prosocial Behavior and Altruism**

In addition to research done in the area of altruism, prosocial behavior has also been a widely discussed concept. In fact, Eisenberg (1982:6) has suggested that prosocial behavior and altruism have often been used to mean the same phenomenon. Researchers are to a greater extent utilizing the term altruism in a more specific manner than prosocial behavior.

Reykowski (1982:378) is among those theorists who have noted that prosocial behaviors cover a gamut of actions. Wispe (1972:3-4) suggested that altruism is the quintessential of the various types—in addition to sympathy, cooperation, helping, aid and donating—of prosocial behavior. Prosocial behavior, can be characterized as behavior that is completely opposite of aggressive behavior. Unlike the other types, however, altruism suggests looking out for others while at the same time not being as conscious of one's own interests.

Bar-Tel (1976:4) has clarified this problem to a certain extent and presented the issue along these same lines. According to Bar-Tel (1976:4):

Specifically, prosocial behavior is defined here as voluntary behavior that is carried out to
benefit another without anticipation of external rewards and is performed under two circumstances: (a) the behavior is done for its own end, and (b) the behavior is done as an act of restitution.

Thus, altruism can be viewed as that type of behavior which meets the first criterion; in other words, altruism refers to that particular form of prosocial behavior which is done solely for its own sake. As a behavior, the motives of altruism are more pure.

In addition, Staub (1978:10) also basically concurred with this differentiation of prosocial behavior and altruism. While prosocial behaviors are in effect, those actions that aid other people (i.e., although there can be great variance in the amount of involvement in a particular prosocial action), altruistic acts occur when it was meant to aid another individual rather than to garner personal gains. Nevertheless, internal gains often accompany altruistic acts.

Thus, although there has been some confusion over interchangeable usages of the terms altruism and prosocial behavior, in its practical utilization, altruism has been used as a particular instance of prosocial behavior in which the action is done for its own sake without hope of reward.

Not surprisingly, as Eisenberg (1982:4) among others has noted, there has been a great deal of semantic disagreement in regard to how to define altruism. For example, there is variation over whether an altruistic act must exclude or can include behaviors that are associated with external reward and whether they have to be acts that are intentional in nature.
Before resolving the semantic issue, various definitions of altruism will be presented; both those that are general in nature and those that are more specific.

Certain attempts to define altruism have been very particular in nature, including those that have a biological or genetic basis. Hardin (1977:5-7), for example, noted that altruism accrues no benefit to the individual and in a unique paradox, can even be detrimental to the individual engaging in the act. In fact, Hardin describes two types of altruism (i.e., altruistic or masochistic and altruistic or benevolent) in terms of the effect on the reproductive success of the actors. While Wilson (1978:11) noted that altruism is viewed in terms of the consequences for genetic success, he defined altruism more generally as "...self-destructive behavior performed for the benefit of others."

Another example of an extremely specific type of definition is the one offered by Aronfeed (1970:105). For Aronfeed, empathy is the crucial criterion in ascertaining whether altruism has occurred. Thus, the outcomes are not relevant; the defining characteristic of altruism is whether or not there has been an empathic motivation accompanying the act.

On the other hand, some definitions of altruism are too general to be of great significance. For example, utilizing the dictionary as a basis for definition, Zahn-Waxler and Radke-Yarrow (1982:110) have posited that "Altruism is formally defined as regard for or devotion to the interest of others." In addition, Darley and Latane (1970:13-26) seemingly suggest that any action that aids somebody having problems regardless of the intentions of of the individual offering the help is equal to altruism (Macaulay and Berkowitz, 1970:2).
At any rate the definitional debate can seemingly be resolved. As Krebs (1982:55) so astutely noted, "...terms like altruism or prosocial behavior serve to orient the reader and put him/her in a behavioral ballpark." Thus, many of the definitions seem to suggest more or less the same types of actions and thus, should be viewed in that light and research utilizing different definitions should be accepted as valid regardless of any minor linguistic differences.

For example, the following principles were stated by Leeds. For Leeds (1963:230-251), an altruistic act is achieved when the individual who is giving does it not expecting reward, does it voluntarily and is viewed by others and the person benefiting from the altruistic act as doing good. According to Cialdini, Kerrick, and Bauman (1982:339), altruism helps another person and although internal rewards may occur as a result, external rewards cannot be the reason for originally engaging in the action. Grusec (1981:65) proposed that altruism could be viewed as consideration for people without the necessity of being motivated by external rewards. Similarly, for Macaulay and Berkowitz (1970:3), altruism can be defined "...as behavior carried out to benefit another without anticipation of rewards from external sources." Furthermore, as Sorokin (1948:59) noted "Genuine altruism is pure also in its motivation: altruistic actions are performed for their own sake, quite apart from any consideration of pleasures of utility." Thus, it can be seen that these thinkers are basically referring to the same type of behaviors.

Finally, Rosenhan (1970:251-252) has provided a good classificatory model for the concept of altruism, differentiating two types of altruism: normative altruism and autonomous altruism. Normative
altruism refers to types of behaviors that occur on a frequent basis and require neither much effort nor much sacrifice on the part of the giver. Additionally, as Rosenhan (1970:252) noted, this "...concern for others is supported and elicited by a vast social network of tacit and explicit rewards and punishments." Such acts as giving small amounts of money to charity or aiding someone who has a flat tire would be considered quintessential examples of normative altruistic acts. On the other hand, autonomous altruism is behavior that is similar to the definitions of altruism already presented. These are more "dramatic" actions and include, for example, people who aided Jews during Nazi domination and abolitionists. In this case, the sacrifice and effort are greater; in fact, danger can ensue. In addition, while rewards can result, these rewards certainly are not the cause of the actions being initiated and are not expected as a result of the actions.

Thus, it can be concluded that the majority of theorists discussing altruism seem to suggest that altruistic actions are those that are voluntarily done to benefit another person, and although rewards, including internal ones, may unexpectedly result, are not the motivating influence for altruistic behavior.

In fact, as Bar-Tel (1976:5) noted, although there is not agreement on a specific definition for altruism, there is still some form of consensus in that most definitions suggest the following criteria must be met: the act must be voluntarily done, the action must aid some other person, and the action must be performed without anticipation of a reward. In conclusion, basically this is the meaning suggested by the majority of the various writers on the subject.
Altruism as Positive Deviance

Why does altruism occur? To understand the nature of altruism as a form of positive deviance, it will be essential to examine various theories including ones based on personality, on the situation, and on social learning. Finally, a multivariate approach that recognizes the importance of these diverse factors will be presented.

Krebs (1978:41) is among those who have suggested that personality features really provide very little to the understanding of altruism. Nevertheless, personality factors have been variously presented as important in any explanation of altruism.

Rushton (1980:81-84) has substantiated the importance of personality in altruism, offering the opinion that there can be considered to be a "trait" of altruism in as much as there are certain individuals who are generally more munificent or are generally more willing to aid others. In other words, some people can be viewed as having more of an altruistic personality than others. As the key variables in an altruistic personality, Rushton (1980:84-85) points to the following two factors: empathy and the internalized norms of suitable conduct. As substantiation of this viewpoint, Staub (1978:42-44) hypothesized that there are three motivating factors for prosocial behavior: self-gain, personal values and norms, and empathy (i.e., identification with other people). Considering the more specific and pure nature of altruism as compared to prosocial behavior, it can be basically concluded that Staub (1978) and Rushton (1980) offer the same factors as key explanatory variables in motivating altruistic personality.
To reiterate, the first component is empathy. Empathy, according to Rushton (1980:260) refers to "...experiencing the emotional state of another." This condition may result from the empathizer's knowledge of the position of the recipient of the empathy, or because of stimuli that emanate from the recipient. In addition, while stimuli can invoke empathy in even the youngest of children, the capacity for empathy increases with age, which accompanies the further development of cognitive skills. In effect, Rosenhan (1978:103) has suggested that affective motivations (i.e., empathy) replace external reward in motivating altruistic behavior.

The second factor that Rushton (1980:251) postulated as important in the altruistic personality tendencies, are the internalized norms of suitable conduct that a person maintains. The norms, or standards, advanced as important are norms of social responsibility, norms of equity, and norms of reciprocity. These three norms, then along with empathy explain altruistic tendency. Seemingly, these norms would be influenced by the socio-cultural context within which an individual exists. Thus, macro-level factors obviously affect micro-level ones.

In essence, it has been argued that certain individuals will have a greater probability of acting in an altruistic manner than other individuals.

The importance of the situation in which the individual is enmeshed becomes an important variable in understanding altruism (c.f., Gergen, Gergen and Meter, 1972:16).

Hartshorne and May (1928-1930) stressed the importance of the situation in causing altruistic behavior. Their study consisted of thirty-three behavioral altruistic tests that were administered to
11,000 elementary to high school students (as cited in Rushton and Sorrentino, 1981:8-9). The view that Hartshorne and May (1930:755) advanced was that there are situations in which virtually no one will act altruistically. Also, there are times when the same people will not be helpful when they would behave that way in other situations [as cited by Krebs (1978:142)].

Cialdini, Kerrick and Bauman (1982:339-340) are among the theorists who have written extensively about the effect of mood, an aspect of a situation in regard to altruism (also, c.f., Isen, 1970, Isen and Levin, 1972, Rushton, 1980, Underwood, Froming and Moore, 1970, Rushton and Littlefield, 1979). At least in the case of children, a linear correlation exists between mood and altruism. In other words, when the chance to engage in altruistic behavior exists, children that are in a "good" mood are most likely to behave altruistically, children that are in a bad mood are least likely to behave altruistically, and those who are in neither a positive nor negative mood will behave altruistically to an extent somewhere between these two ends of the continuum. Rushton (1980:54-55) has suggested that the reason that altruism is correlated with a situational variable (i.e., mood) is because of cognitive processing capacity. As Rushton (1980: 54-55) wrote:

How do we account for the fact that good moods tend to increase altruism and bad ones decrease it? "One" view would be - in terms of cognitive-processing capacity. Compatible with all the data mentioned above would be the view that good moods increase the amount of cognitive processing capacity (Easterbrook, 1959) that an individual has at his or her disposal, thus giving the person more attention to be able to divert to the problems of others. He or she thus would be able to monitor the other person's needs, be more aware of his or her own standards of appropriate behavior for such situations, and so own. It is possible that good moods even directly increase an individual's empathic
capacity. Bad moods in this view, result in a reduction of an individual's cognitive-processing capacity, restrict his or her attention to the needs of others and to his or her own moral standards, and perhaps also decrease his or her own empathic capacity.

A final way that altruism has been explained is through social learning. According to Bar-Tel (1976:17), in utilizing social learning theory, prosocial behaviors, including altruism, are learned similarly to any other behaviors. As Grusec (1981:65) has suggested, elements of socialization are especially important in the development of altruism, especially in children.

Thus, important components of social learning theory, for Bar-Tel (1976:17-31) are the following. In the first place, there is the process of reinforcement, which affects the possibility of an action being done again. Secondly, modeling is important. In other words, if a positive action is watched, it may serve as a basis for an individual engaging in a prosocial, or more specifically, an altruistic act. Along these lines, Grusec (1981:68-72) has suggested that the two major factors affecting modeling or how children imitate altruistic behavior are the nurturance (e.g., warmth and concern) and the power (i.e., control over resources) that the model displays. That is, the higher the degree of nurturance and the greater amount of power displayed by the model, the more there is a willingness to engage in altruism.

Finally, according to Bar-Tel (1976:33-34), familial antecedents are essential in terms of the socializing powers that are maintained by the family. In other words, the actions of the parents and the closeness that they maintain with their children are important contributory factors to prosocial, or altruistic behavior. To more
fully explain this process, Rushton (1980:Ch.7,Ch.8) has advanced the idea that while the family is the primary agent of socialization, both the mass media and the educational systems are increasingly potent agents of socialization and could be better utilized to encourage altruistic actions.

Thus, social learning theory has been advanced to explain aspects of altruism.

Specifically stating the need for a multivariate approach to altruism, Krebs (1978:145) suggested that both aspects of the person and of the situation are important in whether or not altruism occurs. Among other theorists who have noted the value of utilizing more than one approach to understanding altruism are Grusec (1981), Rosenhan (1978), Staub (1978), Rushton (1980), and Bar-Tel (1976).

Staub (1978:42), for example, has presented a theoretical model that emphasizes the personality-situation matrix. In addition, Bar-Tel (1976:53,88) has presented a decision-making model for both emergency and non-emergency occurrences, which postulated the following factors as influencing the judgment process in participating in prosocial, or altruistic acts: personal variables, situational variables, and characteristics of the person in need, and cultural variables. Regarding cultural variables, Bar-Tel (1976:49) while only pursuing this issue to a minimal degree, suggested, "Human beings are innately motivated to pursue their own self-interest, but the culture can socialize them to be altruistic." In other words, various cultures would seem to provide various normative stances toward altruism. Perhaps some cultures provide an attitude toward altruism as a normative behavior. In that cases altruism would be defined as normative rather
than positive deviance. All in all, the nature of altruism as a product of culture is an issue that would be an appropriate area of future research.

A model that seemingly accounts for all of the important variables involved in altruism is the one presented by Rushton (1980:30-57). Basically, social learning is presented as the major approach, meaning that people act in an altruistic manner if that is how they have learned to behave. As Rushton (1980:57) summarized this approach:

Altruism, then, is a product of both enduring characteristics of the person such as his or her self-regulatory system of personal norms and empathy, and fluctuating aspects of the situation. Altruistic behavior is perhaps best viewed as part of a three-way reciprocal interaction involving characteristics of the person, the situation, and the person's behavior. At any point, each of the three components can be viewed as having independent effects on the interlocking causal chain. The self-regulatory systems of personal norms and empathy...clearly influence behavior. They do, so, however, only in reciprocal interaction with environmental events and the behavioral competencies of the individual.

Thus, it can be noted that a multivariate approach offers a broader based explanation to altruism as a form of positive deviance that more fully incorporates various facets of the issue.

**Altruists as Positive Deviants**

Several studies have been conducted centering on groups of altruists. These studies will be analyzed in the hope of illuminating altruists as positive deviants.

An example of a major study phenomenologically conducted by Fellner and Marshall (1981:351-353) centered on the decision making process that resulted in the donation of kidneys to sick individuals. Potential
donors are informed several times of the inherent dangers that they will face if they proceed. Nevertheless, the great majority of the recipients, reported that they decided to donate the organ (i.e., to behave altruistically) almost as soon as they were asked. Additionally, of those who decided based upon hearing of the situation over the phone, virtually none discussed it first with a spouse before deciding. Nevertheless, there were some potential donors who were less than initially enthusiastic about the possibility of being picked out of the several being considered, and were at first, hopeful that somebody else would be the person ultimately selected. Yet, while the people in this group could not specifically remember when a definitive decision was made, none ever really entertained the possibility of not donating.

In regard to why this particular type of altruistic action was undertaken which entailed the chance of considerable physical risk, Fellner and Marshall (1981:357) concluded:

> We began to believe that a significant part of the immediate motivation of most of the donors was not pity for the other, not primarily a wish to help, nor a social idealism involving aid to another human being, but rather an inner imperative.

Internalized norms are obviously affected by cultural values. As one middle-aged woman commented about her decision, "Not a great thing, but the right thing to do." (Fellner and Marshall, 1981:357). In regard to the decision, virtually all indicated that they would repeat it (i.e., even for the thirty-five percent of the donors whose organs did not survive). In addition, there appeared to be the following two types of rewards that resulted for the donor: a satisfaction in the better health of the individual who received the organ—albeit, in some cases the
recovery did not last—and secondly, enhanced esteem and a better view of one's self (Fellner and Marshall, 1981:358-360).

All in all, it can be concluded that in this actual case of altruists as supported by theoretical viewpoints in altruism, the decision to behave altruistically was made almost instantaneously and therefore, no reward was expected. Nevertheless, interestingly, some internal rewards did result.

Blake and Butler (1976:561-564) have examined various aspects of Congressional Medal of Honor winners from the Vietnam War. According to Blake and Butler (1976:564), besides the necessity of two eyewitnesses, in order to receive a Congressional Medal of Honor Award:

The deed must be so outstanding that it clearly distinguishes his gallantry beyond the call of duty from lesser forms of bravery; it must involve the risk of his life; and it must be the type of deed which, if he had not done it, would not subject him to any justified criticisms.

After reviewing the action summaries of the reasons stated for the awards, it became clear that there were two basic types of orientations motivating awards: soldier-saving and war-winning. In the soldier-saving (i.e., "selfless concern for others") category were the following reasons: acts of rescue, grenade actions, and rear defense movements. On the other hand, in the war-winning (i.e., "fighting spirit") orientation are the following actions: extra aggressive acts, refusal of medical aid, and leadership. The findings of the study indicated that higher rank soldiers (i.e., captains and above) were much more often awarded for actions classified as war-winning, indicating a professional orientation, rather than an interpersonal one. Lower ranked soldiers, on the other hand, were much more likely to engage in
soldier-saving actions, thus, demonstrating extreme concern and an intense amount of personal involvement with their comrades.

Thus, it can be concluded that there are those among lower level enlisted soldiers who do engage in altruistic acts of such an extreme magnitude that there is great personal danger (e.g., 81.8 percent of lower-ranking soldiers receive their medals posthumously as opposed to 25 percent of the higher-ranking soldiers (Fellner and Marshall, 1876:562). It can be surmised that high levels of personal involvement with other soldiers can be a motivating factor in the execution of altruism. This, in fact, probably produces greater levels of empathy and changes the nature of the situational definition applied by soldiers.

In a study that was not ever finished, Perry (1970:241-248) interviewed Christians who altruistically rescued Jews during Nazi occupation. These incidents of altruism included actions that were part of the underground movement and in which minimal danger was encountered; actions in which the rescuer repeatedly risked life; and actions which involved few risks at the beginning but somehow escalated to major ones. Impressionistically, it was concluded that three structural personality factors were associated with those individual who undertook this risk. In the first place, virtually the total sample seemed to possess a willingness to help, that could be labeled a "spirit of adventurousness". This spirit did not arise at the time of the altruistic acts, but appeared to be a consistent theme in their lives. A second major factor involved the relationship with their parents. In other words, practically all of this groups of altruists had an intense identification with either one or in some instances, both parents. In
addition, the parent who inspired this relationship was usually a moral
tfigure-albeit, not always a moralist whose principles emanated from
religion. Nevertheless, the parent(s) adopted stringent moral stances
and also abided by a moral code of behavior. Finally, there also
appeared to be many instances of what can be considered social
marginality among these altruists. For example, one grew up as a
stutterer.

All in all, it can be concluded that certain characteristics seemed
to accompany this group of altruists. Interestingly, as strong
interpersonal ties with comrades seemed to be a motivating factor in the
case of enlisted soldier altruists, close interpersonal relationships
with the family seemed essential in the case of Christian rescuers.

In a study of civil rights workers who were active prior to 1961,
Rosenhan (1970:255) examined the differences between passive and active
workers and even more essential to the understanding of altruism, among
the latter group, between those workers partially committed and those
fully committed. In regard to characteristics of partially as opposed
to fully committed, Rosenhan (1970:261-262) found the two groups were
not significantly different on demographic matters, except for the fact
that the partially committed had commanded larger salaries.
Nevertheless, considerable difference was found in regard to two
variables. During the early years of life, the fully committed
maintained stronger psychological ties with either one or both parents.
In the second place, the type of socializing agents they were exposed to
were viewed as important. Parents of both groups were involved with
moral concerns. However, while the involvement of the parents of the
partially committed was of an ambiguous and tenuous nature, in all cases
for the fully committed, at least one of the parents had also been involved in an altruistic pursuit as a fully committed member while the civil rights worker was young.

Thus, again it can be noted that a group of altruists maintained avid personal relationships. In this case, as with Christians who rescued Jews, it was within the family of procreation.

Finally, Sorokin (1950) has examined two groups of altruists: American good neighbors, or ordinary altruists, and saints, or great altruists. Of the three groups of good neighbors that Sorokin (1950:197) examined, most of the actions that resulted in their being defined as "good neighbors" consisted of relieving boredom, loneliness, grief, or some other affliction in others.

To examine the characteristics of saints, Sorokin (1950:92) analyzed Christian saints as embodied in the Thurston revised edition of Butler's Lives of the Saints. Regarding the altruism of the saints, Sorokin (1950:197) wrote:

The social function of the saints, aside from the above role of the good neighbors, consists of being a living incarnation of the highest goodness, love, and spirituality of a given society. The saints are creative heroes in the filed of moral values and they set a visible exam for imitation. In the field of altruistic love the bulk of the saints are masters and creators of "love-energy," which they generate in larger quantities of the purest quality.

In addition, Sorokin (1950:198-200) characterized some of the variables, mostly demographic ones, that were associated with these two groups of altruists. For example, seventy-five percent of his good neighbor sample was composed of women and seventy percent of these people were between the ages of thirty and fifty-nine. The overwhelming
majority of the saints were men and were characterized by an inordinately long life.

Interestingly, among the important characteristics stressed by Sorokin (1950:200-201) was that of the family. Among good neighbors, the families were larger than the average American. In addition, eight percent came from well integrated families. More specifically, seventy percent felt that their childhood was very happy and filled with familial love. While another eighteen percent viewed their childhood as fairly happy, but still filled with love; only eleven percent had a childhood that they perceived as not happy. In fact, twenty-nine percent of them attributed their good neighborliness as having its roots in their parental family (Sorokin, 1950:211).

Among the saints, ninety percent had parents who loved them, including sixty-five percent whose parents supported them in their saintliness. In addition, neither group exhibited "Freudian complexes" in their relationships with their parents.

All in all, according to Sorokin (1950:201)

These data confirm the extreme importance of the parental family and of love in early childhood and youth. The bliss of being loved and of loving appears to be a most decisive factor in achieving good-neighborliness, altruism, and sainthood.

Thus, it can be concluded that Sorokin viewed the family as being an important variable in explaining the actions of altruists.

Thus, by examining studies of actual groups of exemplary altruists, various facets of altruists as positive deviants can be illuminated. In the first place, it appears that the altruistic act was made immediately, thus, reinforcing the idea that external rewards are not
important in motivating altruistic behavior. In addition, it appears that stable relationships of some sort (especially in the family—the primary agent of socialization or the fact that it was lower ranking soldiers) seem to be a contributing factor in altruism. This would appear to support the importance of empathy. This point can well be incorporated into the social learning approach, or a multivariate approach, that includes social learning as an important variable. The final interesting point brought out was the social boldness that was viewed as important. This characteristic is probably a personality asset that increases the likelihood that an individual would be willing to engage in altruism.

Conclusion

Thus, altruism—the voluntarily given action to benefit another done without the anticipation of reward—can be viewed as one form of positive deviance. Discounting everyday acts of kindness or normative altruism as posited by Rosenhan (1970), altruism is a rare form of behavior. Thus, altruism operates outside the realm of what is considered normative in most modern industrial societies and thus, an exemplary form of behavior, it must be classified as a type of positive deviance.

In the case of altruism as positive deviance, various types of variables seem important to explain this type of behavior. Significantly, the person must be active; passive individuals do not make great altruists. Three factors seemingly explain altruism as a type of social behavior: personality, situation, and social learning. Certain people are just more prone to be altruistic, regardless of the situation, which is perhaps partially explained by social learning and the important ties of the family. Most fascinating, perhaps, strong
parental role models have been cited as important: parents who are willing to take unpopular stands and not afraid to risk the criticisms or the stigmatization of their societies. Also, there is an ability to empathize that is important. Yet, to be altruistic, often requires being socially bold and/or being willing to take risks, or living in a society or region where altruism is taken as a matter of course, part of the person's sense of self.
A third kind of positive deviance that has been postulated is that of supra-conformity. Along these lines, Steffensmeier and Terry (1975:4) have pointed to the fact that scant attention has been focused on supra-conventional behavior while much research has been conducted on sub-conventional behavior. Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:59) refer to actions or attributes that exceed expectations as constituting positive deviance. In addition, Buffalo and Rogers (1971) and Ewald (1981) have utilized the concept of positive deviance to mean, in essence, supra-conforming behavior. Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:28) have discussed social idealists as those individuals who share a positive deviant belief. These types of definitions, in a crux, describe supra-conformity as positive deviance. In relation to the classificatory scheme, a good example of a supra-conformist as a positive deviant is the straight-A student as discussed by Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:67) and zealous weight lifters and runners as proposed by Ewald (1981). In order to more fully explain supra-conformity as a form of positive deviance, various types of literature will be examined.
Supra-Conformity

Before describing supra-conformity as a type of positive deviance, an explanatory note must be provided. Supra-conformity must be differentiated from over-conformity. Among those theorists who have discussed overconformity as a behavior are Klapp (1962:82-86), in his typology of American characters, based on heroes, villains, and fools. Klapp (1962:82-86) refers to one group of fools as overconforming fools (i.e., yes-men, rigid fools, prudes or prigs, and high-minded fools) in that they are too extreme in the manner in which they abide to group criterion. As Klapp (1962:86) noted:

Absolute adherence seems fanatical; rules are not sacred but relative; the sensible person conforms 'so much' and no more—'so much' being the amount of actual observance or lip service that others of prestige in that particular game are paying. A person who goes further seems a fool for paying too much for the privilege of playing the game (he is unlikely to make much of it even if not too badly).

In addition, Merton (1957:184) has suggested that one form of adaptation is ritualism which "refers to a pattern of response in which culturally defined aspirations are abandoned while 'one continues to abide almost compulsively by institutional norms.'" In essence, ritualism must be viewed as a type of over-conformity. Hence, before describing supra-conformity, this concept must be separated from that of over-conformity.

Although the term supra-conforming behavior has rarely been used, the basic concept has been often offered by various diverse theorists. Basically, supra-conforming behavior refers to the fact that very few individuals actually abide by the idealized patterns held by a society. Therefore, those people who actually do exist by these standards can be
considered positive deviants, of the supra-conforming persuasion.

To describe this behavior, it will be necessary to start at the most fundamental level. As LaPiere (1934:232-234) pointed out in relation to his study of ethnic guests who frequented hotels and other similar institutions (e.g., auto cabs, restaurants, and cafés), there is no necessary correlation between speech and action, or as Deutscher (1973) so aptly phrased this thought, there is not always a relationship between what we as humans say and what we do.

To take this idea one step further, Warriner (1958:165) in a clinical study of a rural midwestern community, noted the existence of a "...systematic inconsistency between the public and private expressions" of attitudes in relation to the consumption of alcoholic beverages. In other words, the people in "The Village" publicly supported the official ideology that contended not only that drinking was wrong and that only scum drank, but that The Village should remain a dry one. Nevertheless, private behavior did not always adhere to this high standard since, in fact, more than half of the community-for various reasons-felt that drinking in moderation was acceptable behavior. As Warriner (1958:166) noted, "As isolated, persons they know the ideology but do not believe it to be true, but as actors in particular collectivities they will act as if these same beliefs were true."

To illustrate this idea in relation to positive deviance, those people who actually abided by the official collective morality of The Village could be considered positive deviants, of the supra-conforming persuasion. They practiced in their behavior what is portrayed as good or correct by the idealized system of this particular social unit.
Homans (1950:424-426) has suggested that the ideal does not always coincide with real behavior and furthermore, that people are much more in accord in their support of norms (i.e., what people ought to do) than in their actual behavior. Interestingly, Homans (1950:426-427) contended that for a person to be a leader in a group, that individual must abide in action, by the totality of that group's norms, to a greater degree than any follower.

As Sorokin (1948:75) so eloquently noted in regard to this discrepancy:

We daily observe persons and groups who profess high moral standards, but whose moral conduct remains on a low plane. The overwhelming majority of Christians, when slapped on one cheek, fail to offer their other cheek. In general, they practice the norms of the Sermon on the Mount as little as non-Christians, sometimes even less. A scholar may be thoroughly conversant with all the ethical systems, writing excellent treatises in ethics, and yet be as egoistic as the rank and file. In brief, the mere inculcation of ideas of altruism and saintliness is insufficient to elicit corresponding conduct. One may embrace these ideals intellectually, brilliantly analyze them and develop their implications and effectively demonstrate their validity; yet, more often than not, one fails to apply them in one's overt conduct.

As Cohen (1978:93) succinctly expressed this viewpoint in relation to the idea that only a very small number of people—such as Buddha—can attain what is idealized for a society:

The ideal is one thing, the practice another. In other words persons may be variously socialized into the ideological traditions of their society so that the two-ideology and its achievement—are not simply the same thing from different perspectives, but are quite independently variable entities.
This notion has been more explicitly expressed by various theorists. For example, Gerth and Mills (1953:267) have suggested that there are four types of people based on their stance in relation to the attitude toward the ideal or norm and their conduct with reference to the norm or ideal. Type I individuals accept the ideal and act accordingly. While Type II rejects the attitude, but their conduct follows the norm; Type III accepts the attitude, but their actions do not support the norm or ideal. Finally, a Type IV person rejects the attitudes and the actions. Because there will virtually always be violations in relation to norms or ideals, behaviors and attitudes have to be separated or viewed as distinct classes of action. Thus, Type I can be viewed as the positive deviant category. These individuals have internalized these attitudes as ideal as well as have chosen to act accordingly. These norms can cover a variety of types of behaviors. For example, an individual following moral norms is an ethical rigorist, while an individual abiding by religious principles is a saint.

White (1961:6-7) has also posited this idea, noting the existence of a gap between values, or that which people view as what ought to be, and conditions, or what actually exists. Johnson (1978:89) phrased the same concept somewhat differently, positing that reality has two faces in that there is a normative side of that which ought to be and the factual side of what actually does exist. Johnson (1960:8) basically referring to the same idea, noted that norms (i.e., what should be) could be distinguished from operative norms (i.e., a more realistic conception of what actually is and is thus, sanctioned). According to Johnson (1960:8):
A norm is an abstract pattern, held in the mind, that sets certain limits for behavior. An "operative norm" is one that is not merely entertained in the mind but is considered worthy of following in actual behavior; thus, one feels that one ought to conform to it.

Thus, operative social norms are those that are basically enforced in a society, in that those who abide by the norm will be rewarded, while those who violate the norm will be sanctioned. On the other hand, the first type of norm must be viewed as more idealized. Making reference to the Sermon on the Mount, a person not abiding by the standards (e.g., "turning the other cheek") is not going to be negatively sanctioned. Nevertheless, it would appear that since these are idealized norms, a person who consistently turns the other cheek could be viewed as a positive deviant. Blake and Davis (1964:458) make this distinction by referring to the difference between values (or sentiments, themes, or ethical principles) and norms, or particular conduct rules that it is imperative to followed, or that "...represent the cutting-edge of social control" (Blake and Davis, 1964:461). Morris (1956:610-612) also posited this same difference between values and norms, as values are considered to be what is deemed good in society, while norms are prescriptions or proscriptions of how other people should behave, that include sanctions. Norms can range from being more pervasive and more vigorously sanctioned (i.e., absolute norms) or can have more limited applicability (i.e., conditional norms). While values usually serve as a foundation for norms, this is not necessarily always so.

Interestingly, this idea has been supported by empirical research. In a cross-cultural study (i.e., the United States and the Philippines) utilizing college students and examining their attitudes toward sexual
relationships in premarital and other non-marital situations, Eshleman (1981:343-344) found the following results. In the first place, people are the most conservative in their assessment of what they posit to be proper [i.e., values (White, 1961), normative order (Johnson, 1978), norms (Johnson, 1960)]. Nevertheless, people are more permissive in that which they report doing and are most permissive in what the report others are doing [i.e., conditions (White, 1961), factual order (Johnson, 1978), or operative norms (Johnson, 1960)].

Finally, Gibbs (1965), (1981) has written critically and extensively on the nature of norms. In these discussions, the differentiation between [e.g., values (White, 1961)] or what is proper and [e.g., conditions (White, 1961)] or what people are actually doing, have been subsumed under the concept of norm, but as separate entities. After analyzing fourteen standard definitions of norms, Gibbs (1981:7), concluded that most of these definitions are similar to the following one: "A norm is a belief shared to some extent by members of a social unit as to what conduct ought to be in particular situations or circumstances."

Due to the fact that these types of definitions of a norm are necessarily an abstraction from reality, are unidimensional and do not encompass the totality of elements present in the idea of a norm, Gibbs (1981:17-18) has suggested that the idea of "normative properties" be utilized instead of norms. The following are the main normative properties: personal evaluations, perceived valuations, personal expectations, perceived expectations, and distinctive reactions to acts. Obviously, the collective aspects are more important to this discussion. According to Gibbs (1965:589), collective evaluations indicate what
behavior ought to be, collective expectations refer to what behavior will be, and reactions illustrate what actions will be made to make people conform to a certain mode of behavior. The difference between the collective evaluations subcomponent of norms and the collective expectations element of norms is similar to the one that has already been noted. In other words, positive deviance would refer to that category of behavior that not only adheres to collective expectations, but also abides by collective evaluations.

As an example, Gibbs (1965:589) asserted:

Most Americans probably believe that drivers ought to obey traffic regulations, but at the same time they perhaps would refrain from predicting that all of them or even majority of them do so. For that matter, we fully expect all drivers to violate traffic regulations at one time or another, and to do it consciously and deliberately; but we persist in the belief that they ought not do so.

Granted, this example is a more trivial one. Nevertheless, a positive deviant would be an individual who chooses to steadfastly obey all traffic laws.

Gusfield (1963:65) also defined both components as aspects of norms, stating "Norms are both ideal systems of behavior and regularities of action." Finally, as previously noted, Buffalo and Rogers (1971:102) have already utilized the word positive deviance to connote this type of behavior, referring specifically to the concept of norms. Moral norms identify ideal aspects of behavior, while behavioral norms point to actual patterns of behavior.

One further note should be added. Supra-conformity can be viewed in a slightly different, but basically similar manner—the situation in which individuals who pursue norms to their outside limit. In other
words, supra-conformity can be conceived as an intensification of a norm. To reiterate, Ewald (1981:41) has adopted the term in this manner, stating:

Positive deviance is where the relationship to societal norms is not one of blatant violation but rather extension (sic), intensification, or enhancement of social rules. In this case, the zealous pursuit by the general culture.

In essence, to understand this type of or overcommitment to normative prescriptions is what earns the individual or group the label of deviant. The individual or group is essentially true to the normative standards but simply goes "too far" in that plausible or actual results are judged inappropriate behavior is to comprehend adherence to the idealized components of norms.

As an example, Matras (1975:141) pointed to the existence of occupational elites while discussing the privileged strata in relation to the system of social stratification. The occupational elite refers to the most lauded individuals in an occupation or profession, or in other words, basically those people who supra-conform in the manner in which Ewald (1981) noted.

Thus, supra-conformity as a type of positive deviance will be used to refer to that type of behavior which is at the idealized level of a norm, not the expected level.

Supra-Conformity as Positive Deviance

Of those theorists who basically posited supra-conformity as a form of positive deviance, Ewald (1981) has advanced a theoretical approach as an explanation. Weight-lifters and runners who excessively pursue their avocation were examined. To analyze the issue, Ewald
utilized a subcultural framework (i.e., based on Becker's model of marijuana use). The three stages of socialization into the subculture are the following: experience, or learning the techniques; sensation, or learning the effects; and enjoyment, or learning to characterize the effects as desirable when society does not necessarily attach the same meaning. The adoption of divergent meanings also holds for positive deviance in the sense of the intensified pursuit of weightlifting and running. Additionally, the subcultures of weightlifting and running provide the following social supports: an associative structure (i.e., interaction patterns); a reward structure (i.e., recognition and sharing from peers); and an ideological structure (i.e., legitimizing reasons for the respective activities). Ewald (1981:134-154) found that the model adequately explained socialization principles for runners, but not for weightlifting. Weightlifting was deemed to be a subculture of work. All in all, subcultural theory has been advanced as a means to explain supra-conformity as a form of positive deviance.

Due to the paucity of theorizing on this particular subject (i.e., other than the study of Ewald which refers to supra-conformity in one particular manner), to more fully comprehend the nature of supra-conformity as a form of positive deviance, other forms of social science sources will be utilized as a means of attaining the goal of more fully explaining the nebulous area of supra-conformity.

Williams (1970:454-455) has noted that every society sets standards of personal excellence in the areas deemed to be most valuable (e.g., military, religious, or scholarly achievement). In the United States, a central value has been placed on achievement and success, especially as
Merton (1957:136-139,166) noted, on monetary success. This value accompanies the American characteristic of self-reliance, as described by Hsu (1970:237) or those of a this-worldly, technical, non-ascetic, materialistic, energetic and power seeking person as alluded to by Lerner (1970:11-12). On an ironic note, Kaltenbach and McClelland (1958:128-131) found that the people in a small community ranked community service as the most important variable in assessing success or achievement in their town. The next most important factor on the hierarchy of judging success was occupational mobility-income followed by occupational level-education. Nevertheless, success is a crucial value in this culture.

To allow the further exploration of supra-conformity, thus, achievement will be hypothesized as a form of the supra-conformity brand of positive deviance. Williams (1970:458) observed that while a person is capable of achieving without the necessary motivation, there is still a strong correlation between the two factors. Klausmeier and Ripple (1971:314) have offered a very pertinent definition of motive and motivation, stating:

A motive is any condition within the organism that affects its readiness to initiate and continue any activity or sequence of activities. Thus, the experiencing of a need may serve as a motive. Motivation is a more general term, applying either to the strength or duration of a motivational state (e.g., high motivation to study history) or to the regulation of other motives (e.g., the teacher motivated the students to attend the situation).

Veroff, Gurin, and Feld (1962:100) has explained how the relationship between achievement and motivation occurs in the following manner:
Achievement motivation directs people to meeting socialized standards of excellent performance and thus to highly efficient task-centered strivings, whereas power motivation directs people to doing whatever draws attention to their own effect in the world.

More specifically, according to Atkinson (1980:12), motivation affects behavior in influencing how an individual chooses to organize time in regard to pursuits of life, and motivation intensity also nonmonotonically affects performance. Crockett (1967:191-92,98) has described the process uniting motivation and achievement, in relation to occupational motivation, suggesting by means of a research hypothesis that a strong achievement motive induces more realistic endeavors and encourages more ardent effort and perseverance. Similarly, Veroff, Gurin, and Feld (1962:100) noted, "Achievement motive directs people to meeting socialized standards of excellent performance and thus to highly efficient task-centered strivings..." All in all, these factors translate into higher occupational performance than would be associated with weak achievement motive.

Finally, McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1953:79-80) have extensively researched the connection between achievement and motivation, and defined and explained this link in the following way:

This definition of the achievement motive in terms of affect in connection with evaluated performance leaves considerable room for variation as to the type of performance which may be involved...Thus a Navaho may want to be a good sheepherder...an American boy a good businessman. Young males in our culture usually evaluate work or career performance so that references to leadership potential and intelligence increase their Achievement scores...It should not be assumed, of course, that the presence of these signs means the person has actually done well at the task in question. There is no necessary connection between high achievement motivation and more
efficient performance. The standards in terms of which a person evaluates his performance may be quite low objectively or the affect over performance could be predominantly negative because of repeated failures. In either case, a poor performer could show evidence of high achievement motivation. Still, this should be the expectation rather than the rule, since an achievement approach motive at least requires performance that must be fairly close to expectations to yield pleasure; and as performance does approximate expectations, the expectations must increase if it is to continue to yield pleasure. Therefore there should be a significantly positive but moderate correlation between achievement and the actual efficiency of performance of various sorts.

Therefore, much has been explained about the concept of the achievement motivation. To adequately explain the achievement motive as an example of supra-conformity, macro-level factors as well as micro-level ones will be examined. Societal level factors have been explored in relation to the achievement motive. Upon examining various sources of imaginative literature, including children's stories and folk stories, for all types of diverse societies in the modern era, McClelland (1961:105) concluded that an interest by a society in achievement is correlated with accelerated economic growth.

Other cultural factors examined, in regard to the achievement motive, have been in relation to religion, to ethnicity, and to class. Family rearing practices, however, are often posited as the intervening variable to explain the association between the achievement motivation and these cultural variables.

Religion will be examined first. Interestingly, Veroff, Gurin, and Feld (1962:205,213) have concluded that Catholics have higher achievement motivation than do Protestants in the United States. This relationship is attributed to the fact that achievement motives of
Protestants are connected with internalized moralities, but the achievement motives of Catholics are fused with externalized demands for such behavior. Nevertheless, McClelland (1961:47,53) has come to a somewhat different conclusion, suggesting that Protestantism as a religious stance was associated with increased achievement motivation. Based on evidence up to 1950, McClelland (1961:53) concluded that even when discrepancies in natural resources are examined, Protestant countries are more economically advanced than Catholic ones. Utilizing research on child rearing by Winterbottom (1958) and the classic *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, by Weber (1904), McClelland (1961:47) has explained this relationship in the following manner (i.e., child rearing practices are associated with aspects of Protestantism). In the first place, Protestantism (i.e., self-reliance values, etc.), according to Weber's hypothesis, is associated with the spirit of modern capitalism. Protestantism (i.e., self-reliance values, etc.) causes independence and mastery training by parents, which according to Winterbottom's research, affects n achievement in sons. Finally, n achievement in sons in turn will be associated with the spirit of modern capitalism.

Other cultural variables that have been analyzed include ethnicity. Strodtbeck (1958:149,180-88) has examined values and other familial patterns of Italians and Jews. The following values were found to be significant in the attainment of achievement (i.e., in this case, defined as status mobility) in the United States: (1) the belief that a person can and ought to control his own destiny since the world is characterized by regularity; (2) the belief that a person should be ready to leave home to attain goals in life; and (3) a belief that
individual acknowledgement for accomplishments is better than collective accolades. These values were also connected to the way children are raised. In addition, in regard to ethnicity, Rosen (1959:150) concluded that due to the way children are raised (i.e., in relation to independence and achievement training), the achievement motivation is associated to a greater degree with Greeks, Jews, and White Protestants than with Italians, French Canadians, and blacks.

Finally, class has been studied in relation to the achievement motive. Rosen (1956:204) hypothesized, and on the basis of empirical evidence, concluded that the middle class is characterized to a greater extent than the lower class by two essential aspects of an achievement orientation. In the first place, at the psychological level, there is the internalized one of an achievement motivation. Empirically, in a New Haven study of high school students, a significant relationship was found between social position and motivation score. In addition, there are value systems which compose the second facet of a cultural factor. In regard to this component, an association was found between the middle class and the following achievement values of being activistic, future-oriented, and individualistic. These values are inculcated by the institution of the family.

Thus, cultural values as embodied in religious, ethnic, and class differences have been supported as related to achievement motive. However, the family has been hypothesized to be the critical link. Thus micro-level variables must be examined.

As mentioned, aspects of the family, especially as related to child rearing habits, are important to the understanding of the achievement motivation. In addition to the family, individual characteristics
seemingly correlated with the achievement motive will be noted.

In the first place, child rearing practices have been posited as a crucial link in the explanation of the achievement motive. Obviously, as Rosen, Crockett, and Nunn (1969:45) discussed, because of the pivotal role of the family in the socialization process, the family molds individual personalities, and thus, achievement motivation, to a greater extent than any other factor in society. The manner in which the family shapes an individual in regard to achievement motivation has been studied from various angles, but basically posits the same phenomenon.

For example, McClelland (1961:345-346) concluded that high achievement is highly correlated with early mastery training. Nevertheless, to induce this type of motivation, the parental concern cannot be caused by "authoritarianism" or by a desire on the part of the parents to compel the child to achieve just so he/she will not be a hindrance on the child. If the parents, on the other hand, push the child to achieve because they have a sincere interest in having the child become independent, high achievement motivation will result. Optimally, achievement should first be impressed on the child between the ages of six and eight. Other situations which are not conducive to high achievement motivation include the following. In the first place, when a child has an extremely dominant father, neither independence nor high achievement is attained. In the second place, achievement will be low if the child is pampered and stringent standards are not set for the child. Finally, if the child is pushed out on his own before he is ready, achievement will be low.
In a study of mobility as a type of achievement, Rosen (1969:132-135) basically concluded the same, suggesting that achievement motivation has a higher probability of occurring when independence training is imposed on a child by parents. In other words, the parents propel the child in the direction of independence and responsibility, which allows the child to arrive at his own decisions. Nevertheless, Rosen (1969:131) also posited that achievement training on the part of parents is a significant component of high achievement motivation. In other words, parents must impose lofty goals and standards on their children. Additionally, Rosen (1956:211) concluded that after the child has been pushed towards achieving and has accomplished along these lines, there should be a minimal number of restrictions applied by the parents. Thus, the combination of these two socialization practices will produce high achievement motivation.

Regarding other factors about the family, Dubno, Bedrosian, and Freedman (1969:273) found an interesting negative correlation with birth order and high achievement. Rosen, Crockett, and Nunn (1969:46) have examined the importance of demographic variables within the family as an explanatory variable. A small family, for example, is a boon in producing achievement. A smaller family would probably be more conducive to achievement training and independence training.

All in all, the combination of socialization practices involving achievement as a stressed phenomena and some form of independence seem to be important in producing high achievement in children and thus, in adults.
Other micro-level variables that have been posited as important are individual ones, or those at the psychological level. As Rosen, Crockett, and Nunn (1969:7) concluded, other more macro-level factors have an impact on how an individual visualizes his environment and will thus, ultimately taint what he seeks to achieve and thus, what he will actually achieve. In a similar vein, McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1953:287-288) determined that the parents of high achieving college students are perceived by them as self-reliant in the sense that they are not cowered into behaving in a conforming manner.

Another individual characteristic that influences achievement is how much an individual has achieved in the past. Baird (1969:251) found that present achievement is best predicted by past achievement. As Richards, Holland, and Lutz (1967:347-348) noted, the best single predictor of academic achievement among college students is high school grades and the best overall predictor is a combination of high school grades and ACT test scores. In addition, nonacademic accomplishment in fact, is most highly correlated with similar performances in high school.

After examining past achievement, according to Baird (1969:251), the strongest predictors of college achievement are actual life goals and actual self-ratings in a particular area. Hence, individual level factors that have been viewed as correlated with achievement motivation are how a person perceives his environment, past achievement, and how a person perceives himself. All these factors seem to be capable of being adequately intertwined and inherently correlated with the socialization practices (e.g., independence and achievement training) and the cultural values (e.g., activism and mastery) that have previously been discussed.
Consequently, various factors have been found to be associated with high achievement. Societal encouragement of achievement is important. Cultural variables (i.e., including religion, ethnicity, and class) also affect achievement motivation. Family rearing practices are also related to the achievement motivation. Finally, psychological or individual characteristics are significant.

Supra-Conformists as Positive Deviants

Various studies have focused on supra-conformists in the guise of achievers. This research will be analyzed in an attempt to more fully explain supra-conformists.

In the first place, Bullough and Bullough (1971:1048-1050) examined a group of intellectual achievers in eighteenth century Scotland. Prior to that period, a veritable intellectual paucity prevailed, in that nation, unlike the eighteenth century Scotland, which was populated by the countenances of Smith, Hume, Burns, Scott, and Mill (i.e., James). Examining 315 intellectual achievers, Bullough and Bullough (1971:1050-1062) found that the following characteristics were associated with this particular group of supra-conformers. In the first place, there was a tendency for these prominent individuals to come from an urban background. The majority (fifty-five percent) were upper middle class, while eight percent were upper class, twenty-seven percent were lower middle class, and ten percent were working class (i.e., a very low figure when it is considered that ninety percent of the population of Scotland at that time was concentrated in this class). Not surprisingly, the modal occupational category for the father of these individuals were minister and major land owner, with merchants being the next most significant specific occupational title. There was
also a pattern of a slow but steady mobility rise found in the previous generations of these families. Information on religious variables was only available for fifty-five percent of the cases; nevertheless, an interesting finding was encountered. The families of the vast majority were members of the traditional Church of Scotland (i.e., Presbyterian). Nevertheless, by leaving this particular denomination as an adult, a significant portion of this group proved their willingness to stray from this established normative constraint in their lives. A final factor posited as important was that of educational background, especially so in the case of the lower middle class. Only nine persons lacked education; in fact, a university education was extremely common. In conclusion, it can be seen that achievers in eighteenth century Scotland tended to be urban, upper middle class, well educated, and finally, demonstrated a willingness to stray from the conventional pattern set by their families.

Interestingly, Goertzel and Goertzel (1962:vii) attempted to examine the common bonds of the eminent (i.e., "standing high in comparison with others") of the twentieth century. Unfortunately, they utilized the specious reasoning that these 400 eminent people could be identified as those individuals born in the United States who had two books written about their lives and those born in another country who had one book written about their lives, which were housed in the Montclair, New Jersey library. Nevertheless, similarities tended to characterize these individuals. In the first place, Goertzel and Goertzel (1962:3-4) noted that virtually all of these achievers had either one or both parents who were incited by ardent desires to achieve in intellectual or creative fields. Nevertheless, many of these parents
maintained an insouciant or even negative posture toward formal schooling. Consequently, no surprise should be aroused by the finding that sixty percent of the eminent, although usually enormously intelligent or talented, faced severe problems in schools on a repeated basis. This can be attributed to a common pattern of focusing all their attentions in one academic area and a tendency to annoy teachers with their creative brilliance. Goertzel and Goertzel (1962:30-50) also noted that an indifferent attitudinal stance was virtually nonexistent among the parents of the eminent. In fact, the majority of the families supported fervent political views, avowedly sectarian religious opinions, or impassioned liberal religious values. Thus, the parents tended to be not that supportive of traditionally accepted normative patterns of their society. As a result, those children raised in these environments had a tendency to imitate the pattern of their parents rather than to rebel against their parents. Another characteristic found in the majority, according to Goertzel and Goertzel (1962:55-59, 79-102, 130, 153-173, 202), was an example of failure of the father in everyday life, which was often accompanied by an inclination to engage in risk-taking behavior. On the other hand, many of the mothers were dominating, which meant that they visualized through their own children their own ambitious yearnings. In fact, some of the mothers could even be classified as smothering in the sense that they tended to envelop their child in a miniature, almost ethereal world, of which he was the focus. All in all, the homes that producises these eminent people are noted for being troubled ones. Only fifty-eight of 400 of these homes could be described as not troubled, but rather supportive. Tenaciously tremulous afflictions occupied the lives of these eminent as
children; nevertheless, accomplishment was ignited rather than silenced. All in all, the overwhelming majority of the eminent were characterized as arising from troubled circumstances.

Although focusing on different variables, the Goertzel and Goertzel study and the Bullough and Bullough study of prominent achievers both demonstrated a tendency to have non-conformity as a pattern (e.g., in regard to the religious preferences of the eighteenth century Scots and the academic difficulties of those in the twentieth century). Thus, a willingness to stray from the normative seems crucial to achievement. This finding from actual empirical examinations of achievers would seem to mesh quite well with those previously cited of the importance of familial values that enforce independence and self-mastery, which cannot obviously be advanced as a similitude to merely conforming behavior. This finding tends to be corroborated by Hoyt (1960:70-75) of the literature existing in the relationship between college grades and the attainment of post college success. College grades were consistently found to be very feebly correlated with success after college. One exception noted was studies of scholarly achievement as registered by appearance in Who's Who or by some other noteworthy recognition. Valedictorians and Summa Cum Laude university graduates had a much higher probability of achieving; while Cum Laude graduates did not really have any greater chance of achieving than other graduates. Obviously, those individuals only willing to go barely beyond conforming level are not destined to become eminent to the extent of those individuals who are motivated to supra-conform, or to go outside of that which is normative.
Other studies that have been conducted of the eminent reveal many facets of this issue. For example, Veroff, Gurin, and Feld (1962:115-118) examined characteristics of those individuals with high achievement motivation. Men with high achievement motivation appear to be not only extremely inclined toward their work; but also are so oriented as to efficiently meeting the criterion of excellence. For women, achievement motives seem to be more applicable to areas outside of the work realm. Nevertheless, both men and women are thus very well socialized individuals in the various aspects of their lives. As Veroff, Gurin, and Feld (1962:120) succinctly concluded:

For both men and women there emerges a picture of the achievement motive as a measure of socialized assertive motivation for fulfilling expected roles. Adjustment to these external standards of excellence seems to be quite critical. People with high achievement motives seem not only to have assumed these standards, but in trying to fulfill them work out a satisfying pattern of life adjustment.

Research done by Allen (1955:186-187) which indicated aspects of achievement within one specific occupation, also supported this previous finding. In this case the Methodist ministry was chosen. Basically, it was found that success, as defined by upward mobility, can be most prominently attributed to successful interpersonal interaction with both lay people and with other colleagues. Thus, knowledge is not adequate to achieve in life. The capacity to utilize knowledge in social interaction on a daily basis is crucial.

Other factors have been emphasized by researchers examining actual groups of supra-conformists. For example, Ghiselli (1968:480-488) has advanced the importance of trait and motivational factors. Successful achievement was in fact, measured by accomplishment in the realm of
middle management positions for various types of business and industrial organizations. The traits that were found to have a significant impact on success in management were intelligence, supervisory ability, and self-assurance. In addition, the motivational factors that were deemed to be important were the desire for job security, for attractive financial compensation, and for self-actualization. Interestingly, the traits mesh well with previous findings in that supervisory ability and intelligence seem to be supportive of the research of Allen (1955). Also while the first two motivations do not appear to have been as important in other research, the motivation for self-actualization is tied in well with previous finding of the need to foster mastery and independence in children.

Analyses of MBA's—in this case all Stanford graduates—who have attained success have also been conducted. In regard to those MBA's who were the most significant achievers (i.e., interestingly, albeit, appropriately measured in monetary terms) in small businesses five years after completing their MBA's at Stanford, Harrell (1970:373) found that the only significant difference at the .01 level dividing high achievers or low achievers was ascendance or the ability to be socially bold. In some respects, this is blatant supra-conformity in that it is a willingness to take the extra step beyond mere conformity. According to Harrell and Harrell (1973:127-134), various characteristics were found to be influential in explaining why certain individuals reached general management (i.e., success) at an earlier age than others. This factor is especially susceptible to being defined as success since the policy of the Stanford Graduate School of Business was to train students not to become specialists, but rather to become general managers. The
personality and leadership characteristics that were important in explaining the difference were general activity, ascendance, supervisory qualities, decisiveness, and social extroversion. Thus, seemingly, the work of Allen (1955) has been supported again. According to Harrell (1969:459-462), important characteristics of successful MBA's (i.e., high earning MBA's) in big business are ascendance (once again), high energy levels which could be translated into a willingness to endure a longer work week, higher social interest and peer ratings, and higher self-confidence and a self-perception that one has previously been successful in life.

All in all, various similar strands run through these various studies of supra-conformists, or positive deviants. Obviously, as previously cited the desire or motivation to achieve is paramount. Also, there seems to be a willingness to deviate from conventional normative guides of behavior, or at least to be socially bold, to go beyond that which is normatively or normally expected. On the other hand, it still has been demonstrated that there is a necessity to be able to have good interpersonal skills. In other words, the person cannot so completely be non-conforming that he cannot relate to those other individuals that compose his particular social world, or his arena for achievement.

**Conclusion**

Supra-conforming behavior has been advanced as a specific form of positive deviance. Supra-conformity, must be viewed as a willingness not only to attain what is prescribed as normative, but also a willingness to pursue, in quixotic fashion, if necessary, that which is idealized. In other words, a supra-conforming individual is
transcendent in the sense that mere adequacy is not sufficient.

As a result of the nature of this type of positive deviance, achievers could be viewed to be an exemplar of supra-conformity. Achievers are those that are not content to idly watch the ebbs of life pass by. Rather, the flows of life are actively pursued. Consequently, the findings in relation to the achievement motivation as a type of supra-conformity and those who actually achieve as examples of positive deviants are exactly synchronized with this willingness to persist in the path towards excellence that have been defined by any particular society. For example, homes in which independence and mastery (i.e., which can be transformed into an ability not to always be bound by societal prescriptions) are more likely to produce individuals with a high achievement motive, and thus, a high probability of achieving.

All in all, supra-conformity can be seen as one type of positive deviance.
CHARISMA AS A FORM OF POSITIVE DEVIANCE

The fourth form of positive deviance that has been proposed is that of charisma. Wilkins (1965:45-47) has pointed to religious leaders as a type of positive deviance. For the most part, religious leaders will often be considered charismatic figures. As specific historical examples of positive deviants, Sorokin (1950:81) has discussed Gandhi and Jesus—essentially considered charismatic leaders by theorists who have analyzed charisma. In essence, in relation to the classification, these figures, for all intents and purposes, are charismatic individuals. Hence, charisma will be analyzed.

Charisma

In reference to charisma, Burns (1978:244) has stated that the usage of the word "...has become cheapened. Lyndon Johnson would complain that his trouble was that he lacked 'charisma' (a word he pronounced with a soft 'ch'-to the derision of the intelligentsia." Consequently, the original sociological use of charisma as presented by Max Weber will be examined first.
According to Weber (1947:325-327), one of the preeminent sociological theorists of the nineteenth century, charisma could be considered to be one of the three types of legitimate authority. In somewhat of a dispute, Bierstedt (1974:339-340) has noted in general, and Bendix (1962:298) has stated specifically in regard to charisma, leadership is a different phenomenon than authority. Similarly, Friedrich (1961:12) criticized Weber for mixing up the concepts of power and leadership with rule and rulership. The crux of the issue, according to Bierstedt (1974:340) is that "A leader can only request; and authority can require." Nevertheless, this point does not really seem quite as crucial in regard to charisma, since the relationship between the leader and followers is of a voluntary nature. Whether or not the followers adhere to the leader because of a request or due to a requirement, they still choose to follow.

The next important point made by Weber (1947:325-327) is that authority could be arranged into three categories based on the type of assertion made for legitimacy. This claim in fact, will produce different kinds of obedience, administrative staff, and ways of practicing authority. At any rate, the three pure types of legitimate authority are the following: rational-legal, traditional, and charismatic. Rational-legal authority is predicated on the view that there is an inherent legality imbued in the "patterns of normative rules" or the office. Accordingly, any individual who holds that office is extended the authority to command to the full extent, yet within the confines, of the perogatives granted to that particular office. Traditional authority, on the other hand, encompasses those cases, in which personal loyalty becomes important in the sense of following the
individual who possesses the existing traditionally sanctioned position of authority. Thus, cultural continuity is assured. Charismatic authority, on the other hand, can be viewed as being of a different class than either rational-legal authority or traditional authority, since according to Parsons (1969:662) the "apartness" separates it from the routine or the ordinary, or as Gerth and Mills (1946:52) explained, charisma is contrary to institutional routine. Routine is opposed to creativity. In fact, as Eisenstadt (1968:xxi), if the charismatic leader can infuse this creativity and extraordinary ability and create the transformation of an institutional structure, the true test of a charismatic leader has been met. On the other hand, according to Weber (1946:245), both rational-legal and traditional authority are characterized by permanence.

Thus, as Weber (1947:327) noted, the charismatic claim to legitimacy is based on the devotion of followers to the believed extraordinary qualities of their leader and the authority is based on their willingness to obey the leader. Not surprisingly, the term charisma, which was adopted from the usage of early Christianity referred to "the gift of grace." Weber (1947:358-359) offered a more comprehensive explanation of charisma in the following manner:

The term 'charisma' will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader...How the quality in question would be ultimately judged from any ethical, aesthetic, or other such point of view is naturally entirely indifferent for purposes of definition. What is alone important is how the individual is actually regarded by
those subject to charismatic authority by his 'followers' or 'disciples'.

One important point that Weber (1947:359) also noted was that this quality can be attributed to people viewed as having gifts in different areas, including for example, intellectuals, shamans (magicians), war leaders, heroes, and to prophets.

Regarding the essential nature of charisma, the acceptance of the leader by the followers, is conclusive. As Weber (1947:359) explained:

It is recognition on the part of those subject to authority which is decisive for the validity of charisma. This is freely given and guaranteed by what is held to be a 'sign' or proof, originally always a miracle, and consists in devotion to the corresponding revelation, hero worship, or absolute trust in the leader. But where charisma is genuine, it is not this which is the basis of the claim to legitimacy. This basis lies rather in the conception that it is the duty of those who have been called to a charismatic mission to recognize its quality and to act accordingly.

This acceptance involves an almost consecration on the part of the followers. Another point addressed by Weber (1947:360) is the fact that when the leader is not able any longer to offer proof or evidence of his charismatic qualities, he will probably feel that his god-like or magical or heroic abilities are gone. Considering the original use of the word as a "gift of grace," it is surprising that if these proofs come to be missing for a period of time, the ability of the leader to exercise charismatic authority will be gone.

According to Weber (1947:360-361), "The corporate group which is subject to charismatic authority is based on an emotional form of communal relationship." The staff of the leader is composed of individuals chosen for their charismatic attributes (i.e., their sense
of a "call"; not on the basis of either specialized education or on the basis of favorable social standing.

All in all, as noted by Weber (1947:361-363), charisma is outside of ordinary daily events and thus, in certain historical eras, charisma serves as a basis for revolutionary potentialities.

The final major issue analyzed by Weber (1947:364) in regard to charisma, is that of the routinization of charisma. In fact, Eisenstadt (1968:ix) pointed to the fact that Weber in effect, overemphasized the bifurcation between charisma and the routine and the institutionalized. Weber, however, did hypothesize that charisma can become routinized. For charisma to be enduring rather than ephemeral, the nature of charismatic authority must be vastly altered. In fact, the following are ways that the succession of the leader can be accomplished. The replacement for the charismatic figure can be picked because of personal qualities which make him appropriate for taking over the role. Like Saul, the leader can also be chosen on the basis of revelation, such as oracles or lots. As was the case for the Roman magistracies, the charismatic leader can take on this responsibility of ensuring continuity. Another type of succession occurs when the administrative staff makes the designation of the new leader. Hereditary charisma occurs when the relatives of the leader are viewed as the natural successors. Finally, the problem of routinization can be solved by ritual (i.e., an objectification of charisma) conveyance from the charismatic leader to another individual. Importantly, Weber (1948:367-369) noted that the administrative staff will usually also routinize at the same time. Consequently, among other factors, norms will often be established for recruitment. Also, the original antipathy
towards any noteworthy concern focused on economic considerations often has to be modified. These processes may not remain free from conflict. All in all, the process of routinization does change the original nature of charisma. Nevertheless, there necessarily is continuity between the original charisma and the resulting routinization. As Eisenstadt (1968:xxi) so perceptively noted:

The very coining of these terms indicates that the test of any great charismatic leader lies not only in his ability to create a single event or great movement, but also in his ability to leave a continuous impact on an institutional structure-to transform any given institutional setting into it some of his charismatic vision, by investing the regular, orderly offices, or acts of social organization with some of his charismatic qualities and aura.

In fact, Etzioni (1975:307), delving into the issue of routinized charisma, suggested that personal charisma can be attained in various ways within the confines of an established office. For example, simply by juxtaposing the names of Franklin D. Roosevelt with Harding, or Churchill with Baldwin, the point becomes rather evident.

In conclusion, it should be noted that charisma as positive deviance could occur as an original force, as a transcendence of original force with routinization, or could appear first as routinized charisma. In relation to positive deviance this is not really the most crucial point.

One other point should be appropriately dispensed at this point. In regard to charisma, Friedrich (1961:15) expressed an aversion to similarly categorizing Jesus Christ and Hitler. Nevertheless, as Weber (1947:359) subtly expressed in his contention that Joseph Smith, the leader of the Mormons, was a fraud, the crucial point, is how the
followers receive that particular figure. Thus, if various charismatic figures that are now viewed as negative, are examined within the context of their particular historical era and by their following, the charismatic appeal and processes are the same. In other words, as is the case with positive deviance and with negative deviance, relativity becomes an important issue. Designations can and do change.

**Charisma as Positive Deviance**

As explained by Weber (1947:327), charisma involves a relationship between a leader and his followers. As Yinger (1970:475-520) noted, there are some situations (i.e., including the needs of the people in that context), which tend to produce leaders with certain qualities and to thrust them into influential positions and certain individuals, at the same time, are able to utilize their own charismatic qualities to take full advantage of these conditions. Thus, charismatic leaders, according to Zaleznik (1974:225), emerge from circumstances which center on both personal and historical conflicts.

Thus, the two components are equally significant. As Tucker (1968:744) suggested, people are more prone to accept a charismatic leader during periods of stress. Forms of stress can include physical and material anguish, persecution, catastrophes, economic problems, alienation, psychic or emotional distress. In addition, a combination of these various factors can produce the condition of stress within a particular society. Willner (1968:38-44), in her specific discussion of charisma in the political arena, noted the following stresses that can exist within a society: industrialization, growth of literacy in a society, and the effect of colonialism. In addition, stress is produced by the impact of war, economic crises, and internal violence. Thus, the
situation is relevant in the generation of a charismatic leader. As Freidland (1964:21) so aptly noted, "In sum, while there are plenty of people with messages, these must be relevant to social groups before they begin to be received and become the basis for action." On the other hand, the leader is also an active figure in this drama as Dow (1969:309) pointed out. In other words, the role of the leader as an exceptional figure along with his particular ideas is essential to this charismatic relationship. According to Willner (1968:7-8), the attributes of the potential leader and his ability to provide some cognitive orientation to a desirable goal for the group.

Thus, the charismatic leader can be viewed as emerging from some dialectic tension between a leader and his followers. For Willner (1968:14), at some point, charismatic legitimation must transpire, which means that process by which the leader acquires and eventually maintains the adherence of a following.

How, then specifically does this charismatic phenomenon occur? According to Willner (1968:35) there is a process of convergence and catalyzation of the context in which the followers find themselves (i.e., of the deficiencies of the institution in that context) and of the social and psychological necessities of the followers. The three following factors play a role in this process and must be examined: latent conditions, precipitant conditions, and perceptual reality. In the first place, latent conditions suggest that there is a basic tension in the social system. Consequently, some group in that society may feel dissatisfied; this can cause conflict and which can also create an environment which is conducive to spectacular changes. Secondly, precipitant conditions refer to conditions that acutely aggravate those
strains or that create new ones in a system. Finally, there is perceptual reality which refers to the values and opinions pertaining to these factors about their society, shared by individuals in that society.

As the other part of this phenomenon, a process of crystallization occurs in which the potential charismatic leader is the key. According to Willner (1968:45) this process is composed of two parts. In the first place, the potential charismatic leader has to perform the important duty of "crystallizing and catalyzing the call to which he seems to respond." Secondly, the charismatic leader to be plays an important part in the crisis that apparently led to the initial desire for the leader. All in all, the leader can aid the group in their attempt to define the situation.

Willner (1968) basically examined political charismatic leadership. In specific reference to the case of religious charismatic leadership and the social situation which leads to its rise, Barnes (1978:3-6) has hypothesized that the following four propositions explain conditions that lead to the emergence of charismatic leadership. In the first place, the perception of objective symbols becomes important. Objective symbols can be viewed as alienated and de-alienated. Religion, which is usually marked by alienation, is opposed to de-alienation. Barnes (1978:3) defines de-alienation [i.e., based on Berger (1969:96-101)] in the following manner: "...the conscious realization that the social world is humanly constructed and therefore unstable." Charismatic leaders can be de-alienated in the mystical sense or in the prophetic sense. According to Barnes (1978:3) this process of the perception of objective symbols results in the following manner:
Charismatic leaders usually have an intimate connection with a transcendent or immanent divine source. This intense connection with a force or being beyond everyday or normal reality enables the leader to perceive religious symbols in a de-alienated fashion. Secondly, because charismatic leaders manipulate religious symbols, they recognize that they are subject to change. Charismatic leaders who preach a "return to the true faith" do so because they have received private confirmation that the symbols of the "true faith" are an adequate manifestation or representation of the divine. The experience of or communication with a divine source will always take precedence over or complement previously revealed religious tradition. One common mechanism for religious change involves the claim that the leader has received from a divine source an updated version of previously established, religious doctrine. However, a leader whose personal experience does not take precedence over religious tradition would be classified as alienated.

In the second place, Barnes (1978:4) postulates that charismatic leadership will emerge during a period of social change, specifically of extreme social change. On the other hand, some part of the population will feel in some respects, estranged from the society and this is also a likely situs for the development of charismatic leadership. The situation of crisis is imperative. As Barnes (1978:4) so appropriately suggested, "Without proper social conditions the society would regard the potential leader as an eccentric getting excited over nothing."

The third hypothesis, according to Barnes (1978:4-5) refers to institutionalization and the teachings of the leader. That is, for a recently developed religion to become institutionalized, the teachings of the charismatic leaders need to be innovative. This situation results from the fact that any religion grounded in charismatic leadership lacks steadiness. Charismatic leaders can appeal to followers through their individual manner and/or through their
particular teachings. Thus, when a charismatic leader dies, the content of their teaching is what determines if the religion endures. Along these lines, Burns (1978:241) suggested that Moses, a quintessential charismatic figure, affected history through both his personality and through his ideas.

The final point discussed by Barnes (1978:5-6) concerns the relationship of charismatic leaders and traditional religion. In other words, charismatic leadership is not viewed as necessarily anti-institutional in several respects. According to Barnes (1978:6) "...charismatic leaders can occupy an office within a religious organization, they may be inside of the religious tradition exclusively, or they can be the founder of a completely new religious tradition and institution."

Thus, Barnes (1978) has postulated a fairly comprehensive view of the phenomenon of religious charismatic leadership, in which the important roles played by both the followers and the leader has been emphasized. Consequently, the charismatic situation (i.e., political, religious, etc.) is composed of active processes on the part of followers and leaders.

The role of followers needs to be examined in more depth at this point. Not surprisingly, as previously mentioned, charismatic leaders tend to emerge in non-normative situations, or those of stress. According to Willner and Willner (1965:80) one location where charismatic leadership—either positive or negative—thrives is in newly emergent states that were previously governed by colonial powers. As another example, Stewart (1974:139-145) has detailed the case of Henry Alline, a charismatic religious leader in Nova Scotia during the last
quarter of the eighteenth century. These settlements, which were insulated from Halifax, the capital, and from other settlements, were dispersed throughout the coastal area. Prior to 1775, these settlers, including many originally from New England, had neither succeeded economically nor had any form of stability been reached. To make matters worse, during the American Revolutionary War era, these settlements supported neither side, yet experienced repercussions from both sides. Apprehension and dubiety abounded throughout the regions where these settlements were located. Thus, stress prevailed which led to the emergence of the charismatic preacher, Henry Alline, who addressed the concerns of these settlers and was accepted by the people as God's messenger. Thus, a leader can offer salve during distress. As Marcus (1961:238) explained, although Churchill did not really logically offer anything better than other leaders, he did seem to have an ability to soothe and to restore the confidence of the people of Great Britain during the Second World War.

How then does a following emerge for the leader? According to Willner and Willner (1968:81):

The process, broadly stated is one of interaction between the leader and his followers. In the course of this interaction the leader transmits, and the followers accept, his presentation of himself as their predestined leader, his definitions of their world as it is and as it ought to be, and his conviction of his mission and their duty to reshape it.

Any charismatic leader will have a following composed of various groups. For example, a prominent elite group will be composed of a few individuals who adhere to the leader at the incipient stages of the movement.
Utilizing the writings of Weber and of Freud (i.e., on totemism, in which he did not specifically utilize the term charisma), Hummel (1975:760) has presented a psycho-social explanation of charisma. In other words, the issue of why a group of followers will turn to a charismatic leader, is addressed. All of the conditions must be met for charisma to exist. Utilizing first the Weberian explanation and then the similar Freudian theory, Hummel (1975:760) explains the role of the follower in the following manner:

'Charisma' exists as the experience of a follower when there is (1) a moment of distress/object-loss, (2) complete personal devotion to a leader/love projection, (3) experiencing the leader's qualities as extra-ordinary or supernatural/sense of the uncanny produced by unconscious nature of projection.

Thus, when a great number of people in the society feel distress or object-loss Hummel (1975:769-770) suggests in the following manner, that the effects of charisma will be as follows:

Charisma is widely distributed in society as the experience of followers when masses of individuals all feel themselves cut off from the same object. This is possible especially when the object was socially shared as are the symbols, personages, and institutions of state, economy, and religion. To the extent that object loss involves the central guiding institutions of a society, the successful substitute object of the charismatic figure can come to represent all essential links between the individual and society. This accounts for the absoluteness of his rule and the totality of his follower's devotion.

In regard to the appeal of the charismatic leader to his followers, Willner and Willner (1965:82) have defined this attraction as having two components. The first stage involves the leader appealing to his
following(s) based on the particular concerns and confusions of the various groups in a society. This step can be seen as being important in relation to helping to resist traditional aspects of the system while at the same time, pointing in the direction of a new one. At a more profound level, as another stage, the charismatic leader can become linked in the minds of his society, with the venerated heroes and in a sense, the almost mythical figures of a society.

Thus, the following of a charismatic leader does tend to emerge under certain conditions, including situations of stress. In the next section of the paper, the other part of this charismatic situation—the charismatic leader—will be examined in greater depth.

Charismatic Leaders as Positive Deviants

Charismatic leaders will be examined as positive deviants. Reiterating previously stated notions about the nature of a charismatic leader, Bierstedt (1974:340) has defined the phenomenon in the following manner:

A charismatic leader is believed to be different from other men; he rises above them because he is touched with divinity; there is something of the celestial "afflatus" about him, and an almost tangible magnetism. He operates beyond the boundaries of legitimacy. He needs no extant organization in society because he creates his own, a new and sometimes a revolutionary one.

For example, as noted by Shokeid (1979:190), in his study of North-African Jews who immigrated to Israel, the Jewish people of the Atlas Mountains said of their religious leaders, who were most associated with charismatic qualities, that they were hem hayu medaberim ba-shamayim (i.e., they conversed with heaven). Thus, according to
Bierstedt (1974:340), Jesus was a charismatic leader; simply by virtue of his office, the Pope is not. Gandhi and Martin Luther King were charismatic leaders; Nehru and Ralph Abernathy were not. Yet, at the same time, charismatic-non-charismatic leadership should be viewed as forming a continuum, not discrete entities. Thus, for example, Franklin D. Roosevelt and DeGaulle are harder to categorize. The range of charismatic leaders is immense. For example, Willner (1968:53) has studied the following individuals as examples of political charismatic leaders: Ataturk, Castro, Gandhi, Hitler, Lenin, Magsaysay, Mao, Mussolini, Nasser, Nkrumah, Peron, Roosevelt, Sukarno, Toure and U Nu. Barnes (1978:7) posited that the following were examples of religious charismatic leadership: Mahavira, Bal Shem Tov, Guru Nanak, Baha’ "O'Llah, Muhammad, Buddha, Nichiren, Calvin, Luther, Joseph Smith, George Fox, Confucious, Jesus, Gandhi, and Martin Luther King.

In regard to charisma, as previously noted, active roles are engaged in by both the leader and the following. As discussed by Willner (1968:45) the charismatic leader performs the important functions of "crystallizing and catalyzing" the need of the followers to which he is responsive. As Marcus (1961:237) summarized "...the charismatic figure focuses their quest for transcendence back into worldly and social activism, and into the consciousness of history."

An important issue that needs to be examined why certain individuals, given the right situation (i.e., a time or deep distress), emerge as charismatic leaders. Willner (1968:51-55) has analyzed the backgrounds of fifteen political charismatic leaders and found the following characteristics to be associated with this phenomenon. A political charismatic leader at the national level must have the ability
to appeal to and to inspire many diverse groups within a society. As a consequence, marginal individuals, as a result of having been exposed to different groups in a society, are more likely to be capable of establishing rapport with various types of groups. The following variables or a combination of some of these variables were hypothesized to be associated with charismatic leadership, since they lead to the marginality of an individual. In the first place, a heterogeneous family background on dimensions like class, religion, or ethnicity is viewed as being correlated with charismatic leadership. In the second place, another variable postulated is that of family mobility and/or instability while the charismatic leader was young. A final characteristic is that of the mobility of the leader, or at least, exposure to different cultural contexts while he was growing up. Empirically analyzing fifteen charismatic leaders, the only charismatic political figures who deviated from this pattern of heterogeneity were Hitler, Roosevelt, and U Nu.

In addition, Willner (1968:61-68), described a charismatic cluster, or characteristics that either a charismatic leader does possess or is viewed by his followers as possessing. In the first place, the charismatic leader needs to be associated—in the perceptions of his followers—with incredible amounts of energy. In the second place, the charismatic leader needs to face troubles and stress with equanimity. A final quality of this charismatic cluster is that of projecting considerable mental capacity. In other words, while the individual does not necessarily have to be viewed as a veritable intellectual, the person does have to be seen as a mental legend in the sense of having extensive knowledge or possessing the ability to be creative with this
mind.

Finally, Willner (1978:72) has noted an important function that the charismatic leader must perform: he aids in the emergence of support for his cause. In the first place, the charismatic figure must be able to merge the distresses and complaints of a variety of alienated groups into a common grievance and political goal. In addition, according to Willner (1968:72) the leader has to have the ability to "...formulate or elaborate a compelling doctrine that embodies the private dreams and desires of many different people and that elevates these into a public and frequently millenial vision." As Willner (1968:73-104) explained, the charismatic figure will try to become associated in the minds of his following with that aspect (i.e., values, myths, symbols, and historic figures) in their society which is considered venerated or sacred or legendary. Two strategies available for accomplishing this goal are evocation and invocation. Evocation refers to the particular characteristics of a leader that auspiciously lead a following to imagine some sort of bond between the leader and the important symbols of that society. Consequently, new and valuable characteristics can come to be associated with the charismatic leader. On the other hand, invocation refers to a more willfully chosen pattern of actions by the political leader. These strategies will vary depending on the situation in which the leader is located. Brilliant rhetorical skills are an important means for achieving this end. The leader may consciously utilize or just simply refer to the cultural symbols and myths to appeal to his following. As an example, Sukarno owned a magical kris that was believed to possess rare powers.
All in all, the role played by the charismatic leader is not passive; that is, the charismatic leader does not simply emerge because the situation of his necessitates the generation of a charismatic leader. Rather, he is an active participant in the scenario that unfolds.

This point was also well demonstrated by Freidland (1964:22-23) in an empirical study of charismatic leaders in Tanganyika. The vicissitudes of the social structure which created a climate ripe for the emergence of charismatic figures was first analyzed. With the attainment of European dominion that began during the 1880's, the incipient changes in the economic and social structures of the society, caused severe problems with the traditional indigenous structures. Consequently, the inhabitants of Tanganyika started to feel increasingly unsettled with their circumstances. Once this situation of distress existed, as Freidland (1964:23-25) explained, a number of factors in Tanganyika then led to the rise of specific charismatic figures. The first important factor is that of expression, or the ability of a potential leader to vocalize the imperfectly formulated feeling of the population. In Tanganyika, for example, this involved a demand for political change. A second important factor is that expression is not sufficient; concomitantly, the activities involved with the expression should be viewed as being dangerous as well as important by society. For example, the statements made by Lumumbaba which impugned European hegemony, could have resulted in his imprisonment. Finally, the activities engaged in by the charismatic figure must be recognized as successful. These achievements—even if small at the beginning—can serve to legitimize the position of the emerging leader. Interestingly, then,
the charismatic leader needs to be willing to take risks.

Two points stressed by Barnes (1978:3) in regard to important characteristics need to be reiterated. Charismatic leaders need to be de-alienated and the teachings of the leader need to be innovative. In a cross-cultural empirical study (i.e., which included individuals from different eras of history of fifteen religious charismatic leaders and their successors), Barnes (1978:10) found that the leaders differed from their followers at a significant level in regard to perception of objective symbols (i.e., alienation-de-alienation), the essence of their teachings, and the institutional settings. The only hypothesis of the original four that was not significant at the .05 level was that of a period of social change. This phenomenon resulted not because the original charismatic leader did not live in a period of social change (i.e., in fact, ninety-three percent of them did live in a tumultuous era) but rather, most of the immediate successors also lived in a period of social change.

Thus, what the charismatic leader does to help set himself apart as extraordinary is crucial. Some background characteristics such as marginality may give him the capabilities to attempt to elevate his position. Yet, the leader still needs to be able to engage in some actions that set him apart as a transcendent bearer of a gift. These activities could include, for example, vocalizing the concerns of his following or being willing to engage in hazardous activities on their behalf. In fact, Johnson (1979:316-317) has suggested that there are strategies available to the charismatic leader to help him invigorate his position including to make his followers more dependent (i.e., for social, emotional and material exigencies) upon him and to expand the
organization.

Obviously, the charismatic leader needs to believe in his powers and present himself to the public as such. This phenomenon was demonstrated by Henry Alline, an eighteenth century charismatic religious figure in Nova Scotia. As Stewart (1974:142) noted in regard to Alline:

Alline's image as a messenger sent by God was enhanced by his own emotional rhetoric in which he identified himself as a type of Messiah, by his extensive travels in all seasons over hitherto unused routes and by his novel techniques such as organizing large singing processions of his 'triumphant' followers. Those who sympathized with the revival accepted the reality of this image and regarded Alline as a divinely inspired messenger.

Not surprisingly, Burke and Brinkerhoff (1981:276-282) in an empirical study of charisma focusing on Pierre Trudeau and Joe Clark, found significant personality variables separating these two figures and charismatic-non-charismatic individuals, in general. Creating a semantic differential scale and utilizing exploratory factor analysis, the items that were found to be significant clustered in the following manner. The first important group of factors included the following characteristics that best applied to charismatics-non-charismatics (in that order): leader-follower; creative-unimaginative; special-ordinary; respected-unrespected; and impressive-unimpressive. The second clustering of factors included the following: confident-unconfident; exciting-dull; energetic-unenergetic; and powerful-weak. The final cluster included these two characteristics: intelligent-stupid and magnetic-repulsive. Interestingly, Pierre Trudeau was found to be located more toward the charismatic end of the scale more toward all
these characteristics than was Joe Clark.

It can be concluded that these are personality characteristics that would be very important in the active role that a charismatic leader must engage in to be successful. All in all, the activities that a charismatic leader undertakes are as essential to the emergence of charisma as is the situation in which he emerges.

Conclusion

Thus, charismatic behavior has been postulated to be a particular type of positive deviance. A charismatic leader is an individual who is accepted by a segment of his society (i.e., his following) as having some remarkable gift that thus, distinguishes that individual from the rest of the people in his society, who are viewed as common or ordinary.

Obviously, then the charismatic relationship necessarily has to be viewed as composed of two essential components: a situation that provides fertile ground for the rise of a charismatic leader (i.e., a following that wants to be led) and an individual that has the capabilities to meet the exigencies of that following (i.e., a leader who can respond to that particular following). Thus, charismatic leaders also work to achieve their position. Not surprisingly, then charismatic leaders have been found to be associated, for example, with some of the following active characteristics: an ability to provide innovative teachings and the ability to vocalize and direct the grievances of a society. In other words, the charismatic leader performs. Thus, having come from a more marginal background allows a potential charismatic leader to increase the probability of being able to reach an audience.
Consequently, charismatic behavior should be accepted as a type of positive deviance. In the case of charismatic leadership, one factor seems pertinent. Since the charismatic relationship is dependent on an individual being designated as a charismatic leader by a group, then, obviously the designations are subject to imminent change and to divergent expectations by other societies or by other parts of a society. Hence, positive deviance can easily be transformed into negative deviance.
CHAPTER IX

INNATE CHARACTERISTICS AS A FORM OF POSITIVE DEVIANCE

The final type of positive deviance postulated is that of innate characteristics. Physical attractiveness or intelligence or talent are innate attributes (i.e., although definitions of attractiveness or intelligence are socially and culturally defined and obviously affected to a certain unspecified extent by environmental factors). Exceptionally beautiful women have been proposed to be positive deviants (Hawkins and Tiedeman, 1975:59; Lemert, 1951:23-24). As a more actualized category of this phenomenon, Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:29) have referred to beauty queen winners as positive deviants. In regard to intelligence, whether innate, or innate and achieved, Winslow (1970:121) has suggested that wisdom is a type of positive deviance, Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:28) have noted extraordinary intelligence, and Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:59) and Lemert (1951:23-24) have pointed to geniuses as positive deviants. Finally, there is the case of actualized talent as a form of innate characteristics. Pro quarterbacks and Olympic Gold Medal winners have been referred to as positive deviants by Steffensmeier and Terry (1975:4), superstar
athletes by Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:28), and motion picture stars by Lemert (1951:23-24).

Thus, these various cases of innate characteristics, extant or actualized, have been discussed as positive deviance. Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:28) referred to this type of phenomenon, as deviant attributes, in the following manner: "Deviant attributes often are the products of one's biological inheritance, which accounts for such conditions as rare beauty, extraordinary intelligence, or dwarfism."

Since there really is no theoretical perspective on innate characteristics, the process of defining the physically attractive and the intelligent will be examined. To more fully comprehend innate characteristics as positive deviance and bearers of innate characteristics as positive deviants, the physically attractive will be explored.

I n nate C h aracteristics

Physical A ttractivity

The physically attractive are treated as positive deviants in that physical appearance is an innate characteristic that is differentially treated and acted upon. As Byrne (1971:127,131) proposed:

It would seem safe to propose that in our society, physical attractiveness is a positively valued attribute. That is, both males and females would prefer to be attractive rather than unattractive, to have attractive friends, to marry an attractive spouse, and to produce attractive offspring. Such concerns seem both arbitrary and petty in the abstract, but they are obviously of considerable personal import in the concrete world of dating, television commercials, and cosmetic surgery...Clearly, the proposition that members of our culture attach meaning to physical attractiveness is supported.

Obviously, physical attractiveness can be viewed as a form of positive
deviance. Nevertheless, crucial issues are raised. What is physical attractiveness? Who are the physically attractive? Perhaps, as in the case of art, as suggested by Gillespie and Perry (1973:49), the important point is the meaning a public attaches to an individual since there is no inherently compilable way to answer this question. Thus, according to Berscheid and Walster (1964:176), these types of questions have no conclusive nor satisfactory responses. Cultural standards do seem to exist. According to Morse, Reis, Gruzen, and Wolff (1974:529) "...there are general standards of attractiveness within American society to which both males and females from the same cultural background will subscribe." For example, in an examination of the relationship between physical attractiveness and daily social interaction, Reis, Wheeler, and Nezlik (1980:607-608) had students at another university judge (i.e., by use of photographs), the level of attractiveness of participants in their study. Generally, there was agreement between males and females. The consensus was high. In fact, there was a .96 mean ratings correlation for male participants being judged and .95 for the females. As noted by Berscheid and Walster (1964:178-180) although the task of identifying what is considered attractive in this culture may be next to impossible, height, especially in males does seem to be one of the few identified crucial variables. Also, a positive relationship does exist between physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status in this country. This factor can probably be traced to such phenomena as nutrition, medical care, and manipulated variables like dressing style.
Nevertheless, within a culture, demographic variables do seem to have an impact on definitions of physical attractiveness. For example, in a study in which seventy-two subjects were given 300 photographs of various types of individuals to judge as to the extent of physical attractiveness, Cross and Cross (1971:434-437) did find some effect of demographic variables. The age of the judges had no impact; both blacks and females had a tendency to grant higher ratings. Concerning the photographs being judged, teenage faces, female faces, and white faces were generally rated as more attractive.

Thus, while a culture may in some vague and some illusive manner provide definitions of beauty, there will be variations within that culture.

All in all, in certain respects, a culture does provide the meaning for an individual to assess others in a society as physically attractive or unattractive. As Berscheid and Walster (1964:181,186) concluded:

Despite the frequently heard assertion that individual differences in criteria for physical attractiveness are impossibly vast, and beauty is entirely in the eye of the beholder, people typically show a good deal of agreement in their evaluations of others. There exists no compendium of physical characteristics, or configurations of characteristics, which people find attractive in others, even within a single society. It appears, however, that the culture transmits effectively, and fairly uniformly, criteria for labeling others as physically "attractive" or "unattractive". The extent to which these criteria are intimately related at either the genotypical or phenotypical level to other personal characteristics, such as intelligence, health, and socioeconomic status, is nevertheless, not known.
Thus, apparently, a culture provides the framework from which attractiveness or unattractiveness can be defined. However, as Berscheid and Walster (1964:176) have noted, these culturally provided definitions have varied greatly in different societies and in various historical eras. For example, in a comparison of the attribution of physical attractiveness in the United States and South Africa, Morse, Reis, Gruzen and Wolff (1974:538) concluded that males and females in South Africa evaluate beauty in a much more diverse manner than do males and females in the United States. In addition, in a comparison of the same photographs of twelve British young women, by a sample from Great Britain and one from the United States, Udry (1965:332,337) concluded that overall, there was much more consensus about preferences among the judges in the United States. Social class, for example, had a much greater impact on the choices made by those from Great Britain. In conclusion, there do tend to be culturally defined differences in the definition of beauty.

Perhaps, in the United States, this definitional framework has been profoundly affected by the development of the mass media. In other words, definitions of physical attractiveness are provided by the illusive images offered by the mass media. In a study of the modern dream factory, Hollywood, Hortense (1951:11) noted, "A unique trait of modern life is the manipulation of people through mass communications."

In regard to the function of stars, Powdemark (1951:207) suggested that the emphasis is placed on examining what these individuals look like (i.e., including body characteristics), rather than what they can do as an actor. Consequently, definitions of physical attractiveness are provided at a cultural level. As Powdemark (1951:39) suggested,
"Hollywood is engaged in the mass production of prefabricated daydreams." Thus, the daydreams of Hollywood help provide cultural definitions of physical attractiveness.

One issue that must be raised at this point, is that although attractiveness is an innate characteristic that is affected by environmental factors (i.e., the relationship between socioeconomic status and attractiveness), individuals can to a certain extent modify the level of physical attractiveness that people will generally attribute to them. Berscheid and Walster (1964:203), for example, noted the case of cosmetic surgery, although the utilization of make-up, braces, clothing, and level of physical fitness readily come to mind in regard to this culture.

Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:29) have discussed beauty queen winners as positive deviants. In essence, this category refers to an achieved behavior, since an innately more attractive woman (i.e., as provided by the cultural definitions) could chose not to pursue or utilize this attractiveness, in that manner, or at all.

Thus, physical attractiveness, while an innate characteristic that is to a certain extent alterable, is culturally defined.

**Intelligence**

Another innate characteristic and type of positive deviance that is differentially treated and acted upon in society is that of intelligence. Innate is a poor term to describe this phenomenon. The extent to which this is innate and the extent to which environmental factors determine the nature of intelligence is obviously not an issue that has been resolved. Nevertheless, some unspecifiable amount of intelligence will be viewed as inherited and some unspecifiable amount
will be viewed as shaped by environmental factors. Yet, those individuals who are judged to be highly intelligent are treated as positive deviants. According to Wyne and O'Connor (1979:92), a person who is assessed to be intelligent accrues advantages in life, since it is one of the most highly regarded characteristics in a majority of societies.

The concept of intelligence, unfortunately, is not one that can be easily defined. Many erroneous thoughts about the nature of intelligence exist within our society. Keating (1984:1) explained the major faulty assumption as follows: "...that it is a thing that exists in the head of the person, and that that should be our exclusive or principal arena for searching out answers as to its nature and development." In fact, as noted by Rebelsky and Daniel (1976:284), intelligence is culturally defined. What our culture considers intelligence may not be considered in the same manner by another culture.

The fact that intelligence is culturally definable and therefore changeable can be examined by looking at the evolution in the United States of the use of this term. In fact, prior to 1905 and the work of Binet and Simon, the concept of intelligence as it is utilized at this point in time did not exist (Weschler and Matarazzo, 1972:24). Definitions of intelligence that were utilized in the first part of this century presented a simplistic and straightforward view of intelligence due to the fact that the eminent thinkers in the field, including Lewis Terman and Henry Goddard had all been students of G. Stanley Hall, who strongly supported the hypothesis that intellectual capacity was predetermined (Wyne and O'Connor, 1979:93). An example of this type of
definition is the following one that was offered by Burt (1941:57):

Accordingly, from the very outset of my educational work it has seemed essential, not merely to show that a general factor underlies the cognitive group of mental activities, but also that this general factor (or some important component of it) is innate or permanent, in the sense just defined.

Nevertheless, the idea of intelligence has been modified over the years. For example, Wechsler developed a scale that attempted to present intellectual ability as composed of subskills and as a result, his intelligence scales are composed of verbal intellectual scales and performance scales (Wyne and O'Connor, 1979:94). As another example, adopting this basic stance and greatly expanding upon it, Guilford has postulated an exemplar of intelligence that presents up to 120 factors (Wyne and O'Connor, 1979:202-203). Thus, intelligence is structured in the following manner. According to Guilford (1959:470), there are the following major types of intellectual processes: cognition, memory, convergent thinking, divergent thinking, and evaluation. At the same time, there are the following intellectual factors, based on the type of content involved: figural, symbolic, or semantic. When a type of operation intertwines with a type of content, a product results. The products that can emerge are the following: units, classes, relations, systems, transformations and implications. This broadened view of intelligence was postulated as important by Guilford (1956:290) for the following reason:

The term "intelligence" has never been uniquely or satisfactorily defined. Factor analysis has fairly well demonstrated that it is not a unique, unitary phenomenon. A "general factor," found by whatever method is not invariant from one analysis to another and hence fails to qualify as a unity, independent of research circumstances...The methods of multiple-factor
analysis, which have been chiefly responsible for discovering the factors listed above, do not find a general psychological factor at the first-order level and they find no second-order factor that can properly lay claim to the title of "intelligence."

Intelligence is now viewed as a more complex phenomenon. Obviously, then intelligence is culturally defined. As a consequence of the different views of the fundamental definitional nature of intelligence, different stances have emerged as to the source of where intelligence emanates. According to Wyne and O'Connor (1979:96), there are three predominant paradigms dominating this issue which can be summarized as follows:

(1) the hereditary view states that human intelligence is principally determined by genetic factors; (2) the environmental view states that intelligence is primarily determined by environmental factors; (3) the third view is the developmental interaction position, which suggests that intelligence is determined by the constant interaction of environmental forces upon genetic endowment.

Both the first and second point of view seem simplistic. As in the case of physical attractiveness, inherited characteristics are obviously mediated by environmental factors. Nevertheless, the portion of either intelligence or physical attractiveness that is accounted for by either heredity or environment is probably virtually impossible to identify in any quantifiable manner.

While intelligence is culturally defined, intelligence is also acted upon (i.e., serves as a basis for differential treatment). This phenomenon can certainly be seen in the United States in relation to the development and reliance (i.e., although, perhaps a quaint notion) on intelligence tests. Intelligence testing, for all intents and purposes
developed around the turn of the century, specifically with the work of Binet and his colleagues. According to Brody and Brody (1976:207), although often not administered properly and often interpreted on the basis of faulty assumptions, the pervasiveness of the influence of intelligence testing can be seen by examining the usage of these tests in the public schools. Furthermore, public school children are treated differentially based on the results of these tests. The example of gifted children aptly illustrates this point. Gifted children are often identified on the basis of intelligence testing. According to a study completed by Yarborough and Johnson (1983:136), of programs for the gifted (i.e., those identified as exceptional ones by the fifty State Departments of Education), achievement tests were used somewhat more frequently than intelligence tests. Achievement tests were used by eighty-two percent of the programs (i.e., ninety-three percent of the gifted programs, ninety-two percent of the gifted/talented programs, and seventy percent of the personal-development programs). Nevertheless, intelligence tests were still widely used, especially in those programs designed for academically gifted groups, rather than the other groups. Overall sixty percent of the these programs used individual intelligence tests and fifty-one percent used group intelligence tests. Yet, since seventy-three percent of the programs for the academically gifted utilized intelligence tests, the reliance on intelligence tests cannot be minimized. In practice, children are identified as gifted on the basis of their IQ score. According to Schwartz (1975:16-17), intellectually gifted children are usually identified as those children who receive significantly above the average, or 130 (which is almost two standard deviations above the mean) and above. The most widely used
intelligence tests to measure children as gifted are a modern adaptation of the test developed by Binet (i.e., the Terman-Merrill version of the Stanford-Binet test) and an intelligence test developed by Weschler.

The reason that intelligence tests have been utilized to identify gifted children had its roots in the work of Terman and his stance that giftedness was translatable to intellectual ability and concomitantly, that intelligence testing was the most appropriate way to identify gifted students (Yarborough and Johnson, 1983:135). This view dominated until the 1950's. Since that period, the focus has been on broadening the definition of giftedness. This expansion process has been partly the result of the the fear that the gifted in certain subgroups (i.e., minorities and handicapped) were being overlooked. Also, there has been an expansion of the idea of giftedness so that students with other abilities, such as talent or creativity, are now often considered to fall under the same rubric of giftedness. Still, as has been pointed out, the intelligence test is still the major vehicle used to identify gifted children, even though the concept of giftedness is not as narrowly applied as it once was.

In essence, since giftedness is also culturally defined, the definitions will change. Freeman (1979:1) pointed this fact out by suggesting that "giftedness is in the eyes of the beholder" and that what is considered gifted has varied in different societies. Currently, in the United States, then while there is some ambiguity incumbent in this term, due to the broadening process, according to Freeman (1979:2), the term has been used basically to describe a general substantial level of ability and to certain abilities (i.e., the intelligent as measured by intelligence testing). Concerning the viewpoint that giftedness is
based on intelligence, Wyne and O'Connor (1979:197) defined giftedness in the following manner:

Giftedness can be viewed as the psychometric opposite of mental retardation. Just as significantly subaverage measured intelligence is a prime criterion for identifying the mentally retarded, so significantly above average measured intelligence is the major hallmark of giftedness.

In essence, very commonly, the cultural definition predominant in the United States in relation to giftedness is that of intellectual ability, which is still generally ascertained by a score on an intelligence test.

One final point that is an important one relating to the issue of giftedness is that of the "potentiality" that is intrinsic to the nature of giftedness. In other words, giftedness is not the same as achievement, according to Freeman (1979:1). However, this giftedness (i.e., this potential) can often be transformed into achievement. For example, Terman (1959:xii) noted that there is a greater probability that a gifted child will grow up to be more intelligent, to be a success in his/her chosen occupation, and to be generally well-adjusted.

Perhaps, then, intellectualism could be viewed as an applied category of intelligence. Although there is no specific relationship between intelligence, as culturally defined, and intellectualism; in this society, intellectuals are perceived to be highly intelligent. According to Coser (1965:vii), "Intellectuals live for rather than off ideas." Interestingly, intellectuals are often treated as negative deviants due to the fact that there is a strong strain of anti-intellectualism prevalent (Dahrendorf, 1969:51; Seeman, 1958:553; Gurko, 1953:21). Yet, intellectuals can be viewed as some type of
actualized category, relating to intelligence. Along these lines, Albert (1975:144), in fact suggested that genius is only recognizable as productivity, or what a person achieves in life, rather than potential.

All in all, intelligence, is innate, to a certain unspecifiable extent (i.e., and partially environmentally determined) and is also culturally defined and differentially treated.

Physical Attractiveness as Positive Deviance and the Physically Attractive as Positive Deviants

Physical attractiveness can be viewed as a type of positive deviance due to the fact that the attractive are differentially treated in a positive manner. The physically attractive are for the most part preferentially treated in many important aspects of life.

Overall, "what is beautiful is good" according to Dion, Berscheid, and Walster (1972:289) in that due to this stereotype, the following situation occurs in the life of the physically attractive: "Not only are physically attractive persons assumed to possess more socially desirable personalities than those of lesser attractiveness, but it is presumed that their lives will be happier and more successful." Furthermore, research has indicated that this stereotype becomes actuality in that the physically attractive do achieve better lives. In fact, the only negative factor that seems to exist for the physically attractive is what Krebs and Adinolfi (1975:351) noted as a tendency for the extremely attractive to be rebuffed by other individuals of the same sex.

This advantageous treatment that is bestowed on the attractive occurs at various phases and in different aspects in the life of an individual. The benefits begin early in life. In an experimental situation, for example, Dion (1972:212) found that adults reacted in a
divergent manner to the transgressions of a child based on the level of physical attractiveness of that child. Thus, adults viewed the transgression (i.e., whether or not a serious one) as not as unfavorable as the behavior if it were committed by an unattractive child. In addition, this same effect held when the adults were asked to assess the probability of the actions reoccurring at some future points.

The benefits continue to accrue for the physically attractive, which is evident in the case of heterosexual attraction. Generally, as Byrne (1971:34) noted, "When we move from the attraction response to the more sexually oriented concerns of dating, marriage, and sexual attractiveness, physical attractiveness is a highly significant correlate of all three variables for both sexes."

Physical attractiveness has been found to be a crucial variable in explaining social participation, as found by Reis, Wheeler, and Nezlik (1980:616) in their study which monitored the social interaction of freshman during an eight month period. For example, regarding quantity or interaction for males, physical attractiveness was correlated in a positive manner for opposite-sex interaction and in a negative way for same-sex interaction. While there was no significant relationship found for females and social interaction; satisfaction or quality of interaction was found to be positively associated with the level of attractiveness. In a two-week study of college seniors, Reis, Wheeler, Spiegel, Kerns, Nezlik, and Perry (1982:994-996) suggested that perhaps the divergent finding in regard to quantity of interaction was due to the adherence to traditional sex roles (i.e., males are status assertive, in that they will attempt through their human connections to improve their social status, while females are status neutralizing in
that they are oriented toward intimacy in a relationship and thus tend to minimize status differentials).

Taking this finding one logical step further, in relation to dating, Krebs and Adinolfi (1975:250) found that physical attractiveness had a beneficial effect on the first encounter in a heterosexual situation. Also, a positive correlation exists for physical attractiveness and actual dating habits. This relationship exists for both sexes. However, it is more pronounced for females. Berscheid and Dion (1971:84) also noting this fact, suggest that the reason is because males have been found to place more significance on physical attractiveness in their date and mate choices than do females. Overall, the importance of physical attractiveness in heterosexual attraction is partially explained, perhaps, by the "rating and dating" hypothesis as explained by Goldman and Lewis (1977:125). In other words, prestige can be acquired by having an attractive partner. The importance of physical attraction, according to Berscheid and Dion (1971:174-176) has been most pervasively shown experimentally under idealistic conditions (i.e., when any individual is viewed as attainable regardless of the level of attractiveness of the person doing the picking). Under more realistic conditions, a matching hypothesis tends to operate in that people will tend to choose partners who are at a more comparable level of attractiveness. All in all, the physically attractive are the most desired as partners and in effect, also in actuality, are more popular in heterosexual situations. Thus, the attractive are differentially treated in this aspect of life.
In various other aspects of adulthood, attractiveness serves as a basis for preferential treatment. The physically attractive, for example, are more likely to be beneficiaries of helping behavior. Benson, Karabenick, and Lerner (1976:410) conducted an experimental field study in which graduate school applications (i.e., with photographs attached) were "lost" in an airport. Physical attractiveness had a significant and positive impact on the number of these applications that were picked up and mailed. In other words, people are more willing to help a physically attractive individual. Task evaluation has also been found to be affected by the attractiveness of the performer. Landry and Sigall (1974:300) found, in a study involving the evaluation of written essays, that the looks of the "writer" did not really have an effect on well written essays. Nevertheless, poorly written essays by the more attractive were assessed to be superior to those equally poorly written essays by the unattractive. Landry and Sigall (1974:302) concluded:

One possible implication is that if someone's work is competent, personal characteristics are less subject to influence evaluations of that work when the quality of the work is relatively poor. Thus, if you are ugly you are not discriminated against a great deal as long as your performance is impressive. However, should performance be below par, attractiveness matters: you may be able to get away with inferior work if you are beautiful.

Additionally, Dipboye, Fromkin, and Wiback (1975:39-42) found that attractiveness also affected the screening evaluation of job applicant resumes by both student evaluations and by professional interviewers. While sex and academic record also had an impact on the judgment of these resumes, for a managerial position, attractiveness also played a
significant role. The physically attractive were assessed to be more suited for the position and given a higher ranking. One cautionary note must be added. In relation to assessment of criminal liability, attractiveness can be a double-edged sword. In an experimental situation where subjects were asked to sentence defendants, Sigall and Ostrove (1975:411) found support for the following hypothesis: "An attractive defendant would receive more lenient treatment than an unattractive defendant when the offense was unrelated to attractiveness; when the crime was related to attractiveness, the attractive defendant would receive relatively harsh treatment." Ergo, as long as the physically attractive choose to burglarize rather than to swindle, the omnipresent advantage that accompanies the attribute of physical attractiveness will continue intact.

Overall, the physically attractive are treated as positive deviants; the physically unattractive are negative deviants. Differential treatment of a positive nature is accorded to those who look good. Various reasons have been advanced to explain why this group of positive deviants is treated in this manner (i.e., the explanation of physical attractiveness as a form of positive deviance).

Basically, these theories can be subsumed into an overall explanation as some type of self-fulfilling prophecy. In other words, an attractive person is automatically assumed to have certain advantages and people treat the attractive person differentially on that basis. Consequently, the attractive person begins to behave on that basis.

The first part of this explanation can be described in the following manner. These hypotheses have been advanced by Berscheid and Walster (1964:167-171) to explain the preference that people have for
the physically attractive: 1) social learning (i.e., cultural norms that allow people to believe that the proper choices for romantic pursuit are the attractive); 2) the rating and dating complex (i.e., an individual garners prestige from being associated with somebody who is attractive); and 3) the physical attractiveness stereotype (i.e., various presumptions are made about the personality and character traits of an attractive individual). Consequently, based on these factors, presumably, the physically attractive will be treated in a differential manner. These factors will inevitably result in changes on the part of the attractive person. The proposed nexus has been summarized by Krebs and Adinolfi (1975:252) as follows:

The causal sequence which seems most plausible is as follows: early in life physical attractiveness affects social realities, which in turn affects the development of personality. The physically attractive are admired and pursued. Because they are pursued they develop a high level of self-esteem, which mediates the development of personality dispositions oriented toward ambition and success. The physically unattractive are ignored, which forces them to withdraw from social relations; and they develop a social, self-protective personality disposition.

Adams (1977:218) has basically reiterated this entire process, and interestingly, in addition, stated that the opposite occurs in the case of the unattractive.

The level of physical attractiveness of an individual produces different expectations which affects social interaction or exchanges which causes the internalization of divergent social images (e.g., self-expectations), which in the final event, is manifested in different "interpersonal personal patterns". These steps are pointed in the positive direction for the physically attractive and in the negative
direction for the physically unattractive. Goldman and Lewis (1977:126) have basically pointed to the same phenomenon in the concept of differential socialization. In other words, because the attractive, starting as children, are differentially treated they will develop better social skills.

Thus, positive deviance for the physically attractive can basically be explained by a self-fulfilling prophecy stance. As discussed in the first section of this chapter, the positive deviants (i.e., in this case, the physically attractive) are defined within the confines of their particular culture, or by subgroups within that culture. Researchers have been unable to define what factor(s) are associated with a person being defined as attractive in this society, other than the fact that height (especially for men) and socioeconomic status appear to be correlated positively with the designation of an individual as attractive. Consequently, perhaps these designations can be extrapolated from the viewpoint of Justice Potter Stewart "we know it when we see it".

Nevertheless, the basic point is that the physically attractive are treated as positive deviants.

Conclusions

Overall, the possessors of innate characteristics—or those innate characteristics that are environmentally modified—that are positively valued by a culture are in effect, positive deviants. Obviously, cultural definitions are significant. Valued innate characteristics in our society include beauty, talent (athletic, dramatic, musical, etc.) and intelligence. Intelligence is probably the least clear cut and the one which is probably most often negatively treated (e.g., as was the
case of the French Impressionists, designations of positive deviance are not always simply applied). As previously noted, anti-intellectualism is pervasive in our society and this probably serves as the basis for the less than positive treatment that is often accorded to the highly intelligent. As an example, linguistically, stereotypes such as "egghead" and "dork" are common in reference to the intellectually talented.

Possibly with the exception of the intellectually talented, a pattern of preferential treatment is accorded to the bearers of positively valued attributes, just as negative treatment is bestowed upon those who retain characteristics negatively valued by their society. This point has been clearly demonstrated in the case of the physically attractive. Obviously, bearers of positively valued innate characteristics are non-normative actors, just as are those who possess negatively valued characteristics. These traits are culturally defined; nevertheless, they are still acted upon within each society.

All in all, bearers of innate characteristics valued by a society constitute a fifth group of positive deviance.
CHAPTER X

THE APPLICATION OF DEVIANCE THEORIES TO POSITIVE DEVIANCE

Various theoretical stances have been utilized to explain deviance (i.e., negative deviance). An important issue then becomes that of whether or not these theories will be at all useful in explaining positive deviance.

Consequently, the following four approaches to deviance—anomie, cultural support, conflict, and societal reaction—will be discussed in relation to how they have addressed the phenomenon of negative deviance. Each approach will then be speculatively examined to ascertain if there could be any applicability to positive deviance. Also, the issue of how each paradigm would be useful in elucidation of positive deviance will be assessed. These comments are only meant to be of a tentative nature.

Anomie

A structural level theory that has been advanced to explain deviance is anomie. Basically, anomie suggests that at the social level, there is a breakdown in norms. The word is derived from the Greek word anomia, which means lawlessness (Wallwork, 1972:4).
As a concept, anomie was first introduced into sociological literature in 1893 by Durkheim (1933:354-357), in *The Division of Labor in Society*, in which he posited that the anomic division of labor was one of the pathological forms of the division of labor. Durkheim (1951) further expounded upon his ideas on anomie in *Suicide*. Durkheim (1951:96) postulated that although suicide is a very individualistic form of behavior, suicide was only comprehensible in relation to the social structure. Thus, all psychological or extra-social factor theses about suicide were eliminated as inadequate. Suicides were not unrelated and distinct occurrences, but rather they must be viewed as a whole in a given society during a given period of time. This totality would not solely be a sum of independent units, but would rather be a collective total or a fact *sui generis*. Consequently, Durkheim postulated that every society has a definite aptitude for suicide which could in fact be measured.

Further examining the nature of suicide, Durkheim postulated that there are four types of suicide. Egoistic suicide occurs when there is too little group integration, as in the case of unmarried individuals; while altruistic suicide occurs because the individual is overly integrated into his group and engages in the behavior to satisfy a social demand of his group. On the other hand, anomic suicide could be viewed basically as a result of societal turbulence occurring when norms disappear and fail to serve as a form of social control; whereas fatalistic suicide, a form that was scarcely acknowledged, occurs as a result of too much control or repressive social restraint (Bierstedt, 1966:77-80).
In his discussion of anomic suicide, Durkheim began by stating that society serves as a power to control individuals and that a relation exists between its performance and the social suicide rate. In regard to anomic suicide, Durkheim (1951:238) wrote, "The third sort of suicide, the existence of which has just been shown, results from man's activities lacking regulation and his consequent sufferings." For example, in the economic realm, crises whether of a downward trend, or an upward trend, increase the rate of suicide. That this occurs not because of increased hardship was demonstrated by the fact that suicide rates also went up during sudden trends of economic prosperity and because there tended to be low suicide rates in poverty stricken countries, such as Ireland. Rather, the suicides resulted because of crises or disturbances in the collective order. Thus, Durkheim (1951:246) wrote, "Whenever serious readjustments take place in the social order, whether or not due to a sudden growth or unexpected catastrophe, men are more inclined to self-destruct."

Durkheim (1951:246-249) viewed this situation as arising due to the relation between the individual and society. Man, stripped of social control, is basically a creature with an unquenchable desire to obtain more and man could not function happily unless needs were sufficiently proportioned to means. Furthermore, since the individual was incapable of imposing limits of his/her insatiable desires, there must exist a regulative moral external force to function for moral needs in the same manner that the organism functions for physical needs. Since this force must be moral, as discipline occurring solely through custom and force will only produce illusory peace and harmony, and since it must also be an authority that individuals would both yield to and respect, Durkheim
felt that society would have to be this moral force. Society, as a moral force, would be able to set the point beyond which passions would not be allowed to exceed. During each era in history, there is a relative but not rigidly formulated perception of the maximum degree of comfort suitable for the workers in each occupation. If these different groups respect this regulation in regard to their ambitions and do not desire more, man is in harmony with his condition and thus, assured an equilibrium of happiness. However, when crises, such as an economic disaster or an abrupt growth of power and wealth occur, society can not longer exert its moral influence as a regulating device on the desires of men. For example, during periods of sudden growth of power and wealth, regulative values are unknown since there would be a difficult adjustment to restrain the desires of people, or as in times of disaster, when there is an adjustment of making people adapt themselves to an increased self-repression.

Durkheim (1951:256-257) made an interesting point when he stated his view that there is a chronic state of anomie existing in trade and industry. Society had come to view a normal state where there exists an insatiable greed and desire to obtain unattainable goals. In his era, the economic sphere had been increasingly freed from all regulation which used to be exerted by a whole system of moral forces, including religion, temporal power, and from the business world itself. Furthermore, besides pointing to economic anomie, there also existed domestic anomie. Basically, Durkheim (1951:256-257) postulated that in widowhood, for example, the survivor has not yet adjusted to the situation. Thus, Durkheim basically applied the concept of anomie by relating one type of deviant behavior, suicide, to this breakdown in
norms. Still, Durkheim's conception of anomie has been an idea that has been repeatedly and persistently used in sociology, both theoretically and empirically (Clinard, 1964:2; Cole and Zuckerman, 1964:243). However, in an interesting observation, Cohen (1966:74) noted, "The meaning of 'anomie'... has undergone many changes at the hands of different authors." In the area of deviance alone, Clinard (1964:2) asserted that anomie has been applied in critical essays to suicide, crime, delinquency, mental disorders, alcoholism, and drug addiction. Most of this more contemporary research on anomie has been influenced by the essay "Anomie and Social Structure" which was originally published in 1949, and which attempted to explain deviant behavior in general, to anomie. Merton (1968:186) stated that he was mainly interested in examining, "...how some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in nonconformist rather than conformist behavior." For Merton (1968:187-190), two components of the social and cultural structures are important. In the first place, there are the culturally defined goals, purposes, or interests. Secondly, the other component performs the function of defining, regulating and controlling the permissible modes for reaching these goals. Although an effective equilibrium may exist if the individual is satisfied with conforming to both cultural constraints, the emphasis placed on these cultural goals may differ from the emphasis put on the institutionalized norms. For example, at one extreme there may be an extreme concern placed on the goals with relatively little emphasis on the prescribed modes for obtaining these goals. On the other hand, at the other extreme, there are cases where the goals are forgotten and a great concern is shown with regard to the means to obtain these goals.
Merton (1968:190-193) was specifically interested in the case where there is a great emphasis on goals with less concern about the means of obtaining them. As a result of this lack of congruity between goals and means, certain individuals may come to be concerned with using the technically most expedient manner to reach their goals, regardless of whether these means are culturally approved modes of behavior. As this process proceeds, a weakly integrated society is induced and consequently, anomie ensues. Thus, the social structure in this case produces a strain toward anomie.

Merton (1968:193-203) then proceeded to examine how individuals adapt or adjust themselves to this situation, by utilizing a typology of five different ways that adaptation can occur. Conformity, for example, occurs when cultural goals and institutionalized means to achieve those goals are both accepted. For society to exist as a stable entity, this choice must be the most widespread type of adaptation. Innovation, on the other hand, refers to the situation which occurs when the cultural goals of society are accepted, but the institutionalized means of achieving these goals are either rejected or not internalized by the individuals. When a society has strongly emphasized success goals—such as the emphasis placed on wealth and social ascent in the United States—the situation is very conducive to the occurrence of innovation as an adaptation. Although white collar crime is an example of this type of adaptation, Merton felt that the greatest pressure toward deviation exists in the lower classes. This situation occurs because although the culture produces incentives for success, there is structural inconsistency since the ways to achieve these goals are essentially limited to illegitimate behavior in the lower classes.
Along these lines, Merton (1968:200) wrote:

A high frequency of deviant behavior is not generated merely by lack of opportunity or by this exaggerated pecuniary emphasis. A comparatively rigidified class structure, a caste order, may limit opportunities far beyond the point which obtains in American society today. It is when a system of cultural values extols, virtually above all else, certain common success-goals for the population at large while the social structure rigorously restricts or completely closes access to approved modes of reaching these goals for a considerable part of the same population, that deviant behavior ensues on a large scale.

The third type of adaptation that Merton (1968:203-211) advanced is ritualism. Ritualism appears when the cultural goals of society have been rejected, but the individual still continues to adhere compulsively to the institutionalized norms. The least common adaptation, retreatism, happens if both the goals and means of society are rejected. Retreatism, which manifests itself in resignation and defeatism, will result if an individual has repeatedly been unable to reach his goals and if due to various factors he will not resort to illegitimate means. In this category are such people as psychotics, pariahs, outcasts, vagrants, vagabonds, tramps, chronic drunkards, and drug addicts. The final form of adaptation, rebellion, results when individuals reject the conventional social structure and attempt to set up a new or extremely modified social structure.

Thus, Merton garnered many ideas from Durkheim. On the other hand, there are various differences between the two theorists. For example, whereas Durkheim emphasized the breakdown of norms in society, Merton viewed anomie a being caused by the discrepancy between goals and means in society. Furthermore, while Durkheim suggested anomie developed
during crisis periods in society, Merton felt anomie occurred as a result of an endemic gap in the United States (Traub and Little, 1975:60-61). Finally, while Durkheim felt that the inherently insatiable desire of men were important, Merton believed that these were caused by the social structure (Clinard, 1964:41).

All in all, anomie has been an important theoretical approach utilized in the elucidation of deviance. The significance of structural factors and the breakdown of norms or the lack of cleavage between goals and means is stressed by this theory.

The Applicability of Anomie Theory to Positive Deviance

Basically, anomie theory would seem to be most applicable to the explanation of certain types of positive deviance. For example, innovation and charismatic behavior, would apparently be the forms of positive deviance that would be most influenced by the existence of anomie conditions within a society. Also, since anomie is a structural level theory, macro-level issues about deviance are better explained than social psychological ones.

Anomie, for the most part, can be viewed as producing deleterious effects (e.g., increased rates of suicide, delinquency, etc.) in a society. On the other hand, perhaps an anomic state within a society, could also lead to positive effects. Anomie, for example, is probably a fertile ground for innovation. As La Capra (1972:157-158) pointed out, a total lack of anomie within a society would not necessarily be good. Normal societies also need to have within their limits—although solely as a marginal component the average personality or to marginal societal groups—a vivifying element of anomie. These anomic elements are viewed to be necessary forces for progress since creative responses can emerge
under these conditions. Thus, according to La Capra (1972:158):

A measure of anomie corresponded to an element of "free play" in society and the personality: anomic indeterminacy and daring risk were conditions of progress and prerequisites of an ability to respond creatively to changes in relevant conditions of existence. And anomie would be especially typical of artistic and innovative milieus.

All in all, a situation where there is a breakdown in norms as postulated by Durkheim, or even an endemic discrepancy as noted by Merton, could be viewed as particularly fertile ground for innovation. As an example of an innovative response to the disjunction between goals and means in the United States, Merton (1968:195) pointed toward the Robber Barons and their "institutionally dubious innovation." As Linton (1936:308) discussed, even though primitive societies tend to discourage innovation to a greater extent than modern societies, these societies will appreciate innovations most during periods of crisis. A society enmeshed in a state of anomie could be considered to be such a time when innovations would be tolerated. While some innovations may be viewed in a negative light; other innovations could be seen as positive. In addition, there is the possibility that those innovations that were viewed as negative could be reevaluated at a later point in time. In addition, charisma is another type of positive deviance that would be more likely to occur in anomie conditions. Tucker (1968:744), for example, noted that a charismatic leader (i.e., due to the willingness of a group of followers to accept a leader) is more likely to emerge during stressful times. In an interesting point, Tucker (1968:744) pointed to economic problems as an example of stressful conditions, just as Durkheim noted that economic elevations and declines were examples of
anomic conditions. Thus, anomie could be seen as a form of stress that increases the probability of the occurrence of one part of the charismatic relationship—the willingness of a group of people experiencing stress to accept a leader. Thus, the situation is ready for the emergence of a charismatic leader. The crucial variable then becomes whether there is a suitable individual to respond to this need. In essence, a state of anomie existing in a society to the extent that it creates conditions of stress, is obviously conducive to a charismatic situation.

One pertinent note must be added at this point. Anomie theory concentrates on conditions at the structural level. Hence, anomie theory could best be utilized as a more macro-level type of explanation. In other words, issues such as why the anomic conditions in a society provide fertile ground for innovation or the emergence of a charismatic leader, would be those issues that are best addressed by the anomie perspective. On the other hand, social psychological questions such as why certain individuals within that society are more likely to emerge as innovators or charismatic leaders, are not really answerable by anomie theory.

Therefore, anomie theory could be somewhat useful in regard to explaining positive deviance. Anomie theory would seemingly be most appropriately applied to explain two types of positive deviance: charisma and innovation. Charismatic leadership and innovation are especially likely to emerge during periods of anomie. The other kinds of positive deviance, however, could probably be explained better by using other theories.


Cultural Support Theories

Another type of theory that has been elucidated in relationship to deviance has been that of theories regarding cultural support. As Traub and Little (1980:173) noted, unlike such theories as social disorganization and anomie which concentrate on social structure and how it is related to deviant behavior, cultural transmission theory deals more specifically with why individuals in these situations engage in deviant behavior, through such processes as learning that takes place in their environment.

Various theorists have suggested that in certain subcultures, the opportunities to learn are geared in a specific direction. For example, Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967:148-163) hypothesized that there are normative subcultures of violence especially in urban areas and in some rural areas. In other words, violence is seen as a normatively correct form of response in certain situations—albeit, this violence would be viewed negatively by the society in general. Differential learning association, or identification are the manner through which individuals come to acquire positive perceptions in regard to the use of violence in their subculture.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) also reflected on the types of situations in which individuals can learn in a subculture. Reiterating Merton's stance, Cloward and Ohlin (1960:78, 148-152) suggested that the discrepancies existing between aspirations among lower-class youth and the possibility of achieving these goals through legitimate means creates pressures in the direction of delinquent subcultures. However, asserting that social and psychological factors play an important role in access to both illegitimate and legitimate roles, they concentrated
on socially structured variations in illegitimate opportunities. Opportunities include exposure with regard to both learning and performance structure. Since lower-class youth generally do not have the opportunity to achieve through legitimate means, they will respond in accordance with their access to illegitimate means.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960:160-184) further claimed that various forms of neighborhood integration affect the development of subculture content. Three types of subcultures can emerge. The first, the criminal subculture, is characterized by an integration of age-levels, criminal role-models, age-grading of criminal learning and performance, and an integration of values. Since this new opportunity structure provides alternative avenues to success goals, the pressures generated by restrictions in legitimate access to success goals are drained off. Furthermore, since there are social controls over the conduct of youth, expressive behavior on the part of the young is limited. Characterized by violence on the part of the young, the conflict subculture arises where there are severe limitations to both conventional and criminal opportunities which serve to intensify frustrations and position discontent. Furthermore, transiency and instability produce pressures for violent behavior among the young. In regard to the retreatist subculture, they suggested that people who experience double failure, at both legitimate and illegitimate means, are more likely to move into a retreatist pattern of behavior, which is characterized by the abuse of drugs. The criminal subculture probably provides the most explicit example of where a learning process is able to occur within a subculture.
Perhaps one of the most seminal works in criminology was differential association, essentially a learning theory. Sutherland and Cressy (1978:80-83) have offered the following propositions as the crucial aspects of differential association theory:

1. Criminal behavior is learned. 2. Criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication. 3. The principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups. 4. When criminal behavior is learned, he learning includes (a) techniques of committing the crime, which are sometimes very complicated, sometimes very simple, (b) the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes. 5. The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favorable or unfavorable. 6. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law. 7. Differential associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity. 8. The process of learning criminal behavior by association with criminal and anticriminal patterns involves all of the mechanisms that are involved in any other learning. 9. While criminal behavior is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by those general needs and values, since noncriminal behavior is an expressions of the same needs and values.

Essentially, Sutherland felt that criminal behavior is a learned behavior. In his research on gangs, Cohen (1955:Ch.2) provided an analysis of cultural support, when he elaborated on the role of motivation in relation to participation in gangs. The basic hypothesis postulated is that the working-class delinquent subculture occurs due to a reaction-formation, or an inversion of middle-class norms. In this case, the motivating factor is the shared status frustration experienced by working-class boys who are usually not able to achieve by middle-class standards. This behavior also occurs in a subcultural
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context which is predominantly male and working class. The activities and behaviors are characterized by the following traits. In the first place, behavior is non-utilitarian, as exemplified by stealing solely for the intrinsic fun involved. Maliciousness is also present. Additionally, this subculture is negative in the sense that its norms are characterized by a negative polarity to those norms that are accepted by a greater portion of society. Furthermore, the gangs are versatile in the sense that they engage in various types of delinquent activities. Short-run hedonism, or a lack of concrete goals, is another trait associated with subcultural delinquency. Finally, group autonomy, or resistance to outside interference, is a quality found in these groups.

Another essential feature of the theory of Cohen (1955:chs. 3, 4, 5) is that of the middle-class norms that tend to be dominant in his society, which include such valued traits as ambition, deference of immediate gratification, and individual responsibility. Even though in our democratically oriented society all children are compared against all others in their ability to achieve in accordance with these standards, not all children have the same advantage in being able to achieve and conform along these lines. For example, through socialization, a middle-class boy has a much better opportunity than does a working-class boy to achieve in various social settings, such as in the school. Thus, it is only inevitable that by these middle-class standards, the working-class boy is often a failure and is likely to have various feelings such as shame and hostility. Consequently, such adolescent boys share a problem of adjustment and must search for a solution. A working-class boy can choose among the following responses:
college boy, stable corner boy, and delinquent. Thus, because the status discontent permeates the working class, there exists a common motivating factor for the delinquent response. Importantly, in this type of adaptation, there is a status system by which a working-class boy can view himself as successful. Thus, Cohen provides a portrait of the motivating factors that can induce deviant behavior.

In essence, this type of theory attempts to deal with more specific issues of why (i.e., motivation) and how (i.e., learning and subcultures conducive to such behavior) individuals become involved in criminal behavior.

The Applicability of Cultural Support Theory to Positive Deviance

Cultural support theories would also appear to be useful in explaining positive deviance. Altruism and supra-conforming behavior would probably be the types of positive deviance that could best be explained by cultural support theories. In addition, subcultural and social-psychological issues should be the focus of cultural support theories.

In the first place, altruism could perhaps be illuminated by cultural support theories. Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967:148-163) have suggested that at the subcultural level, there are normative subcultures of violence, in which violence is viewed to be the normatively appropriate response to certain circumstances. Perhaps, there are also certain subcultural groups within a society whose tenets would be more conducive to the development of altruism. Interestingly, this phenomenon could perhaps also occur at a societal level, since as Williams (1970:462-464) noted, humanitarianism is one of the key values that is associated with the people in the United States.
certain religious subcultures in a society tend to encourage, if not even demand, altruistic behavior. For example, Quakers in this country, have a long history of engaging in altruistic (at times, even dangerous) behavior. At the more social-psychological level, cultural support theory might also be usefully applied to altruism as a form of positive behavior. For example, the general underlying assumptions of differential association theory as advanced by Sutherland and Cressey (1978) could be important. Just as definitions favorable to criminal behavior are learned in interaction with others, especially intimate others, intuitively, definitions favorable to the willingness to give of oneself beyond an ordinary level is probably learned in intimate groups. Along similar lines, in relation to a type of positive deviance, Bar-Tel (1976:17) has advanced the importance of social learning as a crucial variable for the occurrence of altruism.

In the second place, cultural support theories could also perhaps be utilized in relation to supra-conforming behavior. Supra-conforming behavior requires going beyond what is simply expected in a society to the level of what is idealized in a society. Thus, a willingness to pursue standards of excellence is necessitated. The assumptions of differential association could be utilized in the case of supra-conforming behavior. For example, in relation to the achievement motivation, Rosen, Crockett, and Nunn (1969:45) have suggested that the family influences the achievement motivation more than any other factor. Perhaps, this situation occurs, because as implied by differential association theory, definitions supportive of this pursuance of excellence are learned within that societal institution. To take differential association one step further, perhaps both techniques and
motivations necessary for supra-conforming behavior are learned in interaction with others in the family.

All in all, then, cultural support theories could be utilized to explain some aspects of positive deviance, as well as negative deviance, especially in the cases of altruism and supra-conformity.

Finally, cultural support theories are most important in relation to subcultural and social-psychological issues. In other words, points such as how individuals learn definitions and how they adopt motivations within a subculture or within primary groups, such as the family, should be the focus of these theories. As an example, in relation to positive deviance, Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:11-25) suggested that to completely understand the role of monks, the context of the monastery must be explained. As the criminal subculture, according to Cloward and Ohlin (1960:160-184) serves as fertile ground for learning negatively deviant behavior, the monastery could serve as a situs for the learning of positively deviant behavior. Thus, micro-level explanations should be the focus of cultural support theories.

Consequently, cultural support theories could help illuminate positive deviance. Cultural support theories would best be utilized to explain altruism and supra-conformity of the five types of positive deviance. Additionally, subcultural and social-psychological issues could be addressed by cultural support theories.

**Societal Reaction Theories**

Societal reaction (or labeling) theory, which garnered many ideas from symbolic interactionism, has emerged as a major approach to the elucidation of deviance. Although not addressing the same issues (e.g., etiological problems) as other approaches, societal reaction theory has
filled in many gaps in theoretical knowledge related to deviance.

One of the important functions that labeling theory has performed is to offer a relativistic stance towards deviance. Until the 1950's, absolutist perspectives were, in fact, the dominant stance accepted by sociologists, as Clinard (1974:11) noted. For example, as Becker (1963:4-8) proposed, there are several ways in which deviance can be conceived. Rejecting a statistical, a pathological, and a more sociological (i.e., behavior that fails to abide by group rules) approach, Becker supported a relativistic position that different groups assess different actions as deviant. In turn, this fact supports his idea that other factors such as the decision that someone else or some other behavior is deviant, the process through which this decision is made, and the situation in which it occurs, all become important factors in the study of deviance. Besides various groups making divergent judgements about deviance, there is also variation over time as to what is considered to be deviant. Simmons (1969:4) noted this idea, when he wrote, perhaps somewhat facetiously, "...deviance like beauty, is in the eyes of the beholder." Lemert (1972:22), on the other hand, suggested a somewhat more moderate stance. Proposing that some of the more extreme relativistic positions create the false idea that virtually any meaning can be conferred on human beings, he supported the view that human interaction takes place within limits, including biological, psychological, ecological, technical, and organizational ones. Thus, some acts will be viewed as having deleterious consequences in practically every situation. Thus, acts such as incest, adultery, rape, theft, and lying are disapproved, although in varying degrees, by virtually every society.
Labeling theory has also been very valuable since it has facilitated the study of the societal reaction to an action, which stands in contrast to several types of theories that examine almost exclusively and individual and the etiological reasons for the behavior. Thus, Becker (1963:11), suggesting that society creates deviance, stated very emphatically:

Social groups constitute deviance by making rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those roles to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender". The deviant is one to whom that label has been successfully applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label.

Erickson (1961:10) also wrote:

Deviance is not a property inherent in certain forms of behavior; it is a property conferred upon these forms by the audience which directly or indirectly witness them. The critical variable in the study of deviance, then is the social audience rather than the individual actor.

In addition, Becker (1963:17,143) has explained how the rules are created in the first place. Rules emerge from the initiative of moral entrepreneurs who function to create and enforce rules in society. People have different ability to make and apply rules to other individuals due to political and economic power.

Various authors have conceptualized the process through which the labeling of individuals proceeds. For example, Kitsuse (1961:248,254-255) has proposed that individuals in groups, communities, or societies engage in the following process: the interpretation of behavior as deviant, the definition of individuals who engage in such
behaviors as important, and the treatment of these individuals in a way which is deemed as important. Conventional members of society can utilize the following sanctions against deviating members: explicit disapproval and subsequent withdrawal, implicit disapproval and partial withdrawal, and no disapproval occurring with the maintenance of the relationship continued. Schur (1971:41-60) offered the following scheme. There are basic response patterns including the following: stereotyping, or the imputation of traits such as differentness to the individual or his behavior; retrospective interpretation, or the reevaluation of the past behavior of the individual; and negotiation, or the bargaining that takes place which involves the discretionary power of the control agents in society. Finally, Scheff (1966:31-54) has made some important points about the societal reaction to an individual or to a behavior. Proposing that residual rule breaking can cause the labeling of individuals as mentally ill, certain factors were postulated as impacting the labeling. In fact, the societal reaction will be made more or less effective by the following factors: the degree, the amount, and visibility of the acts of rule-breaking; the rule-breaker's power and his social distance from social control agents; and the tolerance quotient of the community and whether or not the community can offer other possible nondeviant rules.

A final important idea that labeling theory has offered has been to suggest that the labeling of individuals affects their lives, most often in a negative fashion. Tannenbaum (1980:244-247) was among the first to deal with this issue. When an individual is labeled as deviant and separated from his group, there is a "dramatization of evil" in that others begin to feel that the total person is bad rather than just the
behavior that he performed. As a result, this process tends to cause other such actions in the future by the presumed "evil" person. Erikson (1964:167) also noted that the labeling can have a potent impact on the individual. In fact, there is almost a self-fulfilling prophecy: since labeling by the community makes it very difficult for the individual to readjust. Not serving merely as a reprimanding influence on the individual, the sanctions result in the individual being moved from his normal societal position to a deviant role, which is very difficult to leave. The ceremonies that accompany this process include the following: the formal confrontation including the suspected deviant and community members, such as the criminal trial; the public declaration of the decision reached about his deviancy or lack of deviancy, such as the verdict; and the placement of the accused deviant in a new role which redefines his societal position, such as the prisoner role. That it is difficult for an individual to emerge out of the redefinition of his societal position and resume conventional roles was supported by an experimental study which was conducted by Schwartz and Skolnick (1964:105-112). After fabricating employment records that were similar except for the criminal record of the applicant, these requests for employment as unskilled workers were mailed to various hotels in the Catskills. As a result, the following responses were received: a thirty-six percent positive response rate for those folders indicating no record; a twenty-four percent positive response rate for those acquitted, but adding an explanatory letter from the judge; a twelve percent positive response rate for those acquitted without such a letter from the judge; and a four percent positive response rate for those convicted. Obviously, it is very difficult to resume conventional
Lemert (1972:48-63) also had many important comments to make regarding the effect of the labeling process on individuals when he examined primary and secondary deviation. Primary deviation denotes that individuals, although they may be engaging in deviant acts, still manage to hold conventional status and roles and still continue to have an unscathed psychic structure. On the other hand, secondary deviance suggests that the individual has organized his life and his identity around his deviance, facilitating his attempts to deal with the various problems associated with the societal reaction to his primary deviation. During socialization, or that process involved with role transitions, the individual will acquire in varying degrees the following characteristics: a morally inferior status, special knowledge and skills, an integral attitude or world view, and a distinctive self-image. Lemert (1951:77) offered the following scheme to explain the process leading from primary to secondary deviation:

(1) primary deviation; (2) stronger penalties; (3) further primary deviation; (4) stronger penalties and rejections; (5) further deviation, perhaps with hostilities and resentment beginning to focus upon those dealing the penalizing; (6) crisis reached in the tolerance quotient, expressed in formal action by the community stigmatizing the deviant; (7) strengthening of the deviant conduct as a reaction to the stigmatizing and penalties; (8) ultimate acceptance of deviant social status and efforts at adjustment on the basis of the associated role.

On a somewhat related note, Becker (1963:25-39) suggested that deviant careers proceed through the following process. A person first breaks some rule. After being labeled for that act, the individual acquires deviant motives and interests and enters a more extensive and extended
pattern of deviant behavior. Finally, an individual can become part of an organized deviant group which serves the following functions: solidifying his deviant behavior, providing justification or ideology, and offering techniques for lessening any trouble in which the individual might become involved. In essence, the individual becomes enmeshed in deviancy.

In conclusion, the important issues addressed by the societal reaction theorists include the relative nature of deviance, the labeling of acts as deviant and individuals who engage in them as deviants, and the consequences of being labeled deviant on the attributed person.

The Applicability of Societal Reaction Theories to Positive Deviance

Through societal reaction theories, various important issues other than solely structural or etiological reasons for negative deviance have been addressed. Societal reaction theories, can perhaps be applied to these same processes in relation to positive deviance. Thus, the following types of points in relation to positive deviance could be analyzed: changing designations of deviance, the societal reaction to certain types of behavior, and the effects of societal reaction on the labeled. Each point will be separately discussed in relation to positive deviance.

The manner in which definitions of negative deviance change has concerned societal reaction theorists. Basically, behavior that is considered deviance (i.e., negative) in one society or in one era may not be thought of as deviance in another society or in another era. This same point is obviously pertinent for positive deviance. Merton (1968:235) has suggested, for example, that in many cases, rebels or nonconformists of a certain era are defined as heroes in future
generations. As previously discussed, definitions of specific groups of innovators have not remained static. This fact is perhaps traceable to the threatening nature of some innovation (i.e., as viewed by many in a society). According to Lenski and Lenski (1982:70-73), people resist innovation. Thus, the French Impressionists, a group of artistic innovators, were considered to be negative deviants by their society. Nevertheless, the Nobel Prize for Science is an example of an originally applied label of positive deviance. Thus, behaviors (or actors) which are considered positive deviance may be designated at first as negative deviance, as neutral behavior, or as positive deviance. This same situation can also be seen as pertinent in relation to other types of positive deviance. For example, definitions of charismatic leadership are very malleable. A charismatic leader is obviously viewed positively by the group or society that follows him. Yet other groups or other eras may view the same individual in a completely neutral or in a a negative manner. The definitions of innate characteristics are probably also susceptible to changing definitions. Ideas of beauty and those of intelligence are culturally determined. Obviously, these definitions can thus vary cross-culturally. Thus, the point made by labeling theorists that definitions of deviance change and are not static, is also quite applicable to positive deviance. On the other hand, certain examples of positive deviance are probably less malleable. As a type, altruism is perhaps a form of positive deviance—since in essence it involves self-sacrificing behavior—that is more likely to be more universally defined as positive deviance. In relation to negative deviance, Lemert (1972:22) explained the point that certain acts tend to be condemned—albeit in various degrees—by all societies. Thus, certain
acts could be viewed as being more universally praised. In other words, certain behaviors and/or actions have a higher probability of being consistently designated as positive deviance. All in all, societal reaction theories could focus on the changing nature of definitions of positive deviance.

Another important process that could be explained by using labeling theory is that of the process of the societal reaction to an act or behavior. For example, in relation to innate characteristics, intelligence tests have been utilized to a great extent to identify the intellectually gifted (Brody and Brody, 1976:207). Public school officials become labelers. Other issues along these lines are significant and could be addressed in relation to positive deviance. Historically, why did intelligence tests become the means to identify the intellectually gifted? Perhaps, the concept of moral entrepreneurs, or rule creators, as raised by Becker (1963:142-163) would be usefully applied to the explanation of this historical process. Although the issues of cultural bias have been raised in relation to intelligence tests, why is this means still used as the major way to identify the gifted? At any rate, these are the types of questions that societal reaction theory is uniquely capable of explaining. The process of societal reaction could also perhaps be usefully applied to charisma, as a type of positive deviance.

Finally, the effect of being labeled on the people labeled has been addressed by societal reaction theory. The impact of a positive label could also be illuminated by societal reaction theory. As an example, according to Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:6), "...intellectuals and saints are generally evaluated positively and are rewarded for their
activities, thus (hopefully again) heightening the probability of future occurrence." Thus, labeling does have an impact on the labeled. For example, as previously noted in relation to physical attractiveness, an innate characteristic, a self-fulfilling prophecy, appears to operate. In other words, since the beautiful are assumed to have certain advantages due to the stereotypes that exist, they are differentially treated. Consequently, they act (e.g., with an increased orientation toward ambition) in a manner different from how they would act if this whole process did not occur (Krebs and Adinolfi, 1975:252).

In some respects, the attractive can come to behave as secondary deviants, as postulated by Lemert (1972:167) in that their lives come to be organized around this positive deviant attribute.

In conclusion, societal reaction theory could perhaps by best utilized in regard to certain issues and certain processes, including the changeable nature of definitions of positive deviance, the process of societal reaction, and the effect of the labeling on the individual labeled.

Conflict Theories

According to Traub and Little (1980:41-42), the basic idea presented by social disorganization and culture conflict theorists is that "...conflict and disorganization are most apt to increase when the equilibrium of a social system is disturbed during period of rapid social change, and as conflict and social disorganization increase, so will rates of deviance." Thus, it seems only natural that social disorganization theory was first developed in the early part of this century by American sociology especially at the University of Chicago, since that was a period of extremely fast change in this society and a
period characterized by a concentration of social problems in urban areas.

Park (1980:47-48), for example, pointed to this phenomenon. In the first place, he noted that in the family and neighborhood, custom and tradition are embodied in folkways and mores, while such institutions as the church, the school, and the courts at the community level can also serve to aid in the control of the individual. Delinquency was associated with the inability of community organizations to work properly due to the great changes that had been occurring in the cities. With an increasingly complex division of labor along with changes in transportation and communication, there had also taken place an individualization from the standpoint of the individual and social disorganization from the societal and community level, resulting in a continual state of agitation.

Thomas and Znaniecki (1980:44) suggested that social disorganization referred to a state where there was "...a decrease of the influence of existing social rules of behavior upon individual members of the group." This condition can vary from an individual level to the point where it involves the various institutions of a group. Although, to a certain extent, this condition can be found in all societies, it does not become a problem in an era of social stability since the use of social sanctions, for example, can counteract the social disorganization. Faris and Dunham (1980:50-55) analyzed the relationship between urbanism and social disorganization. This relationship also existed between various areas of the city as conceptualized as consisting of the following concentric zones: the central business district, the zone in transition, the zone of
workingman's homes, the residential zone, and the commuter zone. The disorganization process, for example, can work in the following way for a rooming-house section of a sector, although it might be somewhat different for other natural areas, such as a foreign born slum area. The rooming-house areas are filled with young single white collar workers who rent rooms in areas close to their work in the central business district. Since these areas are characterized by transience, anonymity and isolation, various forms of deviant behavior (e.g., venereal disease, alcoholism and suicide) tend to occur at a higher level than in other parts of the city due to the fact that the usual control offered by primary groups does not exist in these areas.

Shaw and McKay engaged in extensive research in the areas with high concentrations of delinquency in Chicago (Vold, 1979:185-195). Analyzing the characteristics of the areas with the highest rates of delinquency, they concluded the following: the physical status of these areas was that they were located close to areas of heavy industry or commerce, the economic status was characterized by the lowest status in economic terms, and the population composition was noted by the high percentages of foreign-born and blacks and by constant shifts in ethnic populations. To further understand the nature of delinquency, they examined the life histories of various delinquents and found the following. In the first place, in regard to intelligence, physical condition, and personality traits, the delinquents were actually very similar to other boys. Most important to social disorganization, however, was the second finding that conventional traditions, neighborhoods, institutions, and public opinion had vastly deteriorated in areas of high delinquency. In other neighborhoods, these processes
function to control the actions of adolescents. Furthermore, often
times, parents and neighbors accepted delinquent behavior as proper in
these areas. Thirdly, adolescents in these neighborhood had more
extensive chances to engage in delinquent activities. Furthermore,
delinquent behaviors started early in life, as part of play activities
in the streets. Also, each neighborhood was characterized by a
different neighborhood tradition which is passed on from older boys to
younger boys. Next of all, conventional social control methods were
incapable of preventing the occurrence of these steps. Finally, the
delinquent only started to identify with the criminal element at an
advanced stage of his career. As a result, the conclusion reached was
that certain areas of the city could be considered to be in a permanent
state of social disorganization. Delinquency and the other social
problems characteristic of these areas were associated with the process
of invasion, dominance and succession. For example, with the changes in
population there is a decay in the formal social organizations of a
neighborhood, an end to the identification that people once had with
their neighborhood, and an inability of neighborhoods to control their
adolescents. On top of all these factors, the neighborhood has a
proclivity to serve as a combat zone between the group that is invading
and the group that is retreating. As Shaw and McKay (1970:225-227)
noted in the following passage, at times, there is even a situation of
conflict between the norms of these neighborhoods and that of the larger
society:

In contrast, the areas of low economic status,
where the rates of delinquents are high, are
characterized by wide diversity in norms and
standards of behavior. The moral values range
from those that are strictly conventional to
those in direct opposition to conventionality as
symbolized by the family, the church, and other
institutions common to our general society...Children living in such communities are exposed to a variety of contradictory standards and forms of behavior rather than to a relatively consistent and conventional pattern...Conflicts of values necessarily arise when boys are brought in contact with so many forms of conduct not reconcilable with conventional morality as expressed in church and school. A boy may be found guilty of delinquency the court, which represents the values of the larger society, for an act which has had at least tacit approval in the community in which he lives.

Therefore, very explicitly, Shaw and McKay pointed to the culture conflict that is often inherent in areas of social disorganization.

Sellin (1980:58-65) also contributed to the idea of culture conflict with his notion of conduct norms, or those norms or rules arising in social life that express the "...social attitude of this group toward the various ways in which a person might act under certain circumstances has thus been crystallized into a rule, the violation of which arouses a group reaction." Thus, there is normal and abnormal conduct, depending on whether a particular conduct complies with or does not comply with a conduct norm. Each individual belongs to several social groups. As a result, it is almost inevitable that in a more complex culture there is an increasing probability that an individual will belong to groups which have divergent or conflicting norms in regard to a particular situation. Therefore, culture conflict refers to the situation when there are legal and nonlegal conduct norms that conflict. Culture conflict can arise as a latent consequence of the growth of civilizations and as result of the conflicts of cultural codes. Conflicts of cultural codes can arise under the following circumstances: if cultural codes conflict at the border of cultural
areas next to each other, if the law of one group is expanded and applied to other areas, and if individuals from one group move to another area. This can be seen to be particularly suited to explain some of the crimes of immigrants who from their cultural perspective, are actually just engaging in what must seem to them, normative behavior.

As an example, a study of street-corner gangs in lower-class areas produced the following results for Miller (1970:351-363). These adolescents—although cognizant that they were violating the law—were actually engaging in behaviors that were either accepted or at least, not rejected by lower-class culture and as a result, conflicted with various legal norms and middle-class culture. The lower-class culture, which has been a persistent and well-established tradition, is characterized by the following focal concerns: trouble, toughness, smartness, excitement, fate, and autonomy. Additionally, the adolescent street corner gangs found in lower-class culture were also associated with the traits of belonging and status.

A newer focus that has emerged in the conflict perspective has been to examine the emergence of law. For example, Traub and Little (1980:297) pointed out that various theorists believe that rules emerge from the political power competition of various groups. Also, whether or not the law is enforced is in large measure a reflection of whether it will be viewed as beneficial by those in power. Vold (1979:283-296) presented an early more moderate version of this viewpoint. After discussing the conflicts of groups, he also suggested that political processes, such as law-making, reflect the conflict between various interest groups and that those who gain power will be in the position to
define what is criminal behavior. Thus, Vold (1979:292) suggested that various criminal actions must be viewed "...as representing primarily behavior on the front-line fringes of direct contact between groups struggling for the control of power in the political and cultural organization of society." The following types of crimes emerge in that manner: the direct political reform type of protest movement, the struggle between management and unions in industrial conflict, the latent result of jurisdictional disagreements between different labor units, and the attempts to reform racial segregation.

Thus, conflict has been analyzed in relation to class and power and exploitation within a society. For example, in an historical study, Chambliss (1973:257-269) very explicitly rejected a consensus perspective in favor of a conflict perspective in regard to the criminal law. Upon examining the vagrancy laws as they emerged and were utilized in various ways, Chambliss concluded that these laws reflected the concerns of "vested interest groups." For example, vagrancy laws as they first appeared in the fourteenth century, stated that it was a crime to grant alms to mentally and physically capable, but unemployed individuals and set a standard compensation for workers. During that era, cheap labor was a necessity for the proper functioning of the British economy. However, the Black Death had ravaged the labor population and there were also increased opportunities for serfs. Thus, the vagrancy laws emerged to protect the economic interests of the powerful. Interestingly, future shifts in the focus of vagrancy laws also reflected the interests of those in power.
In a comprehensive evaluation of crime through the conflict perspective, Quinney (1980:321-326) offered the following propositions to explain crime:

Proposition 1: Crime is a definition of human conduct that is created by authorized agents in a politically organized society. Proposition 2: Criminal definitions describe behaviors that conflict with the interests of the segments of society that have the power to shape public policy. Proposition 3: Criminal definitions are applied by the segments of society that have the power to shape the enforcement and administration of criminal law. Proposition 4: Behavior patterns are structured in segmentally organized society in relation to criminal definitions, and within this context, persons engage in actions that have relative probabilities of being defined as criminal. Proposition 5: Conceptions of crime are constructed and diffused in the segments of society by various means of communication. Proposition 6: The social reality of crime is constructed by the formulation and application of criminal definitions, the development of behavior patterns related to criminal definitions, and the construction of criminal conceptions.

In more recent works, Quinney (1974:15-16) has been very explicit in his blame of the capitalist system. Suggesting that the interests of the dominant economic class are advanced by the state, he proposed that the criminal law maintains this social and economic order, while crime control perpetuates domestic order. Thus, inherently, other classes are oppressed through such means as coercion. As a result, Quinney maintained that the only way to end the crime problem is for a new socialist society to emerge.

Thus, social disorganization and conflict theories cover a gambit of types of theory. From the viewpoint that socially disorganized areas tend to have value systems which conflict with conventional society, to
the more radical viewpoints of Quinney, a variety of conceptions of the nature of the relationship of conflict and deviance have emerged.

**The Applicability of Conflict Theories to Positive Deviance**

Thus, the final type of theoretical stance that has been used to elucidate negative deviance is conflict (i.e., including social disorganization and culture conflict). While the applicability of conflict theories does not appear to be quite as extensive as is the case for the other three types of theories, there do appear to be some points that conflict theory could help to explain.

For example, in regard to conflict as expressed by social disorganization theory, some issues pertinent to positive deviance can be raised. To reiterate, Thomas and Znaniecki (1980:44) wrote that social disorganization refers to a "...a decrease of the influence of existing social rules of behavior upon individual members of the group." As in the case of anomie, a period of social disorganization would perhaps be very conducive to the emergence of charismatic behavior. A period of social disorganization is obviously equivalent to a period of stress, which provides fertile ground for the needs of a group of people to have a charismatic leader, as discussed by Tucker (1968:744). Thus, the first necessary component of the charismatic relationship would be present. If a potential charismatic leader is situated within the group, then the charismatic relationship can emerge.

In addition, perhaps, during such a period of disorganization, a society would be more willing to accept innovations or innovators due to the dire circumstances that necessitate bold changes.
Another interesting point that was raised by Shaw and McKay (1970:226-227) is that in a complex culture, conflicting conduct norms are likely to prevail. In relation to positive deviance, this point could be important. This type of theory could perhaps be utilized to explain certain phenomena. For example, divergent definitions—of whether a particular action or actor will originally be labeled as positive deviance, as negative deviance, or in a neutral manner—will probably be produced in a complex society. At this point, the power of the various groups in a society will probably be significant in determining which definition wins. According to Quinney (1980:322), the second proposition states that criminal definitions will be applied to those actions that are in conflict with the interests of those in power in a society. Although this point was specifically applied to the case of criminal actions, the same phenomenon could be applicable to definitions of deviance, and whether or not certain examples of positive deviance will originally be labeled as negative deviance. For example, often times, certain innovations or certain charismatic leaders could be threatening or at least not supportive of those in power; consequently, these behaviors or individuals will be likely not to be defined positively, but negatively. Obviously, then, the relationship of power to the manner in which positive deviance is originally defined could be examined utilizing conflict theory.

Thus, there do appear to be some processes regarding positive deviance which could be explained by conflict theory, including the increase of innovation or charisma during periods of social disorganization and the importance of power in connection with the original designation of positive deviance as negative deviance or as
positive deviance.

Conclusions

All in all, certain types of positive deviance and certain processes associated with deviance could perhaps be elucidated at some level by various theories of deviance. These comments are meant to be merely tentative and suggestive at this point. There would be a need to delve into each of these issues to a far greater extent. Yet, anomie theory could be used to partially explain innovation and charismatic behavior. In addition, altruism and supra-conforming behaviors, as well as subcultural and social psychological levels of explanation, are perhaps most suitable for cultural support theories. Societal reaction theory could help explain processes like changing designations of deviance, the societal reaction to certain types of behavior, and the effects of societal reaction on the labeled. Finally, conflict theory could be useful to answering questions such as the relationship between power and the applications of designations of deviance. In essence, since positive deviance is akin to negative deviance in many respects, deviance theories could be useful in a more complete explanation of positive deviance.
In essence, positive deviance has been defined, categorized, and examined.

Positive deviance has been defined utilizing aspects of the norm-violation approach to defining deviance and the labeling approach to defining deviance. Positive deviance refers to behavior that people label (i.e., publicly evaluate) in a superior sense. The labeling usually results because the behavior departs from that which is considered normative or normal in the particular case of behavior.

Similarly to the case of deviance, in general, the relativity of positive deviance has been noted. In other words, actions and/or behaviors and/or actors that have been defined as positive deviance in one era, or by one culture, or by one subculture, may be defined as positive deviance or negative deviance or normative behavior by another era, culture, or subculture.

To further facilitate a more complete examination of positive deviance, a classificatory model based on five types of positive deviance was posited. The five types of positive deviance—which were
garnered from the review of the existing literature on positive deviance—include the following: innovation, altruism, supra-conformity, charisma, and innate characteristics. In the first place, innovation suggests a new combination of already existing cultural elements, or a modification of a cultural element to produce a new one. Nobel Prize winners have been discussed by Szasz (1970:xxv-xxvi) as a form of positive deviance. The second type of positive deviance, altruism, includes self-sacrificing heroes Steffensmeier and Terry (1975:4). Altruism involves actions engaged in voluntarily to benefit others, which are undertaken without any expectation of reward or personal gain. Supra-conformity is a third type of positive deviance. Along these lines, straight-A students have been mentioned by Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:67). Supra-conformity refers to behavior that reaches the level of the idealized in a culture, rather than just the normatively expected. In the fourth place, charisma is a type of positive deviance exemplified by Gandhi (Sorokin, 1950:81). A charismatic leader is believed to possess special gifts by a group of followers and consequently, is followed accordingly. The last type of positive deviance postulated is that of innate characteristics. Beautiful women have been discussed as positive deviants by Hawkins and Tiedeman (1975:59) and geniuses have been referred to as positive deviants by Scarpitti and McFarlane (1975:28). Innate characteristics, refer to traits which are partially innate and are partially modified by environmental conditions.

Finally, deviance theories in general (i.e., those theoretical approaches developed to explain negative deviance) have been analyzed to ascertain how applicable each could be in regard to explaining positive
deviance. Anomie theory would appear to be best suited to explain innovation and charismatic forms of positive deviance. Additionally, anomie theory would best explain macro-level issues in relation to positive deviance. Cultural support theory could be utilized to explain altruism and supra-conforming behavior. Also, subcultural and social psychological issues should be the focus of cultural support theories. In the third place, societal reaction theories could be used to explain the following issues in regard to positive deviance: changing designations of deviance, the process of the actual societal reaction to certain types of behaviors, and the impact that the societal reaction has on the labeled. Finally, conflict theory could be used to clarify such issues as the increase of charisma or innovation which occurs during periods of social disorganization and to explain how power affects the application of designations of deviance.

Some illustrative areas in which hypotheses could be developed and empirically examined in the future will be addressed.

At the most general level, as suggested by Steffensmeier and Terry (1975:4) in relation to Congressional Medal of Honor winners and by Freedman and Doob (1968:4-5) in relation to positive deviance, positive deviants are often treated similarly to negative deviants. This issue should be studied. Additionally, this issue should be further pursued in regard to each of the five types of positive deviance. In other words, an important issue to be examined would be whether this process would occur in a differential manner for each type of positive deviance.

Another issue that could be usefully pursued in the future is that of the malleability of labels. In essence, does the label of an action and/or behavior waver much in relation to whether the action and/or
behavior is considered positive deviance, negative deviance, or as a neutral form of action. In addition, this issue could also be examined in relation to types of positive deviance. For example, seemingly charisma as a form of positive deviance would be more subject to changing designations than would altruism. This phenomenon would probably occur because charisma is often based on an emotional response. Altruism always involves selfless behavior and, thus, is more likely to be uniformly labeled in a positive manner.

Another interesting area to examine empirically would be in relation to the question of the original application of a label. As such, does the type of positive deviance have an impact on whether an action and/or behavior is more likely to be viewed originally in a positive, negative, or neutral manner. For example, since according to Lenski and Lenski (1982:70-73), people are very apt to resist change, perhaps innovation would tend to be originally labeled in a negative manner. In contrast, since supra-conformity refers to actions that adhere to the idealized level of a society, seemingly, supra-conformity would be more likely to be originally labeled in a positive manner.

The applicability of the various theoretical stances to positive deviance (i.e., anomie, cultural support, societal reaction, and conflict) could be further analyzed and also empirically examined in relation to positive deviance.

A final significant area of future research would center on the role of gender issues in relation to the various types of positive deviance. Unfortunately, many of the completed studies that have been cited in this dissertation have almost exclusively revolved around males. For example, most research on achievement motivation has been...
conducted with males and traditional male sex roles as the focus. Future studies of supra-conformity in regard to the issue of gender would be an important contribution to a complete explanation of positive deviance.

In conclusion, empirical investigations of positive deviance, in general, and the various types of positive deviance, would illuminate both the nature of positive deviance and negative deviance.
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