DEVIANT LABELS AND GENERIC SOCIAL PROCESSES: INTER-GROUP RELATIONS OF A HUNTING DOG CLUB

by

Rita Marie Tanti Devin

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
in fulfilment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Sociology

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1997

© Rita Marie Tanti Devin, 1997

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-22198-9

Canada

The University of Waterloo requires the signatures of all persons using or photocopying this thesis. Please sign below, and give address and date.

ABSTRACT

This study is an example of ethnographic research in the tradition of interpretive sociology. It provides a conflict-interactionist analysis of the process and nature of subcultural adaptation and contributes to the sociology of deviance, social change, political sociology, and the study of everyday life.

The subject of this research is an individual club of an international hunting dog organization that registers, trains, breeds, and tests hunting dogs of the 'pointing dog' variety. The club exists for the purpose of establishing and maintaining an ideal standard for 'versatile' hunting dogs. These dogs must be able to detect by scent and 'point' game birds (both upland and waterfowl) and 'track' a variety of small fur-bearing and big 'game animals.' They must also be able to 'retrieve' these animals reliably once they are shot by the hunter.

This group constitutes a unique subculture with a distinctive set of rules, roles, routines, artifacts, and language. As part of the constellation of hunting-related activity, this group of sporting dog enthusiasts is having to cope with an increasingly hostile socio-political climate, one that might be characterized as being influenced by 'political correctness.' As a consequence, this subculture may be evolving into a deviant subculture. This thesis documents the process of 'subcultural evolution and adaptation' as it occurred in this club as a result of this political correctness trend.

The main thesis of this research is that in the course of interacting with other subcultural groups in the broader society, members of a group of hunting dog enthusiasts have *acknowledged a relationship to outsiders* that is highly conflictual. This acknowledgment led to an *analysis of outsider perspectives and activities* that began with an identification of these outsiders, progressed to theorizing about their nature, and culminated in a critical consideration of their perspective. Subsequently, in response to the influence of outsiders, members have *changed* some of their activities and techniques, *closed* themselves off socially and physically from outsiders, and *contrived* a new stance and image in their interactions with the public at large. Thus, they have collectively developed strategies to *adapt to outsider influence*.

This study employs Howard S. Becker's (1963) well known 'conflict-interactionist' contribution to the study of deviance, 'labelling theory.' Following Robert Prus (1987;1994;1996), the theory generated by my case study is formulated as a set of 'generic social processes.' As such, the category of generic social processes, *Relating to the*

Subcultural Mosaic that I propose presents a theory of everyday life that is not only 'grounded' but also 'generic.'

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not have been possible without the kind cooperation of the members of a club of hunting dog enthusiasts who allowed me to interview them and to participate as a member of their organization. I have learned so much from all of you and I am so very grateful for the opportunities with which you have provided me to experience your very special social world. Thank you!

My ongoing registration as a graduate student would not have been possible without financial assistance from the University of Waterloo, the NFA, and the OFAH. I would like to extend my thanks to the University for the Graduate Scholarship awarded to me upon entrance to the Ph.D. program and for the Graduate Student Bursary awarded to me for my final term. I would also like to express my gratitude to the National Firearms Association (especially to Mr. Bill Rantz) and to the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters (especially to Dr. Terry Quinney) who arranged for me to receive the very generous emergency funding that enabled me to pay my tuition as I awaited my thesis defense. Thank you all for your much needed assistance.

In addition to the cooperation of respondents and the financial support given to me, this work has benefited from the valuable input of the fine members of my thesis committee. In this connection, I wish to thank Dr. Fred Desroches for his ongoing guidance, support, and friendship; Dr. Rick Helmes-Hayes for stepping into the role of reader at the last minute and for his suggestions for revisions; Dr. Robert Prus for his fine work on generic social processes and his critical reviews of earlier drafts of my thesis; Dr. Al Cheyne (Psych.) for acting as my internal-external examiner; Dr. Robert Stebbins (U. of Calgary) for being the greatest external examiner imaginable and a very nice person, as well; and the most wonderful supervisor I could ever have wished for, the very insightful and thoughtful Dr. Lorne Dawson. There is no possible way that my thesis could have been as well prepared for its final review and defense as it was without the input and critical contributions of Dr. Dawson. I am eternally indebted to you, Lorne, for all the ways (big and small) in which you indicated to me that my work was important and that my feelings mattered.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my family and friends for their support over the years. I would like to thank my parents (Joe and Marie Tanti) for their numerous financial contributions and for their encouragement and support. I would like to thank my closest friends who have let me vent my frustrations in person, by telephone, and by correspondence. Thanks to all of you for putting up with me (especially Janet Clark Borsk, Heather Cadogan, and my four former-student pen-pals from the University of Victoria, Lorelei, Trevor, Phil, and Mike). In this connection, I would also like to thank my very dear friend Dr. Ken Westhues, a great teacher, champion of the student-underdog, and perhaps the kindest person I know. Many thanks to Dr. Westhues for the astute reading of my personality which led him to give me the advice that I have followed for the second round of my graduate career, "Bite your tongue!" I am eternally grateful for this very straight-forward lesson in

diplomacy. It will no doubt be valuable in the many other politically sensitive situations I shall encounter in the future.

Finally, I thank my very best friend and partner of more than ten years, my beloved husband, William Devin. I am very grateful to him for respecting my independent ambition and not attempting to murder me for it in my sleep. He, too, has experienced directly the sacrifices, the frustrations, the small victories, and the challenging social interactions that make up the real life history of this heap of paper. Yes, it has been one hell of a trip---and I hope that you will forgive me. If you will give me another ten years I shall make it up to you, then maybe, if I prove myself worthy, you will give me ten more.

2.D.
Sept. 1 '97

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the preservation of the tradition of hunting with noble sporting dogs who live only to be loyal companions of the many ethical hunters who work with and admire them.

This work is also dedicated to my husband, William, an ethical hunter and my loyal companion, and to our beloved German Shorthair, Thunder, a very fine hunting dog and perhaps the most adored pet in the entire world.

CONTENTS

Chapter One: Contextualization 1
A. Outline of the Chapter 1
B. Subject 1
C. The Problem 3
D. Plan of the Study 10
E. Thesis 11
F. Approach 11
G. Overview of the Group 13
H. Historical Development of the Organization 17
I. Historical Development of the Club Studied 21
J. Chapter Summary 24

Chapter Two: Theoretical Integration 26
A. Outline of the Chapter 26
B. Theoretical Foundations 26
C. A "Subculture" Within the "Subcultural Mosaic" 30
i Training Events 37
ii Hunting Tests 39
iii Meetings and Socials 41
D. Labelled "Deviant" 43
E. The Issue of Power 56
F. A "Deviant" Subculture? 61
G. A Grounded and Generic Theory 64
H. Contributions to the Study of Groups at Risk of Being Labelled "Deviant" 78
I. Chapter Summary 80

Chapter Three: Review of Substantive Literature on Deviant Groups 82
A. Outline of the Chapter 82
B. A Review of Four Ethnographies 83
i The Taxi Dance Hall 83
ii The Doomsday Cult 86
iii Tearoom Trade 89
iv The Rebels 92
C. Summary and Discussion 95
D. Chapter Summary 96

Chapter Four: Methodological Implementation 97
A. Outline of the Chapter 97
B. Historical Development of the Study 97
C. Meta-Theoretical Foundations 99
D. The Ethnography 101
i Research Design: Emergence and Flexibility 102
ii Data Collection: Immersion and Empathy 108
iii Data Analysis: Induction and Ongoing Process 112
E. Chapter Summary 117

Chapter Five: Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic 118
A. Outline of the Chapter 118
B. Overview and Rationale 118
C. Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic 120
i acknowledging a relationship to outsiders 120
ii analyzing outsider perspectives and activities 124
iii adapting to outsider influence 135
D. Chapter Summary 146

Chapter Six: Conclusion 148
A. Outline of the Chapter 148
B. Implications: the promise of "genericism" 148
i the topic: Neopagans 149
ii the problem: inter-group relations of local Neopagans 156
iii analysis: Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic 158
C. Overview of the Study 173
D. Critique 176
i the ideal situation 176
ii my contributions 177
iii the next phase 179
E. The Future...? 181
F. Concluding Remarks 182

LIST OF SPECIAL RESOURCES 183

BIBLIOGRAPHY 184

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: "Role of Prus' 'Generic Social Processes' *within* the proposed 'Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic' category of generic social processes" 70

Table 2: "Summary of 'Generic Social Process of Everyday Life'" 77

Table 3: "Subcultural Adaptation" to being "labelled 'deviant'" 80

Table 4: "Sample = 26---Length of Membership and Extent of Involvement" 110

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

GunDog Magazine - FINAL SUBSCRIPTION RENEWAL REQUEST 4

Chapter 1:

C O N T E X T U A L I Z A T I O N

A. Outline of the Chapter

As a general introduction to the study, this chapter begins with an overview of the **subject** of the dissertation and a discussion of the **problem** explored. At this point, the reader is provided with the **plan of the study**. From there, the main **thesis** is presented along with a brief explanation of the theoretical and methodological **approach** taken. The chapter continues with an **overview** of the group under investigation, and concludes with an account of the **historical development of the organization**, and a brief account of the **historical development of the club** from which data were collected. This chapter intends to introduce the project and to provide some background information. As such, it seeks to *contextualize* the dissertation.

B. Subject

The subject of this research is an individual 'club' of an 'international hunting dog organization.' The intention was to study this group as a unique subculture. This non-profit organization registers, trains, breeds, and tests 'versatile hunting dogs' of the 'pointing dog' variety (German Shorthaired Pointers, German Longhaired Pointers, German Wirehaired Pointers, Vizslas, Weimaraners, four varieties of the French Bracque, Italian Spinoni, Brittany Spaniels, Large and Small Munsterlanders, Wirehaired Pointing Griffons, Cesky Fouseks, and Pudelpointers).

The club exists for the purpose of establishing, training toward, and maintaining, an ideal standard for pointing dogs: The dogs must demonstrate 'versatility' in the execution of the hunt. A 'versatile hunting dog' must 'search for game.' The manner of searching is highly standardized. At the command, 'hie-on,' the dog must 'quarter' and frequently 'check in' with the handler. To quarter is to run in a zig-zag pattern into the wind at the command hie-on far ahead of the handler. The dog is to check in often by either looking back at or returning to the side of the handler for either a repeat of the command to continue or a voice, hand, or whistle signal to change direction. The dog must use his strong instinct to 'point' once he has located game in forest or field. Pointing involves the use of their keen sense of

smell alone to detect game at a distance and then to freeze in a standing position. The point should be 'staunch.' That is, the dog must point with intensity and stylishly extend his neck in the direction of the game, usually with one front leg bent at the elbow, slightly crouched at rear, and holding his tail stiff and high. The dog must also be encouraged and taught to use his instinct to 'honour.' To honour, or 'back' is to stay back behind another dog in a point position without so much as moving a paw while the other dog completes the hunting sequence. It is to point the other's point. Dogs must be trained to remain 'steady to wing, shot, and fall.' In other words, they must reliably stay in the point position at the command 'whoa' as the bird is 'flushed' or driven to fly away, shot by the handler, and dropped onto the ground. Finally in the hunting sequence, the dog is expected to 'retrieve to hand over land and water.' On the command 'fetch' the dog must run or swim for the fallen game, pick it up in his mouth, immediately run or swim back to the handler and deliver the game gently at the command 'out' or 'give' in an acceptable position, either standing in front of the handler, or standing or sitting at a 'heel' (on the left side of the handler). Dogs are also expected to 'track' a wide variety of upland game birds, waterfowl, small furred animals, and big game animals. That is, they are to go to 'find' either live or wounded animals by running with the nose on the ground along a scent or blood trail. Training a dog to perform these tasks reliably and with minimal direction from a handler is an outstanding achievement. Pointing dogs are eager and very willing to please. Indeed, they are considered to be very intelligent in the dog world, however, they have a reputation for being rather stubborn, moreso than retrievers, for example.

In local 'clubs,' members congregate for the purpose of sharing training and breeding information, participating in scheduled training events, arranging approved breedings, setting test dates (for "Puppy-" and "Advanced-Hunting Dog Testing"), testing dogs, arranging for representation at trade shows (e.g. hunting shows, outdoors shows), and hunting in small groups. Additionally, at executive meetings, members of the executive committee are concerned with identifying members' interests and organizational problems, proposing new ways to encourage the participation of current members, and accomplishing certain administrative tasks (e.g. soliciting volunteers to report on and be responsible for finding judges, test sites, setting up training and handler clinics, publishing a bi-monthly newsletter, arranging game shoots and social events, such as picnics, dances, and other fund raisers).

As noted in the next section, people in this club constitute a 'vulnerable group.' They are at risk of being labelled 'deviant' and possibly suffering some sort of maltreatment as a consequence. Because of this, the organization's true identity will be protected, as such its

anonymity must be assured. Consequently, names of persons have been omitted, the 'organization' and the individual 'club' remain anonymous, identifying names of the group's events and practices, and names of its publications have all been changed. Names of dog tests and titles have also been altered. Direct quotations from members are cited as interview code numbers and little or no personal information that would identify the speaker to outsiders is attached to them. Insofar as this has been possible, revealing details have been omitted. Although this will no doubt interfere with a full ethnography of the group (one which would normally present its own terms to illustrate the group's special character as reflected in its language), the interests of this group and its survival must take priority.

C. The Problem

As a consequence of social change, the activities of this group have fallen out of favour with the general public, at least in principle. The reference to "dangerous times" in the illustration [*below*] suggests that members of the 'hunting fraternity' are experiencing social disapproval. As such, this subculture may be evolving into a deviant subculture.

The process of 'subcultural evolution' is inherently interesting because it is characteristic of what is happening to a large number of subcultures that have found themselves suddenly labelled 'deviant.' In any social group or society, there will be sub-groups who, partly as a consequence of their activities, come to be seen as "outsiders" (Becker 1963). In certain public circles, smokers, meat-eaters, dog breeders, sport hunters, anglers, industrial entrepreneurs, loggers, trappers, furriers, and many others may fall into this category. They are experiencing increasingly overt and sometimes vehement moral disapproval, and in some cases, legal intervention curtailing activities which until very recently were seen as unproblematic or irrelevant to members of the general public. In the past several years, a group that was once part of the 'mainstream' of North American life, those that are part of the 'hunting subculture,' have increasingly come to be seen as and labelled 'deviant.'

As a consequence of being part of the constellation of hunting-related activity, sporting dog enthusiasts are being influenced by a particular set of social issues and current events that affect the functions and persistence of their recreational groups. From the activities of social movements, such as anti-fur groups, anti-cruelty to animals groups, anti-hunting groups, anti-gun groups, vocal environmentalists, vegetarians, pacifists, feminists, and others, to the activities of our legislatures, such as changes to and enforcement of gun control legislation, cruelty to animals legislation, migratory birds legislation, hunting regulations, and trespassing

GUN DOG

THE MAGAZINE OF UPLAND BIRD AND WATERFOWL DOGS

P. O. Box 343 - Mt. Morris. IL 61054

FINAL REMINDER

DON'T MISS ANOTHER VALUABLE ISSUE!!!

IN THESE **DANGEROUS TIMES*** OF ANIMAL RIGHTS ACTIVISTS, ENDANGERED WETLANDS AND THE ANTI-GUN MOVEMENT, WE BIRD HUNTERS MUST STICK TOGETHER OR RUN THE RISK OF LOSING OUR HERITAGE AND RIGHT TO PURSUE OUR SPORT!

Dear Old Friend,

It's been a couple of months now since we've been able to send you GUN DOG Magazine. We miss having you as a subscriber.

If you've had some service problems with your subscription that we're unaware of, PLEASE drop me a note in the postage-paid envelope and tell me what it was so we can correct it for you.

If you just forgot to renew, why not take advantage of this reminder RIGHT NOW and return the enclosed form in the postage-paid envelope provided? Don't even take time to write a check (unless you prefer). Just do it now—while you're thinking about it! Better yet, CALL 1-800-800-7724 and tell the operator to enter your renewal immediately. You can charge it to your Visa or MasterCard, or they'll be happy to bill you later.

GUN DOG is still the only sporting magazine written exclusively for upland bird and waterfowl hunters and their dogs. Cover-to-cover, each and every issue covers up-to-date information for you on the **latest anti-hunting activity of various organizations,*** and is packed with practical pointing, flushing and retrieving advice from experts who know like Jim Spencer, Charley Waterman, Ken Roebuck, Dave Duffey, and many others! Dog-training, veterinary, shotgunning and **conservation news,*** and much, much more to keep you informed!

So, don't miss another valuable issue of GUN DOG Magazine—this is the LAST REMINDER we'll send you. CALL 1-800-800-7724 TODAY!

Sincerely,

Carrell E. Bunn
Publisher

P.S. If you've recently renewed, thank you for your order! Well process your order promptly!

*[Reproduction of Subscription Renewal Letter, * emphasis mine]*

or private property legislation, the organization must cope with existing in an increasingly hostile socio-political climate. Indeed, such activities may demonstrate the existence of a "bloc" (Fitzsimmons-LeCavalier & LeCavalier 1994:591) of social movement influence that represents a more generalized 'political correctness trend.' Certainly, that is how members of the club see the situation.

Members of this club have identified their opponents as members of this political correctness movement. They argue that due to the influence of this bloc, the future of the club is not as secure as once thought to be the case. Consequently, they have elected to respond in their own particular way. Before proceeding, it is imperative that the nature of this 'political correctness trend' in the context of this study and from the perspective of this group be explored:

> *What they now call 'political correctness' we used to call social conscience, social justice..... justice for all, the promise of the hippie movement. Inclusion wasn't a gift, it was a right. [000405]*

The self-identified 'politically correct' crowd of the late 1980s and early 1990s defined the exclusion of persons with any socially devalued status, ascribed or achieved or any special need, challenge, special belief or practice as a nasty '-ism.' They made sexism, racism, classism, and ageism common labels for 'deviance-according-to-the-politically correct.' It was expected that the modern, socially aware person of the new generation would profess to be 'anti-sexist,' 'anti-racist,' 'anti-classist,' 'gay-positive,' 'special-needs- sensitive,' *et cetera*. Indeed, according to several undergraduate students, one young university instructor actually introduced himself to his class as such at their first lecture [Notes: Trent U., 1994].

Today, however, various members of the public view the politically correct as people who have gone overboard with regard to defining and protecting victims. That is, they are seen as so caught up with the identification and protection of special interest groups (very broadly defined) that it is almost impossible to not be offending someone in some way. Indeed, the politically correct are frequently ridiculed in mainstream popular culture: The television program *Politically Incorrect* is an obvious effort at reviving and voicing strong political views in the context of an informal debate, often with the effect of undermining the concerns of special interest groups. Also, in a recent program (aired on CBC in mid-July 1997) comedian John Wing poked fun at a fictitious "politically correct children's book of songs" wherein references are made to "Three *Visually Impaired* Mice...," "Baa, Baa, *African-American* Sheep...," and "Rub-a-Dub-Dub Three Men *and Three Women in a Tub*

and They All Get Paid the Same." The 'fanatic' role or label is imposed by backlashers upon many of those with social justice and environmental concerns. The 'PC label' once used ironically among the radical intelligentsia is turned against them as the folk-devil, 'deviant' label in the face of a conservative political backlash (Smith 1995). Indeed, what was once 'in,' or at least tolerated, is now 'out.' The champion of the underdog is no longer appreciated in conservative circles.

Once an inner-circle political credential, so to speak, 'politically correct' has become a subversive dirty word. "PC" is an "ideological code" (Smith 1995:44) that labels as partisan, personal, arbitrary, whining, trivial, and overly-demanding all 'radical' attempts to include the traditionally excluded (e.g., the socially disadvantaged). According to Smith (1995), "PC" is now a label that conservative forces impose without reference to their own special (conservative) interests. Rather, they appeal to our objective, inclusive sense of rights and freedoms and true democracy to authorize and legitimate their counter-attack. Freedom of speech suddenly has become the exclusive privilege of the conservative mainstream. The politically correct are criticized as "obstacles in the path of democracy," people trying to advance arbitrary, personal interests, while "politically *in*correct" interest groups allegedly seek to maintain the interests of "all" (see Smith 1995:44-45). The noble cause is recast as the subversive leftist agenda.

In spite of the (growing) conservative backlash against political correctness, the influence of the PC heyday has left its mark. Although it now appears to be entirely acceptable to grunt and groan, so to speak, in the popular culture against persons of the politically correct persuasion (for overdoing it or going too far), it is not acceptable to flaunt politically *in*correct views in most public circles, especially such attitudes that deny the right of the politically correct to have their say. This may be in part the result of official compliance with and legal enforcement of the provisions given in the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* which defines discrimination and ideological oppression as 'unconstitutional.' Under the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* humans are largely free to vocalize and to demonstrate in support of all manner of ideas (except those that constitute 'inciting hatred'). Thus, challenging the fundamental values of the politically correct (e.g. their desire for the abolition of discrimination and selective use of censorship), is akin to challenging the spirit of the *Charter*. The traditionally excluded (as a result of ascription, achievement, or ideology) now have under constitutional law and through the efforts of the politically correct, the right to be heard and acknowledged.

Members of the group studied and those associated with the sporting fraternity at large do tend to consider the acknowledgment and appeasement of traditionally excluded interest groups as an infringement upon *their* rights and freedoms by the politically correct. Many members of the establishment are reluctant to engage in the power-sharing that being one voice among many requires. They regard themselves as the 'silent majority,' and outsiders as 'minority groups.' They argue that certain minority groups (e.g. dissenting social movements) have been making gains in the political arena as a result of the political correctness trend. Thus, for obvious reasons, those associated with the sporting fraternity are feeling threatened and have begun to construct objections in an effort to re-establish their legitimacy. They resent being pushed to the margins when, until very recently, they were seen as the epitome of mainstream of traditional masculinity in western culture---man, the hunter.

Their *publicly voiced* objections to outsiders are often framed as 'we were here first'-retorts that to some extent suggest not merely a political but also a generational conflict. This permits them to trivialize the PC challenge as faddish, to some extent. Thus, the PC challenge is but a passing trend, frivolity, absurdity (the jogging craze, the hula hoop, the pet rock). Such dismissals of the rise of radical political forces are a form of self-defense in an ideological war. Again, although their fervent desire may be to return the 'minorities' to the margins, it is highly unlikely that this is a real possibility. The political correctness movement has facilitated the establishment of members of such 'minority groups' in a number and variety of high places. For example, due to reforms to the educational system (e.g. Anti-Racist Multi-Cultural Education policies), inclusivity in the media of mass communications (e.g. in advertising and on televised news programs), immigration patterns and the simultaneous persistence (and revival) of ideals and styles from the 1970s to the 1990s (especially in ethnically and socially diverse cities), an entire generation has been socialized to be aware of and try to get along with (if not to unconditionally accept) plurality.

Although members of the group studied have labelled 'the other' pejoratively as 'politically correct' and often refer to them explicitly as such, the 'politically correct' have not directly labelled *them*, as members of *this* particular group, 'politically *in*correct.' Their 'deviance' is undiscovered. As such, their 'subcultural adaptations,' constitute a kind of anticipatory socialization (or perhaps preventative measures). That is, they are seeing it coming, they are playing with the role, they are training themselves to live with it, use it, adapt to it, within limits. Also, members of this group appear to be attempting to identify a 'more deviant' group in order to distance themselves from true offenders and make the label less likely to stick. They are merely 'deviant by (unfortunate) association.' Indeed, in the language

of Robert Prus (1995), the self-defined "target" group is simultaneously engaging in the "tactician" role, in this case (to be discussed below).

At this point in time not all 'politically incorrect groups' have felt the full force of the implications of being labelled 'deviant.' In popular discourse, 'politically incorrect' is still a politically damaging label, and if it does threaten to stick, those so labelled will be forced to respond. Some will give in to pressure and disband entirely. It is also possible that some may choose to go underground. Others could decide, however, to remain visible and either allow themselves to be forced to compromise or to change nothing beyond constructing a public veneer of compromise. They could, however also decide to profit from 'in-group/out-group' hostility and resort to various acts of resistance. The path ultimately chosen will depend on each group's reflective choices and its available resources.

With this particular group, the choice is both clear and entirely 'do-able.' They are not giving in, and 'underground' is a state of mind. There have been compromises, but however subtle, resistance is the agenda. They are, so to speak, fortifying the castle (*changing*), building the moat (*closing*), and flying their most diplomatic flags (*contriving*). In the process, they are making a point of offering directions to other territories more deserving of attack (the camp of the '*un*ethical hunters,' e.g. those who are the more appropriate targets for the politically correct).

It should be noted at this point that a number of individual clubs within this organization could have been studied to explore this problem and process. According to the Registrar and former president of the international organization, many clubs of this organization have experienced public disapproval. He stated that "the ease of 'a club's' functioning really varies..." with more difficulties arising in the (urbanized-cosmopolitan) East. "Bird-watchers, etc., are a problem," he commented. He suggested that in many areas, there is fairly widespread public support for the clubs, especially in rural areas, and even in some urban (industrialized rather than cosmopolitan) areas (International Registrar 1995). As such, it is entirely likely that several individual clubs, in fact, have evolved 'subcultural adaptations' to public disapproval.

It was my wish to document the process of 'subcultural (evolution and) adaptation' as it occurred in one club of the organization as a result of a political correctness movement. Members have suggested on a number of occasions that they "must be more careful today than they had to be 25 years ago." I wished to pursue the meaning of such observations.

Consequently, this research contributes to the body of sociological theory in the areas of social change, political sociology, deviance, and everyday life.

I was most fortunate to have very early on encountered explicit and completely unsolicited evidence for my argument that this group has been influenced by social change and is now faced with having to cope in some way. To give but a few examples: In general, members were quite aware that something is now 'amiss,' that is, that trouble is brewing and perhaps has been brewing for some time, and that they will have to 'be careful,' at least, if not 'change their tactics' (either become active or even militant). At the annual club meeting, members were discussing the problem of securing adequate testing grounds for the dogs, when two comments were made. First, "No, they [the regional government department] won't let us hold it there, too many bird-watchers..." This was, I believed, an allusion to environmentalists or naturalists who may protest. Second, "Well, when we were in Germany, we had to drive all the way to Belgium [to test the dogs] because Greenpeace wouldn't let us kill the birds there [in Germany]..." Here, a direct reference was made to actual and successful interference in the group's activities by "moral entrepreneurs" (Becker 1963). At another meeting, one member presented the group with evidence of some 'writing on the wall.' A friendly member of a retrieving dog club (such as Labradors, Goldens, Chesapeakes, Curly Coats, Flat Coats, and Nova Scotian Duck Tollers) distributed a copy of a letter that was being circulated in his group about the government forbidding them to use any waterfowl, however domesticated, that even remotely resembles wild mallard ducks. The member was quite concerned and threw it on the table with an indignant, "Take a look at *this*," almost as if he were personally presenting them with a challenge. This was interpreted as evidence of their awareness of further and impending legal interference with their activities, instigated again, perhaps, by environmentalists. On another occasion, the director of shows was warned very loudly by the club president himself to make sure that their booth at the local outdoors show was to be nowhere near the "...Humane Society, or whoever the hell they were..." because "that woman [a representative the previous year] carrying the rabbit kept walking by and looking at us like we were murderers..." This was a reference to a situation wherein members faced a certain amount of social disapproval from an animal rights sympathizer. Moreover, at one show, it was frequently commented by those hesitating or declining to purchase a ticket for the club's annual gun draw, "Why bother...when the government's only gonna take it away from me?" Such comments were references to the public's and the group's awareness of the influence of those lobbying for stricter gun laws. Even where individual members did not spontaneously supply their own examples of feeling threatened by outsiders, none of the accounts given by others was challenged with regard to its veracity, nor did members exhibit any confusion with

regard to its meaning and significance for them. Never did I encounter disagreement or dissent among members with regard to interpretations of outsider perceptions and activities or to feelings of vulnerability to outsider influence.

When I approached the club President about doing this study, he offered even more evidence for the validity of my contentions. He stated that he was pleased that someone would care enough to write about the group, reasoning that it would "only help" because such interference is something that, as he put it, "we take very seriously." Obviously, this was indeed an expression of concern for a group that is being threatened. He then proceeded to tell me the story of why practice shooting with live pigeons is no longer allowed, hence (as he concluded), once they put a stop to something, "it never stops there." In his words, "well that just goes to show you... that will be the end of it [for us]." Here, I believed that he was implying that "that will be the end of it" if they did not act soon, or were not aware of the threat. Thus, there is certainly an awareness on the part of members that the group is at risk of being cast in the role of 'deviant subculture' and that this is something to which they must make some sort of adjustment.

D. Plan of the Study

In order to explore the problem, the study is organized in the following way: Immediately below, the **thesis** of the study is presented, followed by a brief outline of the approach taken. This chapter (**Chapter One: Contextualization**) concludes with a presentation of background information on the subject of the research, given for the purpose of acquainting the reader with the group itself and setting the stage for the upcoming analysis. The theoretical perspective informing the study is explained in detail in **Chapter Two: Theoretical Integration.** It provides the reader with the basis for my theoretical interest in the problem (i.e., the case provides examples of deviant group status, inter-group conflict, and adaptive strategizing) and describes the sociological perspective guiding the exploration and treatment of the problem (i.e., conflict-interactionism, labelling theory, generic social processes theory). A review of selected studies of how 'deviant groups' have dealt with outsider influence is given in **Chapter Three: Review of Substantive Literature on Deviant Groups**. The chapter concludes with a consideration (critique) of how these studies contribute to our understanding of inter-group relations, the applicability of generic social processes, the condition of being labelled 'deviant,' and of human group life in general. **Chapter Four: Methodological Implementation** offers information on the methodological perspective which has guided the research design, data collection, and data analysis (interpretivism/ qualitative research) and the actual steps taken to produce the research

findings (natural history of the research, information on sampling, technical details). In **Chapter Five: Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic,** the research findings are presented. These findings are organized in such a way as to illustrate with empirical evidence the generic social processes that were discovered by the research and demonstrate the value of a generic social processes approach to sociological analysis. **Chapter Six: Conclusion** is the final chapter of the thesis. Here a brief comparative case illustration is given to demonstrate the potential applicability of the generic social processes discovered by this study to other empirical cases. A final overview of the study follows (for the purpose of summary), along with a critical review of the study as a whole and some concluding comments.

E. Thesis

The research has revealed that: Members of this group have become aware of and have *acknowledged* some threat to their organization's existence, usually through first-hand experience of disapproval from and conflict with 'outsiders' (both members of 'organized groups' and 'the public'); that they have *analyzed* the nature of this threat and have concluded that it is the work of "moral entrepreneurs" ("the antis") who are seeking to label them 'deviant' (Becker 1963) ('politically incorrect'); and that they have been and will continue to respond to the social changes that are influencing them by *adapting*. The research has documented how this group's 'inter-group power relations' has led its members to engage in "collective resistance" (refer to Prus 1995) that has resulted in the construction of a set of practical subcultural adaptations to a socio-political climate of political correctness. In addition, it was speculated that in a number and variety of cases, social change may result in the evolution of similar subcultural adaptations (such as *changing*, *closing*, *contriving*) among other groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' And as such, that these adaptations may have "trans-situational" or "cross-contextual" applicability (Prus 1987; 1994; 1996).

F. Approach

This study takes a "interactionist-conflict" (Hills 1980:xi) approach to the study of the process of subcultural adaptation. It is based in the symbolic-interactionism of Herbert Blumer (1969) but following Howard S. Becker is explicitly taken in a conflict direction (1963). That is, unlike classical symbolic interactionism, this approach focuses on the role of conflict, power struggles, and power differentials in subcultural processes. In the context of the present study, group members perceive themselves as being involved in a highly conflictual relationship with a bloc of hostile groups within the "subcultural mosaic" (see Prus, in press) who are proponents of a new 'mainstream ideology' heavily influenced by political

correctness. It is to this hostile socio-political climate that group members are attempting to adjust.

Especially germane to this study is Becker's (1963) well known contribution to the study of deviance, 'labelling theory.' Particularly insofar as this theory highlights the process of the social construction of deviance ("labelling") as being the work of "moral entrepreneurs," (Becker 1963) labelling theory sensitizes the researcher to the arbitrary and shifting nature of deviance. In this study, the suddenness of the attachment of the 'deviant' label highlights the role of human agency as well as conflict in deviance construction. Other theoretical linkages with the present study can be found in the works of Gresham Sykes and David Matza (1979), Erving Goffman (1963), Renee Anspach (1994), J.L. Simmons (1964), and Daniel Wolf (1991). These works illustrate similar 'coping strategies' evolved by other groups labelled 'deviant.'

Hence, the present study integrates conflict and interactionist theories and provides a theory of 'subcultural adaptation' (*acknowledging, analyzing, adapting*) that is specific to the case of *being at risk* of being labelled 'deviant' (*changing, closing, contriving*). As such, it contributes to the study of everyday life and to the study of the social construction of deviance, respectively. [Please refer to Chapter Two: **Theoretical Integration** for details.]

The process of subcultural adaptation was discovered using an interpretive ethnographic methodology. In line with Wilhelm Dilthey's 'hermeneutic' approach, the present study offers insider interpretations of social change. Like other studies in the ethnographic tradition, the present study focuses on the lived experience of members of a unique subculture. Their 'accounts' are derived from an interpretive or naturalist methodological framework that demands that research design be 'flexible and emergent,' that data collection involve 'empathy and immersion' and the use of 'qualitative methods,' that data analysis be 'ongoing and inductive,' and that theory generation be '"grounded" and "generic"' (see Lincoln and Guba 1985; Lofland and Lofland 1984; Taylor and Bogdan 1984; Prus 1987, 1994, 1996). The present study evolved gradually, it employed qualitative research methods (participant observation and in-depth interviewing), and its theory of subcultural adaptation was generated by using the "grounded theory" method of Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss (1967). Following Robert Prus (1987, 1994, 1996), the present study reveals the existence of "generic social processes" with "trans-situational" or "cross-contextual" applicability [Please refer to Chapter Two: **Theoretical Integration** for details.].

Hence, the present study is the outcome of an interpretive ethnographic methodological approach integrated with a novel generic social processes application to grounded theory construction. Indeed, it contributes an additional category of generic social processes ("relating to the subcultural mosaic") to the corpus of ethnographic research. [Please refer to Chapter Three: **Methodological Implementation** for details.]

G. Overview of the Group

Late morning, on a warm spring day.... a knot of spectators clad in jeans, hiking boots and cotton casuals sit cross-legged in the grass. Some peer through binoculars as two shots ring out in the valley below. The canine-athlete doesn't flinch, she doesn't stop. She actually runs harder. Three men with clip-boards follow hastily behind a young man fixated on his pup, anxiously clasping his hands behind his back. The gunner opens the action on his handsome shot-gun and quickly gets himself out of the way. All squint through the fairly dense cover as the slight but well toned German Shorthaired Pointer bitch suddenly freezes, her outline tense and trembling. Unable to restrain herself, she lunges into the bushes and with a squawk a chukar takes flight, the pup in hot pursuit.

The spectators nod and murmur their approval. "Good drive. She's birdy."

"Go, 'Bora'!!!" several cheer in loud whispers.

Suddenly a metallic roar interrupts them. A small aircraft circles above, a little too close for comfort. Puzzled, the spectators turn their faces upward, shielding their eyes from the bright sun.

"Probably the Humane Society..." grumbles a veteran.

A few snort in disgust. Most nod and smirk.

"How much leading do you give for that?" a novice asks half-jokingly.*

Mischievous chuckles spread throughout the group.

> *[*How many feet ahead of that flying object do you aim your shot? Notes: Spring test, 1995]*

This group of hunting dog enthusiasts is organized on two levels, the international level and the local level, with individual clubs located all over North America. At the international level, "officers elected by popular vote, with appointed directors constitute an Executive Council" which directs and guides [organization] programs (Pamphlet "the[organization]," most recent edition). The local clubs are "sanctioned " and "sponsor the training and testing programs" (Pamphlet "the[organization]," most recent edition). According to their own literature, this organization of sport hunters and pointing dog fanciers is "an incorporated, non-profit organization whose purpose is to foster, promote, and improve the versatile hunting dog breeds in [this country]; to conserve game by using reliable hunting dogs well trained before and after the shot (on land and in water); and to aid in the prevention of cruelty to animals by discouraging nonselective and uncontrolled breedings, which produces unwanted and uncared for dogs" (Pamphlet "the [organization]," current edition). Its mandate is to "foster," "improve," "promote," and "protect" the versatile hunting dog in North America by helping "the gun dog hunter ... train his dog" (Pamphlet "the [organization]," most recent edition). Since the organization is concerned with the versatile hunting dog, it seeks to serve the interests of owners of dogs "bred and trained to reliably hunt and point game, to retrieve from both land and water, and to track wounded game on land and in water," as such, non-pointing dogs are "not well suited" for its testing and training programs (e.g. retrievers, flushing dogs, and hounds) (Pamphlet "the [organization]," most recent edition).

The objective of membership is for one to be offered opportunities to "learn first hand the various steps involved in training a versatile hunting dog... 'Good dog work,' to many hunters is as important and rewarding as the hunt itself" (Pamphlet "the [organization]," most recent edition). The organization argues that: "Much more pleasure is derived in field, forest and water when a dog is trained properly to do the tasks assigned, and less game is lost with a well trained hunting dog. [Moreover,] there is a special pride in watching a gun dog successfully complete those tasks which could not be performed without training" (Pamphlet "the [organization]," most recent edition).

In order to assist the hunter and owner of a versatile pointing dog, the organization offers a number of training aids: a book on "training and caring for versatile hunting dogs," (all proceeds go to the organization); a video on "training hunting dogs" (a 60 minute videotape); and the "training events" open to members organized by the individual local "clubs." In part, testing is done in order to determine the quality of dogs for future breeding. The motto "breed the best to the best" is often repeated by member-breeders and in order to do this, they

must select dogs that have the right 'credentials,' *organization* titles. These titles (or lack thereof) are recorded in their registry (the only registry specializing in pointing dogs, protecting kennel names and providing three generation pedigrees for each newly registered pup). Registry documents contain the dog's name, organization tattoo number, whelping date (date of birth of a dog), sire, dam, sex, color, hip dysplasia information, breeder's and owner's names, test score, "place" classification, test date, testing club name, dog's age at time of test, coat, temperament information, and any known or visible genetic defects in the line. This "information service" provides test results and comments, breeder reports, breeder awards, sire and dam report of progeny tested, breed and breed club reports, judging statistics, club testing statistics, historical reports, and hip dysplasia information (Pamphlet "the [organization]," most recent edition.)

The tests that dogs must pass in order to earn their titles simulate the actual hunting situation as much as possible. [Please note: to ensure the group's anonymity the following are pseudo-titles and test names]. Dogs are tested at various stages of maturity and thus can earn "First-," "Second-," or "Third-Place" titles in "Puppy tests" (for pups under the age of 16 months), "Advanced Preparation tests" (in which no places are earned, but in which dogs are prepared for) the adult "finished dog" "Advanced tests." The requirements for each test increase in complexity as each is geared to a different set of expectations of the dog's level of training. It should be noted that "no restrictions are placed on the number of times a dog may be tested...repeated tests are encouraged throughout the dog's development" (Booklet on "aims, programs, test rules," 1993). Non-members are free to enter a dog in an organization test, "however, members are afforded reduced rates on entry fees" (Booklet on "aims, programs, test rules," 1993). Dogs earning "First Place Advanced" titles have the opportunity to earn the title "Champion" at the most advanced test, "the Invitational Test." This is the only test in which two dogs are run simultaneously (otherwise, no direct competition ever exists among dogs), in order that they may demonstrate "willingness to back" (Pamphlet "the [organization]," most recent edition). Indeed, "the words ['place'] or 'pass' do not relate to placement as in a race or competition. Dogs compete against an established standard rather than each other. [Places] are awarded on the basis of numerical scores achieved in the test. Each dog that meets or exceeds minimum standards is placed in one of three categories, i.e., [First-, Second-, or Third-Place] with [First Place] being the highest" (Booklet on "aims, programs, test rules," 1993:5-6).

Organization-tested dogs are evaluated by three judges at either a spring or a fall test sessions. Dogs are evaluated for their instinctive and trained abilities to carry out all tasks

required of versatile hunting dogs in a variety of conditions. They are evaluated not just for whether or not they accomplish the task, but *how* they accomplish it. That is, in the "Advanced test," the dog must not only "search" for game, "point," and "retrieve," but "heel" obediently, "stay" at command, behave well in the "blind" [where the hunter lies in wait for ducks to fly overhead], and be "steady" to "wing, shot, and fall." Moreover, throughout the test they are watched closely and judged on their use of nose, desire to work, cooperation, stamina, obedience, and physique (Booklet on "aims, programs, test rules," 1993:27).

Dogs are scored for each quality or task from 0 (failure) to 4 (excellent). The score (0-4) is multiplied by the index number assigned to the quality or task assessed. That is, if "use of nose" is worth index number 6, then, if the dog earns the maximum possible score of 4 (excellent), 4 x 6 (index score) = 24. When scores for all qualities and tasks are added together, the (three) judges (one of which must come from another club) assign an overall score. From there, they refer to the "scoring chart" in order to award the appropriate "place."

In the "Puppy test," for example, a "Third Place" dog must earn a minimum of 58 points, the "Second Place" dog must earn a minimum of 80 points, and the "First Place" dog must earn a minimum of 99 points. However, the judges must take care in their scoring, as the minimum score (0-4) for each task, for each "place," is also specified in the chart. That is, for example, the "First Place Puppy" dog must earn at least a score of 3 on his water work, pointing, tracking, and cooperation, and at least a perfect score of 4 on his use of nose, searching ability or drive, and desire to work. The scoring system is therefore somewhat complicated, and the tests are difficult. It is often suggested that an "Advanced" "Second Place" dog is outstanding and the "First Place" dog is a really a "Second Placer" on a very good day.

Again, training brings inherited instincts under control, yet the performance of the dogs is very much the result of good breeding. The dog is bred to hunt, even though he must be taught the correct procedures for hunting for the handler (of course, his 'biddability,' that is, how easy he is to train, how eager he is to please, is certainly an inherited and much sought after trait). As such, for example, it is "the quality of a dog's nose [an inherited factor], more than any other single factor, [which] determines its usefulness as a versatile hunting dog and for this reason is assigned a higher fixed index number (6) than any other factor in the [organization] evaluation system....[And] as the dog develops, it must learn to use its nose [the result of training and experience] if maximum effectiveness is to be achieved" (Booklet on "aims, programs, test rules," 1993:9).

The organization's booklet on "aims, programs, and test rules," is *the* source of information on the organization, its nature, evaluation standard, testing requirements and procedures. It is the ultimate guidebook for clubs running tests and judges scoring dogs. The booklet describes in great detail what is expected of dogs and why. It begins with a statement of the intentions of the organization, a definition of a 'versatile hunting dog,' and an early history of hunting with dogs.

The organization seeks to "provide the on-foot hunter who, for one reason or another, chooses not to maintain a kennel of specialists [a number of dogs of different breeds, each of which specializes in hunting only certain type of game], with a dog that will serve as a dependable hunting companion in the pursuit of a variety of game in a variety of environments" (Booklet on "aims, programs, test rules"). In this connection, the "aims, programs, test rules" booklet (1993) ends with a recommendation that trainers purchase the book on "training and caring for versatile hunting dogs," in which detailed instructions for training dogs to "whoa," "come," "retrieve," "track," do "water work," be "steady" in the "blind," and to "wing and shot," as well as information on how to "correct faults" and "care" for the dog in "kennel and field" (Booklet on "aims, programs, test rules," 1993:44).

These proponents of the "versatile hunting dog" argue that they have never intended to "replace or improve upon any other hunting breed" nor have they ever sought to discredit or exclude the testing procedures and standards of the specialty clubs. Interestingly, moreover, neither is the club set up for the purpose of producing "propaganda," "influencing legislation," or "intervening in any political campaign" (Booklet on "aims, programs, test rules," 1993:4). This accounts in part for the club's affiliation with [a regional sporting organization] referred to often as a "marriage of convenience" as they are "our only lobby group" and "provide us with insurance." Rather, the organization system is to supplement these other tests and programs and provide a standard for comparing the gun-dog of the foot hunter who must be able to do 'everything' in the field.

H. Historical Development of the Organization

While the hunting dog organization studied did not come into being until 1969, the tradition of hunting game with the assistance of a trained dog is centuries old [refer to Green Book, Layton 1994]. Once tamed wolves began to den with early humans, the stage for a symbiotic relationship of 'hunting companionship' was set. People around the world have found the dog to be a reliable worker and loyal companion and successive generations of dog fanciers have selectively bred for specific traits. The Canadian Kennel Club alone registers 31

sporting breeds (pointers, flushers, and retrievers), 26 working (guarding and drafting) breeds, 31 (sight- and scent-) hounds, 25 terriers (vermin hunters), 18 (livestock-) herding dogs, and 19 toys (not to mention the 18 'non-sporting' breeds, not easily classified) (*Dogs in Canada Annual 1996* 1995:213). Each breed has been developed with some human need or desire in mind. The Pug is a companion, the Mastiff fights lions and intruders, and the German Shorthaired Pointer hunts.

Several of the hunting dog breeds, such as the Vizsla and English Pointer, are especially old. In great Britain and some parts of Europe, specialist game finding dogs such as Pointers and Setters (English, Irish, and the Gordon of Scotland) were developed by and became very popular among the wealthy land owners of feudal times. At that point in western history, hunting was a favourite leisure activity of the aristocracy . Indeed, in order to hunt the widest variety of game possible, members of the upper class kept huge kennels with large staffs to handle and train dogs of a great number of breeds, each of them 'specialists.' As was fitting of their station and wealth, they spared no expense and demanded the very highest standards of breeding. Many of today's specialist hunting breeds owe their existence to individuals of this era.

By the time of the Industrial Revolution, the sport of hunting was extended to the middle classes. Professionals, business-people, and other well-off urban dwellers who did not have the space or time to maintain large kennels of a wide variety of dogs found that unless they limited themselves to the pursuit of only one or two types of game, they could not partake of the full range of hunting opportunities now open to them. By the latter half of the 19th century, the need arose for the development of a 'versatile' hunting dog, or 'all purpose gun-dog.' The retrieving and setting dogs of Britain enjoyed their heyday of popularity, and are still immensely appreciated today (even among those seeking a lively companion, rather than a hunting dog). However, particularly in Europe, breeders began to cast about for the ideal genetic combination for the development of a dog for the on-foot hunter.

> *They wanted and got breeds that would handle a variety of game, both feather and fur, before and after the shot. The dogs had to possess a keen nose and strong pointing instinct, a lively temperament, eagerness to retrieve from both land and water, stamina, and a durable coat and hide that would not hamper the dogs' work in cold water. The dogs also had to be intelligent, relatively easily trained, and have a character compatible with living in or at their master's dwellings. [Green Book, p. 2]*

And form was to follow function. Particularly among breeders of the German Shorthaired Pointer, the hunting and temperament traits took priority. Indeed, it is often suggested that for several (canine) generations, no one had any idea of or real interest in what the versatile hunter would actually look like. Campaigning against any and all sporting factions interested in breeding primarily for looks was Dr. Paul Kleeman of Germany. For him and his followers, 'perfection of performance' was of utmost importance in the versatile dog of the future. The dogs were to be both efficient and stylish on the hunt and the standards of German judges were (and still are) very high. The hunting title of "Kleeman - 'Sieger'" (German test field champion) is very difficult to attain. The hunting dog fraternity in Europe is an elite of highly demanding breeders and handlers.

From this German hunting heritage came the founder of the hunting dog organization studied. He handled his first dog successfully at a German field test at the age of 14. Now in his sixties, he is known to have owned and trained most of the recognized versatile breeds. Since coming to this country, he has devoted himself to establishing field tests for the versatile hunting breeds on this continent and educating hunters concerning the full potential of these breeds (Green Book p. 105).

In 1968, after he had sold one of his dogs to a would be co-founder of the organization (and former president), they began to talk about forming a certain [Breed-Specific] Club. An "All Purpose Gun Dog Club" had been started in 1963, apparently, made up mainly of field trialers, and its tests were very similar to retriever trials. The club had died two years after its inception, mainly because of redundancy (it was but a extension of conventional field trial clubs) and lack of direction (e.g. 'all purpose' was not exactly a good choice of words to describe the nature of the dogs' abilities). In spite of this club's short life, he was determined to try again.

He took some ideas from this previous club and translated the German (Kleeman - 'Sieger,' German Field Champion) test rules. They organized the first "Puppy" and "Advanced" Test in 1965 (very similar to today's organization tests) and although the tests were very successful, no club was formed and the testing was never repeated. These early pioneers determined that with their experience and knowledge it might be possible to organize a club of hunters rather than field trialers that might take off. After some debate about whether the prospective membership should exclude all but members with [a certain breed] only, they printed up some 'founding meeting' cards and sent them to owners of a variety of pointing breeds. On Sunday, May 18, 1969, the meeting that was to be held at the clubhouse

of their [Game Farm] was moved to the co-founder's living room since the group numbered only 12.

The twelve participants included a number of friends and dog trainers. Officers were elected, the founder and co-founder were named President and Vice-President, respectively. After elections, the organization was named and recruitment of new members was discussed. They decided to approach owners of hunting dogs who were active hunters. Monthly training sessions and board meetings would be held to discuss club business. The President explained the test rules (translated from the Kleeman-Sieger tests), and since he was the only one with experience in this area, his rules were readily accepted. As the co-founder and host explained,

> *Once my liquor supply was exhausted, everyone left not knowing that they had started a new movement that soon would expand to the [rest of the Continent] and make history in the hunting dog world. [000610]*

As of this writing there are 42 individual clubs of the organization to which approximately 2500 members belong internationally [International Registrar 1995]. As an organization, the group has operated relatively unmolested for close to thirty years, with only a few known exceptions.

> *In...[one area], we could not hold tests for a number of years because of release of clipped pheasants. [In 1978] a woman came there and was very interested and sat down and saw it and she went to the Humane Society and said that they pull out the feathers and that the poor pheasant was unable to fly and then it would get killed by predators. And that's why, when we have tests, we try not to have too much exposure and try to keep it low-key... [000604]*

In this particular case, it was discovered that in one area, the organization was violating Fish and Game Laws. As a result, a new rule was made, where if some local laws prohibit preparing pheasants for the tracking test by pulling the primary feathers of one wing, tethered birds may be used. [This exception is no longer permitted, however.] Apparently the 'discovery' was the result of 'outsider interference.'

In another (recent) case, animal rights activists interfered with the business venture of a former president:

> *I can tell you a little story of how animal rights people work....I used to import shock collars and bark collars. To make a long story short, they suddenly stopped*

coming across the border, not because of laws, they discovered, but because one customs guy belonged to an animal rights group and wouldn't pass them on. They do a lot of things on their own so we have to be careful... [000612]

Such instances have been highly instructive to members and have lain the foundation for their predisposition to evolve 'survival strategies.' Their experience has therefore resulted in foresight.

I. Historical Development of the Club Studied

At one point, this particular club of the organization studied was referred to as the "regional club." Although this group constituted the first membership of the entire organization, it was not the very first individual club because members considered it to be the head office, so to speak. This was the founding group that recognized and sanctioned all the rest. It really was not until international involvement was established that a need was seen for a regional club. That was around 1974.

The club operated as "the regional" for close to ten years. Eventually, members came to feel that the club was getting too big and too much of a drive to meetings and tests for some of them, so members thought that the group should split into a "south western club" and a "south central club." They assumed that it would be an even split with those from the west going to the "south western club" and those in the east going to the "south central club." There was some heated debate about the "south central club's" eventual name and also, to their amazement most members decided to join the "south central club" after the split. The "south central club" became the power house and it really was not until about three years ago [1993] that the "south western club" recovered. There was weak leadership for a time and although they had some very good people, once the split was made, they were through. The first President of the "south central club" reflected:

I had it relatively easy. I had all my friends in [the executive committee]...we ran it pretty autocratic, and that sometimes works well, you push things through... [000610]

The "south central club" elected its first President in 1982 and he remained the President for a full three-year term. As of this writing, the club has its fifth President, elected in the fall of 1994.

The "south central club" seems to have gotten a boost from the election of its current President (in 1994), an enthusiastic and very hard working breeder and club member. A current problem faced by the group relates to the division of labour. Only a handful of dedicated people do all of the work. Most members of the executive recognize that this is a problem endemic to many voluntary associations, but they still attempt to encourage rank and file members to take a more active role in the club. In fact, in one newsletter [1995 "end of year"], the president solicited the aid of peripheral members to help ease the burden of responsibility and hard work that has been weighing heavily on the shoulders of a few dedicated members. Several members of the executive have expressed bitter disappointment with marginal members. Ironically, one active participant who appears at nearly all of the club's events (unlike the majority of members), is not a club member ["I don't like clubs," he once told me] but does more for the club in practical terms than the majority of long time fair weather members. It is people such as this that members of the executive seek to recruit [001516; 000714; 001707; 001806; 001204; 000906; 001003].

In order to glean a profile of the club's members, a Reader Survey was inserted in one of the 1995 newsletters. The response rate was about thirty percent (20/60). Members responded to a one page, non-threatening, simple self-administered survey which was sent to each member's home with a self-addressed stamped envelope for prompt return. Any generalizations based on it can only be considered tentative (at best) and therefore they have been supplemented by my observations.

Many members of this club are of English-Canadian or Eastern European (especially German) background. There are also several Italian members. However, not one single member of this rather large Italian contingent responded, not even an Italian former club president. There is, according to this survey, a very wide range in the length of time that people have been members (from 2-7 years, up to 17-20 years). Almost all belong to other sporting groups, but members were very often merely referring to their automatic affiliation with "the regional fishing and hunting organization."

The most popular breeds owned and bred are the German Wire-haired Pointer, the German Shorthaired Pointer, and the Pudelpointer, although a few members have Vizslas (Hungarian or Yellow Pointers). One members stated that he has a Cesky Fousek. A few who did not respond have been seen at tests with Brittany spaniels, and many members also have a non-hunting companion dog at home. Most have trained one to three dogs to be 'versatile' hunters, several, however, have trained over ten. A former president and founding

member claims to have trained over three hundred. For the "Puppy test," the average member had tested one or two dogs, but less than half had tested dogs in the "Advanced" test with the majority receiving "Second-" or "Third Place." A fairly large number of peripheral members seem not to be able to get their dogs beyond the "Puppy" level, nor are they likely to do so. Consequently, they are expected to drop out within three years or so, only to be replaced by new recruits. As might be expected, the turn-over rate of peripheral members is very high.

Members remain involved generally as a hobby, for training assistance, to share something in common, and companionship. Many expressed an obsession with the dogs, a desire to understand dogs and keep fit, to be better hunters, to learn from others, to locate good litters, to find information, and to participate in tests. A few even explicitly commented that even though they really did not get that involved with the group, they like to support it (with their dues). They do this because they 'believe in what it stands for;' that is, support for hunting and versatile breeds.

Most members live in suburban communities, but some live in small towns. Almost all own their homes. They work at a variety of occupations: technicians, mechanics, computer technicians, businessmen, managers, salesmen, civil servants, and several are retired. In terms of education, many have skilled trades and some have college certification and training courses, but only a very few have university degrees. About half had other family members involved in training the dogs. There is a split in the kinds of hunting that members do. Many hunt all or most game, but a majority hunt only birds. Almost all primary members are male, and as the secretary has confirmed, there are only about five or six spousal memberships. A former president of the club reported that most members are middle class:

> *... because it's not all that cheap to train a versatile hunting dog! [001611]*

From my own observations, I would argue that the 'typical' member is indeed a suburban, white, middle-class, sports-*man*. Of course, this may seem to be a very broad generalization, but it is one that I have tested against the judgment of a large number of members.

It was interesting to find that aside from one disparaging comment made about one member by another member, there appears to be no open hostility among members. Differences of opinion certainly exist, but it is a fairly cohesive and consensus-based group.

> *[You mean,] somebody wants to take the dog club one way, and somebody wants to take it another way? I don't think so...no, no, I don't think so. I don't think I've ever seen any of that. I mean, I've seen differences in opinion on training dogs, and*

I mean, I have a difference of opinion with some people about training a dog, but I don't think that any of those have ever caused a rift in the club...one of the nice things that I've seen, is that if you do want to train your own dog, and if you want to try to develop your own style as a trainer and your own style in the dog, nobody's going to have any objections to that... [000812]

Thus, aside from the usual dissatisfaction among volunteer organizations concerning lack of peripheral member involvement and recent grumblings about "the antis," it appears that no other real problems are experienced by the group at this point in its history. Moreover, especially after the third president's term, the "south central club" was probably the wealthiest club in the international organization. The club had well over $10,000 earned primarily through raffles. Every year, the club would get about $2,000 from the gun raffle. In light of the socio-political climate of the 1990s, however, the raffle now meets with mixed feelings among members of the public, and is somewhat less of a reliable source of substantial annual income.

It's been a slow transition, but it's been steady, you can see it coming over the last ten years...you know when you really notice it...at the sportsmen's show, people used to look at the gun that we raffled and they used to say, 'hey, that's a nice gun, I'll buy a ticket, two bucks, not a problem,' but now more and more people walk by and say, 'what the hell do I want that for? They're gonna take 'em all away pretty soon you know...' [001206]

[Reflections on the current status of the club and its future relative to the socio-political climate appear in "**Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic**," Chapter Four]. At the present time, there are approximately 50 members in the "south central club."

J. Chapter Summary

Chapter One sought to *contextualize* the present study. It began with a brief overview of the **subject** of the research, an individual club of an international hunting dog organization. The research **problem** to be explored was the nature of the influence of social change, specifically the effects of the rise in popularity of the political correctness movement, upon the club. From there, the **plan of the study** was presented and the overall **thesis** of the study was summarized as follows: upon perceiving themselves as being at risk of being found 'politically *in*correct' (in a 'politically correct' world), members have as a club evolved their own 'subcultural adaptations' to cope with their immanent 'deviant' status. The research was

described as having been guided by a conflict-interactionist and interpretive **approach**, such that symbolic interactionist theory has been integrated with conflict theory, and an ethnographic research method has been implemented. A fairly detailed description of the group (**overview**) and its reason for existence was offered, as well as abbreviated **histories** of the development of the organization and the particular group studied.

Chapter 2:

THEORETICAL INTEGRATION

A. Outline of the Chapter

This chapter offers an *integration of theory* that I see as most useful and relevant with the subject matter of the research. It begins with a general overview of my theoretical perspective in the context of a discussion of the study's **theoretical foundations**. Then, it is argued that the particular group studied is **a subculture within the subcultural mosaic** that is in the process of being **labelled 'deviant.'** Consequently, it has come to share *some* characteristics with other groups that have been identified as **deviant subcultures. The issue of power** in relation to attaching deviant labels and developing subcultural adaptations is also discussed. The chapter ends with a presentation of the **grounded and generic theory** generated by the study and a consideration of the **contributions to the study of groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant'** made by the research.

B. Theoretical Foundations

This research is as much about how members of a group are adapting to suddenly *being* (labelled) 'deviant' as it is about *the making of* a deviant subculture. Unlike in most studies of the making of a deviant subculture, however, the individuals involved did not organize themselves *after* being labelled 'deviant.' They came to be perceived as deviants only after they had created a formal organization which, when first established, was not regarded by themselves or others as deviant. Theirs is an especially interesting case because it is an illustration of the process of shifts in cultural definitions of socially acceptable activity producing *ex post facto* a deviant group. It is an instance of what Hills (1980) calls "the politics of social deviance" (Hills 1980). In his view, definitions of deviance and its social control are the outcome of "moral and political struggles...deviance is in large measure a social creation—a dynamic product of human judgments...and the particular cultural patterns that characterize a society" (Hills 1980:xi). Howard S. Becker provides one of the earliest conflict-interactionist perspectives on the social construction of deviance in *Outsiders* (1963). His theory of deviance [refer to section ***D. Labelled 'Deviant'***] provides the basic theoretical perspective that informs the present study. However, before outlining his views, it is necessary to note that like that of other symbolic interactionists, Becker's (1963) work on 'labelling

theory' is founded upon a set of theoretical assumptions which can be found in the works of Wilhelm Dilthey (see Ermarth 1978; and see Bulhof 1980), Georg Simmel (1950; 1971), Charles Horton Cooley (1926;1928), George Herbert Mead (1934), and Herbert George Blumer (1969).

Robert Prus (1996:35) argues that Dilthey may be considered the founder of the interpretive sociological tradition from which contemporary symbolic interactionism is derived. Dilthey is to be credited with the revelation that social life should be studied by applying a 'hermeneutic' approach to the study of all social products and processes. That is, all social life requires 'interpretation' in the same way that in Greek mythology, the words of the gods had to be interpreted for the people by the messenger god, Hermes. This hermeneutic approach is founded upon the assumption that social life is based on 'shared meanings.' Social life is the outcome of 'intersubjectivity.' An understanding of the social context or 'shared symbolic universe' of interactants is essential to the successful interpretation of activities, gestures, and utterances encountered in human groups. In addition, for Dilthey, human beings are "active agents" who are, moreover, "aware of [their] effects" (Dilthey in Ermarth 1978:107), or able to 'take things into account.' Furthermore, for Dilthey, human activities in the real world are the stuff of 'empirical reality.' That is, the social world is generated in the context of human 'lived experiences' of which an ongoing course of interpretations are made. These interpretations accumulate as stocks of knowledge of the world that are reflected, reinforced, and reproduced (and potentially resisted) through the medium of language. Language is in fact a system of verbal representations or 'symbols' of the distant (or abstract) and the immediately present world shared with and passed on to our fellows. According to Dilthey, language is fundamental to the establishment of 'intersubjectivity' (see Prus 1996:35-39). Hence, in addition to the concepts of interpretation, and intersubjectivity, Dilthey's insights allow for the eventual development of the concepts of human agency and reflectivity, symbolism and interaction which are fundamental to an interpretive sociology.

Simmel (1950; 1971) and Cooley (1926; 1928) also make key contributions to interpretive sociology. Simmel offers an important conceptualization of the nature of human group life in his work on 'forms of human association.' He describes group life as made up of 'ongoing social processes' of various forms. Some of the forms that he identifies in his own work are "conflict, cooperation, compromise, mediation, domination and subordination, secrecy, sociability, and exchange" (in Prus 1996:39). These are labels which he gives to the different ways in which people interact with others that transcend particular settings. Cooley

(1926;1928) however, provides a more sustained argument for attention to 'social process' and 'interaction.' That is, he argues that the constant "social bonding" carried out in human groups is itself a "social process" (in Prus 1996:49). As such, social life is the outcome of social interaction. In combination, these contributions of Simmel and Cooley emphasize the existence of and variations on forms of ongoing processes of social interaction.. Both of these are concepts that are associated with symbolic interactionism.

Contemporary symbolic interactionism owes much of its present character to the development and extension of the work of Mead (1934) by Blumer (1969). Mead's 'social behaviourism,' incorporated the assumptions of intersubjectivity and the importance of language to the sustenance of human group life. That is, social life is possible where group members have shared gestures or 'significant symbols' in common. A system of shared meanings therefore allows for social interaction to occur. Mead was as much a behaviourist as he was a pragmatist (Ritzer 1988:291-3). As such, Mead emphasizes the distinctively human capacity for 'minded behaviour' or 'interpretive action,' the human capacity to delay responding to a given stimulus, allowing for the intervention of interpretation of the stimulus, taking others into account, imagining consequences, and selecting courses of action in response. His work is framed in the tradition of a pragmatic approach, incorporating the assumption that people act toward objects in the world in terms of their practical utility to them. The former emphasis, on behaviour, permits Mead to isolate a distinctive feature of the human condition, 'mind' and I believe that his latter leaning, toward pragmatism, accounts for his preoccupation with the social bases of practical courses of concrete activity. His focus on interpretive action (or minded behaviour) is fundamental to interpretive sociology. Indeed, the work of Mead provides much of the basis for contemporary symbolic interactionism as developed by Blumer (1969) who first coined the phrase in 1937.

According to Blumer,

> Symbolic interaction rests in the last analysis on three simple premises...that human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings they have for them...that the meaning of such things is derived from or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one's fellows... that these meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretative process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounters (Blumer 1969:2).

In an earlier statement, more specific insights of Mead (1934) are incorporated into the symbolic interactionist scheme.

> Symbolic interaction involves *interpretation*, or ascertaining the meanings of the actions or remarks of the other person, and *definition*, or conveying indications to another person as to how he is to act. Human association consists of a process of such interpretation and definition. Through this process, the participants fit their own acts to the ongoing acts of one another and guide others in doing so (Blumer 1966:537-538).

Built into Blumer's formulation of symbolic interactionism are the interpretive meta-theoretical assumptions identified by Prus (1996): there are as many varieties of reality as might be experienced by people; people are objects unto themselves; social life involves intersubjectivity; all social life is processual; and reality is known through human lived experience (Prus 1996:15-18). The connections between contemporary symbolic interactionism and its early influences are unmistakable.

Some symbolic interactionist studies, however, may be criticized for their neglect of two important aspects of social life. First, they give little if any attention to the *problematics* of creating social order and second, to the pervasiveness of efforts at social control. That is, in their attempts to reinforce the 'negotiated' and 'constructed' character of human group life, they generally fail to acknowledge the fact that *not every member of a group has equal power* to initiate let alone successfully participate in negotiating the character (or 'definition') of a social setting's rules, roles, routines, artifacts, and language. As in the classroom, the teacher ultimately has more power than students in any negotiations of their 'classroom subculture.' As such, some symbolic interactionists neglect to attend to the role of conflict in social life. Also in their attempts to reinforce the negotiated and constructed character of human group life, they fail to acknowledge that *not all situations are novel*, or requiring of even periodic negotiations once established. Again, many settings, like the classroom, have a history or an established subculture in which any student can become involved and feel comfortable and where there are established patterns of attitudes and behaviour, to which students 'know' to conform. As such, many symbolic interactionist studies fail to attend to the existence of tradition. These tendencies of symbolic interactionism present both an obstacle and serendipitous opportunity for the sociological study of deviance. On the one side, in the absence of tradition, there can be no established 'standard' from which individuals (or groups) can *deviate*, yet on the other, the concept of *deviance* is revealed to be arbitrary as it is open to negotiation.

Becker (1963) overcomes this obstacle and capitalizes on this opportunity by identifying the existence of *social* deviance and the role of social *conflict* in its definition. He explicitly

stresses the existence of pressures to conform (social control efforts---'labelling'), and the arbitrary nature of definitions of deviance (the process of defining deviance as the exclusive privilege of the powerful). As such, a conflict component may be built into a symbolic interactionist perspective to more explicitly act upon the promise of Blumer that

> ...symbolic interaction is able to cover the *full range* of the generic forms of human association. It embraces equally well such relationships as cooperation, *conflict*, *domination*, *exploitation*, consensus, *disagreement*, closely knit identification, and indifferent concern for one another. The participants in each of such relations have the same common task of constructing their acts by interpretation and defining the acts of each other. The significance of this simple observation becomes evident in contrasting symbolic interaction with the various schemes of human interaction that are to be found in the literature. Almost always such schemes construct a general model of human interaction or society on the basis of a particular type of human relationship (Blumer 1966:538-639) [emphasis mine].

Hence, a conflict-interactionist perspective is one that is symbolic interactionist to the core, but strongly stresses the conflict aspect of the topic under investigation. An application of such a conflict interactionist perspective is presented below [subsection ***D. Labelled 'Deviant'***] as it has provided the starting point for this study.

Symbolic interactionism in general is usually categorized as a micro-sociological perspective. As such, its studies are usually concerned with the analysis of interactions occurring within small groups. Sociologists working in the symbolic interactionist tradition are credited with producing rich ethnographies of (distinctive) small groups which they refer to as 'subcultures' and 'deviant subcultures.'

C. A Subculture within the 'Subcultural Mosaic'

Prus (1997) suggests that 'society,' the favourite theoretical construct of mainstream sociologists, is in fact an aggregate of 'sub-societies.' Indeed, 'society,' a term much more applicable to 'aggregates of beings,' minded *and* non-minded, alike, is best *avoided* as a referent to 'reflective' human groups. The term 'society' says little about collective 'lifeways.' Historically, anthropologists are credited with the conceptualization of the matrix of social rules, roles, routines, artifacts, and language as 'culture.' The term 'society' invokes images of physical groups of people tied to each other more by geography and historical accident than social bonds of interaction, but 'culture' recognizes *human products* that may be 'universal' *forms* but that are highly 'variable' in *content* from society to society. The acknowledgment of cultural variability that anthropological research has demonstrated and

that such a conceptualization permits, allows for the further acknowledgment of 'cultural diversity' within a single society. Hence, there are many cultures or 'subcultures' within any given society or "subcultural 'mosaic'" (Prus 1997). Moreover the ability of cultures to *vary* reveals that culture is not merely a social product, but more explicitly the outcome of creative 'human enterprise.' The 'activity-based' nature of the subculture is the focus of ethnographers concerned with the study of '"doing" everyday life.'

As such, the more recent studies of everyday life are less concerned with the ethnography of the static content of a subculture, in the manner of early (especially anthropologist-) ethnographers of society-wide cultures, than they are with *how* this content is manipulated to 'accomplish' the activities of subcultural groups. More interactional analyses attend to the ongoing production of human group life and centre less around these subcultural elements that are highly 'esoteric' (in content) and 'static' (in form). It nevertheless does provide more complete "thick description" (Geertz 1983) to at least allude to the special character of the content of subcultural elements as well as to identify the nature of the subcultural form (e.g. its scope, level of involvement, regularity of participation, etc.) in the course of developing analyses of subcultural groups.

The term 'subculture' is used by Prus (1997) to refer to "a set of interactionally linked people characterized by some sense of distinctiveness (outsider and insider definitions) within the broader community" (Prus 1997:8). Hence, the broader community is made up of many such groups that *in combination* constitute a "subcultural mosaic." Subcultures may be as small as a triad or so large as to encompass all members of an entire 'time and place'-bounded society or community (Prus 1997:8). A subculture may develop around "perspectives," "identities," "activities," "relationships," "commitments," "styles of ...expressiveness," and "modes of communication" (Prus 1997:9). They may "develop around any set of pursuits that the participants find meaningful in some respect," (Prus 1997:8), and have such continuity and be so far reaching as to transcend particular "times" and "places" (e.g. 'the left wing' whose dissenting views and political perspectives link them with others belonging to many generations and geographical locations). Hence, in terms of their relative scope, subcultures may range from being "transnational or transsocietal" to "local" or "translocal," to "embedded or nested" (Prus 1997:9-11). Furthermore, in terms of the extent of involvement associated with certain subcultures, they may be anywhere from "totalizing" to "focused" in extent of participation and anywhere from "occasioned" to "cyclical" in regard to regularity of participation (Prus 1997:11). It should also be noted that people are involved in a multitude of subcultures throughout their lives and during each of its stages.

Some qualitative sociologists and most ethnomethodologists, at least in principle, extend the concept of subculture implicitly to *all* distinctive social settings and *all* social activities (respectively). That is, there is the subculture of the 'library,' the subculture of the 'restaurant' and equally rule-bounded and orderly ways of 'doing'- 'walking' and 'waiting for the bus.' In all of these social situations there are 'shared assumptions' that are vital to the maintenance of social order (see Lofland and Lofland 1984; Sharrock and Anderson 1986). I would term these 'transitory subcultures' or the sites of 'transient subcultural involvement.' In such cases, the activity or setting is fairly 'permanent,' and it has well defined subcultural features. However, involvements in them are not at all sustained; participants slip in and out of them with relative ease and frequency and they occupy very little 'significant space' in their lives (e.g. lining up for services, browsing or shopping, visiting public washrooms). Thus any group of individuals, whether they be potters, bank machine users, cafeteria diners, students, widows, pagans, boy scouts, amateur actors, weavers, runners, or whatever, constitutes a sub-society of sorts, if on the basis of some common "perspective," "identity," "activity," "relationship," "commitment," style of "expression," or "mode of communication" (Prus 1997:8-9) they enjoy some level of patterned social interaction. Through such contact, a unique subculture may be enacted.

Within the broader translocal and transnational focused subcultures of the 'hunting fraternity' and 'purebred dog fanciers,' there exist local organizations dedicated to the training and testing of 'gun dogs' and or 'field dogs.' Nested within this smaller subcultural group of 'sporting dog enthusiasts,' is a very small and highly specialized group of 'versatile hunting dog enthusiasts' who have established their own highly esoteric local, trans-local and trans-national organization.

> *...like it's a testing organization, [as a member, my benefits are] two-fold, as a hunter, I want to have access to good quality stock when buying puppies and [the organization] is the only dog testing organization that is very similar to the hunting I do, so I would gravitate to the [organization's] system or the [organization's] training results when looking for future dogs or dogs to breed...[for] the versatile dog that will do many things for me...also there's personal gratification [in training and testing] and you meet all kinds of new people and make new friends...there's a social aspect to it. [001703]*

The organization researched here constitutes a subculture of hunting dog enthusiasts who, as members of individual clubs, unite to train and test their hunting dogs, to socialize with and learn from other club members involved in the training and testing of hunting dogs, and to

discuss the organizational business of a group concerned with the training and testing of hunting dogs. The group's level of specialization results in significant obscurity.

> *We're not known...by the public, unless you had a [versatile] dog you'd know us, but if you didn't have a dog you wouldn't know who the heck [the organization] was, you'd say, 'you ever heard of [the organization]?' You wouldn't know what it even meant, you know...like nobody knows and there's many different groups of people that do sewing or kinds of photographers. Oh, you don't hear about them, but there's all kinds of groups. [001107]*

> *Unless you have hotly pursued a versatile hunting dog, you neither know nor care about [the organization]. [The Organization] is not a household word. Many hunters and many dog-people haven't a clue what [it] is. [000301]*

Members easily articulate the ultimate attraction to the sport. That is, they are quick to identify the shared interest in an activity that resulted in the enactment and accounts for the persistence of the subculture. In a phrase, they are 'obsessed with the sporting dog.'

> *[I] enjoy watching a good dog working. To me, it's like poetry. You know, it doesn't matter, be it a pointer, or a retriever,...you know, like, it's a real turn-on sitting in the bush listening to the hounds. To me, it's like music. [001508]*

Members join for the purpose of

> *...training and the sport of working with the dogs. [000206]*

> *...for meeting people, people who could give me a hand, you know... [000101]*

As one member put it,

> *[They] keep people educated and the training, the training is one thing, breeding, and you know, at least, I shouldn't say least, it's the meeting of people, you know, the people coming together, yeah, it's something nice, people with a common interest. [001203]*

The group is very difficult to become involved with unless one has done one's homework. That is, one must have the desire to locate and train to its full potential a pointing dog with champion hunting lines. Eventually, contact with members of this group may be entirely by chance, or the result of contact with members of the broader hunting fraternity who know of members of the versatile hunting dog subculture. As such, it is ultimately by referrals only that individuals become members.

I heard of [the organization] through a friend of mine who knows [the person who was to be his breeder] who recommended me, like he recommended me for a dog...and then when I got to know [the breeder] he just started talking about [the organization] and I got pretty interested.[000101]

Like if somebody bought a dog from me, I'd say, 'well now, I belong to [the organization]' and I usually give people the green book, the training book as a present and this gets them involved. And in the training book, there's an application [for the International organization] if they would like to be involved, and we tell them that that's what the group's about, to help them, we help each other train our dogs...how you find out about it is through word of mouth, and you may be walking down at the park and you maybe meet someone with a Shorthair and you say, 'Oh you have a Shorthair, well so do I! Where did you get it from?' and maybe in the course of conversation you say, 'well I also belong to [the organization].' 'Well who the hell is [the organization]?!' And you tell them, and it's word of mouth... [001108]

This group was enacted for the expressed purpose of pursuing what is certainly a highly esoteric activity. There is no single physical social setting uniquely occupied by members of this club (or any club within the organization) for the purpose of carrying out its activities. Rather, the group may occupy many different physical settings geared to different activities depending on the nature of the particular tasks to be accomplished. Even considering these settings in combination offers little information to the outsider concerning the true nature of this group, as these settings have no obvious connection with each other. That is, there is no 'thematic unity' among the settings occupied by this group to clearly suggest its purpose. Moreover, one can be further confused about the nature of this group because so many groups may unite for the purpose of carrying out similar activities to this group's. In addition, this group's activities are held in settings not often associated with such activities in common discourse, indeed, many different events could also be carried out in these same settings. To illustrate, this group, like others, holds 'tests,' but its tests are not held in classrooms or performed in laboratories, but in fields surrounding a pond, and in these very same fields and ponds, 'outsiders' may camp, picnic, fish and swim.

As such, 'meetings,' 'training events,' 'tests,' and 'socials' are all group assemblies which occur in different physical settings, and involve different rules, roles, routines, artifacts, and language. Nevertheless, all of these assemblies are indeed recognizable as assemblies of this group, even though other groups may assemble for similar tasks (businesses have meetings, government offices send recruits for training, students appear for tests, faculty members gather for socials, and so on). This is because assemblies of this group share one common

distinguishing feature: it is *how* their activities are *performed* which sets them apart as a distinctive subculture particularly *in the context of* their more distinguishing assemblies (e.g. training events, tests). Furthermore, it is *how* the group activity is *linguistically represented* ('member discourse') that reveals that members share in a unique "symbolic universe" even *outside of* their more distinctive assemblies (e.g. in their meetings, socials). Hence, the following description of this group, as a unique subculture," focuses on the esoteric features revealed by the nature of their distinctive *group activities* and the nature of their distinctive *vocabulary*. While the former is tightly bound to special assemblies, the latter transcends them (making it possible for members to 'pass' as such anywhere).

Before providing an overview of the subcultural elements of this group, it is important to first attend briefly to the esoteric nature of the key artifact (and members' relationships to that artifact) without which the entire subculture would cease to exist, the pointing dog.

As outlined in Chapter One, the versatile hunting dog must have the instincts and proper training to expertly carry out all the tasks required in the hunting situation. Although these capacities are genetic, arousing the instincts and channeling them to fulfill the needs of the foot-hunter involves a virtual labour of love. Indeed, it is the respect for the dogs' potential and a love for their sociable temperament that allows the trainer to overlook some of his less tractable characteristics and motivate him to persevere.

Pointing dogs with excellent hunting pedigrees are not always good *pets*. In spite of their affectionate nature, protective instincts, and great fondness for children, companionship alone cannot be the *focus* of their lives. They have too much energy, are too single-minded, and believe that 'life is a contact sport.' These characteristics are not always appreciated in a fifty-five to seventy-five pound dog. Moreover, to say that the pointing dog (in general) is stubborn is something of an understatement. As such, the versatile hunting dog club member is a special type of person. They know not to spoil, to be consistent, firm, somewhat regimented in their routines, but above all accepting of the nature of the dog. Breeders have to be very careful to place their pups with appropriate families. Indeed, pointing dog owners, unless they have exceptionally biddable (or very elderly) animals are often at a loss to find themselves appropriate 'critter sitters.'

> *I once made the mistake of leaving [my sixty-pound puppy] with my parents while I was at work one day. He couldn't bear to be left out so he did his fair share of crying in his kennel. This of course just broke mum's heart, so she convinced my father to take him for a walk. My father isn't exactly a dog lover, actually, he's even afraid of puppies, he never puts his hand near their mouths...Anyway, he let*

him out and managed to snap the lead on him, I don't know how, but as soon as the dog realized what was happening he apparently pulled my father straight out the door and almost ran away on him! He's lucky he didn't get dragged, he's only five-foot-five or so and this monster pup was just too much for him. At least he didn't get mad at him, he knows, well, I told him, that the dog would never hurt him, he just doesn't know his own strength. [000302]

The pointing dog is an exceptional specimen of canine athleticism and instinctive ability. Again, respect for these qualities tends to override owners' frequent complaints about their dogs.

I mean, everybody would love a dog that you just have to wag your finger at and the dog goes, 'Oh, okay, I'll be steady to wing and shot and fall, I won't break ever again, boss.' But it doesn't work that way! [001709]

Not only are they difficult to train, but difficult to keep in the house. On at least three occasions, interviews were interrupted as a direct result of the 'busy' nature of these pointing dogs. Some excerpts from my interview notes illustrate this fact.

Hang on— 'Alex,' go lie down! It's enough pacing!!! [001201]

Hold on a second—Stop it, 'Spike'! You bit my shoe! Go somewhere and sit down! [002004]

Oh shit! He's pointing the [neighbour's] cat! [001205]

R: How is she in the house? I: Oh no! I keep her in the kennel!!! [In the house] they just want to jump all over...they're crazy!!! [000102]

In spite of these tendencies, owners adore them.

When 'E.B.' was having her pups, I came home one day and there was blood all over the floor and I said to my wife, 'My baby, my baby! Where's my poor baby?!' ...Oh, she's my mush!!! [000407]

A prerequisite to full membership in this group is the ownership of a versatile hunting dog, at least 'in the making.' Most members are knowledgeable about the variety of pointing dog breeds, their respective temperaments, their special abilities and faults, difficulties in procuring true hunting lines, and the accomplishments of noteworthy club dogs, past and present. Having and training versatile hunting dogs, most of whom are eventually trained to successfully pass organization tests, is the ultimate hallmark of versatile hunting dog club membership. What follows is a consideration of the training events, hunting tests, and

meetings and socials as they are organized and participated in by members of this club. Attending to this group's events demonstrates how a subculture has been enacted (and continues to be sustained) by individuals whose chief recreational interest is hunting with pointing dogs.

i - training events

This club organizes training events for dogs and owners at least twice a year, although many members 'buddy up' regularly throughout the year to train their dogs. The organized events are scheduled in anticipation of bi-annual tests. Generally, these events are held at a shooting sports club located in a semi-rural area. They are designed to assist the hunter in those areas of versatile hunting dog training that demand either special expertise, or an assistant. All members are welcome to attend training events. Although the events intend to prepare both puppies and 'almost finished' dogs, the training events are overwhelmingly participated in by new pup owners, many of whom are entirely new to the sport. The sessions are facilitated by experienced trainers, most of whom are breeders and judges.

In small groups and individual instruction sessions, novices are instructed by the experienced trainer as to how to train their dog themselves. As such, there is little direct handling by the trainer of the novice's dog. Rather, the trainer tells the novice what is to be done to the dog, sometimes with a brief demonstration with the trainer's own dog and from there the novice is expected to carry out guided training activities with their pup. As such the roles of 'student' and 'teacher' are clearly delineated, except in cases where more experienced owners attend to use equipment, get tips, and more importantly for their purposes, 'socialize' their dogs. That is, long term members with their fourth, fifth or sixth dog might attend to let the dog get used to being around others in a group event situation, use training equipment, and perhaps discuss a particular training problem they had never run into but are suddenly faced with in the new dog. These are not students therefore, but other handlers.

Few esoteric rules manifest themselves at club training events. As in many kinds of dog training situations, handlers are expected to keep their dogs under control, take turns using equipment in a courteous and orderly manner, follow the advice of the trainer, and attend to their dog's needs. The equipment used by versatile hunting dog trainers is unique, however. The artifacts associated with pointing dog training include check cords (approximately twenty-foot-long ropes attached to the collars like leashes), birds tied by a foot to a large piece of cardboard (to instigate the 'point' and enforce the 'whoa'), fishing rods with live birds flapping madly from their lines (to teach 'steadiness to wing'), training tables with ramps

at either end (to teach the 'whoa'), and a dummy launcher (a rifle that shoots a retrieving toy). In addition, trainers may sport whistles to signal their dogs to 'come,' 'whoa,' 'hie on' (just go and 'quarter') 'gee' (go right), 'haw' (go left), and whatever other idiosyncratic tricks they have taught them.

The overall routine of the event begins with an entirely informal assembly. When it appears that no one else is coming (a good twenty minutes or so after 8 a.m. 'sharp'), the ongoing equipment set up is completed at least for the first skill to be taught, and novices make their way to one of the trainers. Individually, the trainer informs the novice of the specific skill to be taught, how this is done, and what to do should the dog not cooperate. The dog is given its turn, the novice being walked through the entire process, then observed and guided where necessary as they perform the lesson a few more times. The trainer normally ends by giving some advice, usually related to how the skill is judged, in order to prepare the novice for a the test.

A typical interaction between trainer and novice would be similar to one witnessed at a spring training event:

"Okay, you're going to lead the dog up on the table, and we're going to teach him to 'whoa.' Come around, keep him on your left—that's it! Okay, now...[he quickly stepped in front of the novice, held his right hand right up to the dog's nose, palm forward] 'whoa.'" He stepped back.

The dog sat.

"Lift him up and hold him still, that's it, right from between his back legs, now praise him, good. Now say it, 'whoa, whoa.'"

The dog stood still, and each time he attempted to look away from the trainer's palm, he was told to 'whoa.' The novice chimed in.

"Never shout at him, say it calm and deep, really serious. See? He's relaxing, good... Oh, very steady, good dog! Okay, now release him, just say 'okay,' or something, but be consistent. Once you decide on what you're going to say, you've got to say it all the time..."

The novice called 'okay!' and the dog wagged its tail madly and leapt off the table, almost pulling the novice under it. Once the commotion ceased, the trainer offered more advice.

"At the test, since it's just ['puppy,'] he won't have to be that steady, in fact you're not going to give him any commands, because if he doesn't obey you, they'll say he isn't cooperating and you'll lose points. It's better to say nothing. But at the ['advanced'] test, he'll have to obey the command the second you give it, and if he breaks, he'll blow it. So start now. Make him 'whoa' for his dinner, before you open the door, before you let him in the car, just get him used to staying put...."

The novice was encouraged to try again, as the handler looked on and corrected his 'whoa' signal. [notes]

ii - hunting tests

The test is an exciting event for members of the club. Tests are held bi-annually, and depending on the nature of the generational cohort of the dogs, they may be all "Puppy" tests, or all "Advanced" tests, or a combination of both. They are held at a conservation area left entirely unmarked as a test site. That is, unlike at garage sales in subdivisions, or Kennel Club shows, there are no signs to guide members in to the grounds. Test grounds must have fields, bush or forest, and water. There is a picnic area that blends into the parking area where a trailer is set up. The trailer has a canopy under which a table is covered with refreshments and a lunch buffet. The wives of club members prepare and serve the food. The cost for a lunch is very low, as are the prices of cakes and tea or coffee. A group of between twenty and thirty people usually appears at tests, the public is not welcome. Generally, only club members or members of other clubs and their families attend the tests.

Most of the rules pertaining to tests are formal and rigorously enforced. Dogs are not to be left to run freely, the 'gallery' of spectators is to remain well back from the test situation, bitches in heat are to be run last and kept well away from the dogs. Entrants are to appear immediately at the field or pond at the time they are called by the judges and the handler is to follow the directions of the judges to the letter and without question. After their turn, the handler and dog are to leave the area, the dog is normally watered and rested and the handler returns to the area to join the gallery. Whether the dogs begin with field work or water work is the decision of the three judges. One of the judges must be from another club in order to maintain continuity of judging standards. They are not paid for their services. Usually an 'apprentice' judge accompanies the trio in order to learn about scoring and judging practices from direct experience. Once the dog has performed the assigned task, the judges confer, finalize scores and call the next dog who should be waiting (since the 'running order' is printed on sheets for all participants). Participants are not to disturb them. No one is to inquire about scores, one of the judges reads them out at the end of the day. The roles of

'handler,' 'judge,' and 'spectator,' exist in all manner of sporting dog tests, however, it is the nature of the individual testing activities that distinguish the 'versatile hunting dog test' from field trials or field dog tests.

Although other sporting dog tests involve the use of such artifacts as dogs, birds, a shotgun, and a pond, a versatile hunting dog test is distinguishable first by the variety of individual events (water work, fieldwork, tracking) and second by the ranking of skills scored. For example, at a versatile hunting dog "Puppy" test, dogs must find, point, and chase (or hold) on birds, two shots are fired to ensure that the dog is not gun-shy, dogs swim to retrieve a duck from water, and find game by ground scent only in the context of tracking. The ability to find game ('use of nose') and the ability to hunt for the handler (being cooperative and 'easy on game') are the most important global skills of the versatile hunting dog.

A typical "Puppy test" routine once began with a dog and handler presenting themselves when called and waiting for the approach of one of the judges:

> *A senior judge approached the handler and explained to him that he would be going to the pond and throwing a dummy into the water for the dog to retrieve twice. Then the dog would be examined for the quality of her coat, bite, straightness of rear legs, and temperament. The judge asked if he had any questions, the handler declined and the trio proceeded to the water's edge where the other judges waited. A hush descended upon the gallery as the handler took the dummy from one of the judges. He showed it to the dog, waving it in front of her and getting her excited by it. He made certain that she was looking at it and as he threw it in the water, he gave her a quick tap and a cheery, "Go get it!" The dog dove into the water without hesitation and members of the gallery exchanged smiles. The handler remained serious as the dog grabbed the dummy, turned back, and swam to shore. Suddenly, the dog took off with it toward the gallery. "Come!" called the handler and the dog turned and reluctantly trotted back to him to drop the dummy at his feet. The judges nodded and told him, "Okay, send her again." The handler repeated his actions and the dog just looked at him. Suddenly, much to the visible relief of the handler, who had not timed the throw properly, she turned and dove after it. As she swam to shore, he walked around the pond to intercept her. With some coaxing, she got out, gave a shake, and allowed him to remove the dummy from her mouth. "Bring her here, bring her here," called the judges, and they crouched to intercept her for a quick examination. The dog was walked in front of them to display her rear legs, and seated while one judge took hold of her muzzle and all three peered at her teeth. Finally she was patted and her coat rubbed and pinched. She happily complied and jumped on a judge to plant kisses on his chin. The handler swiftly removed her with elaborate apologies. The judges nodded to*

him, and he turned to rejoin the gallery. As he passed, the "field marshal" quietly congratulated him. [Notes]

In very concrete terms then, the 'outsider' would recognize the uniqueness of this subculture at its special events (training events, tests). Here one bears witness to the performance of unique routines (with their associated rules and roles) and the presence of a variety of unique artifacts.

iii- meetings and socials

In such esoteric social settings as the club's training events and hunting tests, the group is recognizable as a unique subculture by the nature of its routines and artifacts, as well as by the content of certain of its rules and roles. Yet, an 'insider' would still be able to recognize members as 'friends' outside of these events and without their hunting dogs by the nature of their talk. It is the topic of their conversations and their use of language that most clearly sets members apart and enables the 'outsider' to recognize that they are in the midst of members of a unique subculture even at such mundane events as meetings and socials. Indeed, without familiarity with the 'insider meanings' of a large number of commonly used terms, a virtual 'language barrier' would inhibit one's ability to fully understand members.

Members frequently talk about previous and future hunting trips and may even tentatively organize hunting trips with other members during a meeting or social event. They debate about the best hunting or fishing locations and often refer to topographic maps (often kept in pockets or gloveboxes) to illustrate their points. Members are well versed concerning the variety and quality of sporting goods. They discuss prices, 'where to go for deals,' the best fabrics, and express disappointment in goods that did not live up to their expectations. They are intimately familiar with a wide range of firearms, including special editions or vintage rifles. Experienced trainers, in particular have expertise in the selection and proper use of all manner of training equipment. All members have an opinion on the variety of versatile breeds and will recount stories of their dog's performance (or blunders) at tests or in the field. There is also a lot of good-natured half-joking about other members' dogs, and in recent times, frequent grumbling about "the antis" and complaints about gun laws and hunting regulations.

Any of these topics of conversation are acceptable and expected in encounters with 'insiders.' In addition, versatile hunting dog enthusiasts use a number of terms that distinguish them from other sporting dog enthusiasts. They refer to a wide range of game birds, including chukars, woodcocks, ptarmigan, grouse. They are familiar with an international variety of pointing dog breeds, Cesky Fouseks, Munsterlanders, Spinoni Italiani, Brittany spaniels,

Vizslas, Pudelpointers. Also, they identify dog-skills unfamiliar to companion dog owners, such as, pointing, tracking, whoa-ing, remaining steady, and a number of faults, 'flushing' (stirring up the birds and making them fly), 'breaking" (from a point or 'whoa'), 'hunting for themselves' (not retrieving to hand, and or eating the game), 'blinking' (hesitating or being distracted by something), being 'gun-shy' (fearful and or distracted by gun-fire). Also, as ambassadors of unique 'breedlines' (hunting lines), members are able to name international champions in their dogs' pedigrees, such as the German Shorthair, 'Axel von Pregeleufer.'

One very confusing conversation I overheard at an annual meeting when I was a novice clearly revealed the multitude of esoteric terms and shared meanings and assumptions that are current among members of distinctive subcultures.

A: "He missed it by one point???!!!"

B: "It was my fault, really, I wasn't proofing his backing enough when we went out..."

A: "You've got a 'back-off, Jack,' though...?"

B: "Yeah, but half the time when we've been out they're all pointing at once. Like they're all in a circle around the scent cone. So when the judges saw him step in front of his brace mate and point on his own, they didn't know how well he does honour..."

A: "Yeah, but he's got a good nose..." [Notes]

To translate: The participants in this conversation were talking about a finished dog's performance at the "Invitational" test (held every two years for "First Place" "Advanced" dogs, only). The handler was responding to a member's shock and disappointment that the dog did not manage to earn the "Champion" title at the Invitational because he lost one point. The handler was blaming himself for the dog's performance as he explained that when he took the dog out for informal training sessions or actual hunting with other members ("when we were out"), he did not set up enough situations to 'proof' (or test) the dog's ability to properly 'back' ("honour"). That is, in the hunting situation, when one dog goes on point, the other is supposed to stay back and point his point (without interfering), and without having caught any scent of game himself. One piece of training equipment in the possession of many handlers is the "back-off, Jack!" It is a plastic silhouette of a life-sized dog on point that with a remote controller, the handler can stand up suddenly a few feet in front of his dog. The dog is expected to recognize the sign as another dog frozen on point, and should he not point

behind it, or attempt to creep out of his point position, the handler swiftly corrects him by picking him up and standing him behind it. The handler then went on to explain that many times, the way the scent of the game emanated (usually it rises around the animal like a "cone"), allowed several dogs to surround the animal and point independently, having caught the scent themselves. In the test situation, two dogs are run (in "braces") for the purpose of allowing the judges to witness 'honouring.' In this case, the handler's dog stepped in front of the "brace-mate" already on point because he caught the scent on his own (and therefore did not point his brace-mate's point). The fellow member just shook his head and suggested that the strength of the dog's scenting ability ("his good nose") should have over-ridden at least to some extent the judging standards. As is quickly apparent, an 'insider' translation is required for the 'outsider' to achieve an understanding of some of the esoteric conversations of members.

It is therefore evident that members of this group have enacted a subculture focused on the performance of a unique activity, the training and testing of versatile hunting dogs. In their special events the club is recognizable by its distinctive artifacts, rules, roles, and routines. In more mundane social settings, they are distinguishable by their preferred topics of conversation and unique elements of their vocabularies. Hence, by virtue of its unique patterns of activity and communication, the group studied constitutes a distinctive subculture.

D. Labelled 'Deviant'

Additionally, this group has evolved its own set of subcultural adaptations in response to their perception of being at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' Although this particular group has not been *publicly* labelled as such, it is through its association with the broader 'hunting fraternity,' which has indeed been identified as 'deviant' by the 'politically correct,' that members have come to see the writing on the wall. That is, the broader subcultural group in which the club is embedded or nested has suffered to some extent from being labelled 'politically incorrect.' In view of this, members of the club studied suspect that in the event that their 'secret deviance' became discovered, group members would share the same fate as other hunters. They have determined that becoming labelled 'deviant' is entirely possible, if not probable, should they fail to evolve certain adaptations. Hence, they have elected to 'reflectively" respond rather than allow themselves to become the passive victims of "moral entrepreneurs" (Becker 1963:147-8).

> *We don't want to be high profile when it comes to testing or trials where shooting is involved, it's not politically correct anymore... [000612]*

We don't want to be too visible because of law and ahm, and what is the word now...? perception that, anti-hunting animal-rights age that we live in now. Many of these things are...well, we operate in a grey area...[000604]

Historically, depictions of deviance have reinforced the image of the 'deviant' as objectively 'bad,' intellectually and or psychologically challenged, and without the creativity or reflectivity to respond rationally to the actions of others, let alone initiate a rationally motivated deviant act. As such, 'deviance' has often been individualized and depoliticized. Deviance has been merely a social rather than a socio-*political* issue (at best), and often (and at worst), deviants have suffered from a psychologization of their behaviour. Indeed, prior to the rise of more sociological explanations, deviants were sometimes seen as possessed of "evil spirits" or as being mentally or physically "ill" (Pfohl 1995). The implications of such a legacy are as follows:

1. Deviance was seen as an inherent quality of an act, rather than as a social construction. This assumes not only that deviance could be objectively defined and universally recognized, but also that there exists in society a relatively complete ideological consensus concerning the nature of deviant behaviour and perhaps near universal actual conformity to ideal standards of behaviour.

2. Deviants were seen as irrational, not responsible for their behaviour, and incapable of purposive activity. This assumes not only that deviants passively accept their status (as they are incapable of challenging their stereotype), but that deviant activity is without logical (instrumental) or political significance.

In stark contrast, Becker (1963) and other 'labelling theorists' bring to our attention the need to take a conflict perspective approach to deviance, that is, to acknowledge the importance of power and control to the construction of deviance (Anspach 1994:353-4). Becker (1963) views the attachment of 'deviant' labels as the work of "moral entrepreneurs" in contexts characterized by "social conflict." Thus, deviance is a social construction and not all members of society have equal power to participate in its construction:

> We must see deviance, and the outsiders who personify the abstract conception, as a consequence of a process of interaction between people, some of whom in the service of their own interests make and enforce rules which catch others who, in the service of their own interests, have committed acts which are labeled deviant (Becker 1963:163).

Becker contends that "rules are the products of someone's initiative and we can think of the people who exhibit such enterprise as 'moral entrepreneurs'...[Indeed] it is appropriate to think of [such] reformers as 'crusaders' because they typically believe that their mission is a holy one..." (Becker 1963:147-8). The work of "moral entrepreneurs" is very well illustrated in the historical accounts of the development of juvenile delinquency legislation (Platt 1969), the activities of the Puritans (Erikson 1966), and the American Temperance Movement (Gusfield 1963). Labelling the "outsider" (Becker 1963) is a "symbolic" victory "that enhances the prestige and self-esteem of the victors and degrades the culture of the losers" (Gusfield 1963:5).

In the present study, the moral entrepreneurs are "the antis," members of the bloc of politically correct whose crusade is against a number of 'outsiders.'

> *[The opposition comes from] the general public, now, influenced by environmentalists, animal rights activists, the whole environmental movement, anti-hunting groups, the anti-gun groups in universities. The universities are a big one because that's where it all started, due to the Marc Lepine deal... [000407]*

> *[We are threatened because] hunting is associated with cruelty to animals and the animal rights activists are against it. One of its products, fur, is the target of the anti-fur groups who are against trapping, farming, etc. Conservationists deplore the use-value of nature. Tougher gun-laws lobbyists fear the criminal use of firearms... [000301]*

In the face of such opposition, members of this group engage in coping strategies identified by Gresham Sykes and David Matza (1979) as "techniques of neutralization." Although among members of this group there is no evidence of "denying responsibility," they do appear to be "denying injury," "denying the existence of a victim," "condemning the condemners," and "appealing to 'higher loyalties'" (see Sykes and Matza 1979:667-669).

According to Sykes and Matza (1979), "for the delinquent, wrongfulness may turn on the question of whether or not anyone has clearly been hurt by his deviance, and this matter is open to a variety of interpretations" (1979:887). In this connection, one member argued,

> *Well, there's no real threat to us [in terms of incriminating action] because we do things overboard [sic—read as we go over board, out of our way], we don't harm animals, or in our training methods, et cetera. And we're very humane about what we do, if we have to kill a bird, et cetera... [001103]*

By arguing that animals are 'game animals' and rejecting the 'anthropomorphization of nature,' members "deny the existence of a victim." This is an illustration of the adoption of the strategy that Sykes and Matza describe as insisting that "the injury...is not really an injury" (Sykes and Matza 1979:668). One member criticized,

> *...you've been brought up in the era of Bambi and the little ducks on the TV. And they all talk and everything else, and its all untrue....dogs don't talk and birdies don't talk and they don't think like they tell us on TV. But all these animal rights people believe this, and it's not the true picture of everything, you know?! [001110]*

The "condemnation of the condemners" technique was especially prevalent among member of this group. That is, as Sykes and Matza point out, "the delinquent shifts the focus of attention from his own deviant acts to the motives and behaviour of those who disapprove of his violations...by attacking others, the wrongfulness of his own behaviour is more easily lost to view..." (Sykes and Matza 1975:668). In the case of the hunting dog organization, the "condemnation of condemners" technique is made visible by members' criticisms of the politically correct. The 'hypocrisy' of condemners was frequently pointed out. Members criticized the politically correct for not targeting factory farms, for failing to acknowledge the sporting rather than the criminal aspects of using firearms, and most frequently, for not actively participating in conservation activities.

> *Let them ["the antis"] go to any of these poultry places where they raise chickens and let them see the one with three feet and four beaks 'cause they gave them so much chemicals. [002012]*

> *[They don't see] the smiles on some of those children's faces when they're shooting their first bow, or when they're sitting there shooting at the hunting show... and in the Olympics...[the biathlon - ski and shoot..] [002010]*

> *All the work for rehabilitating habitat...it's only done by the outdoorsman. [001206]*

> *...it's the hunters that are contributing the bulk of funds that are targeted for conservation, et cetera, than "the antis"... [001004]*

Finally, it may also be argued that another "technique of neutralization" that some members of this group are engaging in is "appealing to higher loyalties." As Sykes and Matza (1975) point out, "...deviation from certain norms may occur not because the norms are rejected, but because other norms held to be more pressing or involving a higher loyalty, are

accorded precedence" (Sykes and Matza 1975:669). It was interesting to find at least two members offering justifications for their activities that were indeed along these lines:

> *...I really think [hunting is] a sacred job, and an interaction with the animate or spiritual natural world and I only got into it for traditional economic reasons...And I can only live with that decision because I feel that I at least, consider it a spiritual activity. For me, depending on game is an admission and acceptance of my own subjugation to the forces of nature that are greater than I...[000302]*

> *This is my choice to do things...I just believe that the good Lord put these animals here for man, you know? Originally, that is what they were all intended for man to survive, eating, you know, the wild species... [000108]*

A related technique, beyond mere "condemnation of the condemners" is also visible among members of this group. While labelling may or may not in all cases elicit a response of *bona fide* political activism, deviants may "repudiate the other and work at their own self-elevation" (Anspach 1994:358) in rather public ways. That is, in spite of the apparent 'superior power' of the labelers, those labelled are not powerless victims, acted upon, but not acting in their own interest. Indeed, Renee Anspach (1994) notes that there is a political "backlash" quality to (the continuance of) deviant activity.

> *Politically Incorrect Red-Neck—and Proud of it!!! [Bumper sticker]*

Taking issue with the image of those labelled 'deviant' as "passive victims," Anspach argues that labels are "negotiated," implying that actors are "reflective" and "creative." Using the example of the mobilization of the "disabled and former mental patients," which transformed them from silent "stigmatized" individuals to vocal "activists," she argues that labelling may result in political activism. As such, the "victims" of labelling are not powerless and the process of deviance construction is not one-sided. Deviant identities are not imposed, but negotiated (Anspach 1994:353).

Goffman (1959) too recognized that "stigmatized" individuals are not powerless victims, but "strategists" and "con artists," engaged in "information control" and "tension management." However, he suggested that they carry out "defensive maneuvers." This implies that ultimately the stigmatized person "subscribes to the very societal definitions of normalcy" that oppress him/her (Anspach 1994:356; Goffman 1963:116-24). In direct contrast, Anspach points out that "active attempts [are made] on the part of those labelled as deviant to *mold their own identities*..." (Anspach 1994:356). Thus, the activism of certain

groups is not passive acceptance or endorsement of the labelers' version of the ideal, to which they defensively respond. Rather it constitutes a direct "assault" upon labelers (Anspach 1994:356). In this connection, members may "de-euphemize" terms used against them (e.g. 'politically incorrect,' 'red-neck'), turning the tables on accusers by wearing the stigmatizing label as a "badge of honour" (Anspach 1994:361)

Also, by engaging in self-elevation, the in-group neutralizes to some degree its own deviance. That is, if a group can 'point to' some other group or person that may be equally deviant in principle, yet qualitatively 'more deviant' than themselves, then by *contrast* the deviance of the accused is partially neutralized or defined as less serious. An argument for the existence of a 'hierarchy of deviants' is offered to labelers, in the hope that attention will be deflected away from the less offensive deviants. In the case of the particular group studied, these attempts at self-elevation as a technique of neutralization were demonstrated by members' insistence that *others* deserved the deviant label, but that they did not. They argued that many typical hunters are indeed unethical, but that they are a group of ethical hunters. Indeed, if "the antis" really got to know them better, they might even support them. As such, members argued that they were better than the others, who they unanimously agreed should be stopped.

> *The typical hunter is a guy who drinks Labat's Blue and drives a pick-up and is real careless with his firearms and goes on the weekend and if he hunts and gets something, and if he doesn't then, well that's good too, he got pissed [drunk]...good le boys, most of them... [000402]*
>
> *...no one wants to be associated with THEM! [000206]*
>
> *...there are some people who go out and do that...but we're there to enjoy the sport and we're not there to get drunk and make a party out of it and also make danger out of it...drunk in the bush and shooting innocent people...we're safe, more professional in that sense... [000505]*

Hence, the agenda is ultimately resistance. Beyond engaging in self-defensive "techniques of neutralization" (Sykes and Matza 1979), members of this group seek to affirm their right to exist. As such, they attempt to "mold their own identities" (Anspach 1994:356) in the course of evolving practical coping strategies.

Since members of this group have come to appreciate the magnitude of the impact of the 'deviant' label on their group and on themselves as members, they have evolved subcultural adaptations as a set of interrelated protective strategies. I shall refer to these strategies

(described below) as *changing, closing, and contriving*. In this way, they, like other stigmatized groups have developed certain survival strategies. For example, like others with a "discreditable stigma," they engage in typical "information management" techniques (Goffman 1963). That is, in the course of managing a deviant identity (one that, if revealed at an inopportune time or place would, at the very least, result in the stigmatized individual's feeling put on the spot, being forced to offer some 'account' to excuse or defend the self), the deviant evolves strategies for releasing or withholding information about themselves with great discretion.

From the interviews it was discovered that group members, as individuals, engage in several "information management" strategies in that they "selectively conceal [discrediting] information about themselves at certain times, in certain situations, and with certain individuals and freely disclose the same information at other times, in other situations, and with other individuals..." (Herman 1993:307). Members often referred to the necessity for 'discretion' with outsiders; their ability to distinguish between those with whom they can talk about the club from those with whom they cannot; their penchant for taking the offensive by playing 'devil's advocate' where they feel that they are in the presence of at least a few allies; and the hope of a few of them that properly timed and worded disclosure would educate the public and relieve some of the pressure on all hunters.

> *[Today,] I'm more hesitant to say that I am a hunter... [001702]*
>
> *It's becoming something that you don't speak of so loudly, it really depends on what circles you're in... [000901]*
>
> *I think I know who not to talk to, you know... Yes, you can't be public about it anymore... [000103]*

In general, members have most certainly "re-adjusted group routines" to "protect and conceal the organization from the other" (Prus 1994:407). Since this group perceives itself to be a group of "outsiders," it has come to share a number of characteristics with other "outsiders" (Becker 1963) studied by sociologists, like the Children of God (VanZandt 1991), the "Espers" (Simmons 1964), the Rebels (Wolf 1991), and the Divine Precepts (Lofland 1966), to name only a few. Members of all of these groups have had to engage in activities which "protect their organization" [in their] "encounters with others" (Prus 1994:397).

To give one example, Wolf (1991), Simmons (1964), and Lofland (1966) all refer to one particular type of adaptation, members' tendency to intensify their involvement with their

groups and their groups' corresponding tendency to exclude outsiders, either as a response to some direct external threat, or the threat of attacks on or challenges to their choices. The "Rebels," a motorcycle gang studied by Wolf (1991) constituted a "brotherhood," and as Wolf describes, "as I watched the faces of the Rebels, I could see the hardening of an attitude --- 'us-against-the-world'" (Wolf 1991:17). The 'in-group/out-group' motif is especially strong among those belonging to deviant subcultures. Both Simmons and Lofland describe members' conscious attempts at 'differential association,' that is, they seek to "identify more closely with those who share their beliefs." This is "coupled with relative isolation from and disparagement of those whose beliefs differ" (Simmons 1964:256) or avoidance of contact and or communication with non-members (Lofland 1966:59).

My research revealed that members of the versatile hunting dog club also engaged in this adaptation by deliberately *closing*: Members closed themselves off socially from outsiders and took on an 'in-group/out-group' attitude towards outsiders. One member foresaw a future increase in members' involvement with each other as the opposition to hunting increased---they would take comfort in associating more with their 'club-buds.'

> *We do our own thing, and we do it quietly [001106]*
>
> *...well, I think that the more it gets to be taboo, the more we'll find comfort with each other. [000303]*
>
> *...we really try to keep a low profile anyway... [001302]*
>
> *...it seems they go down to sort of covert...but I don't know if that's such a good idea. That's what their answer has been, I know [a founding member] said that. [000404]*

Indeed, I would argue that any 'us-against-the-world' or 'in-group/out-group' or differential association attitudes or behaviour intended to protect the deviant group from a hostile 'moral majority' constitutes very obviously some sort of coping strategy useful for those suddenly finding themselves labelled 'deviant.'

As such, a theory of social change and the labelling of deviants as the work of "moral entrepreneurs" (Becker 1963:147-8) is clearly applicable to the case of the hunting dog organization studied. For here we have a subcultural group that was attempting to carry out its ordinary routines when it discovered that its activities (along with its image) were now provoking moral indignation.

In fact, provoking moral indignation to the point of becoming labelled 'deviant' is highly contingent. If we accept that all gestures and utterances have no inherent meaning, then actors must respond to the 'stimulus' of the image or action of others not by automatic 'reflex,' but by a complex process of interpretation. Thus, we must attend to the various considerations involved in an interpretive process that can result in a group's being defined as 'deviant.'

Ellis (1987) provides a useful list of many of the considerations that may be involved in the interpretation of a feature/characteristic or behaviour that can lead to the application of the 'deviant' label. According to Ellis, "for a label to stick, it must be applied. The probability that a deviant label will be applied varies with:

- Whether a rule (norm) was broken...
- Who committed the infraction (powerful vs. powerless persons).
- When the infraction was committed (was a campaign being waged against this kind of deviance or not?).
- How frequently the rule was being broken (few vs. many infractions).
- How visible the infractions were (visible vs. secret deviance).
- What the consequences (material and symbolic) were to the labelers (gains increased/losses decreased vs. gains decreased/losses increased)" (Ellis 1987:54).

I would add to this list the consideration of the *seriousness* of the infraction, that is, whether or not and how much 'harm' is allegedly caused to some 'victim' by the deviant status or activity. Although there is nothing objective about definitions of harmfulness, labelers could attract support by revealing evidence that the group in question causes a certain amount of harm. And depending on where recipients of this harm are situated on the 'hierarchy of victims,' labelers may be able to muster considerable support.

Basically, Ellis (1987) is arguing that the attachment of the deviant label to an individual or group based on features/characteristics (deviant status/stigma) or behaviour (activities) *depends*---for the audience, it depends on the existence of some broken rule, it depends on whether or not the rule-breaking is habitual, and it depends on whether or not the

rule-breaking is visible to outsiders. Thus, the one-shot 'secret' deviant act is less likely to cause the audience to want to attach a 'deviant' label than is the public recidivist. Moreover, it is the context in which the alleged deviance is occurring that might ultimately make the difference between rumors or suggestions and labels that stick. The context is comprised of "accusers" and "deniers" (Ellis 1987)---and more importantly, how they rank and what they stand to gain or lose. That is, deniers are more likely to be labelled 'deviant' if they have no ability to resist the label, and the more powerful accusers are more likely to seek to attach the label if they stand to gain (symbolically or materially) from identifying 'deviants.' Furthermore, *when* the rule-breaking occurs (or is detected) also influences labelling---levels of 'tolerance' for certain types of deviance can vary significantly not only from era to era but from week to week, depending on such factors as the occurrence of tragic events, changes to legislation, the rise or fall in popularity of a given public figure, and many others. Such events may incite agents of social control to be especially watchful for certain 'deviations,' and possibly intent on discovering them sometimes by questionable methods. Hence, many factors are involved in attaching labels. It is not sufficient that a given feature/characteristic or behaviour exist for it to be labelled 'deviant,' it must be interpreted for it to be so defined.

Ellis adds that: "Given that a label has been applied, the degree to which the application is successful varies with:

- The severity of the reaction --- the more severe, the more successful.
- The publicity attached to the reaction --- the greater the publicity, the more successful.
- The degree of group support for alternative definitions --- the greater the degree of agreement or *consensus* on the definition, the more successful" (Ellis 1987:54-55, emphasis mine).

Thus, the likelihood that the 'deviant' label will *stick* for good is also contingent. As Ellis argues, the 'moral indignation provoked' must be both severe and public---if the audience reaction is mild and no real fuss is made over the infraction, the accusation is unlikely to stand. Moreover, if the reaction is not only severe and public but also agreed upon by a 'majority,' moral entrepreneurs will likely have achieved great success: The amount of group consensus on the definition of the feature/characteristic or behaviour as 'deviant' is an important condition for successful labelling.

Depending on the outcome of an interpretive process in which the considerations discussed above may be involved, a group might be labelled 'deviant.' However, these considerations actually represent continua---groups are not merely defined as either deviant or conforming, *the extent to which* they are deviant is also defined. Thus, there are actually various degrees of deviance that are perceived by audiences.

If we take for example a (hypothetical) group of privately active 'fetishists' in a major Canadian city (e.g. members of the Macintosh society who wear rubber, foot-fetishists who have highly graphic web sites on the Internet, participants at a "Living in Leather" conference who find body piercing especially arousing) and compare them with a (hypothetical) group of politically active pro-abortionists in a predominantly Christian northern Ontario town, we can see that their respective (community) audiences would certainly define them as deviant, but that because of both the nature of their deviant behaviour and their respective contexts *the extent to which* they are perceived to be deviant would vary. Moreover, *relative to each other within the same social context* these two groups may be seen as engaging is different degrees of deviance. For a given audience, the issue often boils down to how much harm the activity or status is perceived to cause (i.e. does the deviance really hurt anybody?) and how much consensus (i.e. perceived to be deviant by whom/ how many?) on the definition of the behaviour exists for a group to receive the deviant label.

Although fetishists might argue that fetishes are more commonplace than one would expect, the various agents of socialization in Canadian society (e.g. the media) do not appear to be promoting sexual behaviour involving fetishes. Presumably for two reasons, the fact that we are encouraged and legally compelled to engage in sexual activity out of public view and the fact that fetishes are often considered to be 'add-ons' to sexual experience, not a lot of attention is drawn to fetishism. When it does attract attention it sometimes invites curiosity and amusement, but the disapproval (for certain sexual activities involving fetishes that *do not* violate criminal laws, *unlike* e.g. bestiality, pedophilia, necrophilia, etc. [refer to Sections 160 re: "bestiality"; 152 re: "invitation to sexual touching"; and 178 re: "offering an indignity to a human corpse"---of the Canadian Criminal Code, respectively]) often derives more from personal aesthetic values than moral ones. Moreover, no one really stands to gain by preventing individuals from indulging their fetishes. Thus, a relatively invisible (however frequent) and certainly unconventional (but not necessarily harmful) subculture, participated in by members of perhaps all social strata in an era of relative tolerance for openness about sex, is indeed deviant but 'not very.' The audience reaction is not usually severe, nor is it usually publicized, and although there may be some consensus regarding the aesthetic distastefulness

of a given fetish, there is no complete consensus on the harmfulness to some perceived 'victim' of sex involving the wearing of rubber, foot-kissing, or wearing jewelry in pierced private parts (to give a few examples).

Conversely, in a predominantly Christian northern Ontario town, such as Sault Ste. Marie where I live, there can be severe and well-publicized reaction to such deviant activity as participating in a Pro-Choice demonstration, and a significant amount of community consensus on the definition of this behaviour as 'deviant.' Here, one does not feel comfortable expressing a pro-abortion stance---let alone staging a demonstration in support of the right to legal abortion. There is no visible confrontation between Pro-Life and Pro-Choice proponents. For example, Pro-Choice activists are notably absent from the *weekly* anti-abortion picketing in front of the local hospital in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. Thus, in the event that a Pro-Choice group staged a demonstration across the way from a Pro-Life demonstration, it is highly likely that the audience reaction would be both severe and public and it appears that there is (judging from the regularity of encouraging waves and car horn beeping during anti-abortion picketing and the lack of dissent in the local media) at least a solid veneer of consensus that pro-abortionists would be perceived as deviant. Pro-choices are seen as promoting (and practicing) an act of 'fatal harm' to a category of being that ranks very high on the 'hierarchy of victims' in our society. Engaging in demonstrations to offer support for such rule-breaking behaviour would also be a highly visible act. By demonstrating, in the highly conservative moral and political climate of a town dominated by Catholics, Pro-Choices would be putting themselves in a position to be labelled 'deviant.' The group of Pro-Choice proponents is therefore 'extremely' deviant in this situation. Moreover, attaching the 'deviant' label to Pro-Choice groups brings Pro-Life groups one step closer to attaching the 'criminal' label to pro-abortionists and having *their* moral stance entrenched in law. Thus, much is to be gained in such a moral drama. In *this* situation, Pro-Lifers can allege harmfulness and find a fairly solid community consensus on the deviance of Pro-Choices.

Now, if we were to shuffle these deviant groups into *the other* social context and put them *alongside* their counterparts, these groups would probably be received differently. That is, if fetishists were discovered in a predominantly Catholic northern town where Pro-Choice activism were occurring and if some Pro-Choice activists were discovered in a major Canadian city where fetishists were practicing, each group would be ranked differently on the hierarchy of deviants *and* relative to each other in the respective communities. In the northern town, the fetishists would probably be perceived as deviant, and significantly mores than they were in

the major Canadian city, but less deviant than the local Pro-Choice activist. In the major Canadian city, the Pro-Choice activist would probably be perceived as yet another 'special interest group' but there would probably be insufficient community consensus to label him or her as 'deviant.' I say this because of the fairly equal representation of Pro-Choices and Pro-Lifers demonstrating is commonplace and expected, if not fully accepted by most urban dwellers. It would not be shocking to see Pro-Lifers being challenged. But due to the greater social diversity found in major urban Centres, relative to the Pro-Choice activists, the fetishists would probably be perceived as so 'mildly' deviant that they might by a significant number be considered a fairly neutral (if not fully 'conventional') subculture. The Pro- Choices are likely to be perceived as 'more deviant' from the fetishists if for no other reason that the abortion debate itself is more visible to people, and often seen as evidence of social conflict and as such, proponents of both sides may elicit mild disapproval at the annoyance that their public confrontation represents.

It should also be noted that in each of these situations both "targets" and "tacticians" (Prus 1995) can wind up being more or less powerful depending on the social context in which they are found. For example, Pro-Choice activists may be vastly outnumbered and have no control over the media in a Northern town, while in a major city they may enjoy more equitable representation and have sufficient means and freedom to advertise their view widely. For the fetishists, a change in social context would probably have little effect on this group's relative power, yet it does happen that the existence of diversity can be somewhat empowering to even very low key subcultural groups. Due to each group's mandate/purpose, it is unlikely that shifting to the other social context could affect their need for visibility, nor their susceptibility to outsider scrutiny. Hence, as illustrated by the (hypothetical) situations presented above, deviance is both relative and variable.

It appears then that groups can be ranked or plotted along a continuum of how deviant they are, or rather, how deviant they are *perceived to be*. And *how deviant a group is perceived to be has a profound impact on whether or not the label will indeed stick*. Again, evaluating how deviant a given group is requires interpretation. Since the label is attached neither automatically nor universally, *whose interpretation prevails* demands our attention in any study of deviant groups. Thus, the "moral drama" (Becker 1963) is actually a political struggle. By attaching the deviant label and making it stick, "moral entrepreneurs" (Becker 1963) exercise power.

E. The Issue of Power

As stated in Chapter One, I have taken a conflict-interactionist perspective in my analysis of a club of hunting dog enthusiasts. That is, following Howard S. Becker (1963), I have taken the symbolic interactionism of Herbert Blumer (1969) into a conflict direction in my analysis of the deviant subculture (see also Hills 1980). From this perspective, deviance is considered to be both a social construct (the outcome of interpretation) and the result of an act of moral subordination (the result of inter-group conflict). As such, there is no objective definition of deviance that can be separated from a given social context and the ability to construct and label behaviour as 'deviant' reveals the existence of *power differentials* within a given subcultural mosaic. In this sense, power may be seen as the capacity of a person or group "to realize their own will in a communal action even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action" (Max Weber in Girth and Mills 1958:180). Power is therefore manifest in the ability to make one group's version of reality *and the expectations that flow from it* stand. According to Ellis and DeKeseredy:

> The greater the power of a social group, the greater its ability to make rules whose 'infraction constitutes deviance.' Thus parents make rules for children, bosses make rules for workers, welfare workers make rules for welfare clients, teachers make rules for students, and men make rules for women. Associated with differences in social power is the ability to successfully apply labels and to make them stick (Ellis and DeKeseredy 1996:53).

Power is thus the ability to make the rules, to set the standard of conformity. It is the ability of one group to make its definition of reality the only one that matters. Indeed power is the ability to define and label deviance *as well as* to enforce conformity. Furthermore, the precise manner in which power is wielded in relation to those labelled 'deviant' is as important to labelling theorists as the labelling process itself: Labels are not only descriptive and evaluative, but also *prescriptive*---they tell us not only about the status or behaviour and whether or not it is acceptable, but also *how we should behave* in response to it (Ellis 1987:53). The maltreatment suffered by deviants actually represents an effort at effecting social control (rule enforcement). For example, "deviant patients" (medical patients seeking illegitimate entry into the 'sick role') are subjected to the exercise of discretionary power by doctors and nurses in emergency wards. They are treated badly for being deviant: They are made to wait, are ignored for a period of time, endure verbal hostility and vigorous physical

restraint, and are not given any sympathy (Jeffery 1987:120-121). Such treatment does not merely punish for its own sake, but intends to deter "rubbish" ('bad' patients) from engaging in future deviance. Here the exercise of power is obviously one-sided, but in some situations, even such "targets" can and do act as "tacticians" (Prus 1995) in inter-group relations---*at least insofar as they have the power to do so*, I would add..

In a (revised) work titled "Envisioning Power as Intersubjective Accomplishment: Acknowledging the Human Enterprise Entailed in Tactician-Target Interchanges"(1995). Prus offers an alternative definition of power. Here, Prus argues that power is an ongoing "intersubjective accomplishment" (Prus 1995:10) both within and among subcultural groups. "Power" may be "tentatively defined by instances in which people (individually and collectively) shape the behaviors and experiences of others in intended ways...[The] term 'power' implies an intent or capacity on the part of one person or group to influence, control, dominate, persuade, manipulate, or otherwise affect the behaviors, experiences, or situations of some target..." (Prus 1995:11). Although Prus' version is certainly defensible for its references to a "capacity" to "effect certain results," it warrants some fine-tuning. For example, there are *unintended* as well as deliberate ways in which we shape the behaviours, experiences *and ideas* of others, and I would argue that causing these effects requires more than mere *intention*. Prus *does* emphasize that individuals and groups have the capacity to influence others directly, unlike some symbolic interactionists who fail to attend to the element of power involved in negotiating the definition of a situation. However, he tends to over-estimate the capacity of "targets" to influence "tacticians."

For Prus, the existence of power "is often partial at best and is always contingent upon human definition and enterprise for its essence" (Prus 1995:11), for he states that success in the exercise of power "depends in most cases on the target's willingness to cooperate with the agent or tactician in the situation at hand" (Prus 1995:13). As such, power is an intersubjectively defined and negotiated social construct. Hence, for Prus, "power" is in fact a matter of definition, it is "a quality imputed to a situation by some audience" (Prus 1995:11) and we must therefore attend to "the *definitions* that people make (however tentatively) in specific situations in reference to matters of influence, control, domination, and the like" (Prus 1995:11-12, emphasis mine). Moreover, according to Prus, many statements on power "fail to recognize that all parties to an encounter may assume active roles as targets and tacticians on a concurrent as well as a sequential basis" (Prus 1995:9). That is, those "experiencing influence" (targets) and those "effecting influence" (tacticians) may be one in the same, as definitions shift situationally. Those targeted may see themselves as such but may soon

attempt tactical maneuvers of their own. "This means that agents of influence, themselves, may become (or often are) targets of influence for the very people whose lives they intend to shape" (Prus 1995:13). Hence, resistance, rather than passive acceptance of outsider influence, becomes possible. That is, since parties must engage in an "enterprising activity" (Prus 1995:12) for power to become a reality at all, in the course of 'constructing power,' the actual balance or dynamics of power become subject to revision or negotiation. Human actors therefore determine for themselves their 'inter-group relational status,' so to speak. That is, *they define themselves as targets or tacticians at a given moment* (Prus 1995:12).

In subscribing to this 'negotiated' view of power, it is not surprising that the deviant subculture is entirely disattended to in Prus' formulation of the "intersubjective accomplishment of power." Prus argues that "[although] Power is ubiquitous in the sense that it may be brought into existence in any variety of situations, ...it is not a necessary element of any situation" (Prus 1995:11). I would qualify this statement by arguing that *at the very least, power is, however, a necessary element of all situations in which questions of deviance 'arise.'* By definition, the socially deviant subculture cannot emerge irrespective of power relations. *Whose* rules and standards of conformity prevail derives from a power struggle among groups in Prus' subcultural mosaic. From the position of the victor of such battles, negotiations are now over.

It should be noted at this point that the issue of power is dealt with in ambiguous and inconsistent ways throughout the sociological literature. Indeed, as a theoretical issue, it remains unresolved. That is, sociologists do not understand the term 'power' in the relatively predictable way that they might other common sociological concepts (e.g. socialization, social control, conformity, etc.). It appears that constructing 'working definitions' of power that are applicable to particular cases is favoured over making definitive statements. There are statements in support of the 'negotiated' view of power as outlined by Prus and other symbolic interactionists. It is argued that power is a product of social interaction. Here, linkages are made to a Weberian definition of 'authority,' such that power may be sustained by *ideology* or submission to some individual with *prestige*---power is seen as legitimate, and consequently, those subject to it comply. On the other hand, there are statements in support of the 'coerced' view of power as outlined by Marx and other conflict theorists. It is argued that power is more one-sided. Here linkages are made to a Weberian definition of 'power' as the ability to achieve desired ends in spite of resistance from others---power may be sustained by brute *force* or a relationship of (economic) *dependency*. In fact, I would argue that 'power' actually involves elements of both versions. The exercise of power can be negotiated

and is indeed a matter of interpretation---however when one finds one's self unable to resist another's influence, it becomes evident that 'power' can be a superior force that cannot be wished away. A group may only have *limited power* to resist a deviant label imposed on them by *powerful* outsiders---and this is certainly the case with the group that I have studied.

As stated above, 'deviant' labels are not only descriptive and evaluative, but also prescriptive---they tell us how to behave toward the deviant. In fact, power is involved not only in labelling, but also in the exercise of discriminatory treatment. Indeed, as stated above, although power requires definition and interpretation to be meaningful, *it is not just a definition of the situation or fiction that can be wished away.* Being pushed around and put down constantly by 'moral-majority bullies' is a highly obdurate feature of reality for deviant groups, and an inescapable problem for many of them. And as much as "tacticians" can have more or less power to exercise maltreatment toward deviants, "targets" have more or less power to respond to this treatment effectively. How much power "targets" have has significant consequences for the manner (and extent to which) they are able to respond. Thus, a given group will evolve subcultural adaptations of a kind that are consistent with its available resources---if the group has the material resources to confine their deviant activity to the privacy of closed locales, members may choose to do so; if the group has the ideological resources to persuade the public to tolerate if not accept their activities, members may take this option; but if the group is 'powerless' (by some relative standard), the group itself may ultimately be forced out of existence. With regard to the group studied here (hunting dog enthusiasts), the *changing, closing, contriving* response was only possible because of the club's available resources. As such, the *changing, closing, contriving* adaptive strategy is an option only for groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' *who have the power to manipulate* (while still maintaining the integrity of) *their activities, contact with and visibility to outsiders, and their image*.

It is therefore especially important to attend to the aspect of power in relation to deviant subcultural groups and those at risk of being so labelled. Not only are such groups influenced by the power of an outsider group to label them 'deviant' and subject them to discriminatory treatment, but they are also affected by their own ability (or lack thereof) to respond. That is, the nature of their adaptations to outsider influence is constrained by a group's power to implement the most effective (coping) strategies. This in turn can have serious consequences for the group, in that the adaptive strategy that it is able to implement may not be sufficient to sustain it. In addition, it is important to formulate our insights with regard to the issue of power in such a manner as to facilitate their widest possible applicability. Attending to the

aspect of power in our own case studies without working at making our discoveries accessible to other ethnographers negates our efforts to deepen our understanding of human group life.

In his statement on the "intersubjective accomplishment of power," Prus (1995) seeks to achieve conceptual "trans-situationality" or "cross-contextuality." That is, he presents an approach to the study of "influence work" (i.e. how groups exercise power in relation to each other) that facilitates the application of his insights to a wide variety of social settings (Prus 1995). In this connection, Prus offers a list of categories of generic social processes relevant to issue of power. Here, he attends to such experiences as "Routings and Careers of Tactician Involvement; Assuming the Role of the Tactician: Doing Influence Work; Extending the Theatre of Operations (Influence work): Third Parties, Collective Ventures, the Mass Media, and Political Agendas; and Experiencing Target Roles: The Vulnerable, Restrained, Elusive, and Enterprising Self. For the purposes of this study, the category of generic social processes titled, "Experiencing Target Roles: the Vulnerable, Restrained, Elusive, and Enterprising Self" is most applicable. It includes the following processes: "Defining Influence; Initiating Activity and Acting Back on "Tacticians" (i.e. "targets as tacticians"); Engaging in Collective (Tactical) Resistance (i.e., extending the theatre of operations) (Prus 1995:16-17).

In my own work, I, too, seek to unearth concepts, typologies, and social processes that are formulated to facilitate the application of my findings to the widest possible range of cases of subcultural groups. Although Prus' listing of generic social processes pertaining to the intersubjective accomplishment of power certainly makes a valuable contribution to our knowledge of strategies for doing influence work, I find that his generic social processes and sub-processes are not quite as useful as they might initially appear. Prus has created an over-abundance of processes and sub-processes that tend to be so specific to certain kinds of situations that much of their generic appeal and value is lost. I have therefore attended to many of his aspects of targethood under the broad category of *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic* with my own generic social processes of *acknowledging a relationship to outsiders, analyzing outsider perspectives and activities, and adapting to outsider influence* (with the sub-processes, *changing, closing*, and *contriving* as practical matters of target enterprise that constitute 'collective resistance'). [Refer to **Chapter Five: Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic**] In this way, the issue of power and attention to target roles is built into my own work and thoroughly attended to. Also, since my categories are more simple, my theoretical discoveries facilitate trans-situational or cross-contextual application.

Again, the issue of power cannot be ignored in our analyses of deviant subcultural groups. If we accept that the deviant status is a label attached to a given group by outsiders, we must

attend to the fact that a given group of outsiders has had to be sufficiently powerful in order to be able to affix and sustain the 'deviant' label. In addition, in order to better understand the manner in which subcultural groups attend to outsider influence, we must consider how much power a given group of deviants has to resist the label, or adjust to it effectively. Furthermore, although these considerations make for rich ethnographic analyses of particular deviant subcultural groups, we must take advantage of the opportunity they provide us to recognize the generic features of conflictual inter-group relations. This is necessary for deepening our understanding of human group life in general, as well as deviant subcultures in particular.

F. A 'Deviant' Subculture?

From an analysis of the data collected from the in-depth interviews, it appears that members of the club of the organization studied certainly *perceive themselves* as at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' That is, if not directly, at least through their association with the hunting fraternity, members of this group feel that they and their activities have suddenly fallen out of favour with a changed public and that they are now experiencing moral disapproval.

According to members of this group, they, as hunters, if not as hunting dog club members, are being faced with some threat. After experiencing demonstrations, verbal confrontations, and more subtle evidence of disapproval, members perceive that hunting is 'no longer socially acceptable' or 'suddenly deviant' because a number of "antis" or moral entrepreneurs (from vegetarians to gun-law lobbyists) have been influencing public sentiment. They believe that their immanent fate is the result of a new trend, one that leads them to feel uncertain in 'outsider' circles and has resulted in a certain amount of caution, discretion, and secrecy among members. This group has been highly influenced by either their anticipation of becoming labelled deviant in the future and potentially controlled.

[if hunting is banned] the club probably wouldn't survive... [001304]

What they can do is discourage enough people away from hunting, whereas now hunting is hush-hush, hunting is now something like, how can I say it, it's going to be like a secret fraternity,...yeah a brotherhood, 'oh you're a hunter? Oh good...,' secret hand-shake, you know, they can do that... [002012]

The point should again be made that the deviance of this group, in terms of any *wide-spread publicity*, is entirely secret or undiscovered. I would argue that this is due to group's general invisibility. It is invisible not only because it is a highly specialized

organization that is difficult to discover unless one is especially persevering and well connected with the sport, but also because they have the *ability* to construct their invisibility with their wealth, international underground support, and a membership of astute people who have been able to see it coming and deliberately keep the group in the shadows. The group did not come into being as most deviant groups typically do. That is, members were never individual 'solitary' deviants who formed the group *for the purpose of* carrying out deviant activity. They were not similarly-fated people who were thrown together and became a subculture. Rather, they were already a group---and a non-deviant one---it is only recently that they face the threat of being labelled 'deviant.'

> Deviant groups [normally are made up of people who] face more or less the same dilemma. The general dilemma for the persons who ultimately become involved in deviant subcultures is that they want to continue activities that the society labels deviant but at the same time they want to avoid punishment. When enough people become aware that they share such a problem, a deviant subculture can arise to provide a solution... [They are] subcultures formed by and for deviant activity (Rubington and Weinberg 1987:200).

This was not the case for this particular group. Rather, they were a fairly neutral subculture already, prior to the perception of labelling and, as such, only exhibit some of the characteristics of deviant groups. They are thus similar to other organized groups who over time fell out of favour, such as furriers, or clubs which explicitly exclude women or racial minorities. Indeed, the formation and maintenance of the group has had nothing to do with any attempt to consciously form a group "*for* deviant activity." Thus, beyond being in the process of being labelled 'deviant' [at least by association] and subsequently developing coping strategies, the process of evolution and the characteristics of the typical deviant subculture do not apply to this group. Indeed, most of the characteristics that this group shares with deviant subcultures are those which deviant subcultures share with conventional- or conforming subcultures.

In fact, deviant subcultures operate in much the same way as do conventional subcultures, "the main difference, of course is that the content of deviant subcultures is illegal, immoral, or both..." (Rubington 1987:204-5)---at least as it is defined by the powerful. Simmons (1969) argues that "...there are deviant traditions and ideologies, deviant prestige systems, commitment and conformity to deviant codes, deviant recruitment and missionary work, and deviant utopian dreams" (Simmons 1969:88-92) And "[deviant] subcultures evolve their own little communities or social worlds, each with its own local myths..., its own legendary

heroes..., its own honorary members..., its own scale of reputations..., and its own social routine..." (Simmons 1969:88-92). There are "usually a few core members [who] are unequivocally committed, a larger circle of part-time members drift back and forth between conventionality and deviance, and an even larger circle are only tangentially acquainted or involved" (Simmons 1969:88-92).

Thus, while the characteristics of deviant subcultures (and conventional subcultures) outlined above certainly do apply to the case of the club, other characteristics of typical deviant subcultures do not. Generally, "...societal condemnation gives powerful support to the creation and continuation of those deviant groups. Even when the members don't altogether agree with or even like each other they are thrown together because they may have no where else to turn for help and support...." (Simmons 1969:88-92). Indeed, according to Cohen (1955) "there are five stages in the development of a subculture: (1) experiencing a problem, (2) communication about it with someone else in the same situation, (3) interaction on the basis of the problem, (4) developing a solution, and (5) sustaining and passing on the tradition" (Cohen, 1955, as cited in Rubington 1987:203). In such a case, both the formation and the continuation of the deviant subculture centres around deviance. As such, "a subculture of deviants of whatever kind [makes] available to its constituents ways of organizing and executing the deviant act, a set of rules of associating with one's partners in deviance, and some means for either avoiding or managing the consequences of deviance" (Rubington 1987:204). Hence, the fact that this latter feature has indeed emerged in this group is incidental, members do have their activities institutionalized as an element of their own subculture, but it only just so happens that this category of activities is considered deviant.

This is a group of individuals whose broader subcultural group (the hunting fraternity) has very recently in its history been labelled 'deviant.' As such, whether or not they themselves have actually met with any of the resulting conflict or hostility directed at their *particular* group, "situations defined as real are real in their consequences" (Thomas 1928)---they perceive pressure from outsiders and are acting reflexively as they deal with it. Members of the group of hunting dog enthusiasts sense that the public considers them to be closely aligned with a deviant group and as a consequence, they have come to share certain coping strategies (more than common features) with members of subcultures labelled 'deviant.' Members of deviant subcultures in the course of "encountering others," often have to "readjust group routines to better deal with the others" (Prus 1994:407) in a manner that constitutes some level of "protecting and concealing the group from others." That is, they engage in typical

"information management" techniques (see Goffman 1963), "techniques of neutralization" (Sykes and Matza 1979) and they even become "politically conscious" (if not active), "reflective" and "creative" "authors of their own fate" (rather than "passive victims") (Anspach 1994). As such, having perceived themselves as potentially being labelled 'deviant' members have developed their own subcultural adaptations to cope with existing in difficult times. It is only in these ways that they can be considered to constitute a deviant subculture. It is therefore perhaps more profitable to consider the group to be merely *'at risk' of being labelled 'deviant.'*

G. A Grounded and Generic Theory

Ethnographic research is a means to an end, not an end in itself. As proponents of the "grounded theory" approach suggest, the goal of social research is "theory generation" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:125), and the generation of theory that is fully "grounded" (Glaser and Strauss 1967). My analysis of the data using the "constant comparative method" and "theoretical sampling" resulted in the generation of theoretical insights that are indeed "grounded," in the sense described by Glaser and Strauss (1967). The concepts that were developed "fit," in the sense that they emerged directly from the data, and they "work," insofar as they represent empirical events faithfully and usefully. For example, after having discovered that members of the group had been attempting to make sense of 'outsiders' and the possible consequences for them of 'outsider influence,' I developed the concept of *analysis of outsiders' perspectives and activities*. The concept achieved permanence in the study not only because it accurately reflected empirical events (rather than *a priori* assumptions) but also because of its fundamental utility. That is, it is both an immediately revealing and a workable or useful conceptual category.

However, generating theories that are 'grounded' is but one of two essential tasks demanded of the ethnographer. Although the subject of any research enterprise is a worthy topic in itself (and not merely a resource to be exploited for theoretical advancement), it is *not* sufficient to generate theories that are exclusive to a single case study. The presentation of 'insider accounts' provides us not only with insight into *the life world of the other*, but also with an opportunity to develop concepts and theories with which to understand *other life worlds*, past, present, and future. As such, any theories generated must not merely be "grounded," but also "generic," they must have "trans-situational," or "cross-contextual" applicability (see Prus 1987;1994;1996;1997).

Prus argues that the unique features and processes that ethnographers identify are certainly invaluable to our understanding of particular subcultures, but do not always capitalize upon the opportunity that is provided to advance our understanding of "human group life" in general (Prus 1994:394). A deeper understanding of human group life is more likely to be achieved where the theories generated by our substantive studies are formulated as 'generic social processes.' The earliest formulations of generic social process can be traced (at least implicitly) to the work of Simmel on "forms of sociation" which transcend particular contexts and abstract from the particular content of social action (refer to Simmel 1971). A more sustained and explicit treatment of generic social process that moves beyond the "generic *thinking*" of other scholars appears in the work of Prus (1987; 1994; 1996; 1997).

Prus defines generic social processes as follows:

> ...generic social processes refer to the trans-situational elements of interaction; to the abstracted formulations of social behavior. Denoting parallel sequences of activity across diverse contexts, generic social processes highlight the emergent interpretive features of association. They focus our attention on the activities involved in the "doing" or accomplishing of group life (Prus 1996:142).

That is, beyond sensitizing researchers to the existence of identifiable patterns of social interaction, the generic social processes approach emphasizes simultaneously the cross-contextuality of such patterns *and* their situationally constructed nature. Patterns of social behaviour are therefore 'generic,' in 'form,' although their particular 'expression' or 'content' is just as likely to be similar as to be vastly different from social setting to social setting. Hence, the approach highlights both the commonalty and diversity that is manifested in the social construction of human group life. In addition, generic social processes lead us to attend very closely to the 'doing of' or 'activity based' nature of human group life. Moreover, the approach demands that "conceptual frames" are directly derived from or "rigorously grounded in" people's "lived experiences" (Prus 1994:409). As such, there can be a natural (and necessary) evolution from the "discovery of grounded theories" (Glaser and Strauss 1967) to their reformulation and further development as generic social processes. In sum, taking this approach enables the researcher to discover generic forms in the particular content of social interaction as it is accomplished by people in the empirical world and to compare and contrast patterns of activity as they emerge from the particular contexts that actors take into account. As such, by abstracting from the particular to the general and building case by case

upon such insights, a deeper understanding of human group life as a whole is more likely to be achieved.

The generic social processes approach is invaluable for students of human group life for a number of other reasons, as well. As Prus (1995) suggests, casting our theoretical discoveries as generic social processes allows us to recognize in our own work significant insights that have been derived from other substantive studies and permits us to utilize these in future studies. For example, activities associated with 'becoming involved' with outlaw bikers may be found among other subcultural groups (e.g. recruitment by casual or situational association with insider-contacts, such as mechanics). Having an applicable concept at hand may prompt the researcher to articulate such discoveries more easily. In addition, generic social processes enable us to recognize and analyze "processual" similarities and differences among social settings (Prus 1996:141-2). As such, youths may become involved in delinquent gangs through a process that represents a variation on outlaw biker activities that is more reflective of their age and opportunities (e.g. recruitment by casual or situational association with delinquent *schoolmates*, rather than service providers). The ethnographer is similarly able to isolate facilitating and hindering conditions in relation to the emergence of a particular social process (e.g. recruitment as more likely when the insider is in a position of power over the novice, perhaps). The approach also allows researchers to share insights more easily, even where these are derived from case studies that are entirely dissimilar at first glance (Prus 1996:142). For example, the primary event leading to a chain of recruitment activities found among both bikers and juvenile delinquents may have been discovered decades earlier in a study of "tearoom participants" (see Humphreys 1975) (e.g. unintentional witnessing of deviant activity). As such, the pool of empirical resources from which to draw conceptual insights is greatly enlarged by this approach. Indeed, generic social processes permit "deeper interpretive access" to the widest range possible of social settings (Prus 1995:395).

Prus (1994;1996) offers a number of tentative lists of categories of generic social processes relevant to the study of everyday life. These include "Acquiring Perspectives," "Achieving Identity," "Being Involved," "Doing Activity," "Experiencing Relationships," and "Forming and Coordinating Associations" (Prus 1996:149-150).

Prus' category of generic social processes titled, "Acquiring Perspectives," appears to encompass those activities involved in the establishment of subcultural membership on an individual, almost psychological level. Members define the subcultural perspective for themselves and work at adjusting, applying, and adapting it to the various circumstances in which they find themselves. In the course of their socialization, they "encounter perspectives,"

"assess" or evaluate perspectives, "develop images of objects," "learn cultural patterns of objects," "define situations" in accordance with the group perspective, "deal with ambiguity," "resolve contradictions," "extend or improvise on existing perspectives," "promote" the new perspective and "reject formerly held viewpoints," and "adopt" new viewpoints (Prus 1996:151-2).

Prus' category of generic social processes titled, "Achieving Identity," consists of a list of activities closely associated with "Acquiring Perspectives." Those activities that are most geared to 'image work' are more personalized and self reflective. In this category, the focus is on the self as a product of ongoing assessments and negotiations in relation to group definitions and expectations. In the course of "Achieving Identities," group members "encounter definitions of self from others," "attribute qualities to the self," "compare incoming and self-assigned definitions of the self," "resist unwanted identity imputations," "selectively convey information about the self to others," "glean information about others," "assign identities to others," "promote specific definitions of others," "encounter resistance from others," and "reassess identities imputed to others" (Prus 1996:152-3).

Both "Acquiring Perspectives" and "Achieving Identity" are aspects of 'becoming involved' in subcultural life. As such, many of the generic social processes that Prus lists as pertaining to subcultural perspective and identity development reappear in the category of generic social processes that he names, "Being Involved." In this category, Prus lists the activities of "Getting Started," "Sustaining and Intensifying Involvements," "Becoming Disinvolved," and "Becoming Reinvolved," as generic patterns of social behaviour. Under each of these social processes, he lists a number of social 'sub-processes.' The process of "Getting Started" involves "engaging in 'seekership,'" "being recruited," "experiencing closure," and "managing reservations." Once, "Involved," members "internalize perspectives," "achieve identity," "accomplish activities," "make commitments," "develop relationships," and "forego alternative involvements." However, eventually, members may find themselves "questioning the viability of perspectives," "reassessing identities," "finding activities troublesome," "being freed-up from existing commitments," "severing relationships," and "encountering opportunities for alternative involvements," and as such, "Become Disinvolved." Still, "Becoming Reinvolved" remains a possibility should they "define opportunities for reinvolvements in former situations as more feasible than current pursuits," "note greater changes to self or situation that would justify reinvolvement," or "find that they have less extensively organized their routines around their present involvements" (Prus 1996:153-155).

Generic social processes intend to focus on the 'doing of activity.' For Prus, "Doing Activity" pertaining to subcultural involvement consists of "Performing Activities" ("making plans," "getting prepared," "managing stage fright," "developing competence," "coordinating events with others," "dealing with ambiguity," "conveying images of competence," "encountering competition," and "making ongoing assessments and adjustments"); "Influencing Others" ("formulating plans," "role-taking," "promoting interest in ones' objectives," "generating trust," "proposing specific lines of action," "encountering resistance," "neutralizing obstacles," "seeking and making concessions," "confirming agreements," and "assessing 'failures' and recasting plans"); and "Making Commitments" ("exploring and assessing options," "dealing with earlier commitments," "avoiding commitments," "minimizing or diversifying investments," "organizing routines around particular activities," and "neglecting other options") (Prus 1996:156-8).

Within subcultural groupings, the 'doing of activity' also involves generic social processes pertaining to "Experiencing Relationships." Prus maps the 'career' of intra-group relations as follows: "getting prepared for generalized encounters," "defining self as available for association," "defining others as desirable associates," "making approaches/receiving openings from others," "encountering (and indicating) rejection/acceptance," "assessing self and other for 'goodness of fit,'" "developing interactional styles," "managing openness and secrecy," "developing understandings, preferences, loyalty," "managing distractions," "juggling multiple relationships," "severing relationships," and "renewing relationships" (Prus 1996:159).

Prus' final category of generic social processes lists those activities pertaining to "Forming and Coordinating Associations," such as "Establishing Associations" ("anticipating the value of collective enterprise," "involving others in the venture," "justifying the group," "celebrating the venture," "defining the team," "establishing communication forums," "pursuing resources for the group," "arranging member assemblies," "providing instruction for members," "monitoring members," "assessing member performances," "motivating and disciplining members," "rejecting and reinstating members," "facing internal upheaval," "facing generalized loss of interest," "dealing with dissolution," "attempting to revitalize cooperative ventures"); "Objectifying Associations" ("developing a group identity," "stipulating justifications for existence and operations," "creating identity markers for members," "defining exclusiveness," "establishing a public presence," "legitimating the group publicly," "demarcating territories and jurisdictions," and "defining a set of people as constituting a group within the community," "associating specific names with the group," "attributing particular properties to the group," "discussing the group with others in the community,"

"making more concerted effort to attend to, or deal with the group as an entity within the broader community"); and "Encountering Outsiders" ("representing the association," "making contact with outsiders," "defining the theatre of operation," "identifying outsiders," "pursuing associational objectives through the others," "confronting outsiders," "protecting (sometimes concealing) the association from the outsiders," "readjusting group routines to more effectively deal with the outsiders") (Prus 1996:160-163).

Although Prus has astutely recognized the existence of an almost infinite number of possible generic social processes and sub-processes pertaining to the 'doing of' everyday life, I find his detail to be (in the sense of practical utility) almost an embarrassment of riches. I have given careful consideration to the relevance to my own research of Prus' categories of generic social processes, and the numerous processes and sub-processes that he describes(1996). Although many of his processes and sub-processes within the various broad categories are at least to some extent observed in my own study, they are uneven and disorganized in terms of their distribution across my own selection of categories. **[See Table 1:" Role of Prus' 'Generic Social Processes' within the proposed 'Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic' Category."]**

Many aspects of everyday life as described by Prus using the notion of generic social processes may be incorporated into my own conceptual scheme in such a manner as to achieve greater economy and wider applicability. Although Prus does point out that most studies will be based on only a few of the foci he identifies, he emphasizes that "holism" demands a consideration of all of them (Prus 1994:396). As a result, my work appears to be somewhat lacking since it was impossible to gather the variety of empirical data to provide evidence of the existence of all of these categories *within the scope* of my study. In my view this is an indication not of shortcoming in my work but, rather, that his listings tend to over-classify and, by implication, are limited in their genericism.

Ironically, however, there are some broad categories of generic social processes that Prus fails to consider generic or *fundamental* to the (subcultural) accomplishment of everyday life and which are revealed in my own work, discussed below. Moreover, he provides no empirical justification for the selection and ordering of the particular categories he has designated as generic social processes or for the omission of other apparently equally fundamental categories of generic social processes. As such, his entire scheme would benefit greatly from reformulation with a view to achieving a greater economy of more basic and mutually exclusive processes and a more empirically justifiable (i.e. comprehensive) selection of categories.

Role of Prus' "Generic Social Processes" *within* the proposed "Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic" Category					
REVISED----> ---------- (below... PRUS' GSP'S	**"Acknowledging a Relationship to Outsiders"**	**"Analyzing Outsider Perspectives"**	**"Adapting to Outsider influence..." Changing**	**"Adapting ... Closing**	**"Adapting ... Contriving**
Acquiring Perspectives	Encountering Perspectives	Assessing Incoming Perspectives; Resolving Contradictions		Resisting Unwanted Perspectives	
Achieving Identity	Encountering Resistance	Comparing Incoming Identity to Own; Resisting Unwanted Identity		Selectively Conveying Own Identity	Promoting Certain Outsider Imputations; * Resisting Unwanted Identity
Being Involved		Achieving Identity	Foregoing Alternate Involvements	Internalizing Further Own Identity	
Doing Activity	Encountering Resistance	Making Ongoing Assessments; Role-Taking; **Making Concessions; **Assessing Failures	Dealing with Obstacles; **Making Ongoing Adjustments; **Recasting Plans; Neglecting Other Options		Neutralizing Obstacles
Experiencing Relationships	Encountering & Indicating Rejection & Acceptance	Assessing Self & Other for 'Goodness of Fit'		Juggling, Severing, Renewing Relationships	
Forming and Coordinating Associations	Identifying Outsiders	Justifying the Group; Confronting Outsiders	Dealing with [or Preventing] Dissolution; Readjusting Routines to Better Deal with Others; **Protecting Group; Confronting Others [or not]	Recruitment and Screening; Establishing a Presence; **Concealing Group	Self-Definition of Group [and Image Making]; Legitimating the Group Publicly; Relating to the Broader Community

* Repeated Categories, ** Split Categories

For example, the category, "Being Involved" refers to how individuals participate in a subcultural group (and combinations thereof) over time. The 'career' of the individual involved in the subculture may be broken down into four stages: "Getting Started," "Sustaining and Intensifying Involvements," "Becoming Disinvolved," and "Becoming Reinvolved." Each stage may involve experiencing an average of five "sub-processes"(Prus 1994:397-403). To my mind, "Becoming Involved: Enacting Subcultural Life" is an especially valuable category of generic social processes. It is impossible for there to be subcultural membership unless individuals are involved. "Being involved" demands that individuals *become* involved by learning the culture and learning to 'pass' as a member (socialization). It is a necessary aspect of subcultural enactment and membership. Indeed, reformulating this category explicitly as the category, "*becoming* involved" incorporates to some extent his categories of "acquiring perspectives" and "achieving identity." Furthermore, "Becoming Involved" might more productively be presented *first* in this list, with "acquiring perspectives" and "achieving identity" as two of perhaps several generic social sub-processes. This category of generic social processes may benefit greatly from being reformulated in this manner.

Similarly, the category, "Doing Activity" may benefit from reformulation. This category of generic social processes attends to the practical aspects of subcultural group involvement, (assuming that the subculture is enacted to accomplish some practical goal of collective association). "Doing Activity" involves "Performing Activities," "Influencing Others," "Pursuing Objectives by Forming Associations with Others," and "Making Commitments" (Prus 1994:404-408). The category of generic social processes pertaining to "doing activity" is yet another essential element of subcultural existence. As such it merits further development and priority in Prus' list of categories of generic social processes pertaining to the study of everyday life. In this connection, "Doing Activity" may be better referred to as "'Doing' or 'Being': Accomplishing Subcultural Life," as this would sensitize researchers to those social processes involved in both doing an activity relevant to subcultures that are enacted around an activity, and to those processes associated with the sharing of an experience of being that defines subcultural membership for individuals. That is, this category may be split into those generic social processes relevant to how a group activity is carried out (its accomplished natural history) and those relevant to the contingencies and ongoing accomplishments associated with constructing a social type of one's self or enacting a role (individuals' careers). Prus' broad categories of "Acquiring Perspectives" and "Achieving Identity" are therefore better formulated as generic social processes within the broad category of "Doing or Being."

Interestingly, "Experiencing Relationships" denotes a category of its own of generic social processes that Prus concedes may be seen as an element of "Doing Activity," to a certain extent. It is highlighted as a separate category because it refers to the social processes of selecting and maintaining associations and accomplishing degrees of intimacy that are endemic to human group life in general (Prus 1994:408). This is presented mainly as an inter-personal (individual) process. However, every group *as a whole* is involved in some sort of relationship with other groups within the subcultural mosaic. As such, the category of experiencing relationships as it stands here may be left as an aspect of internal group processes (i.e. as part of "Intra-Group Relations: Sustaining Subcultural Life," perhaps) while a new category intended to attend to the group's status *relative to other groups* might be created. Again, 'relating to (other groups within) the subcultural mosaic' is a condition of all subcultural groups, as none exist in a social vacuum. While relationships between individuals within groups or with individual others from outside the group may be dealt with under the category of "Intra-Group Relations: Sustaining Subcultural Life," the potential for micro-macro analytical integration may be better capitalized upon where "experiencing relationships" is reformulated to denote inter-group relations (e.g. as *"Inter-Group Relations: Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic"*). Although one of Prus' lists of generic social processes now includes "managing inter-group relations within the community" (as a sub-sub-process of "encountering the other," a sub-process of "forming and coordinating associations") (Prus 1997), I would argue that this process should be elevated to being a broad category of generic social processes because of its applicability to all subcultural groups with any awareness of (let alone involvement with) other groups within the subcultural mosaic. In this regard, it may be more fruitful to replace the category of "Experiencing Relationships" (and the sub-process of "managing inter-group relations within the community") with the broad category of "Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic" and subsume under it those generic social processes that attend to power relations between or among subcultural groups.

In fact, such a reformulation of Prus' categories of generic social processes of everyday life would emphasize the importance of his recent work on subcultural mosaics. Prus argues in "Subcultural Mosaics and Intersubjective Realities" that a subculture is "a set of interactionally linked people characterized by some sense of distinctiveness...within the broader community" of many such groups that *in combination* constitute a "subcultural mosaic" (Prus 1997:8). It is indeed rather odd that Prus' model of social order (i.e. 'society' as a subcultural mosaic) is not reflected among those generic social processes that he presents as a conceptualization of the nature of human group life. In order to *contextualize* the various categories of generic social processes, indeed, to empirically ground them, it is important to

construct a conceptual category that is capable of attending to *all aspects* of the lived experiences of social actors. However, he fails to list as one of his broad categories of generic social processes of everyday life a category of social processes that pertains to a condition, namely, involvement in inter-group relations, that is *basic* to membership in the subcultural mosaic. Not only do individuals "acquire perspectives," "achieve identity," "be involved," "do activity," "experience *individual level and intra-group-* relationships," and "form and coordinate associations," but they engage in all of these activities as members of one of many subcultural groups *within* a subcultural mosaic. That is, *another of their fundamental experiences is having a relationship as a group with other subcultural groups within the subcultural mosaic*. Moreover, the nature of the relationship between and among subcultural groups merits attention as it may have significant implications for modes of subcultural 'enactment,' 'accomplishment,' and 'sustenance.'

It is actually in an article unconnected to his statements on generic social processes and everyday life that Prus offers a category of generic social processes that does attend to relations among subcultural groups. In "Envisioning Power as Intersubjective Accomplishment: Acknowledging the Human Enterprise Entailed in Tactician-Target Interchanges (Prus 1995)," Prus has generated a new list of generic social processes pertaining to inter-group conflict. This broad category is titled "Tacticians and Targets: Intersubjective Accomplishment [of Power]" and is especially relevant for the present study. The construction of a category of generic social processes that attends specifically to power is a significant contribution to the study of inter-subcultural relations. Indeed, it is a logically necessary addendum to his earlier lists of generic social processes and to his statements on society as consisting of a mosaic of (presumably mutually influencing) subcultures. In this article, Prus presents an approach to the study of influence work in a variety of social settings within the broader social community. Power becomes a generic process of social interaction and this enables researchers to consider and assess the relevance and utility of the existing stock of knowledge regarding the dynamics of power for their own work (Prus 1995:20). In this connection, Prus offers a list of categories of generic social processes relevant to issues of power. He attends to such experiences as "Routings and Careers of Tactician Involvement"; "Assuming the Role of the Tactician: Doing Influence Work"; "Extending the Theatre of Operations (Influence work): Third Parties, Collective Ventures, the Mass Media, and Political Agendas"; and "Experiencing Target Roles: The Vulnerable, Restrained, Elusive, and Enterprising Self." For the purposes of this study, the category of "generic social processes" titled, "Experiencing Target Roles: the Vulnerable, Restrained, Elusive, and Enterprising Self" is most applicable. It includes the following processes: "Defining

Influence; Initiating Activity and Acting Back on "Tacticians" (i.e. "targets as tacticians"); Engaging in Collective (Tactical) Resistance (i.e., extending the theatre of operations) (Prus 1995:16-17).

I have attended to these aspects of 'target hood' under the broad category of *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic* with my own generic social processes of *acknowledging a relationship to outsiders, analyzing outsider perspectives and activities,* and *adapting to outsider influence* (with the sub-processes, *changing, closing,* and *contriving* as practical matters of "target enterprise" that constitute "collective resistance"). While it is not possible in a substantive thesis dealing with one group's activities to systematically revise Prus' list of categories of generic social processes, I am offering an addendum to it that will allow me to partake of Prus' valuable insights while simultaneously framing the theory I have generated as a generic social process *especially* relevant to the subcultural status or condition of deviance.

I find that my own broad category of *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic* highlights effectively the conceptualization of society as a subcultural mosaic of inter-relating subcultures (moreso than does a more intra-subcultural category of "encountering others" or "forming associations," for example). In addition, I have constructed generic social processes (and sub-processes) that encompass a wide variety of empirical cases. That is, I do not wish to dismiss or fail to attend to a group's generalized efforts to analyze their relations with outsiders because they do not engage in *all* of the sub-processes listed for a given category (e.g. "Experiencing the Vulnerable Self"; "Developing a Restrained Self"; "Averting (tactically) Influence in Interpersonal Encounters"). Empirical manifestations of these narrowly defined social processes may be evident among some groups but not others, however, efforts made to more generally analyze relations with outsiders may in fact be *a feature of all subcultures that recognize that they do not exist in a social vacuum*, and indeed that they have influence upon and are influenced by these outsiders.

Prus has taken account of certain aspects of inter-group relations as the category of generic social processes pertaining to "forming and coordinating associations." However, all of the sub-processes he identifies in this category can be collapsed into fewer and more inclusive conceptual categories. That is, the *changing-closing-contriving* model of subcultural adaptation that I am proposing encompasses Prus' generic social sub-sub-processes pertaining to (the sub-process) "encountering others." "Readjusting group routines to more effectively deal with others" may be an empirical example of *changing*. "Making contact with others" and "protecting (sometimes concealing) the association from the outsiders" can be seen as empirical examples of *closing*. *Contriving* can perhaps be seen

in a group's "representing the association's interests" and "confronting outsiders." Moreover, Prus' sub-sub-processes, "identifying outsiders," "defining the theatre of operations," and even "readjusting group routines to more effectively deal with outsiders" represent clearly the broader generic social processes that I am proposing, *acknowledging*, *analyzing*, and *adapting*, respectively, within an empirically justifiable category of Generic social processes of everyday life, *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic*. Hence, all of the social processes that Prus identifies (that are indeed generic) as well as many of those that are merely empirical manifestations of generic social processes can be subsumed under the more immediately workable model that I am proposing.

Thus, to mitigate against the tendency to over-classify, within the process of adapting to the influence of outsiders in the broader subcultural mosaic, I have identified in my own case study only these three generic sub-processes, *changing*, *closing*, and *contriving*, which may be especially germane or even specific to the lived experiences of members of subcultures at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' As such, the category of *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic* is relevant for conforming and deviating subcultures alike, and *it is not until we move to the realm of 'sub-processes' that the more 'special' condition of being involved in a secret deviant subculture is addressed*. It is still important, however, for even sub-processes to be fully generic. That is, they must be obvious as well as simple and explicitly defined as being *specific to a given common 'condition.'* An argument for this emerges upon consideration of Prus' generic social process of "engaging in collective resistance" (Prus 1995:17). This generic social process may merely constitute but *one of many* situationally specific expressions or manifestations of adapting to the influence of others.

It is therefore evident that *'genericism' is lost when form becomes almost as idiosyncratic as content*. Generic social processes should be presented *along with examples* of unique content from actual case studies only to illustrate the trans-situational or cross-contextual value of the concepts more concretely. Highly diverse content cannot be incorporated in a conceptual framework that promises wide-ranging genericism. Hence, I would argue that both of Prus' listings of generic social processes (of everyday life, and those pertaining to power) would benefit greatly from being reduced in number and being made more selective (empirically relevant). To elaborate, first, one could offer a set or selection of generic social process *categories* that is as close to 'universal' as possible, that is, one might construct categories that reflect the *natural history* of almost any given subculture (or, conversely, the career of any given initiate) (e.g. Enacting Subcultural Life, Accomplishing Subcultural Life, Sustaining Subcultural Life, Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic). Second, one might *phrase*

the generic social processes pertaining to these categories far more abstractly, in a manner that demonstrates their applicability to a great number of individual cases. For example, one could actually acknowledge processes pertaining to how a given group deals with outsider groups in the broader society with a category like *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic*, as it is a feature of *all subcultures—by definition—existing in a subcultural mosaic. Within* this category, one could list a *small number* of very widely applicable generic social processes," such as Acknowledging a Relationship to Outsiders, Analyzing Outsider Perspectives and Activities, and Adapting to Outsider Influence. Such generic social processes are equally applicable to the experiences of both "targets" and "tacticians." Note also that these processes are stages that depict *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic* as a process or career. And finally, one could present concrete examples from empirical studies to demonstrate the many ways in which the generic social processes can manifest themselves (like 'Adapting to Outsider Influence: "target accommodations" among social assistance recipients').

Consequently, I would argue that in order to more fully deliver on the promise of true trans-situational applicability to the broadest range possible of ethnographic studies, Prus' listing should be revised in such a manner as to *use fewer, simpler and somewhat more abstract generic social processes and a more empirically justifiable selection of categories of generic social processes that includes a category to acknowledge the special nature (and problematics) of subcultural pluralism.* I am thus proposing to include in Prus' tentative list of generic social processes the category that I have termed, *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic* and its constituent generic social processes, *acknowledging a relationship to outsiders* (evidence, encounters, forms, interpretations), *analyzing outsider perspectives and activities* (identifications, interpretations, analyses, re-considerations), and *adapting to outsider influence* (coping with outsider perspectives and activities practically and ideologically).

In fact, *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic (Inter-Group Relations)* may be proposed as the final category of 'generic social processes of everyday life' of a selection of more empirically relevant and generic categories, such as Enacting Subcultural Life (Forming a Subculture/ Becoming Involved); Accomplishing Subcultural Life (Doing X or Being X); and Sustaining Subcultural Life (Intra-Group Relations), respectively. Such a selection would reflect the natural history of the subculture and the careers of individual members much more faithfully and would incorporate many of the generic social processes pertaining to everyday life and the inter-group power relations identified by Prus.

Having a category for generic social processes pertaining to *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic* sensitizes researchers to the processes and problematics of encountering 'outsider' or

'out-group' imputations, interpretations, definitions (definitions of situations, multi-perspectival interpretations). It also enables researchers to appreciate the role of human agency and interpretive action as they consider the social accomplishment of adapting to 'out-groups' and taking account of the 'big picture.' Such a category also attends to the role of power and conflict, as well as the issues of deviance and criminality. Indeed, by definition, the deviant subculture cannot be analyzed as such without giving attention to its relationship to the broader subcultural mosaic. **[See Table 2: "Summary of 'Generic Social Processes of Everyday Life.'"]**

	Summary of GSP's of Everyday/Subcultural Life			
categories of generic social processes	enacting sub-cultural life	accomplishing sub-cultural life	sustaining sub-cultural life	relating to the subcultural mosaic
generic social processes with trans-situational applicability	defining the sub-culture, coordinating sc association, becoming a member	doing activity, being a member, enforcing member/ activity standards	managing internal relations, adjusting sc activities, adjusting sc boundaries	acknowledging a relationship to outsiders, analyzing outsider activities/ perspectives, adapting to outsider influence*
generic social sub- processes*				changing (activities), closing (relations), contriving (identities)

Thus, by offering an addendum to Prus' tentative list of generic social processes, it is possible to address the relationship between a subculture and other subcultures that make up the broader subcultural mosaic in a more coherent and economical manner. This simultaneously acknowledges the fact that subcultures exist within a subcultural mosaic and, as such, that having some kind of relationship with other groups is an intrinsic feature of subcultural existence. Hence, the category of *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic* merits inclusion among other 'universal' categories of generic social processes of everyday life, such as Enacting Subcultural Life, Accomplishing Subcultural Life, and Sustaining Subcultural Life. Moreover, by framing generic processes and sub-processes in simpler and more general terms, it is possible to create generic social processes that are indeed cross-contextual and trans-situational.

The present study has benefited greatly from Prus' insightful contribution of the generic social processes model (1987; 1994;1996). The theory generated in the present research (of how a subcultural group has adapted to the prospect of being labelled 'deviant') has been framed in a manner that highlights the generic features of this group's adaptive social

processes. Thus, the study seeks to be relevant to the experiences of a wide variety of subcultural groups. The research findings presented in **Chapter Five** are organized under the generic social processes headings, *acknowledging a relationship to outsiders, analyzing outsider perspectives and activities,* and *adapting to outsider influence*, under the broad category of *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic*, the final of four proposed categories of generic social processes of everyday life.

H. Contributions to the Study of Groups at Risk of Being Labelled 'Deviant'

This study of a group's response to the perception of being considered (and ultimately, labelled) 'deviant,' has generated a theory of subcultural adaptation. The adaptations made by this group I refer to here as *changing, closing*, and *contriving*. It is my view that similarly situated and fated groups may elect to engage in these same coping strategies should social change threaten their immanent marginalization as 'outsiders.'

When members of this group were asked about how the group has changed in recent times (and what further changes may have to be made in the near future) *as a result of* a social change, they responded by referring to effects on their group activities, group contacts with outsiders, and group identity.

> *...But we kind of got away from [doing] that because of the public, you know, might not perceive that as being that humane. [000203]*

1. Members argued that with regard to events and recruitment, certain *group activities had been changed*: There were to be no more pigeon shoots at picnics. At tests, a dead duck was now preferred over a live duck for tracking on water. Moreover, it was better to have a cold bird on hand, rather than to kill it in plain view of everyone. For tracking on land, it would be preferable to dip the wing in mud, rather than pluck primary feathers from its wings. Also, recruits are more scrutinized, if not screened, and there can be no advertising to encourage recruitment.

> *We don't want to have the public per se come and see our tests...that's deliberate... [000804]*

2. They also pointed out that in terms of their social contact and visibility, *group contacts with outsiders were closed:* Members were keeping to themselves more and there was much more intense 'in-group/out-group' sentiment among them. As a group they were keeping things 'hushed' or low-profile, allowing access only to the determined specialist or serious

hunting dog enthusiast (who would really have to persevere to find them). Also, tests and other events must not be advertised lest the wrong people show up.

> *We like to be painted green these days, because it's the trend...if we don't follow the trend, we might stand to lose... [001206]*

3. Ultimately, members argued that now and in the future in terms of their public behaviour and image, a new *group identity would have to be contrived:* They felt they had to be diplomatic and work on the development of sound arguments with regard to their position. At a bare minimum, they felt that they had to behave properly while hunting in public places. Several argued that they have to emphasize their role as conservationists and go along with the trend of 'painting themselves Green.'

In sum, in response to social change, the group has engaged in subcultural adaptation in the sense that they have engaged in the social processes of *changing*, *closing*, and *contriving*. This theory may be extended as an heuristic device to "catch the process" (Prus 1995) of subcultural adaptation that may be made by other invisible groups who anticipate being labelled 'deviant' as a result of social change and seek to avoid being so labelled.

To develop such an heuristic device, I have attempted to formulate this individual group theory in terms that will make them broadly applicable to the activities of a wide range of subcultural groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' First, it was determined from the raw data what exactly about the group, in very concrete empirical terms, has been affected and how. Second, I classified on a more abstract level what *aspect* of the group has been adapted. Third, a theoretical interpretation of the *nature* of the process of adaptation was formulated. Finally, I allowed for a consideration of the *extent* to which adaptation was made (*along a continuum*). **[See Table 3: "Subcultural Adaptation to Being Labelled 'Deviant'"]**

To illustrate: I discovered [for example] that those things affected by social change such as the elimination of a pigeon shoot and the use of a cold bird, since they occur in the context of picnics and tests, were revisions to the group's events. Events such as these actually fall into a broader category of group activities (*an aspect of the group affected*) which may be affected. What has been done to these 'activities' may be labelled *change* (under the broader category of *nature of adaptation*), and depending on the group and the circumstances, a group may change to a range of extent, as such, we have a need for a place to take account of the fact that a wide range of alternate courses of action is available for selection, (hence the inclusion of a category of *"extent" of adaptation*). In this particular case, changes to

activities have been minimal, not revolutionary, the group has engaged in changing to some extent.

SUBCULTURAL ADAPTATION to being LABELLED 'DEVIANT'		
"WHAT?"	"HOW?"	"HOW MUCH?"
Classification of the Aspect of the group Adapted	Theoretical Classification of the Nature of the Adaptation	Consideration of the Extent of the Adaptation
GROUP ACTIVITIES	**change**	<<from some things to everything>>
RELATIONS WITH OTHERS	**close**	<<from very little to completely>>
GROUP IDENTITY	**contrive**	<<from somewhat to totally>>

Thus, by moving from the raw data (*content*) to a more abstract level of analysis (*form*), the social processes engaged in by the particular group studied may be extended and made applicable to the experience of other groups. In terms of the study of groups forced to cope with social change, researchers may now be sensitized to aspects of raw data which constitute three dimensions of subcultural adaptation, that the adaptation relates to certain aspects of the group, that the adaptation may be of a certain type, and that the adaptation may be to a certain extent. Moreover, with regard to other invisible groups who are similarly being influenced by political correctness, it may even be possible that this group's particular course of action, *changing, closing,* and *contriving* may be the very path that they, too, have taken.

That is, this strategy may represent a frequent if not always typical response to being labelled 'deviant.' Subcultural groups labelled 'deviant' may move immediately into some sort of *changing-closing-contriving* strategy of their own. Thus, it is on two levels, the level of subcultural adaptation to social change (resulting from being at risk of being labelled 'deviant') *in general* and the adaptation to social change *in particular* (that is, of the particular type resulting from suddenly being labelled '*politically incorrect*'), that the substantive theory generated by this original research may have applicability beyond its pages.

I. Chapter Summary

The **Theoretical Integration** chapter presented the **theoretical foundations** which informed the study. As such, the works of Blumer (1969) and Becker (1963) are especially relevant to the conflict-interactionist approach taken (see also Hills 1980). From there, the

movement from the definition of this group as a **subculture** to its identification as a **deviant subculture** was presented in such a manner as to highlight the evolution of a subculture from the status of conforming to deviating. That is, these topic areas were deliberately bridged in text by a discussion of (1) the process of constructing the deviant subculture as the work of moral entrepreneurs engaged in **labelling** (Becker 1963) and (2) the importance of **the issue of power** in inter-group relations. At this point, the value of Prus' work on generic social processes was reviewed and my own **grounded and generic theory** (based on a revision of Prus' categories of Generic social processes) was presented. Finally, it was argued that this group's subcultural adaptations may be engaged in by all kinds of groups faced with hostile social change and the study therefore makes valuable **contributions to the study of groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant.'**

Chapter 3:

REVIEW OF SUBSTANTIVE LITERATURE ON DEVIANT GROUPS

A. Outline of the Chapter

In order to appreciate the value of my analysis of deviant behaviour, it is important to have a sense of our previous state of knowledge with regard to the process of subcultural adaptation. In this chapter, four ethnographies are reviewed for their treatment of the issue of subcultural adaptation to being labelled 'deviant.' The four ethnographies are: Donald Cressey's *The Taxi-Dance Hall* (1932/1969), John Lofland's *Doomsday Cult* (1966/1977), Laud Humphreys' *Tearoom Trade* (1970/1975), and Daniel Wolf's *The Rebels* (1991).

These are all well-known or fairly typical ethnographies. I selected them because they are similar to my own work. All of these studies flow from a tradition of research (i.e. qualitative) and a theoretical perspective (i.e. interactionist) that I have applied to my own study. The substantive focus of all of these studies, like my own, is a subcultural group labelled 'deviant.' However, the most significant commonalty uniting all of these studies with my own work is *the ethnographers' implicit recognition that deviant group members are keenly aware of their status vis a vis outsider groups and consciously build into their culture a set of attitudes and behaviours that respond to (the threat or fact of) outsider influence*. Beyond this, these particular studies merit attention for at least two other reasons. First, at least three of them (the older studies) are considered to be 'classic' examples of ethnographic research, thus readers are likely to be familiar with them and will easily understand my references to them. Second, this selection represents highly diverse forms of deviant behaviour *and* different historical eras for comparison and contrast with my own study. In spite of my best efforts and the suggestions of several faculty members, it has not been possible to locate cases that more closely resemble my own for this review. Hence, I am willing to bet that a closer match to my own case study may not exist or may be so obscure that it is unlikely to be discovered by traditional methods of scanning abstracts and perusing well-known journals. I maintain that the studies that I have selected for review are nonetheless valuable (for the above reasons) and that readers will appreciate their inclusion.

B. A Review of Four Ethnographies

i - The Taxi Dance Hall

a) description

Donald Cressey (1969) presents us with an ethnography of the subculture of the "taxi-dance hall." His research is the result of participant observation, supplemented with interviews. It was carried out in Chicago in the late 1920s. Cressey's "taxi-dance hall" was a public dance institution. It provided male patrons with an opportunity to dance with women who were paid "a ticket-a-dance" on a commission basis. "Taxi-dancers," like cab-drivers were required to provide their services to any paying customer and such customers could request as few or as many "turns" as they were willing to purchase (Cressey 1969:27). Historically, the taxi-dance hall as a system was the direct descendant of the Californian "Barbary Coast-" or the "49-dance hall," however, *bona fide* dancing schools that had difficulty keeping pupils and dance-halls that were losing in the competition with the newer, more polished dance "palaces" often adopted the taxi-dance system to remain in business (Cressey 1969:181-2; 183-5; 192;195). The taxi-dance hall basically enabled socially isolated and stigmatized men to rent a dance partner (Cressey 1969:195). For taxi-dancers, the hall was basically a step up from prostitution for young women who had few economic opportunities. As public establishments, taxi-dance halls, like other drinking and dancing establishments, were constantly under the scrutiny of police and politicians, and by social protection agencies. Investigators of the "protective agency" sort were the most troublesome because in a system of petty graft, the favour of police and politicians could easily be bought. For taxi-dance hall operators, 'public opposition' was most powerfully manifest in the watch-dog role of the social worker (Cressey 1969:262-9).

b) subcultural adaptations

In *The Taxi-Dance Hall* (1932/1969), Cressey gives explicit, if not entirely systematic attention to the influence of 'outsiders.' In "Part Four: The Natural History and Ecology of the Taxi-Dance Hall," not only does Cressey attend to the offensive actions of outsiders (i.e. in "Chapter IX: The Taxi-Dance Hall Meets the Public"), but also to how taxi-dance hall proprietors analyzed outsider perspectives and activities and how they adapted in response. This appears to have been done more to provide background for his discussion of "the taxi-dance hall and social reform" ("Chapter XIII"), than it was to analyze the inter-group relations of the taxi-dance hall subculture and other members of the subcultural mosaic. Yet, Cressey certainly offers more detail in this study with regard to outsider influence and

adaptive strategizing than one ordinarily finds in an ethnographic study of a deviant subcultural group. Cressey documents activities emerging during the struggle between social reformers and taxi-dance hall proprietors that could be formulated as the generic social processes of *changing, closing,* and *contriving* as adaptive strategies, though his own account does not employ this or any other similar language of classification.

According to Cressey, during the period of "institutional consciousness," taxi-dance hall operators became aware of their vulnerable position in the broader society and began to work toward surviving. Taxi-dance hall proprietors implemented minor *changes* to the routine of the dance hall. Proprietors began to attend to "the supervision of conduct in the hall ...[in order to] maintain every evidence of respectability" (Cressey 1969:199-200). Proprietors imposed strict rules for the girls both in and out of the dance hall, as well as for their manner of dancing and the dancing of their patrons (Cressey 1969:201-2). They sought to *close* by "securing an injunction against police interference and surveillance" as they argued that having police around "hurt business" (Cressey 1969:271). In addition they attempted to secure appropriate licenses and often had to challenge the city to issue a license, or "to show just cause for not issuing it"(Cressey 1969:271). Licensing enabled them to avoid arbitrary interference. At the taxi-dance hall, *contriving* an acceptable public image became increasingly important as hall operators recognized the looming threat of the social reformer. Taxi-dance hall proprietors attempted to combat interference from outsiders by "placing forward as the titular head of the establishment a man about whom nothing unfavourable is known" (Cressey 1969:271). It became very important for proprietors to give an acceptable representation of themselves and their halls to the public as well as to police and public officials (Cressey 1969:197). Proprietors attempted to pass the halls off as "dancing schools" and thus to drape a "cloak of conventionality.... over activities much more dubious and varied than had been tolerated in the past in *bona fide* dancing schools..." (Cressey 1969:262). Their goal was to protect themselves against invasions and questions from outsiders while developing the institution with as little interference as possible (Cressey 1969:262). The proprietor had to consider that it was the patrons who paid the bills and that they usually "expected something other than dull respectability" (Cressey 1969:209). Consequently, the proprietor led a "'Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde' existence, all the while fearful of what an inquiring stranger might discover, yet anxious that his patrons should have a good time (Cressey 1969:209). Insofar as the taxi-dance hall could legitimize itself by appearing "respectable," outsiders were involved or called to intervene mainly in situations where something had occurred (allegedly) in connection with the hall, for example, when runaways (juveniles) were suspected of making a living there, or when a particular hall's notoriety for accepting "indecent" behaviour warranted "investigation." Thus, under the guise of the

"dancing academy," the taxi-dance hall appeared to be able to hide from full public view, except where incident or reputation called it into disrepute.

In sum, it may be argued that they attempted to *close* by seeking injunctions against investigations and getting licenses to evade arbitrary harassment, they attempted to *contrive* a better image by hiring front men and maintaining the guise of the "dance academy," and they manipulatively implemented superficial *changes* that were not always adopted permanently (e.g. having chaperons, outlawing a certain degree of lewd behaviour, monitoring the activities of their dancers). Ultimately, the taxi-dance hall proprietors were not able to resist the 'deviant' label and avoid the consequences. As the influence of social reformers to interfere grew, the institution of the taxi-dance hall could not be sustained. Although the coping strategies of the taxi-dance hall proprietors were indeed effective in warding off moral entrepreneurs for a time, eventually the taxi-dance hall was outlawed. The strategies that they developed were not entirely effective.

c) critique

Cressey does not present these findings in a manner that is easily transferable to other analyses of deviant subcultures. His findings are neither theoretically developed nor are they generically formulated. He mentions activities that may be interpreted as 'subcultural adaptations' only in passing. He creates neither a set of concepts, nor a typology, nor a set of social processes that may be useful for other studies of deviant groups. He does not even offer occasional subheadings that categorize his findings conceptually. This makes it very difficult to compare and contrast his findings to other studies, without making awkward references to empirical details. This is definitely a shortcoming in a study that is otherwise very aware of the social context and highly sensitive to the issue of subcultural adaptation. By remaining locked into a style of analysis that leaves the data too raw and specific, the ethnography contributes little more to our knowledge of subcultural adaptation to being labelled 'deviant' than substantive detail about one group and its struggles.

Thus, from Cressey we learn that adaptive strategizing to being labelled 'deviant' certainly occurs. It is rational-purposive, creative, reflective, emergent, and can be highly effective (if only for a time). However, such strategies may only be found among taxi-dance hall proprietors and they cannot be conceptualized as being of particular types. The issue of subcultural adaptation is merely mentioned in passing. As such, this pattern of subcultural activity is left theoretically undeveloped. It is interesting however, that other ethnographers have discovered such activities among totally dissimilar groups.

ii - The Doomsday Cult

a) description

In "The Doomsday Cult" (1977) John Lofland gives an ethnography of a "fanatical" religious movement. His research is the result of participant observation, supplemented with interviews, and an analysis of mass media reports of the group. His work provides insights into the career of the religious group known as 'the Moonies.' This "Doomsday Cult," or cult of the "Divine Precepts" originated in Korea and sought to build a following of 144,000 believers by a prophesied year in which humanity would achieve perfection. Once in the United States of America, the group's "messiah" made major organizational changes to a formerly covert and rather unsuccessful mission to America. Under his direct control, the group's goal of creating a "large, dedicated, wealthy movement that was an American household word, a movement that could then begin to acquire political power..." (Lofland 1977:287) was well underway. The movement was to expand and flourish through the use of aggressive recruitment practices ("hooking," "picking up," "encapsulating") and in-service re-training of dedicated followers. For such followers, the group provided an international "family" of believers and a sheltered, self-sacrificing way of life that was different from that led by members of upper-middle class American society (Lofland 1977:279-344). Early in its history, the group recruited members covertly. Initially, the Divine Precepts escaped public scrutiny by attempting to attract individuals predisposed to cult membership covertly. Members attempted to convert college students to their religion on a face-to-face individual basis, and in so doing limited their own exposure. With the organizational revolution instigated by the arrival of their "messiah" on American soil, the DP's attracted tremendous public attention. However, they were able to do this only through duplicity. What the general public got to know of them was highly calculated and contrived. The DP's had a dilemma. To attract converts they had to talk about their ideology---but the more that they revealed, the less likely it was that people would convert (Lofland 1977:305). During the stage of intensive missionizing, the group was only 'fully' known to those well on their way to becoming full insiders and to only those few and disconnected parents who protested the conversion of their children. Initially, members could be easily dismissed as "kooks," but as the movement grew, the group became more legitimate and thus much stronger (if still more vulnerable than long-established religious institutions). Eventually, due in part to the pressure exerted by organized groups of parents who were able to influence the media and the government, the group became highly vulnerable to complete exposure and critique. Revelations concerning the group's duplicity ultimately led to its demise.

b) subcultural adaptations

In *Doomsday Cult* (1966/1977), Lofland gives explicit and relatively systematic attention to inter-group relations, however this appears in his epilogue, rather than in the main body of his text. In this addendum to the enlarged edition of this ethnography, "The Boom and Bust of a Millenarian Cult: Doomsday Cult Revisited," Lofland charts the career of the Divine Precepts in a highly organized manner. For each period reviewed, he gives an analysis of the group's Membership (size and rate of growth, including number of centers and class-age-education level of members), Beliefs (predictions and ideological stability and change), Organization (form and funding), Missionizing (own name and fronts), Conversion organization, Foreign Connections, and Morale, *as well as* a thorough and relevant treatment of the American Context--- "macrosocial trends" and "societal response." While the focus of the study centres on members' 'careers' or stages in the subculture ("conversion," "proselytization," and "faith and hope"), this addendum locates the study more strongly in its social context and acknowledges the group's deviant status as an emergent phenomenon. When we take a close look at the documentation of the career of the Divine Precepts, we can see that there are definite strategies that the group developed to challenge the 'deviant' label. They implemented some organizational *changes*, they took pains to *close* off insiders from outsiders, and the worked very hard at *contriving* an acceptable public front.

At the first indication that there were indeed influential critics ready to pounce on them, the Divine Precepts took pains to cover up the objectionable, to build a solid committed core of members, and to present a respectable image. Conversion had to become a finely tuned science: the ideology would be revealed progressively and following a special sequence and in special circumstances. Adapting to threats from the outside primarily took the form of strategies of internal and external concealment. When the heat finally came down on them, the cult sued to retaliate against legal efforts to take away their converts; they appealed the non-renewal of missionary training visas of foreign members; they attempted to force their membership in a council of churches; they appealed denial of tax exempt status. They employed expensive and prestigious law firms. Short of actual suits, critics were threatened with them. An effort was made to control and influence media portrayals of DP's. They employed full-page counter-ads in the major newspapers. In them, they denied and rebutted all of the criticisms and mentioned all of the positive achievements of the group. They also posted letters from happy parents, complete with their photos about how the DP's had "helped" their child. In addition, they sent counter-letters to the editors of magazines that published damaging articles about them. At one point in the conflict, members of the international Parents and Friends Society of the Unified Church were gathered in a

conference under the smooth, young president of the American church, where they were issued counter statements and documents. Also, they were given "first-person grisly tales" of converts who had been kidnapped, harassed by deprogrammers, but managed to escape and return to the movement. Also, front organizations exposed by the press changed their names (Lofland 1977:335-6). Direct and damaging outsider influence (both in terms of labelling and attacks) instigated adaptive strategies among DP's. These actions were, however, too little too late for the group. Although the DP's ultimately failed to resist the 'deviant' label and to ward off various forms of maltreatment, they attempted to protect themselves by contriving a more righteous and innocent image.

In this ethnography and in the Taxi-Dance Hall, we can see how coping strategies emerge directly from an unmistakable outsider assault. Although it could be argued that the defensive posture of the Divine Precepts merely intensified as a result of outsider influence (e.g. they had begun their public life with various fronts and built-in screens), their duplicity became more consciously and closely guarded and some measures were indeed taken to directly respond to unmistakable attacks. While the Divine Precepts did not back down from outsider challenges, they were ultimately no match for wealthy upper-middle class families with political influence. They did have the capacity to implement certain coping strategies, but not the most effective ones.

c) critique

While the basic organizational structure of the body of the text makes the study's findings easily transferable to other studies *in the sociology of religion*, it is the epilogue which facilitates comparisons of subcultural 'career' and inter-group relations among studies of *deviant* groups. Although this contribution is only made in the epilogue, it is a significant contribution. By setting up an analytical framework to present his findings, Lofland focuses the reader's attention on the social construction of deviance. Although Lofland does not create genuine concepts, a typology, or a set of social processes (with a theoretical basis) in his treatment of this group and its inter-group relations, he does contribute to our more general appreciation for the processual and reflective nature of human group life. Yet, this is due more to his historical format than to any efforts to compare and contrast the Divine Precepts with other subcultural groups.

Basically, Lofland demonstrates a strong emphasis on subcultural adaptations, in the sense that he acknowledges and categorizes collective efforts to avoid the effects of a 'deviant' label. Moreover, as a longitudinal study, these categories of adaptive strategies are organized to reflect the various historical eras or trends in which the group operated. Still

our knowledge of subcultural adaptation to being labelled 'deviant' remains too specific to the study of religious groups to be applicable to other deviant subcultures. The various strategies are highlighted, but they are not converted into generic sensitizing concepts that would make them useful to analysis of a wide variety of groups.

iii - Tearoom Trade

a) description

Laud Humphreys (1975) provides an ethnography of the subculture of the "tearoom." The research is the result of participant observation, supplemented with interviews and a survey of participants. Humphreys' "tearoom" is a men's public washroom in which men participate in impersonal sex. The tearoom "game" is entered into by various role players, has well defined rules, and a predictable routine. The tearoom provides an opportunity for anonymous "players" to enjoy instant and impersonal homoerotic activity with a wide variety of partners conveniently and quickly. The tearoom is unrecognizable as such to the uninitiated. It is a transient subcultural entity, yet one in which members must be highly '(sub-)culturally literate' in order to participate. Members are of all walks of life, many have families, and the majority resists a homosexual identity. It is significant that the tearoom game has no cash nexus---sexual favours are free. As such, the tearoom is not prostitution, nor is it coercive. Only consenting participants are invited to play. Humphreys estimates that tearooms exist in all major American cities and serve millions of men each year. By its very nature, the tearoom *must not be* visible to outsiders. It must guard against the risk of inadvertent public exposure and deliberate public exposure staged by law enforcement agents.

b) subcultural adaptations

In *Tearoom Trade* (1970/1975), Humphreys touches on the inter-group relations of tearoom participants and law enforcement agents, as well as "toughs" (who are actually tangential insiders). The attention given to the treatment of tearoom participants by police is adequate and empirical and there is extensive discussion of how participants find their way and their identities in the outside world, beyond the walls of the tearoom. This detail is by necessity given at the individual level, rather than at the *collectivity* level, and as such, leans more to a social psychological approach than the other studies reviewed. It is interesting that the study focuses heavily on the manner in which the deviant activity is performed and structured for the purpose of excluding outsiders, yet Humphreys does not develop a theoretical scheme for the subcultural adaptations he observes. There are elements of

changing (in the sense that efforts at caution may be intensified situationally), *closing*, and *contriving* in his descriptions of the subcultural routine.

By the very nature of the game (Humphreys 1975), the tearoom attempts to achieve complete invisibility from public view. Humphreys reports that: "The trysting place must not be too available for the undesired. It must not be identifiable by the uninitiated. The potential participant passing by should be able to perceive what is taking place inside, while those playing baseball across the way should remain ignorant of the sexual game behind tearoom walls" (Humphreys 1975:12). Some telltale signs of a functioning tearoom are its physical location and layout, its facilitation of one's ability to see people coming, and some suggestive graffiti. There is the possibility of being seen by acquaintances at one's local tearoom and of being entrapped by police decoys. However, with a "watchqueen" and or various other conveniences (e.g. a washroom door that squeaks or sticks), the likelihood that complete outsiders will come upon the scene is very rare. Of course, the risk of being caught is what makes the game exciting (Humphreys 1975:90). Individual participants are easy targets for violence, raids, and blackmail if they are indeed discovered. Because of the tremendous likelihood of "social death" as a result of disclosure of their "discreditable stigma" (refer to Goffman 1957), members of the group are extremely vulnerable. Built into the tearoom game are a number of protective strategies that prevent disclosure and protect the anonymity of participants. For example, tearooms are selected for their physical amenability. This not only facilitates the action but also allows participants to be able to anticipate the invasion of the social setting by outsiders (Humphreys 1970:8). In addition, "...one of the more attractive aspects of the tearooms as places of sexual rendezvous is that they offer an instant alibi for one's presence. Although some park restrooms are seldom used for rest or any other conventional purpose, all of them share a manifest function as places open to the public for elimination. A person's presence in or at such facilities is thus readily explainable" (Humphreys 1970:97).

Many of the defensive strategies developed by tearoom participants may be found in the broader subculture of homosexuals, "secrecy about their true identity, symbolic gestures, and the use of the eyes for communication, unwillingness to expose the whereabouts of their meeting places, extraordinary caution with strangers, and admission to certain places only in the company of a recognized person" (Humphreys 1970:24). Again, such defensive maneuvers are not new to the tearoom nor need they emerge as a result of any particular incident with outsiders. By "looking innocent," or exhibiting "a 'huge elaborate disinterest...,'" when intruded upon by outsiders, members engage in defensive strategies that "dissociate them from the deviant action" (Humphreys 1970:80). Insiders demand that

"intruders" are appraised for their legitimacy before they proceed with their deviant activities (Humphreys 1970:79). On the psychological level, tearoom participants not only seek to avoid trouble, but to construct a particular social image, to show themselves as "respectable members of society" (Humphreys 1970:135). The tearoom participant dons the "breastplate of righteousness" to appear super-normal, to be an "exemplar of good behaviour and right thinking...[he is] respectable to a fault. His whole life style becomes an incarnation of what is proper and orthodox" (Humphreys 1970:135). Thus, there are a variety of adaptive strategies built into the tearoom subculture that are performed by members of this subcultural group to evade outsider influence. *Changes* to the game had surely emerged over time in response to actual incidents and these are now built into their routine (e.g. the selection of facilities, the silence). Also, by structuring in 'unrecognizability' to the uninitiated, the game is tightly *closed* to outsiders and on a situational basis, all participants must 'account' for themselves in order to gain legitimate entry into the game. Finally, on a collective as well as an individual level (e.g. nonchalance, "looking innocent," and wearing "the breastplate of righteousness") much image work is being done to *contrive* conventionality in the midst of deviant activities and identities.

c) critique

In many ways, the manner in which Humphreys presents his findings makes them somewhat awkward for application to other deviant groups. Still, a comparison of the situation of this group with that of other deviants is possible because of the attention given to concealment and information management. In this way a significant contribution is made to the study of secret or discreditable deviance. Another contribution made by Humphreys is much more general. In *Tearoom Trade*, a 'typology of tearoom participants' is provided. This is useful not only for a comprehensive analysis of the intra-group features of this subculture (i.e. an analysis of the various roles and the background characteristics of role players), but also as model for encouraging ethnographers to attend to the contingencies of simultaneous membership in conflicting subcultures. However, in terms of providing a theoretically developed analysis of subcultural adaptation, the study falls short. All of the evidence suggests that adaptive strategizing in response to 'deviant labelling' is indeed going on. Moreover, there is no reason for an ethnographer to believe that such a pattern of behaviour is original to his or her own group. Still, Humphreys does not develop a theoretically adequate analysis to attend to the issue of subcultural adaptation. Although evidence of the genericism of this process builds with every study of deviant subcultures that even mentions in passing that insiders create attitudes and behaviours in response to outsider

influence, our knowledge of subcultural adaptation (beyond substantive details) is not advanced by this study.

iv - The Rebels

a) description

With "The Rebels," Daniel Wolf (1991) offers an ethnography of the subculture of the "outlaw biker." His research is the result of participant observation, supplemented with interviews. From the perspective of a full-participant, Wolf describes the group as a "brotherhood" and a group of 'targets' of legal intervention and vigilante attacks. Wolf's Rebels are a high profile subcultural group. This is partly due to the fact that being recognizable as outlaw bikers is necessary for the group to maintain solid in-group/ out-group boundaries. It is also due to the fact that club membership is an important social-psychological identity marker for members for whom the biker identity promotes self-esteem, confidence, and a sense of superiority. The group is comprised predominantly of young men who have voluntarily alienated themselves from a broader society dominated by middle class values and practices. The group exists to provide a "brotherhood" of social support for the hedonistic and individualistic lifestyle of individuals at the bottom rung of the socio-economic hierarchy. As a group, outlaw bikers have a recognized chain of command and paramilitary structure. Members tend to have jobs, full-time or seasonally, but work mainly to survive and to be able to afford the artifacts and activities associated with membership and riding together in the late spring, summer, and fall. That is, involvement in the economy of the host society is something of an evil necessity for members who attempt to be bikers as a lifestyle insofar as this is possible for them. Bikers in general may or may not engage in criminal activities, but the values and organizational structure of the subculture are uniquely suited to and predispose members to participate in organized crime. Bikers resist social control by intimidating others. As a group in bars or in "club runs," and as individuals wearing their "colours," they intend to be highly visible to their host community. The existence of the bike gang depends in part on their ability to set up clear and visible boundaries between themselves and outsiders, by displays of "lawlessness," "belligerence," and "intimidation." They revel in the ability to appear a fearsome pack on a club run and a force to be reckoned with in the display of their "colours." Although they prefer to have a rural clubhouse where they can be away from the citizenry to do as they please, they often have a club bar from which to recruit new members. "While the clubhouse is a private domain, the club bar is readily accessible to the public" (Wolf 1991:181). Also, members participate in "club runs" as occasions for both recreation and flamboyant public display of

menacing in-group solidarity. While there is a clear split between members and outsiders, there remains some level of social interaction between the groups. While bikers invite the 'deviant' label, the resulting discrimination can be too much for some of them (Wolf 1991: 55). Thus, while in some ways resisting the 'deviant' label does not test them, coping with the resulting 'harassment' sometimes does. Bikers are an easy target for police and the occasional vigilante. Their strength lies only in their ability to threaten violence against those who would interfere with their activities and their ability to pull together as a group and call back alliances with others in situations in which they are threatened.

b) subcultural adaptations

In the *Rebels* (1991), Wolf does not attend systematically or explicitly to the inter-group relations of a bike gang. Some passing attention is given to perceptions of the general public and the group's relations with the police, however the ethnography takes the deviant status as a given, rather than an 'accomplishment' or 'social construct,' and the main focus is on the internal workings of the club. Inter-group relations are mainly dealt with in the context of 'in-group/out-group' sentiment and boundary-establishment. Wolf's presentation of his findings makes them fairly accessible to other ethnographers of deviant groups. The only difficulties with making comparisons to this group arise because this deviant subculture represents a 'lifestyle.' Thus deviant subcultures in which deviance (however regularly engaged in) is not the focus of individuals' lives may be difficult to analyze following Wolf's selection of attributes and processes for analysis. Despite this significant difference, the study does highlight some adaptive strategizing among bikers (*changing*, *closing*, and *contriving*), especially in the context of dealing with the general public and law enforcement agencies.

According to one biker: "The best public relations for us,...is no public relations'" (in Wolf 1991:19). The bike club is structured to keep 'outsiders' outside. Turning only to each other for aid and guidance, they seal themselves off from the outside world by following a rigid code of silence (Wolf 1991:9). Appearing to be a cohesive and threatening group reduces the risk of outsider interference. "Riding in the wind with their brothers goes beyond being a theatre for episodes of togetherness. It becomes an act of defiance" (Wolf 1991:211). The 'in-group/out-group' attitude *closes* them off from outsiders and cloaks their group in secrecy. Seeking physical distance from outsiders is also a defensive feature of the group. When members of an outlaw bike gang are scouting out a location for their clubhouse, "isolation is a major consideration" (Wolf 1991:166). Isolation permits them to remain out of view of the police and to "entertain" in their own style without annoying local

residents (Wolf 1991:166). Bikers are most concerned with avoiding some of the hassles (e.g. discrimination) that come with the label. There are adaptive strategies to minimize maltreatment such as the code of silence, and special rules relating to encountering police, for example. Most of the *changes* to their routines that have been implemented over the course of the group's history are geared to particular situations (e.g. behaviour during arrests; informing the RCMP of their runs). These are likely to have emerged in response to changes in procedural law or models of policing. It is interesting that the image that they *contrive* does not discourage, but invites the 'deviant' label. This is still image work, even though unlike the contrivances made by groups that are at risk of being 'dissolved' by the 'deviant' label, the bike gang thrives under the 'deviant' label. Hence they contrive an image that reinforces and exclaims their deviant status.

c) critique

Wolf attends to such trans-situational social processes as 'becoming a member,' 'building an identity,' 'intra-group relations'(e.g. his attention to 'sex and gender'), 'being a member' (i.e. e.g. his section on "living the lifestyle"), *et cetera*, but some of these classifications of activities require a certain amount of 'stretching' to make them applicable to other groups (e.g. the chapter / category "Making It All work: Economic and Political Realities"). Still, it is significant that generic social processes are applied to the study's findings (although Wolf does not offer a theoretical justification for taking this path). Nor is the selection of social processes analyzed given with any theoretical justification. Although there appears to be some chronological order to the sequential presentation of his findings (e.g. 'becoming a member' is dealt with first, while "Making It All Work" is dealt with last), both a comprehensive theoretical schematic and a theoretically grounded selection of social processes are notably absent. Nevertheless, it is Wolf who makes the most explicit contributions to our broader understanding of human group life, of the four studies examined here. It is only he who constructs categories (albeit as chapter titles and subheadings) that classify elements of life in the bike gang as social processes. The older studies are much less abstract in their use of concepts and summative commentary. It is interesting that this study is the most recent of the four. Perhaps this reflects an emerging appreciation for works that aim for greater trans-situational applicability. Nonetheless, our knowledge of subcultural adaptation as a social process common to deviant groups remains superficial. Wolf does little to advance the theoretical development of the process of subcultural adaptation. He mentions that the group seeks to remain exclusive, that there are special routines associated with interactions with outsiders, and that the biker image is important to participants.

However, he does not formulate these inter-group processes as generic patterns of behaviour associated with the life of a wide variety of subcultural groups.

C. Summary and Discussion

It should be noted that I do not intend to criticize the selected ethnographers for failing to undertake the particular kind of analysis that I have chosen to do (i.e. an analysis of the subcultural adaptations of groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant'). Not all ethnographers have the same interest in the groups that they study. Many studies of deviance do not attend to the adaptive strategies made by deviant subcultures (or groups at risk of being so labelled) at all. Yet who is to say that they should? Some studies of deviant subcultures reflect the researcher's interest in the unique intra-group rules, roles, and routines of a deviant group (e.g. "The Making of an Inmate: Prison as a Way of Life," Cordilia 1983), others focus on how and why deviant individuals form subcultural groups (e.g. "Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang," Cohen 1955), others are most concerned with how deviant groups maintain their integrity over time (e.g. "The Nudist Management of Respectability," Weinberg 1987). Thus, my critique of these studies is not made for the purpose of chastising others for not sharing my own personal interest in deviance, but *to encourage proponents of all kinds of interests to attend to the generic features of their findings*. In so doing, ethnographic studies can be shown to be contributing not merely to our substantive knowledge of a given group, but to our understanding of human group life in general.

From all of the studies reviewed above, it is apparent that deviant groups and groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' engage in various strategies of subcultural adaptation. In fact, it is uncanny that in spite of their own particular focus, each one of these ethnographers gives at least passing attention to the various ways in which their group responds to outsider influence. Coincidentally, it appears that the responses documented in each of these studies are classifiable as evidence of *changing*, *closing*, and *contriving*. However, it is very odd that not one of these ethnographers takes the initiative to develop their findings concerning adaptive strategizing theoretically. Surely none of these ethnographers would argue that outsiders are irrelevant to the study of deviant subcultural groups, nor would they deny that members of deviant subcultural groups are sufficiently reflective, rational-purposive, and creative to collectively respond to outsider influence. And yet, even in the face of evidence generated by their *own* studies, (let alone whatever else they may have encountered in the course of their own reviews of literature), no effort is made to account for and enlarge upon the significance of this process. Prior to my own research, our knowledge of subcultural adaptation remained fragmentary, inconsistent, unsystematic, and non-generic. My own

work recognizes the existence of a process for which there is cross-contextual evidence and transcends the substantive detail to develop and establish the theoretical relevance of this process to our understanding of human group life.

I think that studies of deviant subcultures that fail to attend to inter-group relations and their impact on the subcultural group fail to address the deviant status of the group studied, but treat it like any other subcultural group. I also think that it is important that the findings generated by our studies offer insight into and facilitate the analysis of other deviant groups, otherwise they are limited in their usefulness to those for whom the particular group studied is a specialist interest. Unless we generate concepts, typologies, or sets of social processes in our studies to classify, in a short-hand manner, our empirical findings, it will be impossible to achieve a more complete understanding of the nature of human group life. As sociologists, our ethnographic studies should bring us closer to this ultimate goal, rather than leave us standing on the threshold.

D. Chapter Summary

This chapter consisted of **a review of four ethnographies**: Donald Cressey's *The Taxi-Dance Hall* (1932/1969), John Lofland's *Doomsday Cult* (1966/1977), Laud Humphreys' *Tearoom Trade* (1970/1975), and Daniel Wolf's *The Rebels* (1991). A **description** of each ethnography was given prior to a presentation of the various **subcultural adaptations** that may be observed in each study. Each section ended with a brief **critique** of the treatment of this pattern of collective action by the ethnographer. The chapter concluded with a **summary and discussion** in which our previous state of knowledge regarding the process of subcultural adaptation was summarized and my own contribution to our knowledge of this process was highlighted.

Chapter 4:

METHODOLOGICAL IMPLEMENTATION

A. Outline of the Chapter

The following is a presentation of the methodology of the thesis. It begins with a brief presentation of the **historical development of the study** as an emergent topic (in the tradition of classic ethnography), and a presentation of the epistemological assumptions behind the study in the context of a critical discussion of its **meta-theoretical foundations**. In addition to a practical and a theoretical background, this demonstration of the study's *methodological implementation* provides a justification for the choices made and an explanation of the actual steps taken through all phases of **the ethnography** (research design, data collection, and data analysis).

B. Historical Development of the Study

Before proceeding to the methodological details of the study, it is customary to first 'locate' research as the 'lived experience' of the researcher (Van Maanen 1988; and refer for examples to the works of Sudnow 1967, Wolf 1991, Dietz 1983, Stoddart 1982). Many ethnographies come into being as a result of the researcher's extra-curricular interests or personal involvements---even career contingencies they face. Indeed, for many ethnographers, a most convoluted path can be traced from the initial plan to conduct a study and the eventual topic of the study. Hence, some research interests just seem to 'happen,' they are not merely opportunistic, but to some extent, accidental (refer to Lofland and Lofland 1984:7-10). The present research is no exception.

Although I officially came to the organization studied in mid-1994, my history with and interest in the hunting fraternity, so to speak, can be traced to 1992. At this time, I was casting about for dissertation topics and found myself torn between a study of Aboriginal Law (Ojibwe) and a study of Environmental Ethics (specifically, the relationship between humanity and other animals). Eventually, I proposed a comparative study of the 'hunting law' of Traditional Ojibwe and Modern Western societies. With my ongoing preoccupation with the elevation of hunting law to the criminal realm among Aboriginal peoples in contrast to the relegation of environmental law in general to the realm of regulations and *quasi*-criminal law,

particularly in North America, I began my thesis with a 100 page literature review on Ethnocriminology and Ethnoecology. As such, a comparative study of law and punishment and a comparative study of environmental ethics would provide the theoretico - substantive basis for my hunting law focus. Although my committee accepted the review in fulfillment of my Special Area Comprehensive Examination requirement, the direction to be taken by the proposed thesis was considered to be unacceptable. With the disintegration of this committee, I was forced to start over.

In the course of preparing my Special Area Literature Review, three events arose which presented me with the opportunity to become involved with the organization that was to become the topic of my new thesis. First, my review of the literature on legal and penal criminology, particularly the anthropological field studies of indigenous societies, renewed my interest in fieldwork and reaffirmed my commitment to ethnographic research. Second, for economic, radical-environmental, and interpretive reasons, I became a member of the hunting fraternity. That is, finding myself increasingly taxed by the 'vow of poverty' that graduate-studenthood involves for those of us who are not independently wealthy and increasingly opposed to the factory farming methods that supply the butcher's section of our grocery stores, gathering wild edibles and 'subsistence' hunting suddenly became personally attractive options. Moreover, with my ongoing research on hunting, I felt that I would better understand hunters if I were one myself. Third, about mid-way through my literature review I found myself in pursuit of a new dog. With my intention to hunt, I decided that a sporting dog (of the pointing variety) would be a good choice. It is this third contingency that led me directly to the club I investigated.

In early 1994, my search for a German Shorthaired Pointer began in earnest. I took the traditional dog-finding path and found myself increasingly disappointed. I went to shows and hunting preserves, I went through the *Dogs in Canada Annual* for local breeders, and I even considered having a promising pup shipped to me from abroad. I was looking for a German Shorthair with a certain combination of traits and I eventually learned that the reason for my frustration was the elusivity of a certain 'breedline.' There were 'show' German Shorthairs with the 'hunt' or 'birdiness' bred out of them. There were 'field' German Shorthairs with plenty of hunt but too much 'range' and way too much independence, bred to hunt with on horseback and largely (in my opinion) unfit for companionship. I was after the 'close-working' 'old-style' German Shorthair, a darker, well-muscled, highly affectionate, and almost uncontrollably 'driven' hunting-machine. After having gone through a long chain of contacts I finally found a very small group of breeders committed to the perpetuation and

improvement of this line. Eventually I learned that I was after what these breeders (and other members of their subculture) referred to as a 'versatile hunting dog.' And to make a very long story short, eventually I found myself in possession of a versatile hunting dog, [Flush'n'Track]'s Blue "Thunder" Bay, bred by the current president of the club I would ultimately study.

Once I was forced to start over, I began to consider the viability of continuing to pursue my interest in hunting as a topic in the context of a fieldwork study. I was already a member of the versatile hunting dog club and had invested a great deal of time, money, and intellectual and physical effort in becoming an 'insider.' I approached a former president of the club and founding member of the organization with my idea and he encouraged me to approach the current president and secretary (who approved my project). After having come into contact with a substantial portion of the anti-hunting propaganda circulating within the university community, I became curious about 'deviant-insider' perspectives on their activities and their views on their future in view of the hostile socio-political climate. After quickly preparing a tentative proposal centred on my emerging curiosity concerning this group's relationship to the broader society, I was able to assemble a new committee and begin my work.

C. Meta-Theoretical Foundations

The following represents a rationale for the actual steps taken to produce the present ethnography, in the context of a discussion of the content and methodological implications of the interpretivist or naturalist paradigm, and the implications of this epistemology for research design, data collection, data analysis, and theory generation.

Since the 1930s mainstream sociology has been faced with an "interpretive challenge" framed as a "positivist-interpretivist debate" (Prus 1990). This debate consists of an ongoing argument over which philosophy of science is legitimate. Blumer (1969) argues that the majority of mainstream social researchers adheres very strictly to a "positivistic-scientific" protocol. They engage in and aim for replication of research studies, rely for their conclusions on the testing of pre-determined hypotheses, and employ so called operational procedures (to seek empirical evidence against which to test their hypotheses) (Blumer 1969:32). As such, Prus (1996:5) has determined that adherence to the positivist "paradigm" (Kuhn 1970) historically has involved of a number of *assumptions* which permit the application of "the scientific method" to the study of both the natural physical and the human social worlds.

Positivists and interpretivists or "naturalists" (refer to Lincoln and Guba 1985) are in direct conflict concerning a number and variety of basic assumptions: For positivists, there is one 'tangible' reality that can be split into discrete variables for analytical purposes, but for naturalists, there are many versions of 'reality' which human beings 'intersubjectively construct' and whose elements are tightly interconnected. For the positivist, the researcher is separate from the subjects of the research, and as such, it is possible to eliminate or 'control for' any influence that the researcher may have on the study. Ideally, all inquiry is 'value-free.' Conversely, naturalists argue that it is desirable that the researcher be involved on a personal level with the topic of the research. Moreover, the subjects of study and the researcher 'interact' and influence each other. Hence, all inquiry is in fact 'value-bound' and resulting in real consequences for both researcher and subjects. Positivists seek to construct 'time- and context-free generalizations' (nomothetic statements or universals), while naturalists argue that only 'time- and context-bound' 'tentative' hypotheses (idiographic statements or historical contingencies) are possible and desirable. Concerning the issue of causality, positivists argue for 'linearity,' while naturalists argue for 'heterarchy'; according to positivistic epistemology, there are "real causes, temporally precedent or simultaneous with their effects," but naturalists contend that "all entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping so that it is impossible to distinguish causes from effects" (Lincoln and Guba 1985:37). Although the determination of 'causality' is still very important to naturalists for explanatory purposes, 'uni-causal' explanations are generally rejected in favour of 'multi-causal' explanations and those that take into account the 'mutuality' or 'reciprocal' nature of influences.

Positivists and interpretivists are in conflict concerning not only these but a number of other significant meta-theoretical assumptions. Concerning human nature: positivists tend to follow an almost behaviouristic model, whereas the interpretivist emphasizes the role of 'meanings' and the existence of 'minded behaviour.' Concerning the nature of social change: positivists often down-play its drama and dynamism by stressing the role of external, even systemic forces playing upon society as a whole, whereas the interpretivist stresses the role of human agency in bringing about social change as well as maintaining social order (see Garfinkel 1967). Concerning the relationship between the individual and society: positivists emphasize the 'prior' and 'coercive' character of norms, values, and roles, where the interpretivist characteristically under-plays such aspects of social life in favour of an image of the relationship between the individual and society as 'reflective,' with a stress on the role of 'negotiations' and 'shared meanings.' Concerning the nature of social order: while positivists who support the tenets of conflict theory allow for the existence of 'disorder,' 'inter-group

struggles,' etc., historically, positivists have over-stressed the notion of systemic equilibrium (e.g. structural functionalism) to the point of espousing a virtual consensualist bias. Although some symbolic interactionists appear to imply that all have equal power to enter into negotiations concerning 'definitions of situation,' there are others (for example, Becker 1963; and Chambliss 1973) who present power differentials and struggles as 'normal' features of social interaction or 'forms of sociation' (see Simmel 1971).

All of the above differences of opinion manifest themselves in the most graphic and fundamental conflict between positivist and interpretivist sociologists. Their conceptions of the *nature of 'human group life'* differ significantly. Positivists thus seem to assume (at least by implication) that there is no essential difference between the ways one would study the social world and the natural physical world. Prus (1996) argues that this assumption is not viable because "human group life" is "special." It is "reflective," "negotiable," "active," "relational," "processual," "holistic," "multi-perspectival," and "about lived experience." That is, there are as many varieties of reality as might be experienced by people; people are objects unto themselves; social life involves intersubjectivity; all social life is processual; and reality is known through human experience (1996:15-18) (for similar views, see also Taylor and Bogdan 1984; Berg 1989; Lofland and Lofland 1984; Spradley 1980; Adler and Adler 1987).

Different subject matters demand different research methodologies. Hence, rather than imposing the research design, data collection techniques, data analysis strategies, and hypothesis testing objective of the natural physical sciences upon a world with 'special' *social* characteristics, I have elected to apply an interpretivist ethnographic methodology in this study, a methodology that respects the 'special character' of human group life. As such, the research design is 'emergent and flexible,' the data collection involves 'immersion and empathy,' and the data analysis is an 'inductive and ongoing process.' Moreover, the 'theory generated' is both "'grounded" (Glaser and Strauss 1967) and 'generic'" (Prus 1987; 1994; 1996). It emphasizes the "trans-situational" and "interpretive" features of the "lived experience" of people acting in and toward the "subcultural mosaic" (Prus 1997).

D. The Ethnography

Ethnographic studies that respect the special features of human group life are characterized methodologically by emergence, flexibility, immersion, empathy, induction, and ongoing process. In addition, the theories that are generated by these studies should be "grounded theories," following the directives of Glaser and Strauss (1967). Moreover, these

theories should contribute not only to our deeper understanding of the case study, but of human group life in general. As such, they must be constituted as the various "generic social processes" of human group life (Prus 1994:395; 1996:164).

Hence, as suggested above, the focus of the research must be allowed to emerge as the study progresses and as such, the research design must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate those changes in investigative strategy that the direct pursuit of a narrowing focus demands. The researcher engaged in data collection can generate valid insights only if they are permitted to immerse themselves in the life of the group under investigation to acquire insider perspectives that are knowable only by taking the role of the insider, that is, empathizing with them and respecting their interpretations of their experiences. The data analysis as an exercise in conceptualization and process identification cannot be left to the end (once data collection has been completed), rather it must be an ongoing process of induction. Patterns are not to be imposed on the data but continually discovered, reinforced, verified, and to an extent tested in the field (see Glaser and Strauss 1967). Finally, theory generation is to be a means to an end, not an end in itself. The concepts and processes identified in the case study must be discovered from the data and reflect the interpretive features of the way of life of the group studied. However, they must also be framed in such a manner as to make them applicable to a variety of cases and contexts. As such, they must not only "work and fit" (Glaser and Strauss 1967:3) but be "trans-situational" or "cross-contextual" (Prus 1987; 1994; 1996) and thus, contribute to a deeper understanding of the widest possible variety of ethnographic studies. A theory's usefulness must not be limited to and end with the particular case study, but be a means to achieving understanding beyond it, into other social worlds.

It should be noted that although research design, data collection, data analysis, and theory generation are presented here as discrete 'points' in the research enterprise, they are not chronological stages. That is, ethnographers do not proceed in a linear fashion, completing all aspects of one phase before embarking on the next. Rather, these represent 'elements' of the research process that are carried out simultaneously as the researcher strives to maximize opportunities to pursue the emergent interest and generate valid insights.

i - Research Design: Emergence and Flexibility

Ethnography is a "craft" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:34). While the craftsperson manipulates the same medium as everyone else in a given guild, uses the same tools, and aims to produce the same type of object, the particular 'aspect' of the object that they seek to capture most expressively in their work (aesthetic or functional or historical) must *shape the*

process in order to ensure the production of the 'perfect' form. Similarly, the ethnographer must be guided in the research process by the emerging and increasingly more narrowly focused interest. Thus, the research design of the present study was not predetermined but was kept sufficiently flexible to accommodate the emergent interest and to capitalize upon serendipitous as well as contrived research opportunities.

The first step in the "analysis of social settings" is "getting in" or gaining access (Lofland and Lofland 1984:20). However, my pursuit of and initial contacts with the group studied were not made for the purpose of conducting a sociological study. I was merely a novice in the subculture, actively involved in training my own hunting dog in the organization's system. Hence "getting in" (Lofland and Lofland 1984:20) was not a major *fieldwork* difficulty, I was "starting where I was," so to speak (Lofland and Lofland 1984:9). Any difficulties I did encounter arose in the course of pursuing a highly esoteric extra-curricular interest. That is, not just any member of the general public can achieve 'insider' access to this group.

There are a number of predisposing values, resources, interests, and contacts that must be in place before the 'outsider' can at least become a member of the broader hunting fraternity. One cannot expect to be taken seriously by the subculture of hunters without (at the very least) some technical skills, appropriate licensing, a firearm and the serious intention to use it. Yet, since not all hunters work with dogs, being a hunter is only one necessary condition of acceptance into the subculture of hunting dog enthusiasts. One must also be at least somewhat familiar with the expectations and relevant registering and training organizations associated with the subculture of purebred dog fanciers to appreciate the rigorous breeding, training, and testing standards of a serious hunting dog organization. That is, there is little chance of being accepted by this group if one has no experience with owning purebred dogs. Furthermore, even should one initiate one's self sufficiently to mix with a local gun-dog or field trialing organization, at least two further hindrances to achieving entry to the *versatile* hunting dog subculture may be encountered: The local gun-dog club may be exclusive to Retrievers and the local field trialers may be opposed to hunting. Historically, in North America, the versatile or pointing dog has not been as popular as the Labrador Retriever and a vast majority of field dogs I have run into have been owned by well-to-do upper-middle class couples who also show their dogs and for whom the field test is an end in itself (rather than practice for the hunting situation). As such, involving one's self in local gun-dog and field trialing organizations would not bring the researcher interested in studying the subculture of hunters who train (for their original purpose) pointing dogs in contact with this group. The most fruitful path to the organization, is to pursue pointing dog breeders who put hunting

titles on their breeding stock. Eventually *as one becomes further involved with the specialty*, an organization breeder may be discovered and a point of entry into the group may become accessible.

Hence, it is highly unlikely that a complete outsider would be able to carry out qualitative research on this highly obscure organization. That is, at least prior to the recent development of a hostile socio-political climate, the club's obscurity was not the result of explicit attempts to go underground. Rather, theirs is such a highly specialized interest that very few outsiders would even care to know that they existed, let alone seek them out. Moreover, if the prospective member were not sufficiently keen and persevering (and serious about hunting dogs) to want to know of and join the club, the group "wouldn't want to have them as members, anyway" (according to several members). Today, however, members view this feature of their club as a 'natural screening' device that may protect them from potentially hostile outsiders. As the current president noted,

> *Well, we don't worry too much [about infiltration per se], I mean, who is going to go through all the trouble to find us, to buy and train a hunting dog, just for the sake of.... [causing "trouble"]? [001208]*

The research design with which the study began was very different from that with which it ended: I had entered the group simply as a 'full participant.' But as members increasingly expressed a sense of vulnerability, frustration, hostility, and determination to survive in the face of a perceived threat, I came to see the group as a potential research opportunity and my stance and strategy changed. Soon, I began talking to members of the group about studying them for my thesis and I found myself stepping back as a 'participant as observer' or 'observer as participant' in my interactions with them. In addition, I began to listen more closely to and record more rigorously any of their expressions relevant to understanding their predicament (in their view, "How do we continue to do what we do now that the world is against us?"). At this point, I secured the cooperation of the president, members of the executive committee, and fellow active participants and I attended every meeting and event of the group in order to carry out my participant observation.

Participant Observation has been described as "the process in which an investigator establishes and sustains a many-sided and relatively long-term relationship with a human association in its natural setting for the purpose of developing a scientific understanding of that association," it involves "looking and listening," "watching and asking" (Lofland and Lofland 1984:13-14). It permits the researcher to get insider knowledge, to become a

competent member of the social setting, one who knows the meanings, routines, and the language "as a native does" (see Becker and Geer 1970; Taylor and Bogdan 1984:6). This technique was essential for providing a full contextualization of the nature of this group for future research.

In the course of my participant observation, detailed field note entries were made in which typical attire, activities and conversations were described and a journal was kept in which my feelings and ideas were documented (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:52). The very first observations were rather unintentional, note taking was obvious, and I was a 'full-participant.' At later events, field notes were either overtly taken in the presence of members or jotted immediately after an encounter. At this point I was known by the group to be a participant-observer. With this level of participation insider understandings were easily obtained. I learned the context, the language, the activities, and the expectations of co-members. I learned what distinguished a meeting of this group from a meeting of others, its special character, and I learned about what members had to know, do, not do, look like, believe in, think, have, be, in order to "pass" as a member of this group (Garfinkel 1967). I was also able (since I was a new member) to ask naive questions and fumble a bit of political protocol with impunity.

I soon found, however, that there was not sufficient time to speak at length with members at group assemblies while participating fully in the events. Indeed, I had to spend a considerable amount of my precious research time performing duties associated with full membership. As such, my role and level of participation eventually began to hinder my data collection efforts. Since their encounters were not staged for the expressed purpose of discussing the club's inter-group conflicts much of what I wanted to learn about had only a limited significance at such meetings. That is, only on a few occasions did these meetings provide entirely unsolicited evidence of activities and interpretations directly related to my narrowing focus. Thus, participant observation *alone* eventually proved to be insufficient as a data collection technique for my own research.

The technique of participant observation is best used when the question, topic, or situation in which one is interested is "located somewhere," at least temporarily (Lofland and Lofland 1984:14). However, my particular interest clearly was not. Moreover, participant observation is not good for studying historical trends, or events. In my case, I was studying an historical process that I had not been present for and cannot spend the next ten years watching unfold. Moreover, participant observation is particularly useful for exploring rather "vague" interests (Bogdan and Taylor 1984:16-17), however, my research interests were not vague for very

long. My interest surfaced very quickly and it was one that I wished to pursue for the duration of the study. As such, I soon realized that after having become a knowledgeable insider, participant observation alone would have limited value for the development of the study.

Many scholars encourage researchers to begin with participant observation and then use more "aggressive" techniques of data collection as the study becomes more focused (see Taylor and Bogdan 1984:47). Thus, since I found myself quickly knowing what sort of information related to my interest was indeed available, more direct and aggressive data collection techniques had to be carried out. More often than not, I had been finding myself very tentatively 'interviewing-in-the-field' but in a very haphazard and far too limited manner. Eventually, I felt sufficiently comfortable with and knowledgeable about the group to decide to pursue my ultimate interest in how this group was adapting to social change by recruiting interviewees or 'informants.' The ongoing participant observation was nonetheless invaluable. Without this experience it would have been virtually impossible to contextualize and understand from the member's perspective the experiences which they would relate during 'in-depth interviews.'

In-depth or Intensive Interviewing "involves repeated face to face encounters between the researcher and informants directed toward understanding informants' perspectives on their lives, experiences, or situations as expressed in their own words" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:77). The technique of in-depth interviewing is best carried out when "the research interests are relatively clear and well defined," when "settings and people are not otherwise accessible," when "the researcher has time constraints," when "the research depends on a broad range of settings or people," when "the researcher wants to illuminate subjective human experience" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:80-81). Also, in-depth interviewing allows for the possibility of gathering data on past events as well as for verification of interpretations derived from observations alone.

In-depth interviewing tends to "presuppose a certain degree of knowledge about the people one intends to study" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:92). Lofland and Lofland (1984) recommend that it be combined with limited participant observation where this is possible (Lofland and Lofland 1984:14). As such, the participant observation that I had conducted beforehand was essential to the establishment of the validity of information generated in the in-depth interview situation as I had to get to know people well enough to understand what they meant as well as to create an atmosphere in which they were likely to talk freely (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:82). The potential problems of using in-depth interviewing alone, such as not learning the native language and not really understanding what the interviewee means,

problems of getting complete and accurate information from interviewees who do not want to discuss certain matters, *et cetera* (Becker and Geer 1970:133-141), were to a substantial degree essentially eliminated in this instance by my prior participant observation.

It was with confidence, therefore, that I began my in-depth interviewing. My research interests were relatively clear and well defined, my settings and people were not fully accessible as a group for sufficiently productive periods, and my primary interest was in the documentation of a trend or process that I could not directly observe. Also, I had an eager and cooperative group of informants at my disposal. They were candid, easy to talk to, open and willing to share their views. Most were highly articulate, bright people who were basically approaching the study as an opportunity to talk about what they were experiencing. I could not have wished for more than this. Moreover, they did not see my requirement of repeated contact with them as an inconvenience, but rather as an opportunity to elaborate upon topics or issues not sufficiently stressed, or to mention those previously forgotten. For this particular group of people, selected topic, and practical limitations, the data collection technique of in-depth interviewing was ideal.

The target population was the current membership (from test-participant-only, 'non-members' to highly involved 'founding members') of one individual club of an international hunting dog organization. This was the actual group of which I was a member and I simply did not have the resources to study other clubs. As such, some of my specific findings will be limited in applicability to the experience of this particular club (e.g. specifically how these particular people are actually 'doing' something). However, I would suspect that many of my conclusions will have substantive applicability to other clubs of this organization, especially those in and around urban areas [internationally] (in line with statements made by a number of club members and the registrar of the International organization). Furthermore, I would argue that the generic social processes identified in this study may have relevance to a variety of other subcultures at risk of being labelled 'deviant,' especially those that may be similar to this club (e.g. in terms of having had opportunities for witnessing the demise of related groups, or being so specialized as to naturally screen out undesirable recruits).

Since members of this particular club are very tightly clustered in and around a large urban centre, it appeared entirely likely that I would be able to arrange interviews with a fairly large number of members, if not all of them (the club has a membership of about 55 at present). After having become friendly with members of the executive committee, it was easy to meet the several 'friends of a friend' that make up the club. Members are generally very sociable and it is not uncommon for them to contact each other on a regular basis either to hunt or

train, or simply to socialize. Also, many club activities (such as shows, meetings, the production of their newsletter) also require the coordination of members, thus, there is usually some excuse available to get to know even those members who tend to more often 'work behind the scenes' (such as directors of shows, training clinics, tests, etc.).

Thus, it appeared that I would have no difficulty in recruiting a wide variety of members into my 'theoretical sample' of interviewees. In my journey of discovery I made a conscious effort to present a variety of perspectives, of the informed and not-so-well-informed, executive committee members and fringe players, active members and apathetic ones. All perspectives were considered to be valuable. I recruited interviewees at meetings and informal encounters, with the encouragement of the president. From there, I followed up on members' leads to other members (not present) by arranging interviews by way of a telephone contact. Recruitment involved telling them about my project and its purposes, presenting them with my information letter, and encouraging them to speak freely about their involvement with the group and their perspectives on its evolution.

ii - Data Collection: Immersion and Empathy

I took pains to 'immerse' myself insofar as this was possible in the way of life of the group in order to carry out my participant observation. It was essential to first collect my data on the club in "natural settings because the phenomena of study...take their meanings as much from their contexts as they do from themselves..." (Lincoln and Guba 1985:198-9). Consequently, I attended annual meetings of the entire membership, meetings of the executive committee, social events, and their annual exhibitions at the local outdoors show. I also participated in training clinics, dog tests (spring and fall), and in a variety of other social and administrative meetings. Also, more informally, I was often in touch with several members as resources for training, advice and contacts for borrowing and purchasing training equipment and literature. I wrote very detailed fieldnotes which include "descriptions of people, events, and conversations, as well as my actions, feelings and hunches, or working hypotheses" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:52).

The in-depth interviewees were asked to participate in several unstructured and exploratory interviews of indeterminate length and conversational nature over an extended period. The interviews proceeded in accordance with a tentative, frequently revised, 'interview guide' or 'schedule' outlining what ought to be 'asked about' rather than a presentation, word for word of what would be asked and how. Following the directives of all qualitative methodologists, the research did not adhere to a strict survey format and the

interview guide was used only to ensure that I explored key topics with most everyone, but it was in the interview situation that I decided how to phrase questions and when to ask them (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:77; Lofland and Lofland 1984:59). I gave my interviewees a brief introduction about the interviewing process and its goals, I followed a very malleable format, I tried to avoid leading or loaded questions, and I attended with interest to interviewees, I took notes, and where possible, I did tape record sessions (Lofland and Lofland 1984:59-61) although several instances of technical difficulties precluded this in some cases.

Of course, I was not naive about my informants. Interview data consists solely of verbal statements, or talk, and relies exclusively on secondhand accounts from others (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:81). Like all other human conversations, "the interview is subject to the very same fabrications, deceptions, exaggerations, and distortions" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:81). I believed however, that the nature of the topic would mitigate against these potentialities. Moreover, since they were aware that I would be talking with other members, I suspected that my informants would self-consciously refrain from selective inattention to details of past events or outright tale-telling as they could very easily be caught. Furthermore, they were aware that I may be repetitiously going over past events and topics with them. Still, it was important to constantly re-establish rapport and trust, and be honest with my own feelings toward members. I took them seriously, respected them, but maintained some distance and was critical of them (in a philosophical, rather than a moral sense).

The topics that I wished to 'ask about' concerned their perceptions of how 'things have changed for them [as a distinct subcultural group] in recent times.' Recalling that I was concerned with the nature of "the readjustment of group routines to better deal with others" (Prus 1994:407; 1996:162), I eventually discovered that members had much to say about how they and outsiders see the club; how the general population feels about hunting; how they have coped with opposition (as individuals); how the club has coped with opposition; who the opposition is and why they exist; and how they intend to cope with opposition in the future as a group. In second and third interviews, I asked explicitly about these topics (sometimes 'following up" in a final brief interview for the sake of verification or completeness).

All in all, I logged well over 100 hours of interview time, consisting of interviews with 26 members, over the course of the spring, summer, and fall of 1995. On average, 4 interviews were conducted with each interviewee for an average total of 4.75 hours spent in the scheduled interview situation (not including conversations held during participant observation periods). My sample consisted of 17 men and 9 women. 7 of the respondents were 'core' members, that is, judges and members of the executive committee and 2 were non-members.

Most respondents owned German Shorthaired Pointers, Pudelpointers, or German Wirehaired Pointers. Only one owned a Vizsla (Hungarian or Yellow Pointer). Their level of participation in club activities and length of membership are represented below (by gender M or F).

Sample n=26					
Length of Membership and Extent of Involvement					
founding member				1M 1F	
long-time member		2M		4M	
established				2M 3F	4M
recent member			1M	1M 2F	1M 2F
non-member	1F			1M	
	none	rare	often	regular	core or exec.

In the above table, **[See Table 4: "Sample = 26--Length of Membership and Extent of Involvement"]** members are plotted as having been involved with the group for various lengths of time: "Founding members" are those who made up the original group of 12 (1M 1F). "Long-time" members (6 M) are those who have been with the group since early in its history and who have stayed with the group through all of the cyclical 'turn overs' that occur when novice members train one dog (and very often do not 'finish' the dog) and then leave. "Established" members (6M 3F) are those who became members of the group later in its history and who have remained with the group unlike many members of their cohort who left during 'turn overs.' "Recent" members are those who are involved with the group either for the first time (they have just joined with the intention of training and testing their new pup/young dog), or who are not quite established with the group but appear to be remaining beyond the 'turn over' of their cohort (3M 4F) (e.g. they are training a second or third dog with the club). "Non-members" are those who either participate in occasional training, tests, and socials, but do not pay dues as members or those who just attend to test their dogs (as part of their efforts to put multiple titles on them, e.g. they want a club title in addition to Canadian Kennel Club, American Kennel Club, and / or Canadian and American Retriever Trial titles) (1M 1F).

The extent of *ongoing* involvement of participants in my sample varied from "none" to "core or executive" involvement. That is, an individual with no ongoing involvement ("none")

would be one that appears only to test a dog without expressing any intention to do so again in the future (1F). Members who participate "rarely" may not be seen for months or even years, but remain fringe members to train or test a dog or to act as a judge (2M). Members who participate "often" cannot be counted on for regular participation but, given fewer personal commitments, would indeed participate "regularly" (1M). "Regular" participants can be counted on to appear at all or nearly all meetings and events (9M 6F). Most regular members participated as members of the executive committee at some point in their 'career' with the club. Some regular members take on temporary task assignments for the club (e.g. they may accept responsibility for arranging to have birds available at tests). It is interesting that the members of the group who participate "regularly" vary widely in their membership status—from "founding members" to "non-members." Finally, "core or executive" participants are rather obligated to appear at all functions and normally do (with very rare exception). These are also current members of the executive committee who have active roles in the administration of the club (5M 2F).

It should be noted that although there were approximately 50 club members (at the time of the study,) only 20 (on average) actually participate *regularly* in club activities. This includes 'spectator participation.' Therefore, although a sample of 26 is small by research standards, in this case this number represents proportionally the entirety of the group's active membership and several more in addition. Many breeders of pointing dogs were occasional members at one time and remain on the membership list and receive the club newsletter, but do not associate with other members or even test their dogs with the club. I did interview two such members (and I spoke with a few others), but I noticed that they really did not identify themselves as such. Some former members continue to pay club dues for the purpose of maintaining the club, because they support what they do. The majority of "non-participants" indicate that they are merely potential purchasers of brood bitches or stud dogs who "just want to know who's got what for dogs." They may show up as spectators to a test. Thus, the sample is indeed small, but so is the group. In fact, with adequate financial support for this research it may have been possible for the sample to be 100% representative of the total membership. I never encountered any resistance to my requests for interviews and given sufficient funds to do so, all members might have been approached for participation in the study.

This sample turned out to represent a fair though not perfect cross-section of the variety of active members of the club. Women and "core" members were somewhat over-represented in the sample, however, such background variables did not always have bearing on how

informative, insightful, or experienced with the versatile hunting dog subculture a respondent actually was. All interviewees were regarded as knowledgeable members and therefore each of their accounts was considered valuable.

In practical terms, field notes written at the "data collection" phase (from transcripts of audio-tapes and accompanying written notes) were entered into computer files (Microsoft Word 6.0 "documents"). "Raw" interviews were preserved on disk and copies were made in order to allow me to code the data on-screen, rearrange quotations, insert my own explanations, and then incorporate all 26 completed interview files into one 'master.' Also, frequent handwritten entries were made in a personal journal in which I wrote 'memoranda' to myself to help me to keep track of my hunches, details about the nature of each interview situation, and comments about my concerns.

Since this is a vulnerable group, the actual organization name does not appear in either this report or in published excepts. In order to ensure confidentiality, all raw data remained stored in a locked filing cabinet to which only I had access. Pseudonyms were used in place of real names and no identifying demographic data was collected and attached to raw data files. Raw data were converted in the report to anonymous verbatim coded numerically.

iii - Data Analysis: Induction and Ongoing Process

Following the directives of proponents of the "grounded theory" approach (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Charmaz 1983), data analysis was ongoing and proceeded with a view to the development or generation of "sensitizing concepts" (refer to Blumer 1931) and a "theory of 'doing everyday life'" (refer to Prus, Dietz and Shaffir 1994). In direct opposition to the hypothesis testing - deductive model of positivistic science, the analysis of data was entirely inductive. That is, in working with my data, I allowed for the discovery of concepts, propositions, and theories directly from my raw data rather than searching through the data for evidence of previously existing concepts or for proof of established theories generated by other research (see Taylor and Bogdan 1984:126).

I developed my "grounded theory" of this subculture's response to social change by sorting through my first few interviews using the "constant comparative method" and engaging in "theoretical sampling" as proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). The constant comparative method involves coding and analyzing data with a view to developing concepts and comparing specific incidents in the data on an ongoing basis. This enables the researcher to refine concepts in such a manner as to define concisely their properties, determine their

relationships to others, and ultimately integrate concepts into a coherent theory (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:126). Theoretical sampling involves selecting cases to study based on an assessment of to their potential to elaborate upon or to refine the concepts that are being developed. As such data collection and data analysis are tasks to be carried out simultaneously (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:126).

I became intimately familiar with my raw data, "reading and re-reading" my transcripts (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:130), scanning and re-scanning it while comparing incidents and interpretations for their common and contrasting features, their careers, and their relationships to each other (refer to Taylor and Bogdan 1984:126). For example, I began to recognize that members of the group had come to understand their present situation as being threatened. They reported how they had personally become aware of a threat to the hunting fraternity, whether this awareness resulted from a dramatic incident (such as a personal run-in with a member of the public) or an ongoing campaign (such as having seen demonstrators at a hunting show). They also reported how they began to recognize a direct connection between their personal experience of this threat and a more generalized hostile socio-political climate (such as anti-fur demonstrations, anti-meat expressions their children brought home" from school, and 'cruelty-free' marketing campaigns in the cosmetics industry, as well as a marked *un*popularity of the above in more rural areas). Immediately after discovering this "emerging theme" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:131), I began to 'code' bits of raw data with thematic labels of my own devising, such as "the Nature of the Threat." Further analysis of my data using the constant comparative method allowed me to frame these concepts as elements of a "processual typology" (see Taylor and Bogdan 1984:132-3).

I engaged in thematic coding in conjunction with a theoretically meaningful selection of informants. That is, I carried out "theoretical sampling" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:83), a strategy proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). After having tentatively coded a few interviews, I decided that my hunch concerning the evolution of some sort of coping strategy may have a measure of validity. As such, I planned to ask directly about "the Nature of the Threat" in my next interviews. Judging from my previous knowledge of them as fellow members and subjects of my participant observation, I made efforts (through 'snowballing' and networking) to deliberately select two interviewees whose accounts I suspected would enable me to test my speculation that a conscious consideration of their predicament was now synonymous with group membership. The one was a highly articulate and well-educated long-time member of the group, the other was a novice with whom I had never been able to engage in especially penetrating debates or intellectual conversations. After these interviews,

my hunch was (at least tentatively) confirmed, and I proceeded to select another interviewee whose social consciousness and analytical abilities I believed fell mid-way between these two 'extreme' cases and again, my hunch was confirmed. Therefore, "after completing interviews with several informants, [I] consciously var[ied] the type of people interviewed until [I] had uncovered the full range of perspectives held....[I felt that I had] reached this point when interviews with additional people yielded no genuinely new insights" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:83), a point often referred to as "theoretical saturation."

Consequently, the category of "the Nature of the Threat" became a permanent conceptual category for the duration of the study (and was eventually refined as the conceptual categories of Acknowledging and Analyzing) and a topic to be asked about at future interviews in my interview schedule. My theoretical concepts naturally "fit" the data as they were "indicated [entirely] by the data under study" (Glaser and Strauss 1967:3). Moreover, because I was careful to use "common" terms (rather than "jargon") to label my concepts, they "explained" the practical activities of members of this group clearly, and as such, my concepts can also be said to "work" (Glaser and Strauss 1967:3).

As new themes emerged from a rigorous application of the "constant comparative method" and the research became more narrowly focused, questioning became more precise and directive and my "theoretical sampling" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:126) of interviewees took on obsessive proportions. I soon developed a "story line" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:136) as I found myself thinking of the project as "*'It's Not Politically Correct Anymore': Constructing 'Ethical Hunting' in Order to Survive into the Next Millennium.*" As previously mentioned, my analysis was inductive and ongoing, and as such, my interviewing ended at the point of theoretical saturation. That is, I ceased collecting any new data once several interviews had demonstrated to me that I was not finding anything new, so to speak. At that point, I returned to my raw data and re-coded all of it according to the refined coding categories of the "concepts" I had developed toward the end of my later interviews (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:136-7). Eventually, I sorted my data into conceptual categories that I refined as "macro-" and "micro-concepts" (Acknowledging the threat, Analyzing the threat, Adapting to the threat; and Changing, Closing, and Contriving, respectively) (see Taylor and Bogdan 1984:137). I noticed (particularly among early interview data files) that a fair bit of data would have to be left out as they were now irrelevant to the narrow focus of the study. However, I tentatively coded much of these 'irrelevant' bits of data (into such categories as 'becoming a member,' and 'the nature of the

dogs') as I noticed that there was a pattern in them that allowed them to be categorized and I "set them aside" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:138).

Once the data analysis was 'complete,' I returned to the raw quotations again to "discount the data" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:140). That is, I engaged in the "hermeneutic" task of "interpreting them in the context in which they were collected" (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:140). My goal at this stage was to evaluate the validity of the raw data as actual 'evidence' of the conceptual and processual typology that I had constructed. With my personal journal and accompanying notes in hand, I again re-read my files with a view to eliminating any raw quotations that, in retrospect, did not represent accounts from the perspective of the insider *given as such*.

Hence, I was careful to asses the "trustworthiness" (refer to Lincoln and Guba 1985) or "credibility" of solicited versus unsolicited data (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:140). Of course, I preferred the latter to the former, but as the study progressed, much less unsolicited commentary appeared in the interview transcripts. I had however, gathered enough evidence in early interviews to establish the interpretive or subcultural significance of the topics asked about, and as such, I am confident that I was at no point forcing members to articulate anything that they were not already thinking about or that had not already achieved intersubjective truth or reality within the group. I often found myself fretting throughout the study over my selection of interviewees (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:142). I was always careful to select my sources solely on the basis of theoretical sampling criteria, and I am confident that I judiciously noted at what points informants were speaking for themselves (personally) and when they were offering legitimate 'group member' accounts. Of course, the talkative and eloquent informant tends to dominate any study, and being aware of this, I took pains to include more subtle and briefer raw quotations in my presentation of findings. I did not, however, have to reconsider raw data that might have suffered from being elicited before an audience, as I interviewed informants alone (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:141).

Also, although qualitative researchers acknowledge and expect that the subjects of a study will be influenced in some way by the presence of the researcher and the research process (Lincoln and Guba 1985:37), I was *particularly* concerned about the possible effects of my presence and the research activity. As a participant observer *and* an in-depth interviewer, I had a hand in shaping the real world activities of this group and I was known to be analyzing its members. As such, I occupied an paradoxical role in the eyes of members: I was both an insider and an outsider. It is difficult to assess the influence of my self on the data collection process (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:140). I can only assume that (judging from the nature of

the responses to the research and the lack of variability in interview responses) there was sufficient trust among my 'friends' and sufficient respect for the nature of the research and belief in my goodwill among 'strangers' that in spite of the nature of my relationship with members and my own personal characteristics I have indeed elicited valid insider accounts.

Finally, I must address the possible influence of my own perspective or "assumptions" and "presuppositions" on the research (Taylor and Bogdan 1984:142). The possibility of my going native was remote, to put it mildly. Although I *never* approached this study as an opportunity for infiltration and critique, I admit that I am very much inclined to be supportive of the politically correct perspective. This is, however, much less the result of my association with any 'PC university subculture' than my lifelong commitment to the socially disadvantaged (and politically marginal), my belief in 'sacred places' (in the natural world), and my ongoing interest in and involvement with modern art and 'alternative' popular culture. By *self*-definition, most of my fundamental values are in direct conflict with those of 'typical hunters.'

Obviously, it is not with the *activity* of hunting that I take issue. I am a hunter myself. Yet, I remain ethically opposed to hunting as merely a 'sport.' It is hunting's connections with conquest, decadence, violence, and hyper-masculinity that I find disturbing. In many ways I came to the hunting fraternity very reluctantly. I do not care to be associated with individuals who see hunting as a challenge or victory of man over nature, a privilege of the well-to-do, tough or 'cool,' and the sport of 'real men.' At its worst, 'hunting' is "six guys in jeans driving out of the city with several cases of beer, a portable armory sufficiently large and high-powered to invade a small country, a very vague interest in bagging game but absolutely none in cooking and eating it, and a serious case of 'trigger finger itch.'

At this point it should be obvious that my assumptions and presuppositions concerning the nature of the hunting fraternity reveal my *previous* acceptance of an image of *all* hunters that *ethical* hunters are trying very hard to shake. Indeed, although my personal values and my opposition to sport hunting remain entirely intact, I have been on a journey of discovery that has led me to dispense with many of these assumptions---*at least insofar as they are applicable to the particular group studied.*

I am an insider, albeit one often experiencing severe 'cognitive dissonance.' Hence, I believe that I have had the ability to study this group from the ideal researcher perspective, true 'marginality.' I have been able to produce work that is fair. I can present their accounts as they were presented to me, as the strain of countervailing forces has worn me down to a

state of complete ambivalence. I feel that I have no more personal interest in hindering them than I have in promoting them. I am neither enamored with this group, nor put off by it. Rather, I find myself situationally vacillating between both extremes, and thus leaving the field as I entered it, but much better informed.

E. Chapter Summary

The **Methodological Implementation** chapter began with a brief explanation of the study's **historical development** or how the topic actually emerged and was selected for study. A discussion of the **meta-theoretical foundations** or epistemology of the study was offered next. In the context of an explanation of the nature of and rationale for the particular methodological approach taken, the positivist and interpretivist/ naturalist approaches were compared and contrasted. This analysis of the assumptions undergirding the positivist and interpretive/ naturalist approaches revealed that the latter was most attentive to the negotiated, activity based, relational, multi-perspectival, intersubjective, and holistic nature of human group life. The chapter concluded with a presentation of the methodological details of **the ethnography**: In the tradition of qualitative research, the research design was both emergent and flexible, immersion and empathy guided the data collection, and the data analysis was inductive and ongoing.

Chapter 5:

RELATING TO THE SUBCULTURAL MOSAIC

A. Outline of the Chapter

This chapter presents the findings of my research. These findings are organized in such a manner as to introduce three generic social processes discovered via an ongoing analysis of the raw data. The study has articulated the existence of the social processes, **acknowledging a relationship to outsiders, analyzing outsider perspectives and activities,** and **adapting to outsider influence.** This chapter begins with a presentation of and an argument for the inclusion of the category of **Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic** and its constituent social processes into Prus' (1996) typology of "generic social processes" in the context of a brief **overview and rationale**. From there, within the category of Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic, each of the proposed generic social processes is discussed and illustrated in turn with quotations excerpted from my fieldnotes. Additionally, the generic social process of adapting to outsider influence has been split into the three generic social sub-processes, **changing, closing,** and **contriving** to highlight the applicability of the generic social process of adapting to outsider influence to the cases of groups on the verge of being labelled 'deviant.'

B. Overview and Rationale

The present research has generated a new set of generic social processes, *acknowledging a relationship to outsiders, analyzing outsider perspectives and activities*, and *adapting to outsider influence*, within the category of *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic*. Each of these identified social processes sensitizes ethnographers to the emergent and interactive relationship between a particular subcultural group under analysis and other subcultural groups within the broader "subcultural mosaic" (see Prus 1997). Hence the addition of a category of *Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic* to Prus' (1996) typology allows for a more *comprehensive* ethnography of a given group, since an expanded typology not only encourages ethnographers to attend to *how* members of subcultural groups "acquire perspectives," "achieve identity," "get involved," "do activity," "experience relationships," and "form and coordinate associations" (Prus 1996:149-150), but also to *how* their subcultural group *interacts* with 'the big picture' of which it is a part.

Although Prus' (1996) categories of "experiencing relationships" and "forming and coordinating associations" appear to be able to incorporate the generic social processes associated with Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic, the *particular* generic social processes and sub-processes which these categories include lean more toward attending to *individual* relations with *individual* outsiders. That is, at least by default, Prus' categories of social processes tend to ignore how members of subcultural groups negotiate their role *as a group* with *other groups*---how they justify their existence, acknowledge differences, make compromises, or adjust in light of often far-ranging, macro-level social changes originating in and accumulating in influence among other subcultural groups external to them. Hence, subcultures do not exist in a social vacuum but within a dynamic *mosaic* of 'others.' In a 'mosaic,' as in impressionistic paintings (especially in the 'pointillism' of Georges Seurat), discrete colours placed side by side 'mix in the eye,' creating an illusion of the presence of entirely different colours. In the same way, individual subcultures within a subcultural mosaic not only exist side by side, but *mutually shape*, taking much of their character from the influence of other participants who provide their 'context.' In such an interactive social environment, these subcultures are indeed mutually influencing and the nature of such 'in-group/out-group' relations is certainly worthy of our attention.

For example, few members of large national subcultures participate directly in shaping the economy of their nation. However, developments and changes (such as the institution of a capitalist economy in a formerly communist nation) instigated in those subcultures within the subcultural mosaic that *do* have profound 'agency' or influence (political parties, financial institutions, big business) have some impact on many of the nation's other nested subcultures (students, social assistance recipients, artisans). While members of these nested subcultural groups have had little or nothing to do with the decisions made within economic subcultures, they may feel some influence and evolve some sort of response. Their responses may fall anywhere within a wide range of possible actions: they may deny or refuse to acknowledge outsider influence, implicitly analyzing outsider perspectives and activities and possible effects as irrelevant and deriving from irrelevant sources, and ultimately acting no differently as a group, or they may act on an astute or even alarmist recognition of the most subtle of possible outsider influences, engage in a speedy analysis of the situation to make sense of such influences in a sustained and comprehensive manner, and ultimately embark on dramatic action in response to these influences (dissolving the group, overhauling the group, promoting the group defiantly).

Hence, attending to the existence and manifestation of the generic social processes associated with Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic in our ethnographic studies not only adds a

highly *interesting* (and inherently timely and socially conscious") element to our analyses, but highlights the fact of *the existence of individual subcultures* within *a broader subcultural mosaic of* interacting *and* mutually shaping *subcultures*. As such, the incorporation of the category of Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic into the generic social processes approach of Prus (1996), offers an opportunity for the *integration* of micro- and macro-level sociological 'problems' *within* a symbolic *interactionist* framework.

C. Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic

In any subcultural mosaic, members of a given subcultural group will invariably find themselves in the midst of outsiders. This occurs in the most benign sense simply by virtue of their having enacted a *distinctive* subcultural group which automatically distinguishes insiders from outsiders. As such, 'in-group/out-group' identity is endemic to subcultural status establishment and maintenance. Even where the outsider is merely present, not interfering, hostile, deviant, or even symbiotic, there is some element of the outsider subculture(s) that is different, incommensurable, incomplete, or supplementary. If we consider broader society to indeed be a mosaic of multiple overlapping, mutually influencing subcultures, it makes sense for interpretive sociologists concerned with the study of social *interaction* to attend to the generic social processes that highlight *how these groups relate to each other*.

i - acknowledging a relationship to outsiders

A hermeneutic approach to a study of how members of a subcultural group relate (as a group) to the broader subcultural mosaic must begin by attending to members' own interpretations of the nature of their relationship to a given (set of) outsider(s). The first generic social process to be attended to in this connection is how members of the given subculture have come to *acknowledge* (the presence of and) *a relationship to outsiders.*

Recognition of outsiders may result from any manner of indirect or direct, subtle or dramatic, deliberate or inadvertent, solicited or unsolicited, ordinary or extraordinary action on the part of insiders or outsiders. An 'insider/outsider' relationship may be based on 'competition," "cooperation," "conflict," "exchange," or "domination," to name but a few common forms (see Simmel 1971). Acknowledgment of the nature of the 'insider/outsider' relationship (as, for example, cooperative, conflictual, competitive, etc.) can be related directly to the nature of the process of recognition. That is, if the insider group recognizes the outsider because of the outsider's extraordinary, unsolicited, deliberate, dramatic, and direct actions, the confrontational character of the outsider's approach may predispose the relationship to being (at least initially) conflictual. Equally possible, however, is a situation

wherein the context of recognition has no bearing on the nature of the ensuing relationship (members could be confronted by a dramatic opportunity for cooperative association). Attending to how subcultural group members come to know of the existence of outsiders and how they see their relationship to them is a necessary first step to appreciating the *rationality* of a group's subcultural adaptations *vis a vis* their relationships within the subcultural mosaic.

In this regard, members of the club researched have provided illustrations of how they have *acknowledged a relationship to outsiders* in the context of giving rich and detailed accounts of *their perceptions of a threat to their activities from the outside.*

> *There's more and more control and smaller groups are getting the right of ways and we'll be lucky if we have traditional hunting as we know it in the next 50 years. [001004]*

Most members perceive a threat to their club and to the hunting fraternity as a whole. Many see the club dissolving or going underground due to increased regulation, a ban on firearms, or a ban on hunting.

> *...yeah, I think we'd go underground, there's enough people interested in continuing the sport and that would continue it...possibly on private land, maybe not game farms, but maybe where some guys get together and buy their land together or something like that... [000508]*

> *... the threat to hunting [threatens the future of the organization]...Rock puts in his legislation and six months down the road he goes to collect all the guns and then we have nothing to go hunting with or he bans hunting altogether... [001704]*

> *[We won't be forced underground]...in the near future...[but if hunting is banned] the club probably wouldn't survive, there would be too many changes made, and we'd have to change too many rules... [001304]*

The threat to hunting in general is perhaps the most direct threat to the club. All interviewees and all members consulted agreed that "in these times" hunting is "an issue." Several members complained that hunting is declining in popularity, to say the very least.

> *...people are already getting rubbed the wrong way about hunting... [002010]*

> *I don't think hunting will ever be tolerable again. We've gone off on the wrong track now, we hate anybody that is killing any animals or anything like that, they*

don't say 'harvest animals' they say 'murder animals' or 'kill' them, you know, they've a different outlook. [001112]

...the future of hunting is definitely more at risk because stricter gun control is going to cause a lot of aggravation to people including all the restrictions on FAC's [Firearms Acquisition Certificates]...it's going to be harder to get guns, um, the general decrease in areas to be able to go to hunt in, um that's been for years, and each year it gets worse and worse and worse...so even if there is more hunters, there is less areas for them to go...so I see an overall pressure on hunters. [000507]

The research therefore reveals that members are keenly aware of the effects of problematic outsiders. Most fears for the future of the organization are tightly bound up with their fears for the future of hunting. Several members express concerns that hunting may become increasingly regulated and difficult, privatized or undercover, and ultimately, impossible or banned. Hunting is considered to be highly threatened "in these times" by the nature of the socio-political climate.

...it's been around, but now they speak up...they're not afraid anymore...five years ago, ten years ago, no. Same thing with smoking, a few years ago, you wouldn't worry, but now, if I'm fifty feet away, they tell me to put out my cigarette... they're just coming out of the woodwork... [000104]

Many members recognize the existence of hostile outsiders as a result of their awareness of a new wave of marketing strategies and more frequently as a result of direct experience or run-ins with the outsider general public and "activists."

What makes things run? Money! A lot of the Animal Rights Activists have a lot of money backing them, you know, a lot of the big companies are now not using animal products and not using animal stuff...animal fat and they don't use lab animals, you look on any type of shampoo, 'not tested on lab animals'... ['cruelty-free'] [002012]

One of the times that we were going to a hunting show, there was a bunch of people outside protesting...they were just organized, kind of walking up and down the front of the parking lot with signs, for example, 'murdering animals' and 'killing for fun,' I don't know if those were the exact words...these people were just basically anti-hunting...most of them were female... [000502]

We've had Greenpeacers out front, screaming and shouting, calling hunters killers, there was even a bunch of them at this sportsmen's show, yeah they were at the front they always have their little group five or six of them, just protesting hunting altogether, they don't want animals, innocent animals, being shot... [001207]

In addition to organized protests, members have been confronted by face-to-face public disapproval.

I used to have a pond that I could shoot over that was across the road, and I used to be able to pull a duck or goose off it, but now I get people honking their horns or things like that...Now it's a common thing to hear a car honk, but what's meant by it is that 'I didn't approve.' When I lived in the city, like I mean [a suburb], I bought a gun case that—a square gun case, because I though it would be better to be a bit more discreet than walking out of my house with a gun...people might not like it. [000202]

I ...had a personal run-in with someone who came out flatly and told me that she 'didn't approve of hunting.' She saw my puppy sitting up on the front seat of my truck, asked me what kind of dog it was, told me how pretty she though he was, asked me if he was a hunting dog and then had the nerve to turn around and tell me that she didn't approve of hunting! 'Who asked you?!' I felt like telling her. I couldn't believe she felt so justified, I mean, I was a perfect stranger. I certainly wouldn't feel comfortable declaring in public that I 'didn't approve' of organized religions...! [000301]

One member offered dramatic illustrations of run-ins with anti-hunting people:

A typical example would be a situation by this duck hunting area... hunting by myself, me going out on the lake, you spend a lot of time...it's hard to set up appropriately and day break comes and the birds are coming in towards the decoys and then they're flaring off, and it happened several times and you're trying to figure out what's going on there and so you go rearrange the birds, the decoys, and that sort of thing, still to no avail, and you wonder what's spooking them, it's not happening...and anyhow, I got back to the car park area and I talked to this fellow hunting several hundred yards up the shore and he said, 'you know what was happening there?' And I said, 'no, no, what do you mean?' He said there was a guy on top of the cliff who was probably about 60 feet above where the blind was and

any time birds came anywhere near it he had white coveralls on and he jumped up in the air and started waving frantically. [001003]

Another time, this son-of-a-bitch came down and poured gasoline over the [duck] blind with these guys in it! And this guy was with the [Regional Lake] Conservation Authority! ...that son-of-a-bitch should have been nailed to a cross and he was a member of [RL] CA! [001003]

Hence, members of this club recognize the presence of outsiders through both indirect and direct, subtle and dramatic, deliberate and unsolicited, ordinary and extraordinary events. They perceive themselves as being in a conflictual (and threatened) relationship to a bloc of outsiders so influential that it has fueled the disapproval of corporations, organized interest groups, and members of the public. Members of this bloc are apparently so intent on assuring animal rights that they demand 'cruelty free products' as consumers, engage in public protests, challenge their opponents in face to face confrontations, and perform acts of 'terrorism.' Such activities have convinced members of this group that outsiders are threatening their existence as members of the broader hunting fraternity.

ii - analyzing outsider perspectives and activities

In Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic, members of subcultural groups move from the *acknowledgment of a relationship to outsiders* to some level of *analysis of outsider perspectives and activities.* That is, beyond an awareness of being in some form of 'insider/outsider' relationship with others, members seek to make sense of their activities and perspectives, particularly insofar as outsiders have practical significance for them.

Members of subcultures may name, locate, identify close associates of, and construct a history of the other. In their 'sense making' activities, they are led to consider the causes, course, and consequences of outsider activities, the Who? What? When? Where? Why? and How? of outsider existence. Additionally, they may engage in some level of "taking the role of the other" (Mead 1934:154) as they consider the intentions, possible actions or omissions, and ultimate objectives toward them of outsiders. That is not to suggest that all subcultural groups" faced with the 'other' closely *study* outsiders and *articulate* to themselves their findings. Rather, when asked directly to articulate their theories of the 'other,' the ability of insiders to offer detailed (if somewhat speculative) knowledge is quite remarkable (even to themselves), especially since the outsider is very often just that, a group with whom there is deliberately no association (and in whose activities or perspectives insiders may have no interest), let alone familiarity.

In this connection, members of the club researched offered their own theories of the nature of the outsider, the origins and development of outsider perspectives, actual and anticipated outsider activities, outsider concerns, and outsider popularity as they *analyzed outsider perspectives and activities.*

> *Hunting is associated with cruelty to animals and the animal rights activists are against it. One of its products, fur, is the target of the anti-fur groups who are against trapping, farming, etc. Conservationists deplore the use-value of nature. Tougher gun-laws lobbyists fear the criminal use of firearms... [000301]*

Members easily identified "the antis"(people who are anti-this, or anti-that) as environmentalists, anti-fur groups, anti-gun groups, and animal rights activists.

> *[The threat comes from] the general public, now, influenced by environmentalists, animal rights activists, the whole environmental movement, anti-hunting groups, the anti-gun groups in universities...The universities are a big one because that's where it all started, due to the Marc Lepine deal... [000407]*

> *Animal rights people are a problem...for all dog owners, kind of limits them for what they want to do with the dog...it makes you nervous, discouraged... [000102]*

> *[They are] do-gooders, ...fanatics...the ...Humane society, a couple of years ago, I don't know if you are aware or not, but a few years ago it was overrun by the whatever-you-call-them, the people that, oh humane activists or whatever... [000203]*

> *[The humane society was around 25 years ago] ... but not the animal rights people...it's not so much the humane society as it is animal rights people, and they work in conjunction with the humane society, you know, animal rights people itself is somebody who wants to stir up trouble—they can disrupt your tests, but to charge you they have to go though the humane society. [000612]*

Members tended to have very well articulated theories of the existence of an "anti" trend or movement. Most offered combinations of several of the following explanations: Several members made a distinction between urban and rural cultures with 'alienation from nature' as a condition of city dwelling and as generating much of the opposition toward hunting. Several others spoke of a 'gun-shy' public that associates firearms with violent crime, an association created in large measure by sensationalist news media offering graphic depictions of

'gun-crimes' both in print and 'on prime-time television.' Several members complained of the 'anthropomorphization of nature' in western culture, particularly as seen in the entertainment media. One couple also argued that much of the "anti" influence on this generation has been the result of the imposition of values on children by teachers in public schools. In general, the media were heavily criticized by members for teaching the public that "hunting is bad," "carnivores are bad," "using animal products is bad," and that "nature is to be looked at, not enjoyed." "Antis," according to members, now hold influential positions in society. Ultimately, members agreed that hunting is now 'politically incorrect' and that this is a recent trend or social movement.

> *...if you're living in [a mid-sized northern town], the general population supports [hunting] because everyone does it probably, like in [a far northern small town], you know when I was fourteen years old, I had my hunting test...and went in the day I turned fifteen to get it [my license], but you know the people down here... [000201]*

Members often commented that the real opposition to hunting comes from the 'city-folk' and that most 'city-folk' are entirely 'alienated from nature' in the sense that they do not understand hunting or really know nature and animals.

> *I believe that the general public, particularly the southern ...urban public has very negative feelings about hunting. I think a lot of them would like to see it go. They don't understand why we would want to hunt.... [000301]*

> *...in [a far northern small town], everyone has a gun [for hunting], same as you know, [another northern town] or these other places, but in the city, people just don't, um, people might call the cops—you know, 'what's this guy doing with a gun out there?' My perception and view of the city is that they're not, you know, they're not um, in touch with what guns are and being aware of them... [000202]*

A long time judge argued that much damage is done to young people if they are raised in cities, as they lose touch with nature.

> *...and everybody flocks to the city because all of these companies are here and then when they're born here, a lot of their parents won't take the time to take them to see animals or something, some of those kids they see t.v. shows but they've never seen a cow before, or a horse, even a boy growing up with a dog is a great thing! [001113]*

There's people in apartments in the city here and right down beside them there's the [nearby] River and you can go along for miles and it would take you to the heart of the country, some lovely birds down there, lots of game down there, and yet nobody ever, you would never meet another soul down there, so what's wrong with people? They've gone out of touch with nature... [001109]

According to most members the public is 'gun-shy,' fearful of guns because of their association with violent crime. Members believe that it is the opposition to firearms that accounts for much of the opposition to hunting.

[In the south of this region, you get people who have] never been associated with guns and because they're not associated with them, they don't know anything about them, and they're probably not that comfortable with them... [000202]

[...for] most of the urban middle class ...it [a gun] isn't something they keep in their closets, right? Whereas up here, it's pretty normal. Like even if...yeah somehow, they associate it with crime....just the potential for crime if you have a gun. But up here, you and I know that if you have a gun in your closet for twenty years you may never pull it out. [000402]

They figure that the ones who are doing the murdering and all the shooting people are the ones ...who hunt... [001802]

...the gun issue is kind of getting merged into it...well you hear about some kid who gets a hold of his dad's hunting rifle and goes out shooting people in a school and all of a sudden everybody is against hunting and why should they let us have guns and they kind of intermix hunting and guns together. They may not be opposed to the actual hunting, but the fact that the person has guns, they are opposed... the threat [to hunting] is more gun-related I think. [000504]

Several members have suggested that much of the support for animal rights has come from a generation of people who were socialized by mass media which have 'anthropomorphized nature'---literally given nature and animals human qualities. As a result, people are protective of animals almost as if they were small children. Game animals suddenly rank very high on the hierarchy of victims.

[Hunting is problematic for the public because] it's killing Bambi. [000402]

How old are ya?!?!?!...You've been brought up in the era of Bambi and the little duckies on the t.v. and they all talk and everything else, and it's all untrue, and like even have tigers and lions talking, and little kids they believe all that they'd walk up to some vicious dog and they get eaten up you know? And dogs don't talk, and birdies don't talk and they don't think like they tell us on t.v. but all these animal rights people believe this, and it's not the true picture of everything, you know...? [001110]

[Television is responsible for] giving all these kids from a young age the idea that all...like the poor duckies is out there and the momma duck is shot and the little duck is an orphan and the nasty hunter, he looks like some kind of an outlaw, he shot this little, and he broke the duck's wing, you know... the hunter was always a bad guy who was out there and all these little animals were right, even the raccoon, the nastiest little get in the world...! [001111]

Moreover, the media are accused as being highly selective in what they depict and how. Violent crime and unusual social movements get great coverage and this, too, has influenced the public's perception of hunting, according to members.

Again, I think it's more just a change [in the public consciousness about hunting] because of gun stuff, and I think that is recent and I think it's been happening just over the past couple of years where they get person after person or incident after incident blown up in the newspaper about something happening, where a child or a person has gotten hold of the gun, not even the gun owner themself who has gone and shot their wife or something like that, and it starts in the media... Things like that happened before, you know, domestic disputes, you know a guy would take a gun and shoot his wife, but it wasn't blown up in the newspaper, you'd find it on page 8 with a little three inch blurb...I don't think people are against hunting as much as they are against the access to guns... [000509]

...The thing is for the most part it is minority groups, that are talking the loudest, which is more often the case because the majority says nothing, but with the coverage they get it gets expanded upon and the general public thinks it's a big deal... [001003]

Television is heavily criticized by members for presenting unfavourable depictions of hunting while failing to capture its more potentially 'palatable' aspects.

Perfect example, ... I'm a hunter, okay, the Current Affair ran an episode on some guy hunting bear in [the north],....I would never hunt bear, after I saw that I would never, the screaming and the crying, I told my wife, I could never hunt a bear as long as I live seeing that... the media is more or less a god, because if the media says this is bad, everybody says it's bad [002002;002010]

Members complained that nothing positive about hunting is presented in the mainstream media.

If they showed the smiles on some of those children's faces when they're shooting their first bow, or when they're sitting there shooting at the hunting show, when they're sitting there shooting those air rifles and they're shooting at different things like that, and whatever that sport is....they do it in the Olympics, they got a rifle, it's a .22...[biathlon - ski and shoot] they don't show people in that sport, they show, you know, people with murder weapons... [002010]

Members believe that media depictions set off a very far reaching chain reaction of public hostility.

[So after seeing something bad about hunting on TV] they get riled up, okay, then they go to, let's say, they get riled up and they ...just forget about it...then all of a sudden they look, ah, and it just so happens they see anti-fur protesters, okay all of a sudden, that picture of that poor bear lying down in their head, it flashes, they remember the screaming, they remember that idiot standing there with the gun...you know, 'Here's a 20 dollar donation, I back you 120%...I don't have the balls to get in line with you because I gotta go to work, but here's my money, I support you, here's my name, you want me to sign the legislation, I'll sign it...' and whatever, okay, so that's what and they in turn pass it on to their kids...now kids are very impressionable at a young age, highly impressionable, if they see mommy and daddy sitting there talking about hunting and those aspects well the first thing...well that must be bad, hunting is bad, hunting is bad, hunting is not good, and they grow into adults and they teach their children, they teach their children stuff like that, it all goes downhill! [002011]

Two members, a couple with children, were intensely upset by the influence of teachers in schools on young people today. They argued that politically correct teachers were discouraging students from meat eating, hunting, and interfering with nature at all.

It's probably the youngest one [of my children] that's most opposed, probably through school, I think they're getting away from the meat-eating and that sort of thing... [000901]

I think there's more and more negative views imposed on kids in the schools right now, the animal rights groups and that sort of thing, unfortunately, and uh, they're imposing their views on the young people today, I don't think that's right, ...at all, having raised four kids, I've seen it through all the age groups over the last 10, 15 years now...I think the education is affecting the kids because a lot of instructors in our classrooms today, in high school and in public school that are of the belief of a lot of these animal rights groups and their thoughts are imposed on our children and they have no right imposing their views like that, it's not part of the curriculum! And I've seen it, through all the kids, ...in simple things, such as eating meat for one thing. And, um, just gone right off it. Kids that used to love meat in all different respects, fowl, beef or whatever, have been turned right off. [001002]

Ultimately, several members concluded that 'something has happened' in society, hunting is now a deviant activity.

...it's like we're taboo now, we're in an area that's soon to be, well people have it in their mind that what we do now is soon to be no longer... [001208]

Hunting has become a disreputable occupation, not a 'holy occupation' as the Navajo believe... [000301]

...it's not politically correct anymore... [000612]

Many members conceded that some of the criticisms levelled against hunting, hunters, and hunting-dog training are justified. Some training and testing is cruel to game birds, some hunters in the world are indeed unethical, and ultimately, bloodsport cannot be defended.

Of course, if you start training with pigeons, you are shooting pigeons, and honest to god, who wants to eat pigeons? But, um,...so my first impression was a little negative on that....just in terms of the cruelty to animals, but if you want to train a hunting dog, you have to do it somehow... [000201]

I imagine that most people think of us as people who tend to be a little heartless and inhumane with animals, no conscience... [000206]

[tracking a live duck may be objectionable to the public] it's not like you're flushing the duck and shooting it, you're releasing the duck in a panic situation, trying to get away, you know, here a dog is chasing a duck to its death while most people are applauding it. [000205]

There's some areas like the tracking of the pheasant when we pull the wing feathers. Somebody might see that and take objection. [000610]

The majority of members admitted that some unethical hunting practices are indeed carried out and that ultimately it is difficult to defend 'bloodsport.'

The Current Affair ran an episode on some guy hunting bear in northern Ontario. Here you got this guy video-taping his hunt, along comes a bear, badump, badump, badump, they got a big 55 gallon drum filled with honey and all kinds of free food, so the bear goes, 'well I guess I'll get me some of this nice free meal,' so all of a sudden, this guy's sitting there with a .3006 or something bigger, it was a big caliber, you saw that it was a little bear that was coming, boom! He shoots it while the video's running, you see the bear's shoulder explode. Okay, you see this big red patch, picture it in your head! Now you hear the poor thing laying on the ground, and what is it doing? It's crying! Whah, whah, whah, whah, it sounds like a young child, and the guy goes up, boom! He shoots it again. Right, all of this is on camera, then he realizes that the bear is probably, it's a little bear, a yearling—I don't know, I haven't seen many bears, but this was a little bear, it wasn't a cub because it was by itself, but it was still a little tiny bear, and the guy goes, he comes up to the camera and he says, 'oh, I thought it was a bigger bear, I thought it was bigger, didn't his back look'—he's looking into the camera saying, 'didn't his back look bigger than the 55 gallon drum?' I said, 'of course it looked like that because the 55 gallon drum is laying on its side!' So the guy is, and I looked at that and it made me so mad, you know, well that just set us back another 20 years! So instances like that, so I can understand...I mean me, I would never hunt bear, after I saw that I would never, the screaming and the crying, I told my wife, I could never hunt a bear as long as I live seeing that...you know, and I can understand, then the 'antis'' point of view... [002002]

...it's bloodsport and it's hard to defend... [000910]

...I don't think you can defend that, [the fact that it is bloodsport], I don't think you can. So at the end of the day it's still a sport and they still see it as negative, there's a lot of areas there that are negative... [000404]

Several members pointed out however, that some criticisms of hunters and hunting were not justified. That is, some criticisms do apply to hunting in general and to some typical hunters, but *not* to members of this group. While they too criticized the unethical hunter, they pointed out that they were a group of fiercely ethical hunters who did not commit the offenses of the average hunter (from trespassing to unsafe firearms handling, from wasting game and going on a shooting spree to having drunken weekends out in the bush with the macho men). The only commonalties they share with hunters from outside their group is the commitment of *ethical* hunters to conservationism.

Members were usually very quick to point out that it is largely the ethical hunter who has contributed the most to conservation and to the rehabilitation of habitat, not the environmentalist or the animal activist.

...[members of the public] don't know that—I am only speaking for the group of people that I know—all the work for rehabilitating habitat...it's only done by the outdoorsman..." [001206]

[We are more "ethical"] definitely, and certainly from the conservation angle...in the context that it's the hunters that are contributing the bulk of the funds that are targeted for conservation, et cetera, than the 'antis'... [000903, 001004]

...there's more animals than there used to be at the turn of the century and mainly due to the hunter for the money we give towards it and mostly because the hunters that I know are conservationists, you know they do a great job, you know, I've got lots of nesting boxes I put up for wood duck, etc., you know, on my own time, I build them in the winter time and go out and do them in remote areas that I don't even hunt in...but just to help out... and I've cleaned up areas and you know... try and help the way I can, like the Grouse Society I belong to and they've done a great job, and Ducks Unlimited, I've done a lot of work for them...so like, that's all through hunters... [001109]

The media is not going to print any serious or ...too much stuff that is good that's going on in the communities, the things that Ducks Unlimited is doing and all these

other Conservationist Clubs, they're not going to print anything like that... [002010]

The most popular defense of their activities offered by group members was that although they are hunters, they are ethical hunters, not typical unethical hunters who deserve their reputation.

We look better in the eyes of the public, more like conservationists...we hunt with trained dogs and this is something that sets us apart from your average guy that goes to the back and shoots whatever he finds...we would like everyone to be like us... usually a guy that has a dog has taken more time to train the animal, has a little bit more respect for his neighbour, does things in a more professional manner, behaves properly, you know what I'm saying...yeah more an 'ethical hunter' than the guy who just gets in his car and gets his gun and goes hunting... [001211]

Members were very quick to identify and criticize the image of the typical average hunter. They took pains to point out how they may be distinguished from them.

I sympathize with those who fear the typical average hunter who is someone from a city who takes the weekend with some buddies and beer and goes for a shooting spree. Not all hunters are like this—unethical. Members of [the organization] strive to be 'ethical hunters'—sure, they're middle class, and most of them, urbanites as well, but most will only shoot what they eat and eat or give away to be eaten all they shoot... [000302]

I've seen and heard stories of yahoos going out and hunting and stuff like that...now my experience is that most of the [the organization] people are not like that. We encourage responsible hunting.[001804]

...a lot of the times people go on people's land and they're blazing away, they're shooting back at the house, and of course these people say, 'listen, I have nothing really against hunting, but I don't want you hunting on my land, for the simple reason of you know, it's not your fault, but the last few idiots who came on the land did whatever, they left beer bottles, or whatever...' [002005]

They seek to be professional, safe, considerate, and ethical. It is particularly virtuous to not waste game.

...if you're a hunter then all game you shoot you eat, otherwise you don't be a hunter! I don't know why people would want to go hunting and they wouldn't want to sample the game... [001109]

I tell a lot of people, 'okay, I'll take you hunting with me,' I say, 'we might get a couple of rabbits, how you gonna cook 'em?' and they turn around and they look at me and they say, ... 'I'm not gonna eat 'em!' and I say, 'well, guess what!? I ain't takin' you hunting with me!' 'Why?' Anything I shoot I eat, or I know somebody who's gonna eat it. I'm not going to take anything off this God's Green Earth and kill it when hunting unless I intend to eat it...I don't get into like killing stuff and just leaving it there, so these people are the people that don't need to be in the sport of hunting at all period—take up another hobby like crocheting or knitting... And they won't be missed...! [002014]

They were especially quick to point out that they were responsible firearms owners and handlers.

...I think that's the image that a lot of people have [the image of the 'unethical hunter'] and I think that there are maybe not a lot of people, but there are some people who go out and do that.....but we're there to enjoy the sport and we're not there to get drunk and make a party out of it and also make danger out of it...drunk in the bush and shooting innocent people— we're safe, ...more professional in that sense... [000505]

When [outsiders] talk to you about your guns...I say, 'well I have a safe and they're locked up in there...' and they say, 'oh, well, that seems to be okay...' [000510]

...They [members of the public] think that every gun is evil, but they don't know that there hasn't been one case yet where a gun jumped out of a...took its own trigger lock off, went into, went in there and pulled its own trigger and killed someone....[but] as long as you are a responsible human being and you...you come in my house right now and you won't even see a gun, yet still, I've gone into people's houses,... and they've got the gun cabinet sitting right there in the living room, in full view, a beautiful oak cabinet, those people are not responsible to me... [002004]

One especially astute member latched onto the present trend and made a point of emphasizing the outdoors-person or naturalist aspects of the sport.

We are really Green, we are the really Green people because we're the ones who enjoy the outdoors, who really love the fresh air, and just because we go hunting doesn't mean we shoot everything that's in sight, you know. I'd much rather these days, like myself and some people have changed, it's no longer quantity, it's more quality, even if I do come home empty-handed, I've had an enjoyable day, where I can put away the stress from work, it's a hobby, you see your dogs and go out with your partner [canine] and have fun... [001211]

Members *analyzed* their situation. They theorized that these movements have emerged and become influential due to the media, politicians, and teachers who create 'gun-shyness' in the public, 'anthropomorphize nature,' and give far too much voice to 'minority' social movements. They believed that much of the opposition to hunting comes from city culture which has 'alienated people from nature.' In addition, members have been forced to consider criticisms of hunting and most concede that some hunting dog tests are cruel, some hunting practices are 'unethical,' and that ultimately, 'bloodsport' cannot be defended. However, they argue that they cannot be lumped in with the typical average hunter whose image generates vehement (and, in their view, justified) disapproval from the public. They claim that they are the ethical hunters, and like some ethical hunters outside the group, they are conservationists, or 'Greens.'

iii - adapting to outsider influence

Upon *acknowledging a relationship to outsiders*, and *analyzing outsider perspectives and activities*, members of subcultural groups may evolve a set of subcultural adaptations to being labelled 'deviant.' That is, they may select a course of action out of wide range of possibilities after having 'taken the other into account.' As such, in Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic, individual subcultural groups interact with others on the basis of their interpretations. It is these interpretations that shape the practical action taken.

Members of subcultural groups act in relation to other subcultural groups within the subcultural mosaic. The nature of their action may range from the very simple or limited to the very complex or extensive. Moreover, their action may involve the complete elimination of contact with the outsider to a total involvement with the outsider. In response to a range of demands from the outsider (from none to an almost infinite number), insiders may entirely refuse to comply or comply so fully as to fulfill all outsider demands. It is also possible that any changes that insiders may make can range substantially in degree of sincerity. That is, outsider input might be so fully embraced as to result in conversion or so reluctantly tolerated

that only a veneer of compliance or implementation results. Moreover, in response to the influence of outsiders, members of subcultural groups may experience a range of organizational effects, from the complete dissolution of defeat to the rejuvenating boost of victory. Indeed, such results parallel a range of 'visibility' activities, from going underground to going public. As such, subcultural groups can submit to the influence of outsiders or resist.

> *It's a process where lots of words have been spoken, a lot of ideas have been exchanged, and it takes so long [for us to make changes] it almost looks like 'evolution.' [000813]*

Whatever the course of action, it is collectively accomplished. Members do not act individually. Although they may be faced with opposition from outsiders on a one-on-one basis, the club as a whole has a position and strategy that is the outcome of intra-group negotiations.

> *I think it's a lot of evolution, but there's a lot of things that we discuss in meetings, too. Some changes seem to be evolution because it takes so long to come about, but they are discussed at meetings...[It's slow] because everybody has their own viewpoint...It has to start with one person somewhere along the line, and that's basically what has happened, someone says, "Well, I don't think this is a very good idea anymore," and there would be a discussion, and some people would be for and some people would be against...if there's any opposition..., then we consider the opposition and what the reason is...but we try to convince the other people...that it's the correct way to go... and once we decide that's how we're going to do it, then, let's do it... [000813]*

> *...there is a bunch of people making decisions, we're not one leader, we're a group of people and we decide amongst us. That's the way it's been done. [001215]*

> *I would say...it's collective consensus. I would not want to say that we follow parliamentary rules, but we have a loose unwritten rule that everybody gets to have their say. [000813]*

In the case of the particular group studied, members engaged in subcultural adaptations that consisted of actions *in relation to the subcultural mosaic* that I refer to as *changing*, *closing*, and *contriving*. This pattern may be especially applicable to cases wherein an undiscovered group is *at risk* of being labelled 'deviant.' Their particular course of action appears to be a kind of limited and anticipatory *public* accommodation. That is, their main

concern and the focus of their efforts is on their *image*. Hence, a veneer of compliance to outsider demands for change has been implemented, however, the ultimate agenda is resistance.

> *Well, the other end is attacking, but rather than attacking, we just try to continue doing. So any time the other end attacks, we try to have a tactic, anything that says, well this is not true, this is fact, and this is not fact...But then we try to buffer things, rather than attack back. [001215]*

Although some activities are adapted to the altered socio-political climate (changed), the majority of them are merely hidden (closing). As such the outsider sees what the insider lets them see, a more accepted (contrived) image. It is important to keep in mind there is nothing particularly malicious or sinister about such attempts at self-preservation. We all engage in them.

> *...gone are the days when we could cast caution to the wind. We have to be aware and prepared—with educated arguments, ethical imagery, and frequent and intense involvement. Now we're into politics! [000303]*

changing

The generic social sub-process of *changing* may be loosely defined as any adjustment made by a group to its activities in response to outsider influence. Changing how they do things, eliminating certain practices and / or introducing others in response to pressures from outsider groups may be a common collective survival strategy among groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' Hence, 'changing practices' is a generic strategy that manifests itself as a wide ranging variety of accommodation options. Some changes effected by taxi-dance hall proprietors in response to outsider influence included the implementation of strict rules for dancers, in and out of the hall, and the close supervision of the dancing (Cressey 1969:199-202). The Divine Precepts changed the manner in which they converted people to their religion and employed such 'defensive strategies' as taking legal action to protect themselves and attack their critics (Lofland 1977:335-6). Tearoom participants are likely to have built into their routine ways to prevent disclosure, such as the exclusive use of particular kinds of facilities with 'warning systems' in place, for example, facilities with opaque window panes, squeaky doors (Humphreys 1975:90). It is also likely that over the course of their history, bikers have had to change their ways of interacting with police as models of policing

and changes in procedural law have occurred over time (Wolf 1991). Among hunting dog enthusiasts faced with outsider influence, changes have been effected by members with regard to such activities as bird handling, pigeon shoots, and the use of ducks in tests. Members anticipate having to make additional changes in future to accommodate outsiders (especially in regard to firearms use). Empirical examples of *changing* are given by members, below.

> *I think what they do is that they go, they comply as best they can with the opposition, they will go and use different types of birds and if they have to handle them a certain way, then for the most part, they will [change], to a point... [000404]*

> *[In CKC field trials all they use is] the starter pistol and I tell you, we may see[it], it may not be long that it may be the same with [us]. We may only be having the starter pistols...if we don't want to hear any more of this anti-stuff from these anti-people. [002202]*

Many members were aware of deliberate changes that were made to group activities in direct response to the hostile socio-political climate. Some activities have been omitted or altered, and other compromises may be made in the future. In general, members appeared willing to comply within reason, even if they did not exactly subscribe to the values informing outsider demands.

> *Years ago, every summer, we used to have a pigeon shoot and what a pigeon shoot involved was they got about fifty or a hundred pigeons and they stood behind a hill and when it was your turn, they threw a pigeon up and it starts to fly away and you shot when it was your turn. You're actually shooting. But we kind of got away from that because of the public, you know, might not perceive that as being that humane... [000203]*

> *...Well at the present time we're using the ducks for search for ducks, eventually that's going to stop for two reasons: a) the 'do-gooders' are going to get after us for it and b) the other thing that's prevalent right now is the Ministry... doesn't want us releasing ducks into the environment but if it's not the Ministry, I feel in a certain period of time the 'do-gooders' will stop that, the release of live animals... [000204]*

> *Yes, everybody has to adjust...well we were probably the only [individual club]...that ran an [Advanced] test with a dead duck three years ago. We did that once...since we were afraid of being charged at the next test, we adjusted it by using*

dead ducks instead of live ducks. It worked out quite fine. The dog still had to search, it actually worked well for them, not a whole bunch of scent all over the damn place... [001212]

Well, with the birds, we're always trying to educate the people...you have to make sure that you keep them in the shade and you have to make sure that you give them feed and water while they're there... They are trying to make sure that they keep the birds in good condition and that is because if you do have people [outsiders] come in you don't want them to see that there are birds sitting out in the strong sunlight and things like that—that they're kept in a more humane environment. [0023901]

Changes to their activities sometimes meet with resistance, however. Especially farsighted members have prepared themselves for the inevitability of modifications and even see places where such changes could be made in future without it being the end of the world for them, so to speak.

We could modify the program, like in Germany, they don't shoot the birds anymore...[but they are] not very willing right now. I was instrumental when they wouldn't allow us to use ducks , they wouldn't allow us to use mallards...now they want to even outlaw ducks that resemble mallards...I suggested....not using ducks at all for our search for ducks... but there were still some of the old guard traditionalists and they like to see if the duck is there and they like to see the dog track on the water and they actually had one test here, an experimental test, they allowed us when we had this problem not to use the duck, we put a dead duck out...and it worked very good, but we still didn't get it through so we are back to using ducks. But it could be done, we could shoot blanks and we could do retrieving by the drag...and eventually it will come. We will modify some of these things. I even have told them if they don't like that we pull wing feathers [for "tracking"] we could dip the wing in mud, in muddy water, of a pheasant. He wouldn't fly either for a few hours, but once it dries and he shakes the mud out he will be able to fly, so that's an alternative we have as a stand-by... [000613]

We're not trying to adapt..., we're trying to look more presentable to the outside world. [000813]

closing

The generic social sub-process of *closing* may be loosely defined as any action or attitude adopted by a group that reinforces its 'in-group' status in response to outsider influence. Closing themselves off from outsider groups by rejecting outsiders and / or going underground (to some degree) may be yet another collective survival strategy practiced by groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' Hence, 'closing the group to outsiders' is a generic strategy that manifests itself as a wide ranging variety of presence options. At the taxi-dance hall, proprietors took legal action (injunctions) to keep police from arbitrarily investigating their activities and applied for (recreational) licenses to legitimize their businesses and keep them from outsider scrutiny (Cressey 1969:271). As outsiders began to challenge them, members of the cult of the Divine Precepts began to shield their activities from public view more intensively (Lofland 1977:335-6). The tearoom closes itself off from the ranks of the uninitiated by having a complex non-verbal communication system and by requiring that intruders 'account' for themselves immediately (as insiders or outsiders) before they resume their game (Humphreys 1975:79, 24). Bikers maintain a code of silence and seek isolated locales in which to engage in their routines in an effort to close themselves off from outsiders (Wolf 1991: 9, 181). Among hunting dog enthusiasts faced with outsider influence, 'closure' has been effected by members in terms of their generalized rejection of outsiders, maintenance of their current recruitment practices, and avoidance of publicity. Empirical examples of *closing* are given by members, below.

> *Well, I think that the more it gets to be taboo, the more we'll find comfort with each other—associate more with our club-buds and less with outsiders...Yes, I think it will go underground in [this country]—well, at least in [this region], particularly in the south... [000303]*

Club members engage in closing strategies. That is, they are careful in what they say, suspicious before outsiders, and very low profile" when it comes to their activities. They report being very careful and staying out of the public eye as much as possible. More importantly, the club has closed itself off from public view. This effect upon its visibility has been highly salient, if not universally accepted by members.

> *Well, that's pretty much true of all hunting dog [events] now...we all try to keep a low profile and try to avoid publicity. Yes, it's not only us, it's the whole hunting dog movement in [this country]. [000614]*

we don't want to be high profile when it comes to testing or trials where shooting is involved, it's not politically correct anymore... [000612]

Well, we really try to keep a low profile anyway... you don't want 'do-gooders' coming in...you know, the animal rights people... [001302]

In [international] newsletters, they say 'get people out to your tests, advertise in the local papers' and things like that, that's something that we as a club have chosen to be very quiet about, not to invite the general public to our tests because if you invite the general public then all of a sudden, you're also inviting 'little miss dicky-bird lover' who's going to be all up in arms about us shooting this damned duck in front of...so we've made a conscious effort to...[be] low-key to take any of the dead game birds and tuck them away, or you know like to be conscious of that... [001706]

I think what the [international] is doing will affect us. They go on the Internet and they're really opening up now...if they have nothing to do now, the animal lovers, they can play with the computer and we come up[on the international web site] and they start asking questions. If the wrong person gets a hold of something like that, they've got all the evidence there, all the information on the Internet. I don't like it...it can get to the city people who really object to it. [002502]

In situations, members are careful to be mindful of outsiders and avoid confrontation. They express dismay that others do not.

I've always taken a conscious effort of not waving around game birds...or hauling my gun out when there's all kinds of people around on the sidewalk as I'm coming home or you know, strapping the deer to the front bumper, you know, that kind of thing. As far as I'm concerned, the less reason for conflict or confrontation the better...the other day a guy pulled over to the side of the road and there was a little pothole in a cornfield and there is always ducks in there, and I look down and there's this guy carrying his shot-gun and two dead ducks and his dog and he's looking for another one of them, and I just thought, 'oh you fool, why there, in plain view of everybody?' I just, I'm very conscious of that and I don't hunt where other people who are not hunting are going to see me... [001709]

Well, I generally don't talk a lot about being a hunter...unless I know the person...just because I don't want to offend people...I don't necessarily let people know what I do...[I've become] very careful who I say what to... [001702]

Interestingly, there has been *relatively* little influence of the times on the group's recruitment practices. Attracting new members has never been priority for this group. Recruitment has generally been a 'word of mouth' contingency or accident among other specialists. As such, members are merely relieved to have in place a recruitment system that keeps them largely out of sight of the general public in these 'dangerous times.'

> *...we don't think that growth is a good role, a good goal, [but internationally] they're trying to get their numbers up and I don't necessarily see the purpose in that...I think [this club] should be staying in the low, the low profile... [000206]*

> *...we don't go out and recruit people...we won't call you, you call me, type of thing...in [this country] we don't [advertise] as much...a lot of it has to do with our gun laws and hunting—it's gone the way it's gone...downhill...! It's big business over there [in another country], but over here, they don't care anymore... [001105]*

> *[When a magazine editor recommended that we advertise] she thought the more [new people] we can get, the better, you know, strength in numbers, but then you forget about the ones who are there to do damage, they can get in there as well....we really have to be [discriminating about who we attract], we have to screen everyone... [001107]*

> *We expose ourselves at the various shows so we don't hide from anybody, but I don't think we go out of our way to promote it. I know we had a Springer [spaniel] guy, he wanted to get the Springer people together, the lab people, the [club] people together to do a whole TV thing, a major promotion. We sort of ducked out of that. We sort of thought that wasn't necessarily good for our cause to blatantly put this out in front of the do-gooders...I think that's happened with all hunting, like you used to see people come home from hunting with a deer strapped to the hood of their car. Well you don't see that anymore. I think we have become more aware of not publicizing what's going on. [0026001]*

contriving

The generic social sub-process of *contriving* may be loosely defined as any stance or identity taken on in response to outsider influence. Contriving a new, more acceptable attitude and image for themselves in order to appease outsider groups may be a final collective

survival strategy implemented by groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' Hence, 'contriving a new image' is a generic strategy that manifests itself as a wide ranging variety of image options. Taxi-dance hall proprietors worked hard to build an acceptable image for their businesses by maintaining the fiction of the "dance academy," appointing a respectable figure-head, and concealing any evidence of disreputable behaviour insofar as this was possible (Cressey 1969:262, 271). Similarly, the Divine Precepts attempted to build a respectable image for themselves by marketing themselves in a positive light through the media, ensuring that members were "clean-cut" and middle class-looking, and establishing deceptive 'fronts' (Lofland 1977:335-6). The contrivances of tearoom participants at the group level involve appearing "innocent" and "disinterested" in order to dissociate themselves from the activity, and on an individual level, "wearing a breastplate of righteousness" and looking "respectable to a fault" in their public lives (Humphreys 1970:80, 135). For bikers, contrivances intend to reinforce a deviant identity (belligerent, unkempt, threatening) as they seek to alienate themselves from mainstream society (Wolf 1991:211). Among hunting dog enthusiasts faced with perceived outsider influence, contrivances have been effected by members in terms of defensive and suspicious role-taking and making politically acceptable identity linkages and associations. Empirical examples of *contriving* are given by members, below.

> *Well, we're not keeping it hush, but we're keeping it low...you can't be too careful...[we have to be discriminating about who we attract]...we really have to be...we have to screen everyone...by the way, I have to ask you this, what are you intentions with this? Are you going to Greenpeace with it?! [001207]*

Members offered a variety of 'contrived positions' to be taken when interacting with the public. The majority felt that it was important to 'bite one's tongue" and be diplomatic, selective and cautious when one is unsure of one's audience, and to be prepared with intelligent arguments with the "antis." Some felt that it was important to take opportunities to educate the public, however a few were not convinced that this would have much effect.

When it came to making contact with the public, some members were especially suspicious in their stance.

> *Well, there was the test I was at and people were there that I didn't recognize, I questioned their clothing and went and introduced myself to check out who they were and what they were doing there just to make sure that they weren't Greenpeace people or something like that... [0002103]*

We aren't really [that careful now about who we recruit], but as far as, well maybe I'm more paranoid than other people, you know, you have to watch... [000205]

You can get a pretty good idea who's in there...a guy that wants to harm the club, or tamper with our integrity is not the one that's going to buy a puppy and you know, go through the right channels to get it... [001208]

In addition, they now know to expect possible challenges and some take pains to be prepared. This means not merely diplomacy but preparedness. Some members are more quick to make their point than others.

Well, I'm always mindful of how I talk to these people but I never make,...I never hold back if somebody wants to know if I'm a hunter... [000805]

I've had several discussions about hunting, and I'm not black and white about it. I'll accept people's point of view and I'll explain mine the best I can, I'm not really, I'm not going to tell them, "I don't give a shit whether you like it or not, I do what I do..." Well, in a way I might say that, but...! [001213]

I think you've got to fight for what you believe in...even if you don't always make friends along the way... [001805]

I'm picky about who I talk to about my hunting. I don't need another run-in. But if I were at the hunting show, I'd be prepared for challenges. I know all the standard arguments...I'm responsible, ethical, blah, blah, blah....and I'm not lying, either! [000301]

[We have to be] making people more aware that it's a ...natural thing, and it's not necessarily just out there to make a kill...[000903]

Even more significant has been the group's efforts to contrive a new and more socially acceptable public image.

[This work on our image] a continuing thing...it evolved slowly but at the same time, there were certain times when we had to discuss problematic issues [at meetings] that would involve the public. [000813]

We should be associating ourselves with the wildlife association, just to show that, yes, we like dogs, we like animals, we like hunting, but, no, we don't ruin the wildlife just because we like to hunt. So, I guess that sort of image [is ideal]. [002101]

We like to be painted Green these days, because it's the trend...if we don't follow the trend, we might stand to lose more training grounds, you know, more game laws, you know things like that, things get tighter and tighter, and make it more difficult for the average Joe to go out and take his dog hunting... [001206]

Members very often expressed the idea that 'image is everything.' It is important for the organization to elicit positive associations. The decorum of members is of great significance to the future of the club. Members are keenly aware that how they look to the public will influence how hunting will be viewed. Even if only to raise a doubt in the mind of the public concerning the universality of unethical hunting practices---it is imperative that members realize that they are ambassadors for the sport. Members have argued that showing themselves to be professional, ethical, responsible, and 'green,' that is, conservationist is good public relations for all hunters.

I don't think we should give in to them in any way, we should however be ethical about it...don't give them the opportunity [to have something to criticize], so you don't broadcast! [000805]

[The club] has always promoted that we dress properly and not look like slobs, or damage people's property or interfere with people's rights. They've always had a pretty good image, and they're always trying to promote that. [002601]

Several members pointed out that even just getting away from the typical image of hunting would go a long way with the public.

Having more women hunters and making it a family thing is really a good idea...I really think we need more young people involved, at least encourage people with kids in the club to really get into it. Maybe start a youth club and really get girls involved. I'd like to be involved in that... [000303]

[Women in the club!?]—it sucks!!! Hah hah! It's terrible... there shouldn't be any women anywhere—heh heh! Sure I think it would help to have them in the club. I always think it would help...sure it does. It's an image thing. You've got to have that image—[Yes, we have to get away from], the male-dominated 'macho' image

of [the organization], but they've been working on that for years...the hunting clubs need women representation, they need to have it because at least that way, even if it's not that significant, and it's just tokenism at least it's there! [000406]

..Most of them [other hunters] are just shocked because I'm a woman...when I'm dressed for a day [in the field] when I've got a toque on, and heavy coat, and I just look like a young guy with a feminine voice — hah!...it's not a bunch of guys (going with a case of beer) it's women going too...I think there's people who are against fishing, too, but since maybe more women are involved, it's not quite as bad, they don't view it quite as bad, it's more accepted...it can be a 'family thing...' [000510]

Members have *adapted to outsider influence*. The research has allowed members to articulate the impact that social change has had on their *activities*, their *relations with the public*, and their *identity*. In terms of their *activities*, some things have been *changed*, members have become more cautious, more 'careful' in their testing techniques, and anticipate more changes in the future. As for their *relations with the public*, the group has *closed* in terms of members' involvement with outsiders and also in terms of its visibility to outsiders. That is, members keep to themselves more and take an 'in-group/out-group' stance while they keep a very low profile and encourage a level of secrecy. As for the group's *identity*, this is more *contrived* on two levels---both in terms of the stance taken with members of the public face to face and in terms of the image offered to the public in a more abstract sense.

When you walk into a field with a dog that is doing everything correctly and is well trained, people take notice, people look, so hopefully, being members...they will carry themselves accordingly...[it's] very good public relations.[0021003]

D. Chapter Summary

The chapter, **Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic** organized the research findings into three proposed generic social processes. After offering an **overview and rationale** for the application of the generic social processes model, raw quotations excerpted from interview transcripts were used to illustrate the three generic social processes discovered through an ongoing analysis of the data. In **relating to the subcultural mosaic**, members reported having **acknowledged a relationship to outsiders** that is highly conflictual through indirect and direct, subtle and dramatic experiences. In addition to ordinary evidence available to a wide range of members of the subcultural mosaic, members of this subculture were confronted with the presence of outsiders through protests, face-to-face challenges, and violence. Their acknowledgment led to an *analysis of outsider perspectives and activities* that began with an

identification of the outsider, led to theorizing about the nature of the meaning and existence of outsiders," and culminated in a critical consideration of the outsider position (including an acknowledgment of the merits of outsider arguments and a presentation of their own justifications). Members theorized that much of the opposition from anti-hunting groups, animal welfare organizations, and environmentalists could be linked to the 'alienation from nature' that appears to be a condition of urban dwelling, 'gun-shyness' that results from the association of firearms with violent crime, the 'anthropomorphization of nature' in the juvenile educational and entertainment media, and especially the selectivity, sensationalization and 'PC control' of 'he media of mass communications. Having considered these influences, members concurred with outsiders' perspectives (to a point) but quickly offered justifications of their own activities. Indeed, they argued that *in contrast* to other outdoor-sports people (with whom they, too, are in conflict), *they* carry out 'ethical sporting activity,' 'conservationist hunting,' and 'safe firearms handling.' In response to the influence of outsiders, members have as a group adapted by *changing*, *closing*, and *contriving*. That is, they have changed some of their activities and techniques, closed themselves off ideologically and physically from outsiders, and contrived a new stance and image in their interactions with members of the public. This chapter has thus provided an illustration of a viable new substantive grounded theory of subcultural adaptation. By identifying and organizing the research findings as generic social processes, this theory is designed for trans-situational and cross-contextual application. Such an application is presented in the final chapter [**Chapter Six: Conclusion**] which begins with a comparative case study of another group at risk of being labelled 'deviant,' modern day Pagans.

Chapter 6:

C O N C L U S I O N

A. Outline of the Chapter

The final chapter begins with a tentative illustration of the trans-situational or cross-contextual relevance of the theoretical concepts generated by the study. In the first section, **Implications: the promise of theoretical genericism,** the generic social processes pertaining to Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic are applied to the case of Neopagans. From there, a complete **overview of the study** is given along with a **critique**, followed by a consideration of **the future** of the hunting dog organization studied, and some **concluding remarks.**

B. Implications: the promise of theoretical 'genericism'

It has been argued throughout the thesis that the intention of my research has been to generate a 'grounded theory' that is 'generic.' As such, the theory that is derived from this study is framed as a category of generic social processes pertaining to Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic. In order to provide a test of the applicability of this theory to other subcultures a brief 'comparative case' illustration is presented below. The case I have selected is one that I have been studying out of personal interest for the past few years. It is generally referred to as the subculture of Neopagans.

It should be emphasized that my analysis of the case of Neopagans is meant only to be illustrative. I am using this case to show how my analytical model might be applied to other cases. However, my results should not be seen as conclusive or definitive. They are merely indicative of *how* this model may be used. This case study does not pretend to be a true test of my ideas, it is meant only to suggest how they may be relevant to the study of other groups, and that they are indeed, 'generic.'The data presented are not based on a representative sample, but on a sample of convenience as this material pre-existed the study. Information on this group was pursued in another context and derives from conversations with acquaintances involved in this subculture. In spite of these limitations, the case of Neopagans provides both an interesting and clear demonstration of the utility of my set of generic social processes for the analysis of the inter-group relations of subcultural groups.

i - the topic: Neopagans

The term 'pagan,' a pejorative label among Christians since third century Rome, comes from the Latin *pagus* (countryside). The *paganus* was the country dweller who, being 'backwards' or 'resisting progress,' was not as readily converted to Christianity as the city dweller. These 'hicks' kept to their old ways, living on the heaths, hence the pejorative label, 'heathen' (Adler 1986:9). Pagans inhabited the rural areas of Europe in self-sufficiency and celebrated a religion of beliefs and practices that can be traced to the Stone Age. Early Paganism involved "the worship of the god of the hunt and the goddess of fertility. One can see remnants of it in cave paintings and in the figurines of goddesses that are many thousands of years old" (Adler 1986:45). In fact, "the two main festivals of [Paganism] on May Eve and November Eve are described as 'pre-agricultural,' having more to do with the fertility of animals than of crops" (Adler 1986:48).

With the widespread establishment of an agricultural economy, ritual practices became even more closely linked to observable natural cycles. Phases of the moon, seasonal changes, weather patterns, and planting and harvesting routines became matters of great significance among early agriculturists. They recognized their dependency upon nature and upon their own practical action for survival. Hence, in their rituals, they expressed reverence toward earth elements and sought to influence cosmic forces in a positive way to ensure fertility among their crops and livestock. The early Pagans practiced "a religion of the earth," so to speak, one that "linked culture with nature" (Orion 1995:3). During the long process of Christianization, common people were able to sustain their Pagan beliefs and practices for a considerable length of time, especially in rural areas. Eventually, however, "churches were built on the sacred sites of the Old Religion. The names of the festivals were changed but the [traditional Pagan] dates were kept. The old rites continued in folk festivals, [since] for many centuries Christian policy was one of slow cooptation" (Adler 1986:45-6). As such, Christianity was adapted to or aligned with existing practices in order to establish its legitimacy among the common people.

Pagan peoples practiced ritual magic. They attempted to influence natural forces ceremonially as they believed that human will could influence events in nature.

> Magic is a convenient word for a whole collection of techniques, all of which involve the mind... [We] might conceive of these techniques as including the mobilization of confidence, will, and emotion brought about by the recognition of necessity; the use of imaginative faculties, particularly the ability to visualize, in order to begin to

> understand how other beings function in nature so we can use this knowledge to achieve necessary ends....[Magic employs] a knowledge of how emotion and concentration can be directed naturally to effect changes in consciousness that affect ...behaviour...Magic [according to one leader of the revival] is 'the Science and Art of causing change to occur in conformity with Will' (Adler 1986:8).

In 1398, the theology faculty at the University of Paris linked magical practice with "heresy" (Orion 1995:46). On the authority of Pope Innocent VIII, two German Inquisitors, Kraemer and Sprenger, wrote the *Malleus Malificarum (1487-1489)*. This book became the most influential source on witch beliefs and practices (Orion 1995:46-7). In it Kraemer and Sprenger devised "a theory of a secret society that was in league with the devil to destroy Christian society" (Orion 1995:46-7). In his translation of the *Malleus*, Montague Summers (1928) claimed that "heretical witches intended to abolish monarchy, private property, marriage, inheritance, order, and all religion" (Orion 1995:47). In 1603, James I of England, who suspected himself to be the victim of "black magic," published *Daemonologie*, a book similar to the *Malleus*, that became a textbook for officials on their witchhunts (Orion 1995:47). In the villages, people began to "worry about *malificarum* (the harm that witches might do)" (Orion 1995:47). Church and state officials, however, were more concerned with "the act of rebellion that the witch was deemed to have committed in order to have obtained her evil power---an act of apostasy" (Orion 1995:47). In these times of Pagan persecution, "the Church took the god of the Old Religion and---as is the habit with conquerors---turned him into the Christian devil" (Adler 1986:45-6). Ultimately, the common people became convinced that their neighbours were indeed "in league with the Devil" and, as such, that the demonologists' version of witchcraft was correct (Orion 1995:47). The legacy of this association of Witchcraft with Devil-Worship by Christians continues to plague modern day Pagans.

Hence, with the enforced Christianization of Europe 'witchcraft' fell into disrepute. As a result, many of the sacred groves of the Pagans were cut down, a 'witch craze' that led to the annihilation of thousands of suspected 'witches' ensued, and 'witchcraft' went underground. But "small families kept the religion alive and in 1951, after the Witchcraft Laws in England were repealed, it began to surface again" (Adler 1986:45-6).

The 'classical witch,' as defined by Isaac Bonewitz (1977), is

> 'a person (usually an older female) who is adept in the uses of herbs, roots, barks, etc., for the purposes of both healing and hurting (including midwifing, poisoning, producing aphrodisiacs, producing hallucinogens, etc.) and who is familiar with the

> basic principles of both passive and active magical talents, and can therefore use them for good or ill, as she chooses' (Bonewitz (1977) in Adler 1986:68).

Classical witches are likely to have existed among most peoples around the world. "In Europe this woman (or man) would be an old peasant, perhaps, 'a font of country wisdom and old superstitions as well as a shrewd judge of character'" (Adler 1986:68). With Christianization, these powerful elements of peasant community life were not merely discredited, but became the convenient scapegoats for the social ills that imperialism had instigated. It was imperative that the common people abandon all 'illegitimate' remedies and solutions and seek State-authorized 'guidance.' In this connection, "...the persecutors of the legendary (female) witch...accused her of possessing and using power that belonged rightly only to the Christian God. Her creativity was unauthorized" (Orion 1995:27).

For many Neopagans who use it, the term 'witch' is 'de-euphemized *among witches*,' and worn as a "badge of honour" very much in the sense described by Anspach (1994:361). Indeed, the witch is regarded as a heroine:

> ...the historical witch is the prototypical victim of an advancing civilization that diminishes personal autonomy in favor of reliance on socially endorsed authorities... [The witch dares] to persist in self-sufficiency where the individual's authority is being eroded, even when that self-sufficiency is deemed superstitious by more powerful representatives of another world view. In the historical witch, today's witches see an example of an extinct tradition of authority over one's own life... (Orion 1995:27)

The actual origin of the term 'witchcraft' is a matter of some dispute among academics and Neopagans. It is often stated that "witchcraft comes from the Old English *wicce* and *wicca*, referring to female and male practitioners, respectively, [and that] these two words derive from the root 'wit' or wisdom" (Adler 1986:11). As such "witchcraft" or "wiccacraeft" refers to the "craft of the wise," which is "understandable, since the old Witches were often the *wise people* of the village, skilled in healing and the practical arts" (Alder 1986:11).

Witchcraft today "is a revival of European pre-Christian religion" (Orion 1995:1). That is, "...the new Witchcraft and Neopaganism represent parts of a continuum of a generally submerged (occult) tradition within Western culture" (Orion 1995:6). It is "occult" in the sense that it incorporates "hidden or obscure forms of knowledge that are not generally accepted..." (Adler 1986:12). "For hundreds of years, the occult tradition has been a

repository of beliefs, techniques and ethics relating to the creative process deployed to achieve spiritual refinement" (Orion 1995:6). Although it is debatable whether or not the 1950s revival of witchcraft (Orion 1995:2) actually emerged among 'hereditary witches,' it is widely believed that the Neopagan traditions and rituals are indeed representative of those that were submerged for generations, often by act of law. In fact, the matter of whether witches today have genetic lineage to European witches is a matter of dispute among some, irrelevance among others. As one witch put it:

> 'Let's assume that many people lied about their lineage. Let's further assume that there are no covens on the current scene that have any historical basis. The fact remains: they do exist now. And they can claim a *spiritual* lineage going back thousands of years. All of our pre-Judeo-Christian or Moslem ancestors were Pagans!' (Leo Martello cited in Adler 1986:89).

In her 1985 survey, Adler (1986:443) found that modern Western witches share a number of characteristics. They are mostly middle-class people who unobtrusively live in mainstream society as conventional men and women. However, they are often radically nonconformist in private (Adler 1986:382). It is not easy to identify Neopagans in any given community. Although groups of Neopagans exist in most cities, they are difficult to find (Melton 1992:25).

Becoming involved usually happens through friendships, lectures, books, or articles, but most often "these events merely confirm some original, private experience..." (Adler 1986:14). One member reported, "'I always knew I had a religion, I just never knew it had a name'" (in Adler 1986:4). Pagans report seeking membership in the pursuit of "Beauty, Vision, Imagination; Intellectual Satisfaction; Growth; Feminism; Environmentalism; Freedom" (Adler 1986:22-3). It is difficult to estimate how many are the Wicca. Some estimates have been based on the number of subscribers to Pagan periodicals, however, many Wiccans do not subscribe to any. Also, since all covens are autonomous, many are not known to others. Furthermore, the tradition of solitary practice remains strong. It is therefore almost impossible to compile accurate statistics (Adler 1986:107).

There are a number of differences among the various magical groups in North America. However, members generally acknowledge that "whether they call themselves ritual magicians, witches, pagans, druids, or even voodooists, [they] are part of the same movement" (Melton 1992:5). The Neopagan subculture is certainly diverse. There is a very wide variety of traditions practiced by a large number of groups as well as a branch of 'eclectic' practice especially among the 'solitaries.' Moreover, the Neopagan subculture has

also been appropriated by various 'trendy' members of social movements (e.g. environmentalism, native spiritualism, feminism). The implications of this ideological appropriation for local groups are dealt with below.

Although "there is far more diversity than conformity, ...within rampant diversity some consensus on matters of worship, belief, and lifestyle runs as a thread holding the movement together" (Melton 1992:22). As a group, Neopagans see religion as meaning "to relink" and "to connect." The "linkage" or "connection" is between humanity and the universe. Hence, they believe that any philosophy that establishes this unity is a legitimate "path" or "religion" (refer to Adler 1986:12). There are two main Wiccan deities: "the God, lord of animals, lord of death and beyond, and the Goddess, the Triple Goddess in her three aspects: Maiden, Mother, and Crone. Each aspect is symbolized by a phase of the moon---the waxing crescent, the full moon, and the waning crescent" (Adler 1986:112). This belief is not universal, however, and some groups focus their attentions on a wide variety of lesser deities, especially those of Greek mythology. Others, in contrast, may not recognize any deities, but acknowledge and revere the various 'spiritual forces' of cosmic elements to which they do not attach personal names or qualities (i.e., unlike many other Pagans who refer to the Moon as "Diana," or "the Goddess" for example).

"Most Neopagans believe in the basic hermetic principle, 'As above, so below'... which implies the interconnection of all things" including an interconnection or relationship of mutual influence between the "macrocosm" and the "microcosm" (Melton 1992:22). Wiccans believe that as much as human beings are dependent upon their harmonious interactions with nature, natural forces are affected by human agency (Orion 1995:3). A belief in reincarnation is very widespread among Neopagans, and many believe in what they refer to as "the 'threefold law': that whatever you do returns to you threefold. [While] some witches don't believe in the threefold law, ...most believe that you get back what you give out" (Adler 1986:112).

The "Wiccan Rede, 'That you harm none, do what you will'" (Melton 1992:24) governs their individual-level social interactions. "Witches and Pagans are admonished to concentrate on getting their lives in order and not to interfere with others in accomplishing the same..." (Melton 1992:24). The magical life also involves secrecy. "Witches and magicians carry with them the memory of the 'burning times,' and although few fear a tortured death, they do fear loss of job or home and trouble with family and acquaintances from the revelation that they are Pagan" (Melton 1992:25).

Three core Pagan beliefs have been identified by Adler (1986). Pagans tend to believe in animism, pantheism, and polytheism:

- "*Animism* is used to imply a reality in which all things are imbued with vitality," or all elements of the universe are imbued with spirit or "life force" (Adler 1986:25). Neopagans feel a kind of living presence or spiritual power in nature (Adler 1986:4).

- "For many Pagans, *pantheism* implies much the same things as animism. It is a view that divinity is inseparable from nature and that divinity is immanent in nature" (Adler 1986:25).

- *Polytheists* argue that there are many varieties of divinity and many versions of reality (Adler 1986:25).

While there is a tradition among them of obscurity as well as non-interference, not all witches practice as isolates. Pagans often form small groups. "Witches form covens. Neopagans form groves, nests, and circles. Ritual magicians typically form lodges and temples..." (Melton 1992:23-4). A coven is a group of (usually thirteen) witches who "convene for religious or magical or psychic purposes. Not all Witches form covens" (Adler 1986:108), in fact, "classical witches" are solitary. Covens often meet "bi-weekly on the new and full moon (esbats)" (Melton 1992:23-24) and "on the 'sabbats,' the eight great festivals of European Paganism, the Quarter days and the Cross Quarter days. The lesser four are solstices and the equinoxes" (Adler 1986:110-111). Esbats are generally "working meetings" that can be scheduled according to a particular phase of the moon or on a more situational basis.

> [The] festival (sabbat) occasions are: *Samhain* (October 31); *Yule* [Winter Solstice] (December 21); *Oimelc/Candlemas* (February 2); *Spring* [Vernal] *Equinox* (March 21); *Beltane* (April 30); *Summer Solstice* (June 21); *Lammas* (August 1); *Fall Equinox* [or Michaelmas] (September 21). These festivals follow the agricultural cycle of spring rebirth, summer growth, [fall] harvest, and winter death. The Pagan year begins at *Hallowe'en* or *Samhain*, which is celebrated as a time of examination of the past and resolution for the future (Melton 1992:23-24).

The seasonal festivals intend to renew and reinforce "a sense of living communion" with nature and an attunement to "natural cycles" as reflected in the changes of seasons (Adler 1986:111).

The meetings are held for the purpose of engaging in ritual activity. Magical operations begin with the creation of "sacred space" and

> ritually purifying it with the ancient elements: fire, water, earth, and air. The circle is cast with a ritual sword, wand, or *athame* (a small, usually black-handled and double-bladed dagger that is used by almost all covens, whatever their tradition). Different covens have different symbologies, but often the sword represents fire, the wand (or incense burner) air, the cup water, and the pentacle---a round, inscribed disk of wax or metal---earth (Adler 1986:109).

A "magical space" must be "cast" or constructed in which to "work" (Adler 1986:109). "The circle drawn on the floor...becomes the microcosm of the macrocosm... The sacred space is both a meeting ground between the mundane world and the world of the gods, and a place of protection from the forces dealt with in magical operations..." (Melton 1992:23).

Magical practice incorporates invocation and evocation: "Invocation is the process by which the magician ... calls from the cosmos a particular force...." (Melton 1992:23). One method of doing this is referred to as "Drawing Down the Moon." This ritual aspect involves drawing lunar forces into the priest or priestess who then takes on the persona of the goddess and emits a message to the coven. "In contrast, evocation calls forces from within...the forces are personified as spirits and directed to the task at hand" (Melton 1992:23). In this case, the inner powers of the priest or priestess are heightened and harnessed for ritual use. "These forces [cosmic and personal] are to be tamed and used either for the development of the magician or for a specific mundane magical task" (Melton 1992:23). Magical practice is ultimately a ritual celebration of communion with the forces of nature.

To summarize, the subculture of Neopagans originates in the magico-religious practices of ancient pre-Christian peoples. Their practices intended to celebrate the unity of humanity and nature and to influence spiritual forces for the benefit of the local community. Following the enforced Christianization of Europe and an era of violent persecution, the religion was forced underground until such time as witchcraft laws were repealed (c. 1950). Especially since the late 1970s and early 1980s, the magical community has established a presence for itself in middle-class North America. Although the broader subculture has been enjoying a revival in recent decades, the legacy of stereotypes generated during the 'burning times' remains with its members who often fear harassment, prejudice, and discrimination in their local communities.

ii - the problem: inter-group relations of local Neopagans

Local (covert) groups of Neopagans and hunting dog enthusiasts are 'similarly situated' social entities. They share the status of being at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' Members of the fraternity of hunting dog enthusiasts sense that they are wearing out their welcome within a subcultural mosaic heavily influenced by "the antis." While hunters are generally divided with regard to the need for secrecy, many have come to acknowledge an emerging need for 'discretion.' The image of the typical hunter is used to discredit and malign all hunters in political maneuvers engineered by influential moral entrepreneurs. Such stereotypes threaten the credibility of the ethical hunters and perpetuate a fear of irresponsible firearms handling, senseless slaughter, and disrespect for private property and trespass among the general public. Moreover, the generalized social disapproval of hunting has provided a justification for the occasional moral entrepreneur to terrorize or interfere with the activities of hunters. Such experiences are common to hunting dog enthusiasts and Neopagans as they may be seen as 'deviant' *by their association with* (unethical) typical hunters and Satanists, respectively.

Today, Ritual Magic, and Witchcraft more generally, meet with such social disapproval in North America. "Dictionaries define witches as (primarily) women who are either seductive and charming (bewitching) or ugly and evil (wicked)" (Alder 1986:10). Witchcraft is "power exercised by beauty or eloquence or the like" (Pocket Oxford Dictionary, 1974). The latest version of the Chambers Dictionary adds that the witch is "...a woman, supposed to have supernatural or magical power and knowledge *esp* through compact with the devil or a minor evil spirit;...a dangerously or irresistibly fascinating woman..." (Chambers Dictionary, 1994:2005). The words "witch" and "witchcraft" unleash a chain of negative associations that are often disturbing, if not fear inspiring (Alder 1986:10). This is because "much ...[Secular and] Christian literature repeats the myths of the witchhunters who in medieval times identified witchcraft with Satanism..." (Melton 1992:26). Hence, fear and misunderstanding continue to plague the inter-group relations of Pagans and Christians.

> The encounter between Pagans and Christians fills a significant part of the Pagan life, both because of the single fact that the Western world is still nominally Christian and because of the memory of the witchhunting of past generations. Some Christians, mostly conservative Evangelicals, help keep alive this negative encounter by a continued attack upon witchcraft and occultism in books and tracts....[Neopagans often] ...complain bitterly of the slander that much Christian literature continues to direct against them (Melton 1992:25).

The Anti-Pagan Christian front is seen by Pagans as a kind of 'powder keg,' always threatening to ignite. "The Christian attack perpetuates a certain level of paranoia within the community. Many Pagans are genuinely afraid that the Christians will do more than just write against them and have widely circulated accounts of Wiccans who have [been persecuted] because of their religion" (Melton 1992:25). There are many stories of Christian harassment and interference circulating in the Pagan community. Adler reports that one witch

> ...lost custody of her children in a divorce proceeding after her husband said she was practicing witchcraft...Local teenagers tried to set fire to [the home of a pagan couple... after [one of them] appeared on the 'Tomorrow Show' to talk about the Craft...Among other incidents is the probable murder of a man by his 'caring' relative who wanted to make sure his soul would be saved, and the case of Robert Williams, a psychologist who, after he mentioned the Craft in an interview in a local newspaper, was fired from his job at a Kansas reformatory and shortly after committed suicide (Adler 1986:131).

Adler states however that "most persecution is not this blatant. It takes the more subtle form of the images of Witches portrayed in television shows and in films like *Rosemary's Baby* and *The Exorcist*" (Adler 1986:131). Indeed, it is important to note once more that it is with Satanism that members of the general public generally take issue, not with Paganism, *per se*. Generally, however, the public is unaware that there is a difference between the two. Images of 'Satan-worshipping witches' in the popular culture closely mirror the images of witches found in the 'anti-witch' propaganda of Christian Inquisitors.

Consequently, although some Witches and Neopagans enjoy being secretive, others feel it is "a hard necessity" (Adler 1986:411). "Because of negative public attitudes towards Witches and their fears that the 'burning times' may return, the modern Craft movement is mainly underground" (Scott 1980:100). There appear to be two schools of thought with regard to persecution among Neopagans. These may be expressed as follows: "'If we're respectable and quiet, we won't get persecuted---only flashy trouble makers do,' and 'It's time we stood up and fought for our religious rights'" (in Adler 1986:133). It is often the case, however, that the public is generally unaware of the reality of a Wiccan presence. "'I go my way, they go theirs,'" (in Adler 1986:133) is a common expression of this situation. Another Pagan gives her comrades a much less optimistic view with regard to relating to outsiders:

'My advice to Aquarians who are persecuted is: Keep your eyes open, your mouth shut, and your shotgun behind the door, and hope you never need to use it. Don't tell your neighbours you're a Pagan unless they are Aquarians. Don't tell people at work. Use a *nom-de-guerre*, or several of them. If they don't know where you live, they can't burn your house down' (in Adler 1986:133).

Solitary practitioners as well as organized groups of Neopagans exist in communities as different as Toronto and Goulais River, Victoria and Sudbury, all over Canada. They tend to establish, however, a relatively invisible, often transient presence. Although Wiccan book and supply shops exist in various cities, they are often subject to sudden closure (due to shifts in levels of community tolerance) and are not (publicly) the sites of highly visible ritual activity. These groups, in spite of differences in tradition and location nonetheless share a number of commonalties. These include not merely fundamental values and some similar (if not identical) practices, but also the experience of belonging to a (local) subculture at risk of being labelled 'deviant.'

As such, local Neopagan groups provide a dramatic illustration of inter-group relations within the subcultural mosaic. Consequently, I have decided to apply my category of generic social processes (and sub-processes) pertaining to Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic to them in order to demonstrate the potential for trans-situational or cross-contextual relevance of my theoretical formulations.

iii - analysis: relating to the subcultural mosaic

a - acknowledging a relationship to outsiders

Since subcultural groups are not enacted, accomplished, or sustained in a social vacuum, at some point in time, either collectively or individually, members are faced with outsiders. This may happen simply by virtue of group formation or by the act of becoming a member wherein the group is identified as a *distinct* entity. By definition, all others become outsiders. Outsiders are not without influence, however. Since few if any subcultural groups can exist as perfectly self-sufficient and impervious cocoons there is always some level of interaction (or interference) between insiders and outsiders. No matter how casual, this interaction *is* potentially influential, especially where the participants hypothetically, half-jokingly, or deliberately identify the subculture or its members as distinctive and morally *evaluate* it. Indeed, there are instances in which the nature of the inter-group relationship is very dramatically revealed by inadvertent or deliberate action on the part of either the insider or the outsider. It is at this point that an acknowledgment of having a relationship to outsiders

crystallizes. And so begins the conscious 'career' of the subcultural group as an interacting participant in the subcultural mosaic. It is a career that commences with *acknowledgment of a relationship to outsiders*, proceeds with *analysis of outsider perspectives and activities*, and *culminates in some sort of adaptation to outsider influence*. Furthermore, this is an ongoing and emergent 'career path,' for as members adapt, the adaptation may alter the nature of the relationship, lead to a re-analysis, and to yet another kind of (or more of the same kind of) adaptation.

It is generally believed that there is at least some risk of 'friction' with outsiders that may result from a Neopagan's disclosure of his or her religion. The relationship that Neopagans have with the outside is usually described as being potentially conflictual, or at best, extremely fragile. It is something to be aware of and where possible, *carefully handled*. The participants 'got off on the wrong foot' many generations ago and the grudge (perpetuated in Christian mythology and by the popular culture) persists on both sides.

North American Neopagans, in spite of the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the United States of America's *Constitution*, have been subject to discrimination, harassment, and violence due to the nature of their religious beliefs.

> *We came into the city one time to a friend's house-warming and the editor of the [Local Newspaper] placed a cross on the front lawn and video-taped us. We actually had to call the police because he was harassing us. And we were not being 'in your face,' we were being very quiet, but he noticed someone in a robe, and I think he must have known that in the neighbourhood there were friends [of ours] who were inclined that way, and so he had binoculars and the whole bit. But we never encountered that here [in the country]. [002103]*

The Ravenwood coven in the United States earned notoriety upon 'going public' with the craft, in 1982. This 'open' coven was studied in depth by Scarboro et. al. (1994). Upon their establishment of a public presence, the Ravenwood coven in Atlanta experienced the arrest of two of its leading members, picketing at one of its conventions, threatening and abusive phone calls, rock throwers and fire starters, vandalism, pranks, official acts of harassment (such as unannounced fire and safety inspections by local authorities), and the ongoing stress of being open to constant public criticism (Scarboro et. al. 1994:20-27). As such, the inter-group relations of the coven with elements of the local community were defined by them as highly conflictual.

Thus, in addition to knowledge of 'ancestral' persecution that they may have derived from either popular culture, historical study, or perusal of the opening pages of many 'introductory' Wiccan texts, many local pagans have first-hand experience of hostile actions or attitudes toward them by other members of the subcultural mosaic. As such, they are very quick to acknowledge their relationship to outsiders: Their 'inter-group subcultural status' due to their association with the occult is indeed that of the group at risk of being labelled 'deviant' should they be discovered.

Similarly, for a group of hunting dog enthusiasts, awareness of their developing conflictual relationship with other members of the subcultural mosaic resulted from both indirect and direct, subtle and dramatic experiences. Members of the group studied witnessed protests, experienced harassment, and were subject to direct interference with their activities. Such events quickly accumulated to provided them with evidence that they were at risk of achieving 'deviant' status.

b - analyzing outsider perspectives and activities

Acknowledging a relationship to outsiders instigates 'sense-making activities' that include efforts to identify and classify outsiders, to understand the position of the outsider, and to articulate the insider perspective in relation to that of the outsider. The implications to the insider group of their relationship to outsiders emerge in articulating to themselves (and others) similarities and differences between insiders and outsiders in their features and viewpoints. Motives and future plans of the other are speculated upon, the origins of the other's position are analyzed, and the relative position of the insider group is constructed. Especially in the case of a deviant group, analysis of the other is imperative for strategic planning. Where the goal is self-preservation, knowledge is power. Such 'reflectivity' or ability to take the other into account in the broadest sense is a major asset of those at risk of being labelled 'deviant.'

'Deviant' labels are both descriptive, and prescriptive. Not only do they tell people what others are, but how they should be dealt with (refer to Ellis 1987). Members become aware of the implications of their immanent 'deviant' status by analyzing their relationship to outsiders.

> *I always felt that if you're going to do the dance, you might as well get used to the beat of the music because you can't have it both ways, you can't be Wiccan and expect people not to react to that...[002102]*

Local groups of Neopagans must determine for themselves the implications of a 'deviant' label for their survival in their respective communities. Indeed, new members may have to weigh the risks and benefits associated with wishing to practice collectively against those associated with solitary practice. Both the novice and the veteran are able to identify local manifestations of traditional enemies (e.g. fundamentalist Christians) as well as other possible objectors. At some point they take the role of the other as they seek to determine their place with respect to their other subcultural affiliations, such as occupational, ethnic, and local community subcultures.

Part of locating themselves ideologically from the perspective of their critics involves articulating their position in such a manner as to differentiate and symbolically 'remove' themselves. For Neopagans, this almost invariably involves arguing that the charges against them (of Satanism) are unfounded and that they present no threat to their host communities. Members recognize that it is clearly the popular cultural association of Wicca with the Satanic occult that accounts for public opposition to their activities and existence. They, too, concede that magical practices that intend to effect harm are 'immoral.' By educating outsiders about their beliefs and revealing to them the Wiccan Rede they seek to justify their activities and protect themselves from charges of malevolence. In doing this, they poise themselves to orchestrate collective action to prevent the 'deviant' label from being attached to them for good.

The stereotype of the Witch as Satanist or maker of 'black magic' is well known to Wiccans and is responsible for much of the opposition that they endure. It is indeed ironic that members actually "shun black magic because they believe these negative forces are dangerous...and black magic violates Craft law, which provides that magic should never be used for harm" (Scott 1980:107). In response to discrimination, harassment, and threats of violence, the Ravenwood witches took pains to deny their involvement with Satanism and to emphasize those elements of the Craft that may be associated with inoffensive and benevolent activities more familiar to the host society, such as its 'therapeutic' or 'counselling' aspects, its 'legitimacy as a religion,' and its 'tolerance' of other religions (Scarboro et. al 1994:24)

> To Witches, Satan, like Christ, is a Christian deity, a part of Christian mythology that explains evil in a way unsatisfactory to Witches since it allows individuals to deny responsibility for their own actions. Using magic for personal gain, without considering the ethical implications, is equally unsatisfactory since Witches firmly believe in the rule of Three. Because anything that one sends out in the way of energy, positive or negative, returns to one threefold, Witches are careful to avoid

> negative energy work. In other words, Wiccans do not hex people, since doing so would only throw a bigger hex back on the Witch who cast the spell. (Scarboro et. al. 1994:61)

> ...we have put children back with their parents; we have helped the terminally ill come to recognize death without fear of hellfire and damnation; we have helped young people hooked on drugs; we have counselled young people who cannot communicate with their parents...we are trying to eliminate the stigma or fear of the old religions and we're here to fight as much as anyone for religious freedoms...Psychic readings, the Tarot, are a part of the Craft---they go with the territory. It's not fortune-telling; it's sort of counseling. [Lady Sintana in Scarboro et. al. 1994:22,24]

> We'd fought some battles and it was important to be recognized---in effect, force the government to say, 'This is a religion'... We made the conscious decision to bring about these fights. It seemed people thought we were a bunch of crazy folk doing Satanic things. We would not get full protection of the law without being recognized. [Lord Mikael in Scarboro et. al. 1994:29].

Similarly, hunting dog enthusiasts avoid associating themselves with other hunting clubs or organizations that they feel may 'do nothing for their image.' Also, they easily identify special interest groups that cause them grief, such as stronger gun-laws lobbyists, animal welfare activists, and anti-hunting groups. Moreover, they have analyzed their situation and evaluated their ideological and political position in relation to that of their critics. They have determined what it is that outsiders find most objectionable about their activities and have articulated justifications for their activities insofar as it has been possible. For example, although they feel that they cannot defend bloodsport, they argue that in their interactions with nature they are conservationist or 'green,' ethical, and responsible with their firearms, unlike the typical hunter who they condemn with as much vehemence as do "the antis." Hence, they seek to differentiate and 'remove' themselves from the rank and file of hunters.

c - adapting to outsider influence

Groups experiencing outsider influence may adapt by implementing such measures as 'making adjustments,' 'establishing boundaries,' and 'doing public image work' on an empirical level (depending on the nature of their particular situation). However, groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' are highly likely to *change*, to *close*, and / or to *contrive* a more acceptable public image in response to outsider influence. Since both groups studied here

qualify as groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' and since this status is a common or generic condition of all *undiscovered deviant groups*, I am tentatively proposing the inclusion of three generic sub-processes of the generic social process *adapting to outsider influence* in a deliberate effort to describe and explain the actions of such groups. *Changing, closing,* and *contriving* are concepts that emerged from an analysis of the data derived directly from this study. As such, these concepts both 'fit' and have been phrased to 'work' in order to sensitize researchers to the adaptations that may be made by undiscovered deviant groups. While adjusting to outsider influence more generally is a process applicable to all kinds of groups, deviant and conventional, this study presents an opportunity to take account of (acknowledge) and analyze the adaptive strategies of a recognized category of subcultural group that should not be ignored. Although I hesitate to generate sub-processes for fear of falling into the over-classification trap, the ubiquity of this category of subcultural group justifies such an inclusion.

Upon analysis of the position of outsiders, group members are able to take 'new facts' into account in formulating a response. Adapting may occur to a greater or lesser extent, depending upon the group's level of visibility and opportunities to manipulate their level of visibility. That is, once members determine for themselves the implications of the actual and potential activities toward them of outsiders, they adapt in a manner that is consistent with their discoveries and to the extent that it is necessary given their level of visibility and or vulnerability. A group that is already vulnerable may choose to reduce its level of vulnerability by reducing its level of visibility. Conversely, a group unable to reduce its level of visibility may remain or become increasingly vulnerable and may choose to adapt by engaging in such extremes of behaviour as 'war-waging' or 'disbanding.' Similarly the group with the luxury of being already relatively invisible may be able to delay taking direct action, or select adaptive actions that increase its relative invisibility, and as such virtually eliminate---or at least temporarily avoid---direct participation in inter-group relations. In any case, some amount of influence is indeed experienced.

making adjustments: changing

Among subcultural groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant,' making adjustments as a result of inter-group relations would normally amount to making some sort of 'change.' The nature of actual change or accommodation depends on a combination of the group's level of visibility to outsiders / vulnerability or dependency and decisions that members make regarding their choice of direction in terms of openness and public involvement. Change may be more or less sincere it may involve any kind of adjustment imaginable. Whatever the

ultimate action, a conscious decision with regard to possible adjustments (change) is certainly made in taking account of outsider influence.

In terms of both enactment and ongoing operation, undiscovered *deviant* groups must 'adapt' in some manner to their local circumstances in light of the prevailing 'definition of the situation' provided by more influential outsiders. It may be speculated that, since historically the broader subculture of Pagans was able to go underground, actual changes in activity required by outsider influence may not have been made. It is equally possible, however, that there were changes made to their practices during or soon after their historical persecution. That is, perhaps more 'objectionable' practices had been eliminated during times of overt conflict in an effort to offer some sort of concession, that is, to appease the sensibilities of those who might otherwise tolerate them.

It has been argued among folklorists that the "Fam Trads [Family Traditions]," that is, those Wiccans who claim direct genetic lineage from European witches, managed to stay alive prior to the repeal of witchcraft laws by 'changing religions' according to local religious trend while continuing to practice the craft. These are

> ""classical witches" who changed with the times.... In order to stay unpersecuted, they had to use a lot of protective coloration. When Rosicrucian terminology was in, they would train their kids with that terminology. When Theosophy was in, they were Theosophists. When Spiritualism was in, they were spiritualists...' (Bonewitz in Adler 1986:71-2)

A modern witch described her grandmother as follows:

> 'I doubt she would have described herself as a Pagan. She was raised Presbyterian and she remained a devout Christian, but her Christianity was of the peasant variety; it was centered on the Virgin Mary. She got her power from the Tuatha De Danaan. Most people called them the Gentry or the Sidhe or the Shining Ones. And there are many stories about the fairies that are associated with her.' (Sharon Devlin in Adler 1986:137)

Indeed, in many families, Pagan traditions were celebrated *alongside* Christian ones where local tolerance permitted. For example, most Italian families today celebrate Christmas, but many of their children look forward to the days prior to the holiday (usually starting on the 21st of December---Neopagan "Yule"/winter solstice) during which time *la Befana*, a *strega* (witch) leaves them gifts. Change as an adaptation can vary widely in degree and is very much

subject to real or perceived necessity. Moreover, changes may be highly superficial, which clearly demonstrates that these are deliberate efforts at outsider accommodation.

Certain changes to their practices may have been made among Pagans merely as a result of more 'blanket' changes in sensibilities. I wonder how many Pagans today would relish the thought of effecting "foreknowledge and sound memory...[by tearing] out the heart of a hoopoe bird..., pierc[ing] it with a reed, grind[ing] it with honey while the moon rose, and drink[ing] the concoction during seven recitations of the formulae stating [their] desire" (Orion 1995:83)! Hence, to some extent, there are probably a number of ritual practices that may have changed less as a result of antagonistic outsider influences upon the subculture, *per se*, than as a result of more generalized cultural changes (e.g. changes in cultural definitions of the 'cruel,' or 'repulsive').

Nevertheless, there are indeed practical changes in activities that may be made by a given coven to accommodate the host community *on a local level*. For one local group of Wiccans, change is very much situational. In certain situations they may choose to modify their activities in response to the presence of outsiders:

> *Sometimes we 'll make a change, but not always. [Depending on where we are], instead of having circle in the front yard,* we'll *have circle in the back yard and try not to be 'in your face' as much... [002101]*

In the magical community of Ravenwood witches, members consciously took a very different direction with regard to change. This decision was determined in part by the earlier decision to go public with their religion. In this case the changes made to their activities represented a radical break from Wiccan tradition---going out of their way to encourage and attract (although not proselytize) members of the community with various 'outreach strategies.' However, at the local level, *internal* practices remained the same. The adaptation to outsider influence in this case was the continuance of their activities with the incorporation of increased openness and the implementation of activities explicitly geared to establishing positive public relations. Hence the form of social interaction labelled 'change' manifest itself as a conscious or deliberate continuance of activity and increased community involvement.

Changing as a variation on making adjustments in response to outsider influence is a strategy common to groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant.' Changes made to actual practices occur among hunting dog enthusiasts as well as local groups of Neopagans. The direction to be taken as well as the perceived need for change appears to be a function of a group's degree of relative visibility and or vulnerability. Among hunting dog enthusiasts,

changes were not extensive as they are a relatively invisible group. They did, however, accommodate broader social changes in that they ceased to engage in activities that could offend the sensibilities of some members (such as the pigeon shoot). The more significant changes effected among all of these groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' are those made in order to establish boundaries.

establishing boundaries: closing

While the more vulnerable group at risk of being labelled 'deviant' is most likely to close, closure as a type of behaviour on a continuum of establishing boundaries may be manifest as 'less closure'/ 'increasing openness' among groups that are less vulnerable or more willing to defend themselves with direct action. Indeed, closing is always relative to the current state of a group's 'openness.' While one Neopagan group may be already fairly closed, another may be quite open. Thus, as 'content, closing as an adaptive sub-process is highly variable from group to group while the 'form' of establishing boundaries is more generic. That is, while all groups involved in inter-group relations may respond to outsider influence by establishing boundaries, closing (more or less) is more likely to be considered to be an option among groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant.'

In addition to making adjustments, such as changing, Pagans and Neopagans respond to hostile inter-group relations by establishing boundaries, usually closing. "For major episodes in Western history, the resources of the occult tradition have been suppressed and hidden" (Orion 1995:28). It is apparent that closing was an actual response to outsider influence in times of persecution. As for closing being a response to persecution in modern times, I would certainly suspect that since the 1950s revival the degree of openness fluctuates significantly with social trends and the nature of different host communities (as it has with the hunting dog organization). That is, it is likely that these normally very closed groups (as they have been for centuries) may be more public in more tolerant times, but close again very abruptly as conservative forces threaten to expose and destroy them and their members.

> *...I call myself Wiccan. I don't have a problem saying I'm a witch with like-minded people, but I'm not going to go broadcasting that through [the area]—because that would be stupid! It's hard to explain...I don't really think I care that much about what people think of me, but I live in a community and my children have lived here and my husband, and I have a granddaughter, I just don't think there's any reason for me to be burned at the stake! I just don't think that's necessary for me to practice what I believe...[002104]*

...I try to be...very low key and I practice my beliefs in my own space...I try not to be 'in your face' too much, as it may possibly cause some problems with neighbours...we try to be discreet. [002102]

For many Wiccans, secrecy is a burden, for others, it is a delight. Closure provides for opportunities for 'psychic bonding' in modern times, such that Craft members are 'in,' while others are 'out.' Through this binding, each individual gains a sense of...belonging [and this] strengthens the power of the ritual by increasing the group's sense of itself" (Scott 1980:124). As such, the 'in-group/out-group' sensibility encourages the secrecy that has been the movement's protection. While most recognize that there are many situations in which they must manage information for the sake of protecting themselves, there are others who see it additionally as a duty or condition of membership in special society. "[Secrecy] creates a certain elite sense in movement participants who believe they are privy to the secret wisdom kept from the masses of the secular world" (Melton 1992:25). As such, secrecy may be seen as not merely an individual's or local groups' survival strategy in hostile situations, but as a method of 'cultural survival' that enables the tradition to be passed from generation to generation (relatively) uncontaminated. Secrecy is also a natural screening device that (ideally) prevents individuals with 'malevolent spirits' from abusing the formidable powers of the Wicca.

For the Ravenwood coven, the decision to maintain a public presence was heavily context bound. In Atlanta, the coven got away with being radical in a radical side of town. The Boutique of the Unusual opened in Little Five Points, a "bohemian area," "Atlanta's countercultural centre" (Scarboro et. al. 1994:19). And here, the coven engaged in "outreach" publicly offering introductory classes in Wicca (Scarboro et. al. 1994:19). However, when the coven moved to a rural setting in Alabama,

> ..the Witches were careful to conceal their presence from their rural neighbors; they presented themselves simply as some Atlanta people who wanted a retreat, a country place. During rituals, the Witches wore street clothes under their robes and kept picnic hampers handy. In the unlikely event any unexpected visitors should find their way onto the property, the Witches could doff their robes and don the roles of a group of people on an outing. The pavilion had been built 'to look like a picnic pavilion---we had to be ready to look normal in an instant,'... [Scarboro et. al. 1994:38]

In the past several years, some witches have become political activists. This has happened mainly in situations where some local piece of legislation has been found to be discriminatory toward witches. In such cases, and provided that witches have had the ability to mobilize and the courage to subject themselves as individuals to all manner of possible negative repercussions, they have gone public in the name of securing their right to freedom of religion. As the founder of the Ravenwood coven explained in a 1976 interview, "We went public here in Atlanta...to correct the blasphemies done to witches through the ages" (Lady Sintana in Scarboro et. al. 1994:19)

Also, when Anti-Satanists have targeted Wiccans, there have been statements given publicly by the more politically active witches (such as Starhawk) denying that they are Satanists. The recent trend toward 'publicity' is somewhat misleading, however, as it is associated closely with other factors. Often it is the more 'trendy' groups or those embroiled in ongoing conflicts that are actually the more public ones. Generally the more traditional the group the less likely it will expose itself to the outside, simply by definition. This qualification is dealt with in more detail below.

Hence, like the subculture of hunting dog enthusiasts, Neopagans are sensitive to outsider influence, especially as this intensifies or dissipates with broader social trends. While hunting dog enthusiasts existed in a state of relative openness to the public for much of their history, Neopagans have traditionally been highly secretive. As such, establishing boundaries as a response to outsider influence is relative. For many local Neopagans and for the hunting dog club, boundaries became more 'solid' as these vulnerable groups feel a need to literally close. They tend to hide their activities from public view and screen their members carefully. Conversely, the deliberately public Ravenwood coven established more 'fluid' boundaries, by opening to the public. Hence, the Ravenwood coven represents to a certain extent an exception in this regard.

doing public image work: contriving

Contriving is more or less of an issue depending on the context within which a subcultural group is put in position to adapt. While contriving is more an individual and situational matter among members of relatively closed groups, more open groups must devote a considerable amount of their time to contrivances. The local Neopagan group deciding to remain obscure has fewer concerns with contrivances than a hunting dog organization that puts on an exhibit at regional outdoors shows twice a year, and even fewer than does a Neopagan group that has rebelliously decided to go public (and suffer the consequences). Contriving may therefore

range in terms of degree of importance to a group. It may be of no real concern, or it may simply consume the group. It depends entirely on the wider social climate, but some decision with regard to doing image work is definitely made when members are faced with outsider influence.

Consciously contriving a public stance and image, much like leaning toward openness, is generally a characteristic of the less traditional groups of Neopagans. I would speculate that the normal state of affairs (that is, their underground status) mitigates against any perception of a need for traditionalists to contrive a particular stance or image in the face of outsiders. Image work is largely irrelevant for such groups, many of whose members sustain complete secrecy. It is those groups whose members are already in the public eye for some reason and especially for those who are politically active that contrivances become important. These are people who are involved in encounters with outsiders as ambassadors of the subculture on a regular basis. Such is the case of many 'environmentalist,' 'indigenous,' or 'feminist'-pagans. Indeed, in 1986, Adler wrote that the Neopagan religion is often "interwoven with the visionary and artistic tradition, the ecology movement, the feminist movement, and the libertarian tradition" (Adler 1986:6).

It appears that much image manipulation is done by Neopagans as a result of contact with a politically correct subculture. The fairly widespread unity of environmentalism or native traditionalism or feminism and Neopaganism is just as often a marriage of convenience as it is a band-wagon effect. That is, I have heard individuals publicly justify or defend Wicca by mentioning its affinities with trendy issues as often as I have seen trendy people convert to paganism to give an ancient and spiritual edge (or credential) to their pet political cause.

> [Some recommend] that Neopagans align themselves with others who do not necessarily share their spirituality, but who nevertheless share the egalitarian ideal. Pagans should support pro-choice, gay and animal rights, and the rights of the poor and hungry (Orion 1995:237).

Yeah, it can be trendy, like "the religion of the week!" [002107]

There is, in addition, some enlightening image work done by a number of academics and other intellectuals who have generated revisionist histories of Witchcraft. In many cases this has been done in an effort to discredit persecutors (whose views find support in most unsympathetic historical and anthropological texts) and validate as legitimately religious the practices of pagans of modern times. Among such proponents of the religion are Margot Adler (1986) and Loretta Orion (1995). In this instance, image work may be seen as resulting

directly from outsider influence and an example of the "target" taking the role of "tactician" (refer to Prus 1995).

It is difficult to say just which 'objectionable' elements of the subculture are perhaps being painted over with a more acceptable contrived image. From my personal knowledge of Neopaganism, I would expect that for most groups there is nothing truly objectionable to hide. Historically, magic was practiced for purely benevolent reasons. Moreover, proselytization, let alone revolution has never been the mandate of the subculture and therefore, in its purest form, Neopaganism does not harass or upset the social order. It does however, demand that the official social order be enforced to the letter. That is, Neopagans expect to receive equal treatment in a 'pluralistic' North America. Even in less democratic societies, Neopagans are more likely to be a benign or positive political force than a negative one, as they vehemently support cultural and ideological 'pluralism.' Thus, although I have never been privy to the contents of a coven's *Book of Shadows*, I strongly suspect that contriving a positive image is not relevant for groups of traditional Neopagans. They generally prefer not to be public and leave historical revisionism to academics and politically active pagans who are bent on 'setting the record straight.'

It is most often when they are forced to defend themselves against charges of Satanism that most image work is done. Members recognize that a certain kind of Pagan imagery, most notably that which the Christian community has linked to Satanism, is likely to elicit social disapproval among the public. The 'horned god' is one.

> I once saw a Neopagan frown at the sight of "the horned god" depicted on a web site on the Internet. The novice witch exclaimed: *Well that just set us back a few hundred years! Ooh, take that away! They [the public] won't appreciate that! [notes]*

Another image or symbol that may be associated with Satanism is the 'pentacle'(five pointed star). And as long as the occult tradition is associated with the horrifying and frightening images that appear at Hallowe'en (Pagan new year), misconceptions and fear surrounding Witchcraft (as a potential expression of Satanism) are highly unlikely to dissipate.

> *I wear my pentacle all the time...I had one girl say to me last week, "Are you a witch?" and I said, "Well that's your choice of words, but I consider myself Wiccan." That's somebody's expectation: When they see a pentacle, they call me a witch [in the sense of Satanism]... [002105]*

As with the hunting dog organization, members of groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' are keenly aware of precisely what it is that members of the public are upset by. As a result, they try to present themselves in such a manner as to dispel the myths that are the source of antagonisms. Ethical hunters try hard to portray themselves as such. They are conscious of being under public scrutiny and attempt to present themselves to the public as professional, responsible, and respectful proponents of the sport. In the case of a local coven, members imagine how outsiders see them and then work toward shattering the stereotype by presenting aspects of themselves as exemplary ambassadors to rebut the negative stereotype:

> *I think that [I don't have problems with the community] because people know who I am, and...they know I don't sacrifice rabbits or goats, ...I believe that they would listen, I don't think [being questioned] would be antagonistic, I think it would be informative...If you present yourself honestly and people know that you are a good person...and your heart is strong and noble and that you're not killing goats or something or sacrificing children, I mean once people know you, the point is to present yourself as a good person and when people know that, they're not going to try to [cause you grief]... [002104]*

In Georgia, the Ravenwood Witches were very conscious of the importance of positive image work. Fostering good public relations became part of the coven's three pronged strategy to fight for their civil right to freedom of religion (Scarboro et. al. 1994:21). They had interpreted the arrests that they had been subject to as "violations of their religious rights" and decided "that those rights needed defending" (Scarboro et. al. 1994:22). Georgia was allegedly "friendly to freedom of religion" and the coven's founder had been informed that she was allowed to "practice freely" (Scarboro et. al. 1994:22), but the State had turned against them.

Consequently, they worked hard to "establish neighbourly relations in the local community" (Scarboro et. al. 1994:32). They began to fashion a public image of openness and conformity with many mainstream ideals such as 'marriage' by allowing the press to cover a 'handfasting,' a ceremony in which

> ...we're gathered in a ritual [handfasting]...where you pledge one to another [that] you will remain faithful in your love for as long as love lasts (Scarboro et. al. 1994:24).

They also cooperated with a number of mainstream and alternative newspapers in order to "put the coven's activities before the public in a favorable light" (Scarboro et. al. 1994:24).

The goal was to depict the coven in a "nonthreatening, friendly manner" (Scarboro et. al. 23). It was also important to entrench in case law their status as *bona fide* religion,

> For the first time in the United States, a group of Witches [in 1982] had not only opened and maintained a public house, providing information about the Craft, extending an educational outreach to the community, and withstanding hostility and threats, but had argued [successfully] in a court of law that the Craft was a legitimate religious organization (Scarboro et. al. 1994:31).

Hence, contriving an accepted if not entirely acceptable public image is especially important for subcultural groups that are often in the public eye. Part of constructing a more tolerable image includes making positive and recognizable associations. When the public is led to view the group as a variation on common and nonthreatening practices, the 'deviant' label is much less likely to be applied.

It has been demonstrated that the generic social processes associated with Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic are at least potentially trans-situationally or cross-contextually relevant. These 'forms' are indeed applicable to the groups studied, while the 'content' reveals differences, or variations that result from situational contingencies. Through an analysis of the case of local Neopagans it has been found that as local groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant,' they *acknowledge their relationship to outsiders*, *analyze that relationship*, and *adapt to outsider influence* by *changing*, *closing*, and *contriving*.

This study of the inter-group relations of Neopagans is merely given as an exemplar, however. A much more thorough ethnographic study of this group for the purpose of such an analysis would have to be undertaken for these theoretical findings to be conclusive. However, it is my contention that analyses of other groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' ---radical environmentalists, participants in tearoom trade, groups of wealthy/ high profile recreational drug users, even extremist Christian fundamentalists---are likely to yield similar results. That is, they too, may *change*, *close*, and *contrive* since they, too, may be at risk of being labelled 'deviant' in their respective social contexts.

All groups situated within a given subcultural mosaic are equally amenable to such an analysis of their inter-group relations. But the nature (and extent) of outsider *acknowledgment*, *analysis*, and *adaptation* will vary widely depending on an infinite number of factors. The discovered empirical 'content' is likely to be highly diverse, yet the conceptual

'forms' will tend to be generic. Herein lies the rationale for considering empirical evidence for these concepts to occupy a point on one of the three *continua* (of change, closure, or contrivance). Hence, the generic social processes pertaining to Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic are designed to be trans-situational or cross-contextual in their applicability. And furthermore, the generic *sub*-processes of 'making adjustments,' 'establishing boundaries,' and 'doing public image work,' hold true for all groups, including groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' that *change*, *close*, and *contrive*, respectively.

C. Overview of the study

The main **thesis** of this research is that members of a group of hunting dog enthusiasts have become aware of some threat to their organization's existence, especially through first-hand experience of disapproval from and conflict with outsiders (formal organizations, the public); that they have analyzed the nature of this threat and have concluded that is the work of certain "moral entrepreneurs" ("the antis") who are seeking to "label them 'deviant'" ("politically incorrect") (Becker 1963); and that they have acted upon the social changes that are influencing them by evolving subcultural adaptations. The research has thus documented *how* this group's reflectivity has led them to evolve subcultural adaptations in response to a socio-political climate of political correctness. In addition, it was speculated that in some cases, social change may result in the evolution of similar subcultural adaptations (such as *changing*, *closing*, and *contriving*) among other groups in the process of being labelled 'deviant.'

The first chapter offered a **Contextualization** of the research. A brief description of the subject of the research, an individual club of an international versatile hunting dog organization, was given. The research problem to be explored was described as an inquiry into the nature of the influence of social change, specifically the effects of the rise to prominence of the political correctness movement, upon the club. From there, the overall thesis of the study was summarized. A fairly detailed description of the group and its reason for existence was offered as well as an abbreviated history of the development of the organization at large and of the individual club. In addition, the theoretical and methodological perspectives informing the study were briefly noted as they would be elaborated upon in subsequent chapters. It was suggested that the manner in which the group studied has evolved subcultural adaptations to the influence of outsiders may be construed as "trans-situational" or "cross-contextual" "generic social processes" (Prus 1987; 1994; 1996). This potential was indeed demonstrated in the final chapter [**Culmination**] through an application of the generic social processes generated by the study to the case of Neopagans who, like hunting dog enthusiasts, are at risk of being labelled 'deviant.'

The second chapter, **Theoretical Integration,** presented the theoretical foundations which informed the study. The works of Blumer (1969) and Becker (1963) in particular were noted to be the most relevant to the "conflict interactionist" (Hills 1980) approach taken. From there, the group was analyzed as being a subculture within the subcultural mosaic (see Prus, in press) that as a result of the work of "moral entrepreneurs" was being "labelled 'deviant'" (Becker 1963) and consequently, has come to share some of the manners of relating to others exhibited by other deviant subcultures. These included "managing information" (Goffman 1963; Herman 1994), and "repudiating the other and working at self-elevation" (Anspach 1994). In addition, it was found that members of this group were employing several "techniques of neutralization" (Sykes and Matza 1979) in order to resist imputations of deviance. Finally, it was argued that this group's subcultural adaptations (*changing, closing,* and *contriving*) may parallel the various management strategies of other invisible groups suddenly faced with the prospect of being labelled 'politically incorrect.' As such, this particular social process of adapting may be engaged in by all kinds of groups faced with hostile social change. By establishing possible linkages between the theoretical conclusions of these studies and the substantive theory generated by the original research, it was argued that this study contributes substantively to the study of deviance in general, and to labelling theory in particular. Following Prus (1987;1994;1996), it was argued that human group life is more fully understood where the theories generated by case studies are framed as generic social processes. This allows for research findings to have trans-situational or cross-contextual relevance. The chapter concluded with a proposal for a revision of and addendum to the list of generic social processes formulated by Prus. The inclusion of the category of generic social processes, Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic among his categories pertaining to the study of everyday life would contribute to his work on both subcultural mosaics and the issue of power.

In the third Chapter, **Review of Substantive Literature on Deviant Groups**, four ethnographic studies, *the Taxi-Dance Hall* (1969), *Tearoom Trade* (1975), *Doomsday Cult* (1977), and *the Rebels* (1991), were reviewed for their treatment of deviance as the outcome of inter-group relations and the quality of the theoretical development of their empirical findings. The chapter began with a brief introduction to the focus of the review---how it is that four ethnographers (Cressey 1969, Lofland 1977, Humphreys 1975, Wolf 1991) attend to inter-group relations in their studies. Each group's subcultural adaptations were discussed as they were presented (to varying degrees of explicitness) in their respective ethnographic studies. It was found that attention to this aspect of a group's inter-group relations was very uneven across four ethnographies that were *all studies of deviant subcultures*. Throughout this discussion, the group of hunting dog enthusiasts studied was compared to and contrasted

with the subcultures of the taxi-dance hall, the Divine Precepts, the tearoom, and the motorcycle gang. The chapter concluded with a critical review in which each ethnography was evaluated for its mindfulness of inter-group relations, its contributions to our understanding of deviant groups, and the quality of the concepts, typology, or social processes that it generated, especially in terms of their ability to deepen our understanding of human group life in general.

The fourth chapter, **Methodological Implementation** began with a brief explanation of the study's historical development, or how the interest evolved and came to be selected as a topic for study. This was a personal account of my gradual involvement with the hunting fraternity. Before moving into the methodological details of the ethnography (its 'emergent and flexible' research design; 'empathic and immersive' qualitative data collection; 'inductive and ongoing' data analysis; '"grounded" and "generic"' theory generation (refer to Lofland and Lofland 1984, Lincoln and Guba 1985, Taylor and Bogdan 1984, Prus 1987; 1994; 1996)), a discussion of the epistemology of the study was presented. An analysis of the assumptions undergirding the positivist and interpretive/ naturalist approaches revealed that the latter was most attentive to the "negotiated," "activity-based," "relational," "multi-perspectival," "intersubjective," "processual," and "holistic" nature of "human group life" (see Prus 1996).

In the fifth chapter, **Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic**, the research findings were presented in such a way as to emphasize how this study is one of the first empirical tests of the value of the generic social processes model proposed by Prus (1987; 1994; 1996). Here the research findings were organized into three proposed generic social processes. After offering a brief overview and rationale for the application of the generic social processes format, raw quotations from interviews were presented to illustrate the three generic social processes discovered via an ongoing analysis of the data. In the course of Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic, members of this group reported having *acknowledged a relationship to outsiders* that is highly conflictual through both indirect and direct experience. In addition to ordinary evidence available to a wide range of members of the subcultural mosaic, members of this subculture were confronted with the presence of outsiders through protests, face to face challenges, and violence. Their acknowledgment led to an *analysis of outsider perspectives and activities* that began with an identification of the outsider, and progressed to theorizing about the nature of the outsider, and culminated in a critical consideration of the outsider perspective (an acknowledgment of the validity of some of their arguments and the presentation of a set of defensive justifications). In response to the influence of outsiders, members have collectively *adapted to outsider influence* by *changing, closing,* and

contriving. That is, they have *changed* some of their activities and techniques, *closed* themselves off socially and physically from outsiders, and *contrived* a new stance and image in their interactions with the public at large. Without the generic social processes model, the findings of this study may have seemed too esoteric. The generic social processes model emphasizes the necessity of wide-ranging conceptual applicability. As such, the approach facilitated the identification of social processes having the potential for trans-situational or cross-contextual relevance.

D. Critique

i - the ideal situation

With adequate funding and sufficient time, I would have liked to have done some further comparative studies to enhance my research. Comparative analyses can always make valuable contributions to studies of small groups. Ideally, I would have gathered data from two or three *other clubs* of this organization. This would have enabled me to have a broader range of people from a variety of geographic locations and unique clubs to add to my sample. Another improvement to the study would have been a comparison of the experiences of the club studied, within its particular social context, with those of another club in a completely different social context. For example, a comparison could have been made between my group (which operates out of a highly urbanized location in Canada) and another group which operates out of rural middle-America. This would (I believe) strengthen my argument that the club has had to develop subcultural adaptations in response to (hostile) outsider influence. From what I understand of the situation of most American clubs, such a comparison would sharpen the contrast between the inter-group relations of a conventional subculture and a subculture that is being labelled 'deviant.' Yet another comparative study could be made of the group that I studied and a group of non-specialist hunters (e.g. those that do not hunt with dogs, or have formed a club around a special-interest area of hunting, such as bow-hunting). This kind of study would perhaps reveal more dramatically the nature of the hostile outsider influence directed at a more visible and easily stereotyped group and the (perhaps) more drastic measures that such a group might have had to take to avoid outsider influence. A comparative analysis of each group's relative ability to resist outsider influence could add valuable support to my contentions regarding the likely character of a group's subcultural adaptations.

Another area in which my study could be improved is in its variety of data collection techniques. While I maintain that the combination of techniques that I did use (in-depth interviewing and participant observation) was ideal for the kind of study that was produced,

some sort of content analysis of the group's communications might have added another dimension to the study. Although very little is available that is produced by the group itself (e.g. newsletters, correspondence), the communications of the international organization, or even those of similar clubs could be analyzed to provide richer detail and further support for my findings. However, the content analysis can only be done after sufficient research to understand insider meanings is completed. Of course, in this study, the group's communications and those of the international organization, and similar groups were consulted, but they were not analyzed as part of a systematic and 'independent' data collection and data analysis project. Given adequate financial resources, the resultant 'triangulation' of data collection techniques would have been a most interesting addition to the thesis.

Ultimately, however, I am very pleased with what I have been able to produce considering the various limitations with which I was faced. I was fortunate to have been given a pointing dog (as a gift), to have already been a member of the broader subculture of hunters, to have been already equipped with two shotguns and a rifle (on loan), and to have had a half-ton four by four (at the time of the study). Hence I was able to fit into the club and to participate as a full member without great inconvenience or additional expense. I was also very fortunate to have had an excellent group of people to deal with and from which to derive a sample. Most importantly, I think that very few people could have carried out this kind of study. Granted, I am no Daniel Wolf with the courage to study a biker gang, but I am the kind of person that people are comfortable talking to and I am adventurous enough to try anything (almost). Both qualities were highly important for the successful completion of *this* study. I had to be both very personable to be able to maneuver productively through this group of highly sociable people and I had to be sufficiently knowledgeable and 'outdoorsy' to be treated like a credible member---particularly since I am a woman.

ii - my contributions

The most obvious contribution made by this study is to the development of a theory of subcultural adaptation. My theoretical model of subcultural adaptation (*changing, closing,* and *contriving*) attends to the position of targets and their ability to collectively resist outsider influence. The *changing-closing-contriving* strategy is most applicable to groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' who are attempting to resist the label, as well as groups labelled 'deviant' who have been coping with outsiders through various accommodations for a very long time. The kind of strategizing that is conceptualized is especially relevant for groups that may be 'indirect' targets (e.g. deviant by association or due to affinities with those directly labelled 'deviant'), as well as targets who have had to 'build into' their subculture strategies to

cope with outsider influence. The development of an explicit and distinct theory of the process and nature of subcultural adaptation and related predisposing factors is both an original and a valuable contribution to our understanding of how groups adjust to outsiders in the subcultural mosaic.

Another obvious contribution of this study is to the corpus of symbolic interactionist theory, especially as it gives support to the conflict-interactionist perspective. That is, it illustrates the importance of accounting for the impact of power differentials among groups in the subcultural mosaic on the nature and evolution of the groups that we study. As an ethnographic study, it adds to the genre of qualitative/interpretive sociology. This research also lends support and contributes to the further development of the 'grounded theory' approach, as it demonstrates the value of building theories that are *both* grounded and 'generic.' As such, the study makes small but valuable contributions to the various 'alternative' branches of sociology that represent a challenge to the mainstream.

This study also makes the important contribution of attending to the various social patterns associated with "targethood." According to Prus, too many ethnographers fail to consider the roles and perspectives of both tacticians and targets in their analyses. In "Envisioning Power...," Prus highlights the existence of "tacticians" *and* "targets" in an effort to remedy a general neglect of "target roles." He argues that "target roles" have been "understated and understudied" (Prus 1995:17). In contrast, my own work focused from its earliest development on targets and their: "(a) definitions of situations; (b) notions of vulnerability; (c) practices of self-restraint; (d) styles (and tactics) of neutralizing the influence of endeavors they encounter; and (e) capacities to act back on those endeavoring to influence them. As well as: (f) the ways in which targets deal with influence work over time and across situations on either individual, interactive, or collective basis...[and] (g) matters of target enterprise" (Prus 1995:17).

Additional support for attending to power as a social process is also provided by my study. Prus argues that since power is a social process and not a static structure, it is "amenable to a natural history or career analysis" (Prus 1995:12). This is well demonstrated in my own research. I have sought to trace the timing and nature of definitions of situations relating to aspects of influence and control and how it is that group members take these definitions into account as they develop lines of collective action. I have also attended to the practical nature of their anticipated lines of action and the continuous adjustment techniques that they use when relating to others (Prus 1995:12).

This research also contributes significantly to the development of the 'generic social processes approach.' In addition to being an *example* of the generic social processes approach, this study contributes to the development of the approach itself through various proposals and revisions. For example, in this study, a set of categories of the generic social processes of everyday life is proposed. Although it is based in large measure on the ideas of Prus, my generic social processes of everyday life is a more collectivity-oriented listing (while Prus' is more social-psychological and given at the individual level); more economical (fewer in number and more concise); more processual (listed in a manner that reflects the career of the subculture and expressive of members' practical activities); more empirically justifiable (coherent and based on processes that are intrinsic to subcultural existence in contrast to several of Prus' generic social processes which often remain too esoteric, despite his efforts at cross-contextual applicability); more attentive to social order (the subcultural mosaic); and more generic (as they intend to be applicable to the widest variety of subcultural groups). Hence, the study offers a partial test of the viability of Prus' generic social processes and a refinement of his approach.

iii - the next phase

In order to further develop the areas of study touched on in the present research it is important that the generic social processes pertaining to inter-group relations and the sub-processes (*changing, closing, contriving*) of subcultural adaptation be given a number and variety of empirical tests of their applicability for and value to other studies of both conventional and deviant subcultures. Studies of conventional subcultures may be able to employ my theoretical model depending on the nature of the outsider influence that the group is experiencing (e.g. cooperative, competitive, rather than conflictual). Studies that focus on subcultural adaptations of groups at risk of being labelled 'deviant' which employ my model of sub-cultural adaptation *(changing, closing, contriving*) would contribute significantly to the testing and refinement of these generic social processes. It would be interesting for ethnographers to study such subcultural activities at risk of being labelled 'deviant' as sport-fishing, the operation of certain kinds of retrograde (physically and socially 'unsafe') workplaces, the keeping of animals in captivity (i.e. various zoos in disrepute), and the operation of 'environmentally unfriendly' industries. Such studies could test out the applicability of the *changing-closing-contriving* model of subcultural adaptation, as well as the more general *acknowledging-analyzing-adapting* model of Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic.

Additional research studies employing the model of inter-group relations that I have proposed is necessary for a lasting and more refined contribution to be made to the study of both deviant *and* conventional subcultures. While deviant subcultures may be seen as having conflictual and or competitive inter-group relations with outsiders, conventional subcultures may have cooperative inter-group relations with other groups in a given subcultural mosaic. It is important that ethnographers not indicate (even by default) that their group is operating in a social vacuum. Members of even the most remote and inaccessible groups are aware today that there are indeed others 'out there.' This awareness changes everything. It forces comparisons, evaluations, and all manner of interpretations that can influence how collectivities elect to act in response. Granted, some of the most dramatic responses are likely to occur in groups (at risk of being) labelled 'deviant.' Nonetheless, all ethnographic studies, and most certainly those of deviant subcultures, would benefit from the application of the generic social processes pertaining to Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic, as this focuses attention on the subcultural mosaic and undermines the frequently implied assumption that groups operate in a social vacuum. Studies of all manner of subcultural groups are possible tests of the *acknowledging-analyzing-adapting* model. This is because no subcultural group operates in a social void and regardless of how inherently interesting the intra-group features of certain subcultures are, part of the life of the group is somehow bound-up with outsiders whose inevitable influence should be attended to.

The construction of a complete and grounded list of categories of generic social processes to represent fundamental processes intrinsic to subcultural enactment and existence would be the most important contribution other studies of this style could make to interpretive sociology at large. It is desirable for future ethnographic studies of deviant and conventional subcultures to frame their findings as generic social processes with a view to achieving this end. Although the particular interpretive approach that I have taken to this study is admittedly not everyone's cup of tea (even among interpretivist colleagues), I still think that much is to be gained by a development of the findings of ethnographic studies as generic social processes. My attempts at linking the contributions made by other researchers to my own study convinced me further of the necessity for the formulation of social process that are framed and worded in such a manner as to quickly indicate far ranging applicability. That is not to say that researchers have not been able to apply the insights of others to their own studies (obviously, I have managed to do so myself), what is being argued here is that *with a little foresight and will to facilitate the work of others on the part of researchers, theoretical concepts might be 'shared' much more easily* and *frequently by taking a generic social processes approach*.

As one very small substantive study, the present research generates only a cursory and very tentative proposal for such a list of generic social processes that are fundamental to subcultural enactment and operation. The focus of the study offers only a portion of such a list relative to the category of generic social processes, Relating to the Subcultural Mosaic. If the generic social processes approach becomes more widely accepted and other ethnographers employ it to develop their research findings, then it is possible that eventually the individual sets of generic social processes generated by separate studies can be pieced together to create a more complete list of generic social processes of everyday life. Although it is possible for such a list to be 'theorized' into existence, it is preferable that the generic social processes are generated by empirical studies.

E. The future.....?

Since the revision of the first draft of this thesis, there has been a fair bit of "anti" activity. In the latest issue of a regional sporting magazine readers were being kept apprised of the anti-fishing activities of an animal welfare organization; in the local paper it is reported that animal rights and anti-hunting organizations are protesting the fulfillment of a dying child's last wish to hunt a Kodiak bear; and on the Trans-Canada Highway a billboard poster depicting a bear cub announces, "Orphaned. Stop the Spring Bear Hunt." Certainly members of the group studied are not being 'paranoid.' A substantial threat to them and to the sporting fraternity at large exists and appears to be gaining momentum. Once again one is led to wonder what they are going to *do*.

One of the most important points underlined by my research is that social life is indeed an 'ongoing accomplishment.' As such, the role of human agency on the course of history is not to be underestimated. Not only has a cluster of special interest groups been able to lead a moral crusade that has resulted in a fundamental challenge to a powerful establishment, but also, members of a little known subcultural group have evolved a set of subcultural adaptations that have largely kept them out of harm's way.

Upon recognition of a threat to their activities, this subcultural group has demonstrated the capacity to analyze their situation rationally and act reflectively. Moreover, the explanations given for their experience of moral disapproval were varied and astute, in addition to being entirely plausible. For example, they blamed alienation from nature, the anthropomorphization of nature, and urban culture for much of the public opposition. Most impressive, however, is their recognition of the significance of their image and of their own ability to reshape that image for the new era. Hence, barring fatal legislative action, and in

spite of ongoing inter-subcultural hostility, I think their subcultural adaptations may well sustain them into the next century.

F. Concluding Remarks

My interest in this topic originated in my ongoing fascination with the social construction of deviance. In retrospect, I think that examining the assignment of outsider status to 'the establishment,' so to speak, provided me with an opportunity for personal growth.

Over the course of my journey of discovery, I have had to re-examine and reconsider my roles of insider and outsider in relation to this group, not only in a methodological sense, but in a political sense, as well. That is, I have been led to contemplate at various points my place in the real world as a simultaneous member of two conflicting subcultural blocs within the subcultural mosaic. I do not believe that just anyone could have studied this group. I think that I have occupied a privileged position of very well informed marginality, that is, I know both sides of the fence equally well and feel the same amount of commitment to each.

I believe that my knowledge of and support for radical environmentalism, traditional indigenous hunting economies, animal welfare, and vegan vegetarianism allowed me not only to maintain a critical distance from the subject of my research, but also to reconsider my own participation in moral crusades. As I suggested earlier in this volume, I leave the field with my fundamental values intact. However, I am far less inclined to attempt to impose them on others now that I have witnessed the possible effects. The possibility of the end of hunting disturbs me *as much* as veal farming, but the possibility of the end of our noble hunting dog breeds and the loss of traditional survival skills and a sense of dependency upon nature disturbs me *more* than the spectacle of 'bloodsport.' My absolutism on several matters has been entirely eliminated: I am now willing to pay the price of my share in democracy.

> *...We say, "pretty well, the law is there to cater to you* and *me, and if I stick to my side, you stick to your side, you know? Our opinions are our own, and you might not like it, but too bad! Nah-nah-nah-nah nah-nah!" So what else are you going to say...?! [001207]*

SPECIAL RESOURCES

Dogs in Canada Annual Magazine 1996

1995 (Vol. 87 No. 4.) Etobicoke: Apex Publishers and Publicity Ltd., p. 213

GunDog Magazine

December 1994/January 1995 to October/November 1995 (Vol. 14 Nos. 3,4,5; Vol. 15 Nos. 1,2.) Des Moines: The Stover Publishing Company, Inc. FINAL SUBSCRIPTION RENEWAL REQUEST

KEGEL, John

1993-4 "How it all Started," in *Versatile Hunting Dog: a Publication of NAVHDA* (Jan. 1993, Feb. 1993-June 1993; Aug. 1993-Dec. 1993; Feb. 1994; April 1994; June 1994).

LAYTON, David

1994 *German Shorthaired Pointers Today.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, pp. 1-12.

NAVHDA: (Brochure)

NAVHDA: Aims, Programs, Test Rules (1993); (Brochure)

WINTERHELT Sigbot and Edward D. BAILEY

1973 *The Training and Care of the Versatile Hunting Dog.* Puslinch, (Ontario): The North American Versatile Hunting Dog Association, pp. 1-2,105.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

ADLER, Margot

1986 *Drawing Down the Moon: The Resurgence of Paganism in America.* Boston: Beacon Press.

ADLER, Patricia A. & Peter ADLER

1987 "The Past and Future of Ethnography," *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 16 No. 1, (April), pp. 4-24.

1994 *Constructions of Deviance: Social Power, Context, and Interaction.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

ANSPACH, Renee R.

1994 "From Stigma to Identity Politics: Political Activism among the Physically Disabled and Former Mental Patients, " in *Constructions of Deviance: Social Power, Context, and Interaction*, Patricia A. Adler and Peter Adler, eds. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, pp. 350-363.

ARNOLD, David O.

1970 "Subculture Marginality" in *The Sociology of Subcultures*, David O. Arnold, ed., Santa Barbara, California: University of California Press, pp. 81-89.

BABBIE, Earl

1989 *The Practice of Social Research*, 5th ed. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

BECKER, Howard S.

1963 *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. The Free Press of Glencoe.

1970 *Sociological Work*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

BECKER, Howard S. & Blanche GEER

1957/1970 "Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison" in *Qualitative Methodology*, William J. Filstead, ed. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, pp. 133-142.

BECKER, Howard S., Blanche GEER, Everett C. HUGHES, Anselm STRAUSS
1961 *Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

BERG, Bruce L.
1989 *Qualitative Research Methods.* Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

BERGER, Peter L. And Thomas LUCKMANN
1966 *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

BLUMER, Herbert
1931 "Science Without Concepts," *American Journal of Sociology*, 36:515-33.

1969 *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

BULHOF, Ilse N.
1980 *Wilhelm Dilthey: A Hermeneutic Approach to the Study of History and Culture*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

CHAMBERS DICTIONARY
1994 Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers.

CHAMBLISS, William J.
1973 "The Saints and the Roughnecks," *Society*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (November/December), pp. 24-31.

CHARMAZ, Kathy
1983 "The Grounded Theory Method: An Explication and Interpretation" in R. M. Emerson, ed., *Contemporary Field Research.* Boston: Little, Brown, pp. 109-126.

COHEN, Albert K.
1955 *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang.* New York: The Free Press.

1966 *Deviance and Control.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

COLLINS, Randall

1989 "Sociology: Proscience or Antiscience," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 54 (February), pp. 124-139.

COOLEY, Charles Horton

1902/1922 *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Shocken.

1926 "The Roots of Sociological Knowledge," *American Journal of Sociology*, 32:59-79.

1928 "Case Study of Small Institutions as a Method of Research," *American Sociological Review*, 22:123-32.

CORDILIA, Ann

1983 *The Making of an Inmate: Prison as a Way of Life*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.

CRESSEY, Paul G.

1932/1969 *The Taxi-Dance Hall: A Sociological Study in Commercialized Recreation and City Life*. Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith.

DESROCHES, Frederick J.

1990 "Tearoom Trade: A Research Update," *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 39-61.

DEVIN, Rita

1991 *Ideal Types and Ideology: Gender-Relations in Self-Help Books, 1950-1990*, unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Waterloo.

DIETZ, Mary Lorenz

1983 *Killing for Profit: The Social Organization of Felony Homicide*. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

DURKHEIM, Emile

1982 *The Rules of Sociological Method*. New York: The Free Press.

ELLIS, Desmond

1987 *The Wrong Stuff: An Introduction to the Sociological Study of Deviance*. Don Mills: Collier Macmillan Canada.

ELLIS, Desmond and Walter S. DEKESEREDY

1996 *The Wrong Stuff: An Introduction to the Sociological Study of Deviance, 2nd ed.* Scarborough, ON: Allyn & Bacon Canada.

EMERSON, Robert M., ed.

1983 *Contemporary Field Research*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

1987 "Four Ways to Improve the Craft of Fieldwork," *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 16. No. 1, (April), pp. 69-89.

ERIKSON, Kai T.

1962 "Notes on the Sociology of Deviance," *Social Problems*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Spring), pp. 307-314.

1966 *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

ERMARTH, Michael

1978 *Wilhelm Dilthey: The Critique of Historical Reason*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

FILSTEAD, William J., ed.

1970 *Qualitative Methodology*. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.

FITZSIMMONS-LECAVALIER, Patricia & Guy LECAVALIER

1994 "Social Movements and Social Change," in *Sociology*, 5th ed., Robert Hagedorn, ed. Toronto: Harcourt Brace and Company, pp. 537-607.

GARFINKEL, Harold

1967 *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

GEERTZ, Clifford

1983 "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture" in *Contemporary Field Research*, R. M. Emerson, ed. Boston: Little, Brown, pp. 37-59.

GERTH, Hans and C. Wright MILLS

1958 *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

GLASER, Barney G. & Anselm STRAUSS

1967 *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

GOFFMAN, Erving

1959 *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

1961 *Asylums*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

1963 *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1989 "On Fieldwork," *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 18 No. 2, (July), pp. 123-132.

GUSFIELD, Joseph

1963 *Symbolic Crusade*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

HERMAN, Nancy J.

1993/1994 "Return to Sender: Reintegrative Stigma-Management Strategies of Ex-Psychiatric Patients," in *Constructions of Deviance: Social Power, Context, and Interaction*, Patricia A. Adler and Peter Adler, eds. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, pp. 304-323.

HILLS, Stuart L.

1980 *Demystifying Social Deviance*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Inc.

HOOVER, Kenneth R.

1988 *The Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, 2nd ed. U.S.A.: Addison-Wesley Company.

HUMPHREYS, Laud

1970/1975 *Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

JEFFREY, Roger

1979 "Rubbish: Deviant Patients in Casualty Departments," *Sociology of Health and Illness*, Vol. 1 No. 1 (June), pp. 90-107.

KUHN, Thomas

1970 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LASSWELL, Thomas

1965 *Class and Stratum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

LINCOLN, Yvonna S. & Egon G. GUBA

1985 *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

LOFLAND, John

1966/1977 *Doomsday Cult: A Study of Conversion, Proselytization and Maintenance of Faith*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

LOFLAND, John & Lyn H. LOFLAND

1984 *Analyzing Social Settings*, 2nd ed. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

MEAD, George Herbert

1934/1962 *Mind, Self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MELTON, J. Gordon

1992 *Magic, Witchcraft and Paganism in America: A Bibliography*. New York, Garland Publishing Company.

MILLER, David L.

1987 "George Herbert Mead" in *Classical American Philosophy: Essential Readings and Interpretive Essays*, J.J. Stuhr, ed., New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 419-429.

MISHLER, Elliot George

1986 *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

ORION, Loretta

1995 *Never Again the Burning Times: Paganism Revived.* Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.

PFOHL, Stephen

1994 *Images of Deviance and Social Control*, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

PLATT, A.M.

1969 *The Child Savers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

POCKET OXFORD DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH

1974 Oxford: the Clarendon Press.

PRUS, Robert

1987 "Generic Social Processes: Maximizing Conceptual Development in Ethnographic Research," *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 250-293.

1989a *Making Sales: Influence as Interpersonal Accomplishment*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

1989b *Pursuing Customers: An Ethnography of Marketing Activities*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

1990 "The Interpretive Challenge: The Impending Crisis in Sociology," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 355-363.

1994 "Generic Social Processes: Intersubjectivity and Transcontextuality in the Social Sciences" in *Doing Everyday Life: Ethnography as Human Lived Experience*, Mary Lorenz Dietz, Robert Prus, William Shaffir, eds. Toronto: Copp-Clark Longman Ltd., pp. 393-412.

1995 "Envisioning Power as Intersubjective Accomplishment: Acknowledging the Human Enterprise Entailed in Tactician-Target Interchanges," paper presented to the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction, Washington, D.C.

1996 *Symbolic Interaction and Ethnographic Research: Intersubjectivity and the Study of Human Lived Experience*. Albany, New York: State University of New York.

1997 *Subcultural Mosaics and Intersubjective Realities: An Ethnographic Research Agenda for Pragmatizing the Social Sciences*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press. **[Note: page references to this source given in the thesis correspond to the numbering of pages found in the *unpublished* (manuscript) version.]**

PRUS, Robert and Lorne DAWSON

1991 "Shop 'til You Drop: Shopping as Recreational and Laborious Activity," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 16:145-64.

RITZER, George

1988 *Sociological Theory*, 2nd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

ROBBINS, John

1987 *Diet for a New America*. Walpole, New Hampshire: Stillpoint Publishing.

RUBINGTON, Earl

1987 "Theory of Deviant Subcultures," in *Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective*, 5th ed., Earl Rubington & Martin S. Weinberg, eds. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, pp. 203-205.

RUBINGTON, Earl & Martin S. WEINBERG, eds.

1987 *Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective*, 5th ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

SANDERS, Clinton R.

1988/1994 "Marks of Mischief: Becoming and Being Tattooed," in *Constructions of Deviance: Social Power, Context, and Interaction*, Patricia A. Adler and Peter Adler, eds. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, pp. 511-529.

SCARBORO, Allen, Nancy CAMPBELL, and Shirley STAVE

1994 *Living Witchcraft: A Contemporary American Coven.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

SCHUR, Edwin

1971 *Labeling Deviant Behaviour: Its Sociological Implications.* New York: Harper & Row.

SCHUTZ, Alfred

1964 "The Stranger" in *Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory.* Arvid Brodersen, ed. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

SCOTT, Gini Graham

1980 *Cult and Countercult: A Study of a Spiritual Growth Group and a Witchcraft Order.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

SHAFFIR, William B., Robert A. Stebbins, & Allan Turowetz, eds.

1980 *Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

SHARROCK, Wes and Bob ANDERSON

1986 *The Ethnomethodologists.* Chichester, England: Ellis Horwood.

SIMMEL, Georg

1950 *The Sociology of George Simmel*, Kurt H. Wolff, ed. New York: Free Press.

1971 *On Individuality and Social Forms*, Donald N. Levine, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

SIMMONS, J.L.

1964 "On Maintaining Deviant Belief Systems" *Social Problems*, 11 (Winter), pp. 250-256.

1969 *Deviants*. Berkeley, California: The Glendessary Press.

SINGER, Peter

1975 *Animal Liberation*. New York: Avon Books.

SMITH, Dorothy E.

1995 "'Politically Correct': An Ideological Code" in *Beyond Political Correctness: Toward the Inclusive University*, Stephen Richer and Lorna Weir, eds. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 23-47.

SPRADLEY, James P.

1979 *The Ethnographic Interview*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

1980 *Participant Observation*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

STEBBINS, Robert

1971 *Commitment to Deviance: The Nonprofessional Criminal in the Community*. Greenwood: Greenwood Press.

1990 *The Laugh-Makers: Stand-up Comedy as Art, Business, and Lifestyle*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

1992 *Amateurs, Professionals, and Serious Leisure*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

1993 *Career, Culture, and Social Psychology in a Variety Art: The Magician*. Toronto: Irwin.

1996 *The Barbershop Singer: Inside the Social World of a Musical Hobby*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

STODDART, Kenneth

1982 "The Enforcement of Narcotics Violations in a Canadian City: Heroin Users' Perspectives on the Production of Official Statistics," *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 23 No. 4 (October), pp. 425-438.

1991 "It's Easier for the Bulls Now: Official Statistics and Social Change in a Canadian Heroin-Using Community," in *Crime in Canadian Society*, 4th ed., Robert A. Silverman, James J. Teevan, jr., and Vincent F. Sacco, eds. Toronto: Butterworths, pp. 99-107.

SUDNOW, David

1967 *Passing On: The Social Organization of Dying*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

SYKES, Gresham and David MATZA

1957/1979 "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency" in *America Sociological Review*, 22 (6), pp. 664-670.

TAYLOR, Steven J. and Robert BOGDAN

1984 *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

THOMAS, W.I. and Dorothy S. THOMAS

1928 *The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs*. New York: Knopf.

VAN MAANEN, John

1988 *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

VAN ZANDT, David E.

1991 *Living in the Children of God*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

WEBB, Eugene J., Donald T. CAMPBELL, Richard D. SCHWARZ & Lee SECHREST

1966 *Unobtrusive Measures: NonReactive Research in the Social Sciences.* Chicago: Rand-McNally College Publishing Company.

WEINBERG, Martin S.

1976 "The Nudist Management of Respectability" in *Sex Research: Studies from the Kinsey Institute*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., pp. 217-232.

WHYTE, William Foote

1943/1955 *Streetcorner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

WOLF, Daniel

1991 *The Rebels.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.