A.T.M. Wilson, Eric Trist
and Adam Curle

Transitional Communities and Social Reconnection

The Civil Resettlement of British Prisoners of War*

The Prisoner of War Experience and
the Problem of Repatriation

THE BACKGROUND OF THE SCHEME

In the early years of World War II the need of repatriated British Prisoners of War (PsOW) for assistance in readjusting was not urgently manifest, but, as more men returned after escape or were repatriated on medical grounds, the rate of sickness and disciplinary offenses caused anxiety. Officially, PsOW were regarded both as "casualties" and as men awaiting trial by court of inquiry to re-establish their military rights. Though this attitude was largely historical and was weakened by experience of returned men, ambivalence, shown by simultaneous idealizing and scapegoating, remained.

Through the Army the POW returned to his own society. It was the Army that possessed special understanding of his difficulties, just as it had been responsible for his troubles. Among institutions in his home society it was of the Army that he was most suspicious, yet it was on the Army that he was most dependent. Despite a certain opposition to differential treatment, among both military and civilian groups, and also among PsOW themselves (many of whom were determined to deny the existence of their difficulties), it was decided at Cabinet level that the repatriate needed not only special training to

refit him for military duty, but that the Army should itself undertake the first steps toward re-equipping him for civilian life.

This policy sanctioned the development of a scheme based on technical studies. At the beginning of 1945 a pilot Civil Resettlement Unit (CRU) was formed. By the end of that year (PsOW having been repatriated from all theaters of war), there were twenty CRUs operating in different parts of the United Kingdom, each capable of dealing with some 240 men at any one time. These units acted as bridges between the Army and civilian life. They were designed as *transitional communities* to permit change of attitudes which retarded reassumption by the repatriate of a fully participant role in civilian life.

THE NATURE OF DESOCIALIZATION

Unsettlement on repatriation could not be understood solely as a disturbance in the repatriate himself. His family was also affected. On the larger social scale this was reflected in the relations generally between those returning from the services and those who had remained in civilian life. Resettlement was a two-way process, calling for emotional readjustment by all members of the re-formed family and the wider community.

From this wider point of view unsettlement may be regarded as a process of *desocialization*. Desocialization can be defined only in relation to a general concept of society, since it appears differentially related to various components in the total social order, such as *social structure, social roles, social relationships* and *culture*.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

This term covers social forms (economic, kinship, governmental, etc.) which together act as a more or less stable and organized framework within which the basic needs of the individual may be met. Structure is external to the individual—something felt as "out there." The effects of structural breakdown on the individual cannot, however, be traced without additional concepts, for considerable structural breakdown may often be survived with little desocialization, while desocialization may occur apart from structural breakdown.

SOCIAL ROLES

Structure by itself gives no information on the position taken up by the individual within it. A number of such positions are possible, referred to as social roles. While structure is there, it is up to the individual himself whether

he takes an available role. Through failure to take roles he goes out of the social framework in certain directions. *Failure to take roles* may be proposed as one criterion of desocialization.

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

Once roles are taken, social relationships begin to be made. Their course, however, is not determined by the roles which are a condition of their beginning. The structure of his society may initially determine whether or not an individual may take a certain role, but other factors enter with respect to his ability to handle and make good the widening and changing series of relationships, variously personalized and intimate, in which he is involved if his participation and satisfaction are to continue. *Failure to sustain social relationships* provides a second criterion of desocialization.

CULTURE

Culture represents the means, however imperfect, at the disposal of the individual for handling his relationships. On it he depends for making his way among, and with, other members and groups belonging to his society. The central thesis of this paper is that *it is the internal assimilation of culture that is primarily disturbed in the process of desocialization.* This gives the third criterion to which the other two may be related.

An inquiry into desocialization, therefore, implies an assessment of the level at which an individual possesses internal assimilation of his culture. So far as he has reached a state of cultural dispossession, the breaking of relationships and the refusal of roles have serious consequences, for he now lacks the resources to make the restorations necessary and the resilience to resume abandoned activities. The process will now be traced which induced desocialization in repatriated PsOW, despite the degree of structural equilibrium in post-war Britain.

THE COURSE OF DESOCIALIZATION IN THE REPATRIATE AND HIS FAMILY

At first, while serving in his home country, the soldier carried over into the Army a good deal of his former civilian being. Nevertheless, it was a common observation by servicemen that they soon found it difficult to take an effective part in their family affairs.

When the soldier was drafted overseas he had to make a second adjustment.

As he neared the combat zone, the in-group solidarity of his unit insulated him from his old life. Whether or not a man had traumatic battle experiences, emotional disturbances were commonly associated with capture. The feeling of guilt over "allowing" oneself to be taken and of rejection from the fact that the Army had "allowed" it made capture a painful experience. Life in a POW camp entailed a third adjustment—to the condition of being rendered useless, though something of the soldier's role could be maintained by engaging in a morale battle with the prison authorities. Men learned to lead a double life of surface compliance and concealed activity.

On return, after a period of leave, most repatriates spent some months in the Army before release. This had a protective effect and the full impact of desocialization was only felt when they re-entered civilian life. On demobilization men found themselves lost and out of place, separated by a gulf of experience impossible to share and by a sense of guilt related in part, and however irrationally, to the fact of having left home. When a husband or father goes away, he takes not only himself but those activities that have become part and parcel of everyday life. In his family, readjustment takes place toward the altered situation. When the absent member returns, a disequilibrium is caused comparable with that created by his departure. Outside the family, his associates had similar difficulty in accepting the repatriate into the milieu they had established without him. Such experiences led many men to feel that their rejection had been callously prepared.

Often, however, the gain in maturity was very great. One difficulty of many was how to use their maturity in a society they felt they had outgrown. The consequent isolation was as painful as the isolation of captivity.

Stress tended to pile up between the second and fourth months. If this period could be weathered, a man was set toward resocialization. If it went badly, satisfactory adjustment often posed formidable problems. The policy of the CRU was to reach men at a point when they had begun to feel the force of their difficulties—and so be willing to seek help—but before they were overtaken by the crisis of their desocialization.

THE SEARCH FOR SANCTION OF POW EXPERIENCE

After the initial shock of capture many men regressed to quasi-psychotic states, but the majority gradually became aware of the existence and power of various supranational organizations governed by the Geneva Convention on PsOW, and the International Red Cross. They also learned the extent to which their survival as individuals depended on their success as a group in keeping some kind of society alive in their midst. The European prison camp situation may be summarized as follows:

- Separation of officers and other ranks (noncommissioned officers and privates) under the Geneva Convention created the need for an alternative leadership from below. This centered in an elected "man of confidence" who represented the group to the Protecting Power.
- The removal of material weapons meant that alternative weapons had to be forged with cultural resources, since the fight had to go on and the degree of capture held as low as possible.
- The two points above had effects which reinforced each other so that a strong democratic culture developed with the double function of preserving the group and waging war.
- The prison camp emerged as a society of "creative casualties" in whom a deep revaluation and skilled utilization of certain components in their culture had occurred; but in whom, because of the severity of the trauma and the limitations of the situation, a partial mastery of their experience was alone possible.
- The democratic society of prison camps was largely self-sanctioning. It recognized no societal "parent," except the para-medical maternal authority of the Geneva Convention and the International Red Cross.

The repatriate was in a state which led him to search for consistent sanction for the values of his prison-camp experience in the culture of the controlling societal authorities of his home society. If he did not find such sanction there remained such painful reactions as:

- Regression once more to the isolated existence of early captivity. A man would live as a passive prisoner of his own society. Men were found who had not left their houses for weeks.
- Renewal of his cultural war in a particularly embittered form—against his own society, now regarded as the enemy. He would tend to align himself with malcontent minorities.
- Alternatively, he might seek revenge by taking up a role based on unrecognized identification with his late captors, whom he would outdo in authoritarianism (and even brutality).
- He could attempt to escape from his problem by emigration.
- He might be forced to accept the role of a psychiatric casualty.

All these reactions must be thought of as techniques of living, not so much mutually exclusive as coexisting or alternating in any individual man. The first four are based on aggression. It is only in the last that there remains any conviction of success in the search for sanction from the home society. But the repatriate was an unlikely person to declare himself as a psychiatric patient. Yet his own illness remained a fact whose denial whether by himself or others had

serious consequences. Early follow-up studies showed that only a minority of repatriation states were self-adjusting. A special scheme was necessary but had to be built up in a wider para-medical setting.

The Character of the Transitional Community

PRINCIPLES AND POLICY

To meet the situation described it was necessary to secure acceptance of the principle that participation cannot be imposed. Military authority had either to take no action or to sanction the development of a permissive community within the Army. This meant offering a voluntary scheme and reversing a number of rules and regulations.

By conferring the right to volunteer for a CRU the Army gave evidence of its willingness to accept the negative feelings of the repatriate (who could reject the offer), and also of its evaluation of his worth and its trust in him (by risking a considerable investment in a scheme which only a few might utilize). By abrogating its authority over him it recognized its responsibility toward him. The method of gaining his trust was to take *informed social action*.

To volunteer implied for the repatriate the acceptance of a role which opened up relationships in a community whose culture was fashioned in terms of his own values and whose existence was itself proof of their compatibility with the home society. His shattered sense of security, mistrust, and need for consistency made him a "connoisseur in sincerity" and adept at looking for snags. He could accept only a community where acceptance of his values was consistent.

The production of this self-consistent participant community did not in the first place depend on action taken within the Civil Resettlement organization, but on decisions made—and maintained—by the controlling War Office branches of all sections of the Army, and also by civil ministries and organizations, both industrial and social. It was from widespread discussions on implementing these decisions that the intergroup relations between the repatriate and the home community were clarified.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHEME

It was postulated that if the scheme was planned with the participation of repatriates no difficulty would arise in obtaining volunteers. Over-all, 40,000 to 50,000 men attended CRUs. Contact with as many more was made latterly, on a day basis, through the Extension Scheme.

A survey of the regional distribution of the homes of PsOW permitted the scheme to develop so that men could attend a CRU in their own part of the

country, units being located on the boundaries of industrial areas to provide contact with social and industrial life. The staff had to bear the stress of an unfamiliar para-military and para-medical community and were specially selected. In training, they received, first, opportunities of contact with repatriates, then group discussions on repatriation problems and finally a brief apprenticeship at a working unit. The pilot unit was administered under medical and social-science auspices. In working units, administrative control reverted to regimental authorities advised by psychiatrists and psychologists. New units budded off from old.

The initial task of a new CRU was to make contact with the Ministry of Labour, through which groups of guests representing various industries and trades were invited to the empty unit, an explanation of the scheme made and suggestions received as to how repatriates could make informal contact with those on the job. A developed CRU was in touch with 200 to 400 firms and social institutions willing to allow visits by repatriates.

The Staff and Organization of a CRU

The officer staff consisted of a commanding officer, second-in-command and nine officers for casework—four "syndicate" officers and five specialists. A syndicate was a man's living group and each syndicate officer was parent to 60 men—four sections of 15 from successive weekly intakes of 60 to the whole CRU. This staggered intake allowed each syndicate to contain old as well as new members.

Specialists ran "practices." All attendances were voluntary. With a monthly turnover of over 200, units with a disproportionate load of disabled required two medical officers. Two units had a resident psychiatrist; in others he was part time. A vocational officer and sergeants helped men to evaluate, on a reality basis, long-cherished vocational plans and fantasies. A Ministry of Labour officer facilitated practical openings. The technical officer provided, through workshops, an opportunity to rebuild confidence. The women social workers—known as Civil Liaison Officers—were psychiatric social workers. Matrimonial problems made up two thirds of social case work in returned service people and were abundant at CRUs.

Clerical and domestic arrangements were standard for a static military establishment, but the scale of accommodation was that provided for the ATS (the women's branch of the Army). It included, for the whole unit, beds and sheets as opposed to boards and blankets. The proportion of permanent staff was high—the seriousness of resettlement was indicated by allowing repatriates to be fully occupied in learning about civil life. One hundred of the other

rank staff (NCOs and privates) of 140 were women (ATS) who enabled the CRU to develop the mores of a mixed community.

Men with experience of starvation placed a high value on food and the conditions of eating. Meals were served at pleasantly arranged tables by ATS, midday dinner being taken in a common dining room by all ranks and by repatriates and staff alike. This event symbolized CRU "democracy," while common sharing in the scale of accommodation eliminated trouble between repatriates and other rank staff and assisted them to discover a common identity as potential civilians.

THE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

Length of stay averaged four to five weeks. Except for terminal interviews, a man was not ordered to see anyone. He passed through four phases: learning about and testing out the unit; establishing himself within it; orienting himself to the surrounding industrial and social community; making and reality-testing personal plans. These phases may be summarized as neutralization of the suspicion of authority; return to a less regressed social attitude with role-taking in the safety of the unit and assimilation of its culture; a more general movement toward a reconnected relationship with the home society; the structuring of personal goals. The program was sequenced accordingly—reception phase, settling-in phase, orientation phase, planning phase—and the balance of spontaneity and control altered to throw the repatriate more and more onto himself. The gradient was steep so that the anxieties aroused could be dealt with during the program month that made up the standard CRU course. In content, scope, sequence and duration this standard was intended to act as an over-all interpretation of the nature and dimensions of the resettlement task and to indicate a norm in terms of which men could gauge their progress. (Provision was made for lengthening stay up to three months.)

Special care was necessary over the reception phase (Thursday afternoon to Saturday midday). The socialized adult usually belongs to a family group, a work group and an informal group of leisure-time friends. It was postulated that if repatriates could be inducted—as rapidly as possible—into prototypes of these three groups, *on a basis of personal choice*, they would be securely positioned in the unit.

On the first day the unit took little initiative while giving the repatriate full scope to find out about it. After an arrival meal, men were conducted to a dormitory to choose their beds, then left free to hear what those already there thought. On the second day the unit took more initiative. After an introductory talk by the commanding officer, the 60 new arrivals were taken around the unit

in informal groups, briefly introduced to key resettlement staff, then invited to redivide themselves, for syndicate allocation, into four sections of 15. A man at once experienced the value of his syndicate in a group discussion with his syndicate officer, with whom he also had a personal interview. During the afternoon he attended a first workshop session. By the evening he had usually found friends. On the Saturday morning he selected civilian clothes, which he wore home, weekends being spent at home to avoid damage to new social roots in the home environment and to keep alive questions related to future planning.

During their first full week (apart from a visit to an employment exchange and to one factory) men were occupied inside the unit, attending workshops and informational discussions. They took part in a social life which included dances, attended by civilians, particularly girls from the neighborhood, who did much to diminish exaggerated fears of women. By the second week they were visiting factories, shops, training centers and social organizations in small self-chosen groups. During the third and fourth weeks assignments became more individual. Men undertook job rehearsals, spending several days acquiring the feel of a job—without the burden of responsibility. Personal problems were discussed with the specialist staff, vocational anxieties usually being brought out before those concerned with family relations. Many of these latter anxieties first appeared in the guise of job problems. As CRUs matured they passed generally from being employment dominant to becoming family dominant, and wives and families were more fully brought into activities and discussions.

THE INTERACTION OF ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION

The many-sided activities and the frequent contact with civil life stimulated the need to talk, while the syndicate and other groups provided the occasion. In this way the activities of individuals led to a therapeutic discussion of their significance, and the process of acting out or testing out plans was linked to that of evaluating and assimilating their significance—the process of working through. The raised insight and changed feelings led to further activity—but at a higher social level, e.g., group projects through which the repatriates attempted to express altruistic needs often freed up as they resolved individual problems. A kind of circulation came into existence—from action to understanding and back again to action—which gathered in spontaneity and extent as the community matured.

This circulation made it easier than might be expected to impart CRU technique to a wide variety of people. Social sharing and diffusion of insights are implicit in any group technique, for different kinds of people come into the group. Group techniques represent a change in the means of production of

insight, establishing an exchange that permits circulation in an open and public, as distinct from a closed and professional, market. The simpler discussions of the syndicate officer and the more sophisticated discussions of the vocational officer or social worker were events in the same series to which the group session of the psychiatrist belonged. The power of the series was raised as various specialists learned to work together as a team (which had its own discussions).

Reducing the "Fear of Freedom"

Central were difficulties over authority. The development of a morale-based self-discipline was the basic prescription of treatment. Absence of formal discipline caused severe anxiety both to PsOW and to unit staff. Of special importance were the interviews and discussions through which this fear of freedom was reduced.

Some weeks after the first CRU opened, a group of 15 men refused to cooperate, using the CRU as an easy-going hotel. Two or three were flagrantly antisocial and in trouble with the civilian population and the police. All exhibited psychosomatic symptoms and depressive trends. The administrative staff had come to the end of their tether; expulsion was their only solution. The presence of the psychiatrist also created anxiety. In consequence, he and his patients were isolated in a consulting room in a remote part of the building. The remainder of the community felt that they had rid themselves of a doubly dangerous group, and that the delinquents could be conveniently removed by the psychiatrist, via a hospital or, if they refused treatment, by his taking the responsibility of recommending termination of their stay.

For the CRU so to rid itself of its troubles would have been fatal. The first duty of the psychiatrist was toward the staff, his first efforts to impress them with the necessity to keep these disturbing elements within the CRU. Manipulation of the neurotic "attack" on the community was outside the scope of the executive. His second function was to tackle and, if possible, to canalize the neurotic force. This was undertaken by group discussions.

The topic thrown up in these discussions was the failure of the unit to provide discipline; without the discipline of authority there could be no punishment, and without punishment nobody knew where he was. Could they go on behaving in the way they were doing? If they did, would not authority take action? Authority in the person of the psychiatrist assured them that, so far as the CRU was concerned, no action would be taken; but that outside bodies, such as the War Office or the civil authorities, were less inclined to such tolerance, and their behavior might so seriously reflect on the scheme as to bring it to a close. Also there were 385 other people in the CRU who would

assert their authority should they be affected adversely. They were up against not the authority of the executive but the wishes of the CRU as a group. A general meeting would be held and a vote taken on their conduct. This approach proved effective. After one memorable and stormy meeting in which this whole situation was made quite clear there was silence. Then, one by one, each gave an assurance that no further trouble would be experienced.

Needless to say, what was going on between the psychiatrist and the neurotic group was being closely watched by the rest of the CRU. The outcome was to decide the future pattern of unit government. Should the neurotic triumph, chaos would result with subsequent dissolution of the resettlement unit; if the neurotic was expelled, authoritarianism would supplant the demo-cratic atmosphere essential to the scheme. The recognition by the neurotic element of the effect they were producing on the rest solved the immediate problem. Their altered attitude became reflected in the unit as a whole, which was now not only tolerant of the "bad boys" but also took up a rather protective attitude, removing them from public places if drunk and so shielding them and the unit from the outside world.

Practically no further difficulty was experienced in disciplinary matters after this showdown; nor did one arise later with similar intensity at any other CRU subsequently opened. The solution of this single psychiatric event influenced the growth of the whole scheme. The psychiatrist emerged from his confine-ment into the general life of the community. The increasing rate of the demand for his help was shown by the following figures: during the first month about 5 percent repatriates were seen, all referred through a medical or other officer; whereas in the third and fourth months some 60 percent were spontaneously seeking advice.

A Follow-Up Appraisal

METHOD

In one area, chosen in accordance with carefully determined criteria, compara-ble samples of 50 repatriated PsOW who had, and 100 who had not, been to CRUs were studied in relation to a control group of 40 families from the same area. These represented the civilian norm at the socio-economic levels at which the repatriated groups were settling down some months after demobilization.

The investigator saw most men several times in different settings: (1) *Alone*. Covering at least an hour, often much longer. (2) *At work*. The managements of several factories provided facilities for men to be seen in working hours, a type of contact most effective when it combined a private interview with the man with a subsequent more general discussion involving management, staff, fel-

low workers and others. (3) *With his family.* These contacts frequently took place over a cup of tea, and were invaluable in demonstrating the whole family situation, including the wife's reactions to the husband's condition. (4) *In group discussion.* The investigator often had other discussions in addition to those listed above. These were sometimes arranged but sometimes grew spontaneously out of meetings in the home or the works. Family members, fellow workers, other PsOW and neighbors took part.

The role adopted by the investigator was that of a supplementary extension officer of the CRU organization—that is, an officer concerned with aftercare, and with extending CRU facilities to non-volunteers, or to men who had canceled their applications. His initial approach—that he had come to see if there was anything he could do—quickly dispelled the apprehension of men or their wives at meeting an officer who obviously knew something about them. This view was supported by the greater difficulty experienced in establishing relations with the control group.

Actual elicitation of information was through observation and discussion, rather than through direct questioning. With the CRU samples, one stage was an explanation of the purpose of follow-up, which involved a modification of the investigator's role as initially described. This was important for two reasons. First, in his follow-up role, he moved out of the part of a counselor who might raise dependency hopes which could not be fulfilled. Second, there was a therapeutic gain in giving men, through the assistance they provided by their information, a chance to participate still further in an experiment which had helped them.

All men were seen at approximately the same juncture of their lives as reestablished civilians.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA FOR NORMS OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Sherif (1936) writes of social norms as follows: "Social norms arise from actual life situations as a consequence of the contact of people with one another. . . . But once formed, they tend to persist. Many times they outlive their usefulness." In the samples under discussion norms had rather neutral prestige value and were described as "all right"; "just ordinary"; "nothing special"; "quite respectable."

Besides the norms, certain forms of deviant behavior were observed. In the first, roles are rejected: the husband deserts his wife; or the worker leaves his job and makes no effort to get a new one. In terms of the norm, this behavior lacks prestige. The man concerned is judged as either "sick" or "wicked."

A second type of deviation occurs when a man accepts the roles, but cannot use the culture to manage the relationship: he gives his wife housekeeping money, but never goes out with her or helps her in the home; he works, but

without loyalty or friendliness to employers and fellow workers. Such a role has great persistence, but behavior of this kind is inadequate to any emergency in which flexibility is required. Sometimes judgments about these men are more harsh than about those in the first category, since an element of pity often enters into references to a man whose domestic or social life is completely disintegrating.

A third type of deviation was *positively* assessed and appears to represent congruence of individual development with the realities of social situations. In this third deviation the patterns are the good husband and neighbor; the man who has a certain capacity for leadership; the men who are loyal employees, but prepared to take positive action if their principles are outraged. In such people the approach to situations is flexible, and less governed by stereotypes. This type of deviance, above the norm, appears to represent the cultural aspiration level of the norm itself.

In the norm, certain features of behavior imply anxiety, typified by the erection of barriers which restrict the mobility of human relationships. Many of these barriers take the form of culture stereotypes: that men do not push the pram, that they do not take their wives to football matches. But there is no derogatory evaluation of those who do.

If the norm and the three deviations are scaled by standards of social participation, they occur in the following ascending order: first deviation (roles rejected); second deviation (roles accepted, inability to use culture); norm; third deviation (behavior at cultural aspiration level of norm). These findings are consistent with the concept of desocialization. There follows an analysis of behavior which illustrates the application of this scale. The sequence of these illustrations corresponds with the arrangement of the different regions of the life space of the individual. These are ordered to radiate out from family relationships through neighborhood and work groups to the more abstract relationships with authority.

For convenience, the two infranorm deviants, the norm and the supranorm deviant are named grades on a four-point scale, and appear in the later tabulations as *Grade* 1 (first infranorm deviant); *Grade* 2 (second infranorm deviant); *Grade* 3 (norm); and *Grade* 4 (supranorm deviant). In some of the statistical tables these grades are used as scores and treated as equal class intervals.

FINDINGS

1. The first step was to determine whether the criteria of social participation could be regarded as valid indications of the degree of resettlement. Two other criteria were available. The first may be called a psychiatric criterion—con-

cerned with the presence or absence of signs of unsettlement (apathy, restlessness, hostility, extreme dependence, etc.) generally acknowledged in CRU practice. It was a direct over-all assessment by the investigator, unrelated to specific patterns of overt behavior in specific roles or relationships. The second was an over-all opinion of relatives, neighbors, friends, and employers, questioned to assess the local reputation of each man. Both the "psychiatric" and the reputational ratings of "settled"—"unsettled," and "all right"—"not all right," were compared with the social participation ratings. There was a definitely significant relation between both ratings and all fifteen criteria.

2. The mean score of an individual in his performance over all his social relationship criteria may be regarded as indicative of his position on a degree of resettlement continuum. Comparison of the more settled (mean criteria score 3 or above) with the less settled (mean criteria score below 3) shows a significant relationship between degree of settlement and CRU attendance ($p \leq .01$). Similar calculations using the psychiatric and reputational ratings also show a definitely significant relationship ($p \leq .01$ in both cases).

3. The CRU and non-CRU samples were now compared on each of the social criteria. On all fifteen, incidence of below norm scores was greater in the non-CRU group, seven of the differences being of definite, and three of borderline significance ($p \leq .05$). As regards scores above the norm, on six criteria the CRU was superior to the control group. The trend was in the same direction elsewhere. In relation to the norm, Table 3 (*a*) represents the pattern of negative deviance, (*b*) the pattern of positive deviance. Only to a limited extent are the directions of significant gain those of significant loss. The negative pattern points to a state of desocialization in which, though a man still exists in the framework of society, he lives only in his home. The positive pattern indicates that resocialization was associated with supranormative use of the culture in the bridge regions, with corresponding improvements in husband-wife relations and a more responsible attitude at work. The relation of Table 3 (*a*) to Table 3 (*b*) points to a main fact: the overcoming of negative deviance entailed the appearance of positive deviance—that is, the therapy of desocialization did not consist merely in the restatement of the norm, but in some degree the actualization of supranormative potentialities—the pattern of resocialization was not that of desocialization in reverse.

4. In respect to individual performance (as opposed to total scores with regard to each criterion), Table 4 (*a*) shows that there is a significantly larger number of low scores in the non-CRU sample ($p < .01$ for *t* on group means). In Table 4 (*b*) there is a significantly higher proportion of norm scores ($p \leq .01$) in the control group.

In Table 4 (*c*) the poverty of supranorm behavior in both the control group and the non-CRU group are shown. In fact, there is a significantly greater

TABLE I   Fifteen Criteria of Social Participation

General definition	Norm (Grade 3)	Supranorm (Grade 4)	Infranorm (Grade 2)	Infranorm (Grade 1)
1. *Husband-wife, domestic work.* Rigidity of role-differentiation, amount and character of husband's contribution in all relationships between husband and wife in the sphere of domestic economy.	Husband helps about the house; may help with the dishes, though it depends on whim or special need; is responsible for business affairs, often making major decisions such as changing address—i.e., getting a new house or apartment and making decision to move to same. Decorating and carpentry are his, but he refuses to help with tasks like bedmaking.	Greater cooperation, interchange of jobs wherever desirable. Combining of forces is characteristic, e.g., the investigator would find a couple together decorating a room.	Practically no common roles. The slightest encroachment on the man's role causes domestic upheaval.	Complete failure to accept husband responsibilities, without misconduct on wife's part: separation, desertion or extreme domestic violence.
2. *Husband-wife, leisure pursuits.* Degree of participation between husband and wife in activities beyond those of breadwinning and household management, both inside and outside the home.	Husband dutifully spends at least five evenings at home with wife, but does not cooperate in leisure activity, though a weekly visit together to the cinema is a ritual.	Considerable sharing of interests, both within and outside the home. If one partner does not actively engage in the concerns of the other, he will encourage them.	The husband frequently goes out without his wife, though not for anything in particular. Scorn for the interests of the other, but sometimes subordination to the wife's, the husband tagging along.	Never together. Ignoring or sabotaging each other's activities.
3. *Father-child, play and encouragement.* Nurturant relationship of father with children with respect to	Man does something with or for his children most evenings after work, especially the young ones, up to ages 5–7. After that	Constructive interest as well as affection. Readiness to help children, even in the face of their	Children ignored, irritation shown. Relief when they go out to play. Much time sometimes	Absence of, or withdrawal from, relations with children, or a consistently hostile attitude

play, school, hobbies, achievements, ambitions, etc.; his degree of concern with and approval of these various activities.	little time spent on those who do not follow some paternal preconceived idea.	own disapproval. They are brought into most family activities.	spent, offset by uncertainty of mood. Emulation demanded. The slightest lapse brings discord.	toward them.
4. *Father-child, authority and discipline.* Methods and consistency of the discipline imposed by father on his children; extent to which he accepts responsibility as representative of authority.	Father has a clear idea of what he wants his children to be like (rather like himself but with a better education). Threats and shouts employed more than beating, but every few days outburst accompanied by indiscriminate cuffs, for little reason apart from accumulated irritation.	Tries to see the children's point of view, slow to punish, but has some standard, relatively unconcerned with his own personal whims and prestige, which he enforces, usually by reprimand, with a fair degree of consistency.	Fixed ideas about upbringing, uninfluenced by experience of his children. Otherwise little consistency, the same action being punished one day and laughed at the next. A common punishment is locking children up.	Neglect, or persecution. Unprovoked violence may be shown and/or children allowed to run wild.
5. *Ritual in the home.* Interactions between the individual—whether married or not—and other members of his household, which affect his own status and privileges; extent to which prestige has become a function of maintaining personal idiosyncrasies and stereotypes as rituals in the household group.	Has three or four fads to which the whole family must conform. If not, a noisy row, which does not last long. Male prestige is carefully guarded by both husband and wife, even if the latter is dominant.	Lack of ceremony, coupled with toleration of unusual behavior. Likes and dislikes, the expression of which is tempered by the exigencies of the moment, replace rigid rituals of propriety. No high value set on prestige.	Dependence on things being "just so." The slightest deviation produces a domestic crisis. Prestige at a premium which increases with the decline of effectively exercised authority. In a minority of cases the man will accept almost any treatment.	Idiosyncrasies are divorced from any relationship with the everyday domestic round.

TABLE I   *Continued*

General definition	Norm (Grade 3)	Supranorm (Grade 4)	Infranorm (Grade 2)	Infranorm (Grade 1)
6. *Quarreling in the home.* The ways in which hostilities are expressed and dealt with in the household group: frequency and duration of quarrels, degree of their violence, extent of their repercussions, methods used to adjust differences of opinion and restore situations.	"Words with the wife" every week or two about some matter, tacitly accepted as a harmless, but long-standing difference of opinion. He gets over it by going to the pub, the garden, or keeping quiet. These rows spread through the household, but blow over in a couple of hours without need for reconciliation.	Quarrels, sulks or glooms replaced by acrimonious discussion of differences, so that rows are not only nipped in the bud, but subjects which have been a chronic cause of argument become settled once and for all. Such real rows as occur are usually excusable, concerning, for example, neglectful conduct toward children.	Quarrels more frequent, often last overnight. They are made up overemotionally, or smoulder only to blaze up again; upset most other relationships of the individual concerned. The husband may leave the house for days, or refuse to speak to his wife. Children and other members of the family usually implicated.	No restraint over quarreling. Quarrels of indefinite duration and may be so violent that the home is left.
7. *Staying home and going out.* Balance of time spent in and out of the house, degree of purposiveness in outside as compared with inside activities, extent to which other members of the household are taken along, or those outside are brought back, i.e., degree of interconnection between home relationships and other regions of social contacts—	One or two nights a week spent in a public house or club, with occasional outings for such purposes as tax-payers' meetings. Considerable reliance on home patterns; most men put out if compelled to spend more time than usual away from home. Time away usually spent in some form of "male" activity. Few people invited in.	More going about, usually with wife, who is inducted into many more types of social contact. A variety of people come in. More entertaining.	Either more time spent away, especially at places where the wife could also come (with overspending or drunkenness), or refusal to go out, especially to places where old acquaintances might be met. When the wife goes out, the man will stay indoors however unpleasant the circumstances.	Going off for spells alone, periods of desertion lasting anything over two days. Alternatively the man never moves out of the house for weeks or even months, though nonparticipant and alone in the home.

the unmarried naturally away more. Cf. time spent in organized group activities, Criterion 14.

8. *Parents and relatives.* Relationships of married men with their parents and in-laws, and of unmarried men living away from home, with their parents. Degree of active participation outside the home, with various members of the home family group, and type of interaction existing with other close relatives (married brothers and sisters, aunts, etc.) living in the vicinity.	(*a*) For unmarried men living away from home, and married men. Periodical duty visits, often arranged, not spontaneous. Fairly strong sense of responsibility manifested by material assistance in times of stress. Relationships to some extent joking relationships, badinage covering up mutual emotional shyness. Visits by relatives not encouraged, save on special occasions, such as birthdays. (*b*) For unmarried men living with parents, as for Criterion 7.	(*a*) Greater inclusion of parents, etc., in various activities; a good deal of coming and going between the various homes. This is two-way, invitations are not needed. (*b*) As for Criterion 7.	(*a*) Lack of visits. In a few cases dependence on relatives, especially the mother. Continual visits to parents' home without wife, but no participatory activity linking the two homes. (*b*) As for Criterion 7.	(*a*) Complete break with parental family. More rarely, abandonment of marital family in favor of a permanent return to the parental roof. (*b*) As for Criterion 7.
9. *Neighbors and neighborhood.* Relationships established by geographical propinquity; extent to which a man tolerates and makes constructive use of the fact that his household inevitably exists in a context of other households.	On "dropping-in" terms with at least three immediate neighbors, says "good morning" to most people living on the same street, but not intimate with many. Emphasis is on keeping the neighbors out, rather than on letting them in.	Positive friendships with neighbors—shared activities of various types. Neighbors not afraid of these people. Several times neighbors—and not even immediate neighbors—looked in while the investigator was there, to borrow something or to arrange a project.	Greater seclusion. Goes out over the garden fence to avoid meeting acquaintances in the street, drops old friends among neighbors and does not accompany his wife when visiting, easier to associate with strangers. His pub is outside his district.	No contact with neighbors, even of merely a formal character, through withdrawal or hostility.

TABLE I *Continued*

General definition	· Norm (Grade 3)	Supranorm (Grade 4)	Infranorm (Grade 2)	Infranorm (Grade 1)
10. *Workmates and unions.* Relationships with fellow workers, taken as those with whom the individual enters into nearness through his economic role; includes men working on the same task, fellow union members, etc. The quality of the relationship is shown by the degree of participation both in work and outside that area.	Lack of hostility to workmates at the bench, intimate relationships with one or two, who visit each other's houses, occasionally go on communal family excursions. In at least one works activity outside his job, but, apart from his intimates, does not like meeting mates out of hours—work and home do not mix. Rarely attends his trade-union branch.	Friendships not exclusive, but include, in a more casual way, many fellow workers known through various activities. Friendship with one group does not entail hostility to another. In many works activities, and usually attends his trade-union branch.	Hostility to groups of fellow workers pronounced; work relationships confined strictly to work hours. Passive lack of cooperation at the bench. Practically no participation in works activities, most often no trade-union membership.	Unemployment if the whole economic role is rejected, otherwise complete lack of communication inside as well as outside working hours, whether this isolation is self-sought or the result of rejection by mates.
11. *Employers and management.* The relationship of the employee to the employer in terms of his behavior at work and his attitude toward it; degree of independence and loyalty in direct relationships with authority in the economic role.	Relations usually quite good, lack of absenteeism, and very infrequent changes of employment; but a good deal of grumbling, little sense of obligation to employer, who is expected to provide various amenities without being entitled to extra service.	Increased wages, positions of greater responsibility than prewar. Employer given credit for good things done, but actively fought for injustices. Absenteeism, indiscipline not used as weapons of opposition; group mechanisms invoked.	In some absenteeism, minor indiscipline, forfeiture of pay, drop in wages; in others anxious efforts to work well. Dissatisfaction confined to morose withdrawal. In a few cases, dependence on employer; the man in and out of personnel manager's office.	Unemployment, or gross indiscipline of a type inevitably leading to dismissal, e.g., chronic absenteeism.

12. *Wider personal contacts.* Ability to establish personal relationships with members of social groups to which the individual has not previously been joined by any common role or relationship; ease or difficulty of crossing barriers of class, caste, education, race, etc.	Friendships, save of a polite and formal kind, not common. Any depth of association going beyond conventional small talk invokes embarrassment and aloofness. Once contact established, difficulties of communication eased, though every difference of background is, as it arises, a disturbing factor.	Far more fluidity between groups, visiting terms easily established. Group differentiation, as judged by income, work, education, etc., almost ceases to exist, or at least to be a barrier. Personality factors rather than class or caste the main determinants in friendships.	Hostility and suspicion against anyone in the larger outgroups. An almost paranoid fear, manifested by avoidance and complete uncommunicativeness toward any intruder in his narrowed circle.	Inability to enter into any type of relationship with anyone outside the individual's ingroup.
13. *Women outside the family.* Intersex relationships, primarily of a sexual, or potentially sexual, nature; degrees of their avoidance or pursuit, emotional investment, inclusion-exclusion from other activities and social networks of the individual, for both the married and unmarried positions.	(*a*) Married men. Occasional flirtations emasculated by facetiousness. Efforts to make wife party to these. Public joking about them. Relations with other women—mainly the wife's friends—somewhat formal. (*b*) Unmarried men. Marriage as ultimate end in view. Casual affairs, but all the time developing ideas of what he wants wife to be like. Casual girl friends not brought home; discussion of them taboo; girl's home not visited.	(*a*) Intimate with women without danger to marital relationships of either party. Women friends of his own, and also independent relationships with his wife's friends. (*b*) Girl friends, temporary or permanent, brought into all activities. Homes mutually visited. Some intimacy with her family, going out with her brothers and sisters. Often more than one girl at a time; though they know this, he remains on straight terms with all.	(*a*) Avoids women more than men, or else attempts to establish relationships on a purely sexual basis. Often goes to places where there are women (dances, etc.), but seldom plucks up enough courage to speak to them, except as they are going out, when semijocular advances may be made. (*b*) As for (*a*).	(*a*) Sexual offenses, or complete refusal to enter into any relationships (often combined with impotence). (*b*) As for (*a*).

TABLE I *Continued*

General definition	Norm (Grade 3)	Supranorm (Grade 4)	Infranorm (Grade 2)	Infranorm (Grade 1)
14. *Organized group activities.* Relationships which occur through the medium of some organized social activity—clubs, political parties, etc., in which membership is voluntary; nature of interest involved; its degree of seriousness and narrow-wideness; quality of group tie, and the roles and responsibilities carried by the individual in the organizations to which he belongs.	Few group activities of an intellectual or political nature, but likes to know what is going on, especially in the realm of sport, without taking much active part. Embarrassed, confused, or irritated by any attempt to penetrate below the surface. Prides himself on some special skill or knowledge of the hobby type, such as horticulture, or pigeon breeding, around which relationships may be built.	Has interests leading to some sort of active, responsible membership of social organizations. Is obviously open to new ideas, especially in their practical application. Whatever his level of interest and intelligence, is looking for, or has found, a social means of expressing himself in action.	Lack of interest in political or other matters, or overexcitement uncompensated by any positive attitudes toward social issues, i.e. violent opinions are not transformed into social action. Activity is disorganized and destroys the possibility of constructive participation in social organizations.	Serious restriction of the interest field amounting to complete mental apathy; or violent hostility, unrelated to group action or to the needs of his own situation.
15. *Impersonal authorities.* The individual's behavior and attitude toward the city council, the government, U. N., etc.; degree of feeling an active, if microscopic, contributor to macrosocial events; quality of social projection on to "gods" and "powers that be," who represent to the individual his sense of being in a total society which he cannot control.	Expects things to be done for him by a power vaguely described as "they." Criticizes "them" a good deal, particularizing them as some special party or organization, but not prepared to act unless his personal interests are drastically impinged on. This occurs, not when affects as a citizen, but as a particular category of person—a tax-payer, a car owner, etc. Lukewarm about all political parties on all levels; if he does play a part in public affairs it is a protesting one.	Does not feel servile toward, or dominated by, "them." Sees himself as a small component of the forces which control him and is alive to his own share in the business. Active at election times, tax-payers' meetings, locality clubs, etc., with a realistic approach.	Impotent rebellion or submission, sometimes alternating. The rebel belongs to no organized body of opposition. This noisy helplessness allied to apathetic helplessness, equally common a feeling that "someone" must be concerned and will eventually act; in the meantime dice are loaded against him, activity on his own part futile.	Complete absence of any personal attitude to authority except, in some cases, an undifferentiated hostility which may lead to antisocial activity—even the lonely sabotage of crime.

TABLE 2   Distribution of Degree of Settlement Between CRU and Non-CRU Attenders (%)

	More settled	Less settled	Sample size
CRU sample	74	26	50
Non-CRU sample	36	64	100

TABLE 3   Comparison of CRU, Non-CRU and Control Groups on Social Criteria

Criterion of social participation	(a) Frequency of scores below the norm Non-CRU/CRU	(b) Frequency of scores above the norm CRU/control group
1.	Borderline significance	Significant
2.	—	Significant
3.	—	—
4.	—	—
5.	—	—
6.	Significant	—
7.	Significant	—
8.	Borderline significance	Significant
9.	Significant	Significant
10.	Significant	Significant
11.	—	Significant
12.	Borderline significance	—
13.	Significant	—
14.	Significant	—
15.	Significant	—
Totals	7 Significant criteria (3 borderline cases)	6 Significant criteria

proportion of supranorm behavior in the non-CRU as compared with the control group—this may be accounted for by a small proportion of the non-CRU sample who have been able to make a very good adjustment through social utilization of their supranorm potentialities. Most important, there is a significant difference between the CRU sample and the control group (and the non-CRU group) in the proportion of these scores ($p \leq .01$). More than half the CRU cases score five or more times in Grade 4. This general superiority of the CRU sample occurs in spite of the existence of individual cases in which treatment has been inefficacious, and in spite of a higher degree of current stress in the sample.

TABLE 4   Comparison of CRU, Non-CRU and Control Groups on Social Criteria

(a) Distribution of individuals scoring below the norm (1 and 2) in each group on varying numbers of criteria (number of critera above norm)

Individuals in	0–4	5–9	10–15	Total
Control group	38	2	—	40
CRU sample	40	9	1	50
Non-CRU sample	45	40	15	100

(b) Distribution of individuals scoring at the norm (3) in each group (number of criteria at norm)

Individuals in	0–4	5–9	10–15	Total
Control group	—	8	32	40
CRU sample	7	33	10	50
Non-CRU sample	16	58	26	100

(c) Distribution of individuals scoring above the norm (4) in each group (number of criteria above norm)

Individuals in	0–4	5–9	10–15	Total
Control group	35	5	—	40
CRU sample	21	26	3	50
Non-CRU sample	77	20	3	100

CONCLUSIONS

1. In view of the equivalence of the samples, the significantly higher proportion of well-adjusted men among those who had attended a CRU emphasizes the worth of the CRU as a therapeutic community.

2. The extent of social integration among those rated as settled cannot be attributed entirely to CRU experience of approximately one month's duration. Traumatic experience, where circumstances of personality and social setting are propitious, may lead to improved social participation. This suggestion is supported by the supranorm social participation of settled men, in the non-CRU group. The proportion of settled men, was, however, significantly higher in the CRU group. The CRU may, therefore, be regarded as an agency through which the potentially educative experiences of POW life may be released from tensions and anxieties which otherwise inhibit their assimilation and application in civil life.

3. The fact that the settled men appear to be able to manipulate their basic social relationships better than the civilian control sample, raises several

points. Normality is not optimum adjustment and is certainly not synonymous with the most free and unanxious interaction within a given social framework. Whatever their origin, the atomistic tendencies of modern life have greatly reduced the size of the functional family. Outside an individual's immediate family, parental or marital, most relationships of an affective nature into which he enters have no socially organized pattern. This lack of dependable support seems to be one of the major foci of anxiety in Western society. It is conducive to withdrawal and it is such a withdrawal that the pattern of negative deviance exhibits.

4. In a sense the CRU replaces the larger organized family group by providing a series of safe and stable relationships between the immediate family and the wider society. Not only recovery but supranormative quality in these bridge regions characterizes the pattern of positive deviance. It is to be noted that a better level of both husband/wife and worker/employer relations appear in the context of this pattern. When a man has left the CRU, the sense of security seems to persist; the potentialities of relationships are effectively discovered to be congruous with the framework of society.

5. What we have called desocialization cannot be confined to those who have had specific experiences of separation, but is a general social phenomenon. It is a kind of affective dislocation from the exigencies of social interaction which has become highly organized on a cultural basis. To focus attention on gross desocialization such as characterized extreme POW unsettlement would be misleading. Unsettlement which is unspectacular—since it is far more widespread and less easily identified—is in the long run a greater menace than that which leads to broken marriages and crime. The results point to the presence of a certain desocialization in the norm itself. This is a problem that would appear to provide a focal point of study for social scientists.

Reference

Sherif, M. 1936. *Psychology of Social Norms.* New York and London: Harper and Brothers.