

When a group deals with a deviant, the group can accept or reject the deviant, and be either strengthened or weakened. Take for example a group of dog owners in a neighborhood. It comes to their attention some owners don't pick up their dogs waste. Any of the following scenarios could happen.

Most early sociologists would say the group would reject the deviants, and in doing so strengthen the group's sense of solidarity. One function of deviance is defining a boundaries of a group + constructing a group identity. The dog walkers could get together and say to their neighbors frustrated with dog waste "we would never forget to pick up dog waste," or "we're all responsible here, it must be people from the next neighborhood over." The deviance would be used to say "being responsible with pet waste is the mark of a true Oak Glen resident." Thus rejecting deviance would have strengthened the group.

The group could also be strengthened by accepting the deviant. Imagine if the irresponsible dog owners were identified, and ~~not~~ rather than being shunned by their neighbors (as above) the neighborhood set up a mentoring program that paired responsible + irresponsible dog owners in order to correct the deviant's behavior (rejecting the deviance, not the deviant). This would increase group solidarity + connection between all kinds of dog owners in the neighborhood. ^{writes} ~~also~~ that this strength-through-acceptance is common in Quaker communities + military units.

The group could also weaken themselves by rejecting deviance. In this example, the neighborhood could enact stricter + stricter dog waste policies w/ heavy penalties. Neighbor could turn on neighbor, surveilling, citing + shaming until no-one felt they could trust anyone + people only walked their dogs very quickly in the wee hours of the morning. The neighborhood would be weakened as a group, bereft of solidarity.

Of course, accepting the deviant might weaken the group. The neighborhood might decide "it takes all kinds," and that they can't really tell people what to do with their dogs. Without having deviants ~~to~~ ^{with} which to judge their behavior, responsible pet owners might become more lax. Individuals would each have their own code about how to deal with dog waste, but ~~would~~ be unable to reconcile it to their neighbors because they can't talk about what the group might consider wrong for fear of offending someone. The group would become less cohesive without a shared moral standard, and devolve into a collection of ~~the~~ individuals brought together by only geographic happenstance.

~~There also might be a book beyond deviance as an act which is what~~
Deviance can also be a mechanism by which groups innovate and change. Imagine if the one really cool guy in a neighborhood never picked up his dog's waste, and no one wanted to correct him because it was accepted he was

eccentric. Now imagine the group noticed his yard & the boulevards he walked along always seemed lush. The neighborhood might realize that (with the right dog diet) dog waste could serve as a great fertilizer. They might completely revisit their assumptions that not picking up dog waste was deviant. Thus the person who was allowed to be deviant would be an innovator.

Deviance and deviants can serve many functions in a small group. By their rejection or acceptance, they can strengthen a group or weaken it. Deviance keeps a group from becoming trapped in ritual, widebound, by testing & defining the group's boundaries & causing them to consider who they really are.

First rate - excellent. A

The issue of failing to clean up dog waste can demonstrate how deviance can be good and bad for a community, as outlined by Cofer

It takes village

Deviance can be good for a community because it can create solidarity by bringing everyone together on a common issue. By joining together to stop dog waste from poisoning parks and places where children play, the community feels that they are together, that they think alike. People can then feel more comfortable and one with their neighbors in the community because everyone understands that dog waste is a serious issue. When people decide to, say, put signs around parks to remember to clean up after your dog, they feel they have solved the problem together.

Another way that deviance can be good for the community is by allowing others to look at their own behavior and reflect. In this community, when dog waste becomes a problem, people can think and remember if they have ever forgotten to clean up or didn't have a doggie bag and just left it. By looking back on their own experiences, they can change or modify their behavior to the betterment of the community.

OR OTHER POINTS OF BEING A "GOOD NEIGHBOR"

A third way that deviance can be good for a community is that the deviance can reaffirm values that the community has. For example, by acknowledging that dog waste left in parks can be dangerous to children, the community can emphasize and recall that their number one priority is to protect their children. They all realize that anything they do has to be for the health and welfare of the children, thus remembering an important value and applying it to other areas in life, not just dog waste, but perhaps also a fun and safe play structure for the children so they can get exercise.

good pts

Deviance, however, can be harmful to a community. One way that deviance can be bad for a community is that gossipers and other people can destroy unity in a community. In this community, people have started to call out other people who they say have not picked up after their dog. Everybody then starts to gossip about each other and spread lies and create suspicion in the community because everyone is being called out as deviant. This type of behavior can destroy a community's sense of solidarity.

Another way that demands can be bad for a community is by creating a punishment that is too harsh to fit the crime. In this community, perhaps they decided that not cleaning up after dogs was such a problem that they said that soon now or nobody can own a dog anymore. This punishment to the demand is much too large a consequence and can result in many forms of behaviors that separate the community. Some people may decide to move away to keep their dogs and others may decide not to move into the neighborhood to avoid this rule.

One more way that demands can be bad for a community is that too many resources may be delegated to fixing the problem. Perhaps in one neighborhood they decide that the police should patrol parks to make sure people clean up after their dogs. This, however, leaves the police unable to do other things like respond to domestic calls or police crashes or respond to traffic laws. Then other problems happen in the community because the police are too busy patrolling the parks monitoring dog owners.

Through these examples, we can understand how demands can either bring a community together or drive it apart.

Nice thorough review of potential issues that demonstrates solid grasp of underlying ideas.

A

There are many ways a group may react to deviant behaviors. According to Lewis Coser's article, the four main reactions of the group are, ^{the} deviant is rejected and the group is strengthened or weakened, and the deviant is accepted and the group is strengthened or weakened. One way to demonstrate these effects is through the example of the common neighborhood problem of dog waste. Each of the possibilities, explained by Coser, can lead to a different group outcome.

The first possibility is that the group is strengthened by rejecting the deviants. According to Coser, the group can be strengthened by reinforcing the boundaries of "normal" in a group. In the dog waste problem, individuals who do not pick up after their dogs may be kicked out of the neighborhood. The group is strengthened by asserting the boundaries of deviance. People in the group who are not deviant, thus feel more connected to one another in their punishment of deviance. (AND ONE CAN IMAGINE SUBSEQUENT "EVEN IN A SOCIETY OF ANGELS" PROBL

Although rejecting deviant behaviors may seem like an obvious benefit to the group, rejection may also harm the group. Too much punishment and rejections may diminish group solidarity. For instance, if neighbors started spy on each other and telling the whole neighborhood about deviant behaviors, the sense of trust and solidarity may be diminished. Also, the neighborhood has the potential to lose members who may be an asset to the community in other ways. Therefore, group rejection of deviant behaviors may harm the group as a whole by diminishing group solidarity.

Another possibility is that the group accepts the deviant behavior and is thus strengthened. According to Coser the deviance of one member or group can actually bring the group together. In the case of dog waste, it may turn out that one of the deviants is

very old and therefore unable to bend over and pick the waste up. Upon learning this the group will have to come together to think of a solution.

One possibility would be that the children of the neighborhood started to help the older person out. In this instance group solidarity is strengthened because the group has to come together in order to solve their problem.

The final possibility according to Coser's article is that the deviant is accepted and the group is harmed. In the case of the old woman, people may not help her pick up the waste, but instead they may just let her leave it on the lawn. Then, more people may not see the need to pick up after their dogs and the problem will be exacerbated.

Depending on the group's reaction to a given problem, there are many possible outcomes to dealing with deviance. Coser's theory of the functions of deviance serve as a clear outline for the possible outcomes of deviant behavior.

VERY FINE JOB

(A)