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### iii
CHAPTER I - BACKGROUND

Significance of the Study

We are living in a world shaken to its very foundations by change. Societies are experiencing social transitions with swiftness unimaginable only fifty years ago. We talk calmly of Telestar, with matter-of-fact coolness of putting man on the moon in this decade. Around the globe, no longer content with the conditions of semi-starvation and misery which has been the lot of most men throughout history, people are on the move. Today for the first time we have the technological ability to provide for all people the prerequisites of a truly human existence.

Our social skills, however, appear to have been outdistanced by our technological ability. Our world is shot through with paradox. All people can be fed, but people are hungry - in the United States as in the underdeveloped countries. 1,2 Millions of Americans live in slums; on every side automation devours the jobs of people. In free America freedom is not yet equally available to all citizens. Our world is permeated with war and the threat of war. Over head on a slender thread hangs the Bomb.

---


Our world is a world of conflict. On every side we see signs of conflict - of the "opposition of alternatives". There are conflicts between labor and management, conflicts with racial and religious roots, conflicts among workers for rapidly disappearing jobs, marital conflicts, delinquency and crime, conflict among nations. As social workers we are well aware of these conflicts and of others which rage within our own profession. Much of the effort of social workers is directed toward the amelioration of problems which are created by conflicts. Social work embodies a vision of a better future and actively strives to attain that goal.

But if that goal is to be ought but utopian - if man is to enjoy the new prosperity and the possibility of universal social justice which can be the golden companions of modern science - our social technology must overtake that of our physical science. We need to learn to resolve or constructively to employ human conflict while guaranteeing opportunity for societal and international social change.

Social work and social work research have a special responsibility in this critical arena. As the applied division of the social sciences, social work must accept responsibility for practical efforts designed to resolve social conflict constructively. In so doing, social work research must be action oriented; practice and research must go hand in hand.

1Morris L. Eisenstein, Teens in Conflict: A Study in the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: A Replication with Modifications of Sherif's Robbers Cave Experiment (unpublished material). Our operational definition of conflict as the "opposition of alternatives" is broader in scope than the common conception of conflict.

2There is, for example, the perennial struggle between the advocates of truly social welfare and the proponents of rugged individualism.
As McClelland 1 has put it, "Until the tenuous hold of knowledge on the incredibly complex processes of conflict is strengthened, there is no way to know if a proposed line of action will, in effect, pour water or gasoline on the flames." It is, therefore, to an investigation of the resolution of intergroup conflict that this thesis study in social work is directed.

In one sense this study is designed to help bridge the gap which Robert S. Lynd 2 contends has developed in the social sciences between the perspectives of the "scholar scientists" and the "social technicians". The former, he says, overlook the realities and the crying needs of the real world in their leisurely pursuit of knowledge great or small for its own sake; the latter lose perspective for the future in their concern with the details of the immediate present. Too often, it would seem, social workers have fallen into the latter category.

Similarly, Lewis Coser 3 has pointed out in The Functions of Social Conflict the contrast between the early giants of sociology (e.g., Ward, Veblen, Ross, Small and Cooley) with their reform orientation and consequent interest in the phenomena of social conflict, and the modern writers (e.g., Parsons, Lundberg, Mayo and Warner) who have concerned themselves more with the adjustment of individuals to given


societal structures than with the study of conflict. The modern spotlight tends to focus more on social statics than on dynamics.

Apparently a similar shift of interest has occurred in social work. While early social workers such as Jane Addams 1 were interested in the problems of social conflict, of labor unions, of peace and war, a survey of the literature in the university library of an accredited school of social work revealed no strictly social work materials related to social conflict. A review of the journals *Social Casework*, *Social Work* and the *Social Service Review* for the past decade revealed no indexed references to social conflict or its synonyms: contention, dissention, strife or struggle. There were a few references to personality conflict.

It has been necessary to turn to the field of sociology for most background materials related to this study. In one sense, perhaps, this is as it should be. There is a real need for closer cooperation between these fields than has commonly been the case. On the one hand, we social workers need to increase our familiarity with the increasing volume of sociological research which may be converted to our use. On the other hand, our increased familiarization with the language of sociology may make possible better communication of the research needs we recognize from our work to the end that sociologists may undertake studies more directly beneficial to our field. There will be in this thesis, accordingly, a more detailed survey of sociological materials than one might expect to find in the efforts of a social worker.

---

Survey of Related Literature

In an article fourteen years ago Jessie Bernard \(^1\) attempted to explain the current lack of interest in conflict study. She argued that Americans have a cultural policy of "hush-hush with reference to many conflicts." They believe in "letting sleeping dogs lie," in "not making an issue of it," and "not stirring up trouble." Consequently, American scholars have been reluctant to deal with controversy. She suggests that few social scientists have studied conflict because: (1) the study is difficult; (2) we prefer cultural to interactional explanations of conflict; (3) we have wished to avoid identification with Marxism or socialism; (4) certain "powerful fighting organizations" are opposed to the general spread of knowledge of their techniques; (5) we don't like to admit the existence of certain conflicts; and (6) there is a fear that to study conflict is to aggravate, advocate or approve it.

Since Bernard's article appeared there has been a reawakening of interest in the study of social conflict. In a world of change the central sociological problem is that of the relation between stability and change. Florian Znaniecki \(^2\), indeed, contends that all new ideological models and systems are developed as the attempts of theorists to eliminate this antagonism. "The models or systems they create are intended to be collectively accepted and effectively applied, with the result that harmony will be substituted for conflict."


Evidence of re-awakening interest in conflict study is reflected in major theoretical works by Coser 1 and Boulding 2 and in important experimental field studies by Sherif, et al. 3 and Eisenstein, et al. 4 These studies explicitly recognize the imperative of developing more adequate means for dealing with social conflict. Concern with the problems of war and peace has caused Boulding 5 to cast his net wider and to study war as a special case of the general social process of conflict.

As has been suggested, two major approaches to the study of society have developed during the 19th and 20th Centuries. Of greatest concern to the present research is the approach which emphasizes social dynamics. The major alternative approach to sociology emphasizes social structure and is concerned with conflict primarily only to the extent that it disturbs societal equilibrium.

Perhaps the foremost contemporary proponent of the structural approach is Talcott Parsons. Parsons has been characterized 6 as "primarily interested in the conservation of existing structures." Given this orientation, he not unexpectedly de-emphasizes the dynamic processes of social change and has been "led to view conflict as having primarily disruptive, dissociating, and dysfunctional consequences. Parsons," says Coser, "considers conflict primarily as a disease."

1Coser, op. cit.
4Eisenstein, op. cit. 5Boulding, op. cit., p. viii.
5Coser, op. cit., pp. 21-23.
Parsons' own critique of Durkheim may be taken as a criticism of his own work.

Almost from the beginning he had thought in terms of substance rather than process. He had always been looking for the reality manifested in social facts... thought of as norms, ends or representations. ... Durkheim was thinking of the social elements as a system of eternal objects. Now the very essence of such objects is timeless-ness. Hence the concept of progress, of change, is meaningless as applied to them in themselves.

Parsons argues that Weber, on the other hand, was quite concerned with value conflicts. His Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft are seen as two types of positive social relationships both of which "specifically exclude conflict elements" and accordingly necessitate Weber's description of conflict as a third basic social relationship. "With this issue," according to Parsons, "it will be unnecessary to be concerned."

Industrial sociologists in the Mayo tradition seem to take their cue from the Parsonians. "Committed to the view that the source of conflict is to be found in sentiments which distort relations rather than in the nature of social relations themselves, (they) see all conflicts as 'social disease' and the lack of conflict as 'social health'." They attempt to deal with the individual's frustration symptomatically rather than with the sources of those frustration.

This atomistic approach to conflict also characterizes many of the followers of Freud. Erich Fromm may be taken as a slightly atypical example. Freud, says Fromm, saw conflict generated in a battle between the two human instincts for life and for death.

---


2Ibid., pp. 664 and 687. 3Coser, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

Each individual's life, then, is a battlefield for these two fundamental instincts: "the effort of Eros to combine organic substance into ever larger unities" . . . and the effort of the death instinct which tends to undo precisely what Eros is trying to accomplish.

Fromm modifies this, 1 contending that the life instinct is more basic than that for death, but argues for the existence of a "special type of personality, not rare, yet not the rule, which loves destruction and death." His fundamental psychological and moral distinction between man is between "death-lovers" and "life-lovers". These instincts, then are a primary source of human struggle. In most men both trends are present with the stronger determining man's behavior. "...environmental factors can only account for the direction the death instinct takes, either outwards or inwards." The lovers of death make war possible.

Instinct theories, however, have a major flaw which has been pointed out by Sorokin. 2 Supposed to be constant, they cannot and do not explain the tremendous fluctuations of conflict between various social groups or in the same society at various points in its history.

The viewpoint of one contemporary psychiatrist, Roy W. Menninger, is unusual. He sees conflict as essential and desirable in life: 3

To live in a psychic world where all is "good and pure", where struggle and conflict is absent, predisposes a kind of lotus-eating indolence and an indifference to everything else. The dangers of satiety are fully as great as those of deprivation. Struggle is life and life is an incessant sequence of struggles.

The psychological approaches to the study of conflict may fall into the trap of unwarranted reductionism. As Sherif 4 has emphasized,

1Ibid., pp. 5-8, 18, 52. 2Ibid., p. 43.
3Ibid., p. 39. 4Sherif, op. cit., pp. 26-34.
group phenomena must be studied at the level of the group; they cannot be extrapolated merely from the properties of individuals. Similarly, it is often erroneous to tread upon methodological quicksand extrapolating from intra-group to intergroup relations. Keeping these principles in mind we now turn to a consideration of a number of thinkers who have dealt with conflict as a social phenomenon and in so doing have come to view it as functional and a potentially positive social force.

In the late 1800's in his book *War and Its Alleged Benefits*, J. Novicow recognized that the elimination of war would not mean the end of social conflict. His concept of conflict was broad and functional. He agreed that the apologists of war were quite right in contending that "struggle is life". They erred, however, in not realizing that war was but one possible form of conflict. "Struggle," he said, is the action of the environment upon the organism and the reaction of the organism upon the environment, therefore a perpetual combat. . . . Without struggle and antagonisms societies would indeed fall into a state of somnolency, of most dangerous lethargy. . . . (But) besides the physiological struggle, humanity has economic, political and intellectual struggles. . . . (Even within each state) struggle has by no means disappeared but goes on under the form of economic competition, lawyers' briefs, judge's sentences, votes, party organizations, parliamentary discussions, meetings, lectures, sermons, schools, scientific associations, congresses, pamphlets, books, newspapers, magazines - in short, by spoken and written propaganda.

Charles H. Cooley is another sociologist writing at the turn of the century who recognized certain functional aspects of conflict. Cooley saw the small group as the primary unit of socialization, as a context for producing in group members change which would persist beyond

---

the existence of the group. Such changes are grounded in conflict. Indeed, as Boulding has put it, "The process of socialization . . . is a constant process of conflict." Cooley saw society being created progressively and wrought out tentatively through "experiment, struggle, and survival." He saw conflict as central to this process.

Conflict, of some sort, is the life of society, and progress emerges from a struggle in which each individual, class or institution seeks to realize its own idea of good. The intensity of the struggle varies directly with the vigor of the people, and its cessation, if conceivable, would be death.

Conflict, according to Cooley, has positive aspects which are indispensable to the continued existence of society. He contends that social progress depends upon human resentment of existing conditions and circumstances; without opposition and resentment the vigor necessary to overcome obstacles to progress would not be generated. Resentment and hostility ought not disappear, but these feelings "should become less wayward, violent, bitter, or personal, in a narrow sense, and more disciplined, rationally discriminating, and quietly persistent." Conflict should be carried on "with sincere and absolute deference to the standard of truth."

---


4Ibid., p. 199.

Cooley held competition and survival of the fittest to be equally as righteous as kindness and cooperation.  

"The more one thinks of it, the more he will see that conflict and cooperation are not separable things, but phases of one process which always involves something of both." 

In an essay written in 1917, Max Weber argued that conflict may be transformed but never can be abolished. "Conflict, he said, cannot be excluded from social life. One can change its means, its object, even its fundamental direction and its bearers, but it cannot be eliminated. There can be instead of an external struggle of antagonistic persons for external objects, an inner struggle of mutually loving persons for subject values and there-with, instead of external compulsion, an inner control (in the form of erotic or charitable devotion). Or it can take the form of subjective conflict in the individual's own mind. It is always present and its influence is often greatest when it is least noticed, i.e., the more its course takes the form of indifferent or complacent passivity or self-deception, or when it operates as "selection". "Peace" is nothing more than a change in the form of the conflict or in the antagonists or in the objects of the conflict, or finally in the chances of selection.

Robert MacIver has suggested that most social conflicts are generated by economic, racial and religious differences. These may become a threat to the society, but "Given some basic agreement there is room for the play of a thousand minor differences, competitive and other conflicts, which need not and normally do not impair the sentiment of the community." If conflict is to be held in check, it is apparently necessary to develop

---

1Cooley, Social Organization, p. 35  
2Coser, op. cit., p. 18.  

a superordinate value framework within which differences can be at least tolerated. While conflict cannot be eliminated, its forms can be altered. The conflict between the "haves" and "have-nots", for example, in its revolutionary form is rooted in conditions of destitution and exploitation which are amenable to alteration and abolition by the "power of social intelligence".

In his article on conflict in The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Harold Lasswell ¹ suggests that a major type of social conflict results when a "mass of repressed hostility", no longer containable within the framework of society, bursts forth. Lasswell sees conflict as an underlying process of life and notes both functions and dysfunctions although he emphasizes the latter. He sees conflict as a mode by which social change is registered and often consummated. Where change is swift, conflict will be acute, for there the vested interests of the status quo clash sharply with the "eager pressure from the new". Social conflict, says Lasswell, is the competitive, conscious pursuit of exclusive values -- of "claims on society for life, liberty of movement, property and deference." Like Weber, Lasswell sees the transformation of conflict into new forms as one type of conflict resolution.

... it is often said that issues are never decided, they are only superseded. National cleavages push religious cleavages into the background, and class division threatens national unity. But behind the clash of armor and argument are the silent processes of social life, which redefine the value pyramid and eventually display themselves in new frontiers of strife and controversy. ²


²Ibid.
The cultural setting in which the conflict occurs is the major determinant of its form. In democratic industrial societies, for example, physical combat is usually replaced by "argument, admonition, ridicule, litigation and manipulation of surrounding circumstances." Once again we are impressed by the variety of potential expressions of conflict.

Ogburn and Nimkoff apparently view conflict as a negative phenomenon which must be checked or eliminated to preserve the peace which they state is essential to organized social life. They describe a dialectic of cooperation and opposition which together constitute the two basic processes of group life. "When men work together for common goals (emphasis added--W.H.W.), their behavior is called cooperation. When they strive against one another, their conduct is labeled opposition." (p. 163) Their description of the termination of conflict is similar to that of Lasswell. "Conflict may be followed by accommodation only to revert to conflict again. . . . Lasting adjustments in any phase of human experience are rare phenomena." The ultimate and "logical extreme of all conflict," they contend, "is the elimination of competitors." The means for this are several (Cf. discussion of Boulding below).

In a discussion of the "causes and factors of war and revolution" Pitirim Sorokin summarizes his theory of the dynamics of war. He argues

---

2Ibid., p. 178. 3Ibid., p. 164.
that both multiple-causational and single factor approaches to the cause of war are inappropriate and presents a theory supported by extensive historical evidence that the existence of conflict requires a major necessary cause in conjunction with supporting and dyssupporting factors. The necessary cause of war and revolution is the clash of value systems; the probability of war varies directly with the degree of inter-system incompatibility. Contemporary society, he contends, is sensate and therefore conflict-ridden. Consequently, war can never be eliminated until society is drastically changed in form to one based on love and overall unifying norms and values. When this occurs, dysfunctional conflicts will be subordinated to the social welfare. Sorokin hypothesizes that:

(a) The main cause of internal social peace is the presence in a given society of a well-integrated system of basic values, with their corresponding norms practiced in overt conduct. The fundamental values of the various factions and members of the society must be essentially in harmony with the system and with one another. The values must be based on the principle of the Golden Rule and not on that of hatred.

(b) The main cause of international peace is the presence in each of the interacting societies of a well-integrated system of basic values and their norms, all of which are compatible with one another, practiced by the societies involved, and based on the Golden Rule.

(c) In a given universe of societies or within a particular society the probability of peace varies directly with the integration of the system of the basic values and their mutual compatibility. When their integration and harmoniousness decline, especially suddenly and sharply, the chances for international or civil war increase. ¹

The importance for our purposes here lies in the emphasis upon superordinate values and norms and not upon the specific orientation Sorokin contends these must take.

¹Ibid., pp. 507-508.
The three sociological treatises of major importance to conflict study are those of Georg Simmel, Lewis Coser, and Kenneth Boulding. Simmel, a German sociologist deeply interested in the study of conflict, hoped from a wide-ranging study of small groups to derive insights into the dynamics of larger social structures. Simmel contended that the commonly held idea that society results from positive social forces to the extent that negative forces were removed was superficial and mistaken. "Society," he said, "is the result of both categories of interaction, which both manifest themselves as wholly positive." He stressed the importance of asserting the functional nature of conflict because of the force with which conflict impresses men with its apparently destructive qualities. Even a specific instance of conflict should be viewed from alternative perspectives, for what may appear to be dysfunctional in terms of particular individuals may be functional for the group. Simmel uses a somewhat narrower concept of conflict than is utilized in the present research. This limitation leads to statements which sometimes appear to term conflict dysfunctional in contradiction to his general thesis.


2Coser, op. cit.

3Boulding, op. cit.

4Riecken & Homans, op. cit., p. 786.

5Simmel, op. cit., p. 16. 6Ibid., p. 17.

7For example, "Relations of conflict do not by themselves produce a social structure, but only in cooperation with unifying forces." (emphasis added--W.H.W.) Ibid., p. 20.
Everett C. Hughes summarizes Simmel's position in this manner:

Simmel sees conflict as part of the dynamic by which some men are drawn together (and others, by the same token, driven away from each other) into the uneasy combinations which we call groups. . . . Instead of seeing change as disturbance of a naturally stable thing called society, he sees stability itself as some temporary (although it may long endure) balance among forces in interaction; and forces are by definition capable of being described only in terms of change.

The study of conflict is crucial to an understanding of change. Simmel resolves the apparent paradox of functional conflict by the introduction of a dialectic. He describes conflict as the relation of opposition between contraries. Opposition is a high tension state involving success or failure by a social group in transcending the barriers to locomotion. When the conflict ends in the transcendance of the barriers, equilibrium is restored. Thus while it superficially appears to be an element of division in society, conflict is actually an integrating relationship; the resolution of tension between contraries.

For Simmel, conflict is a never ending process; social conflict and peace each contain the seeds of the other. He contends that the process of conflict resolution is a special type of social interaction belonging neither to peace nor war but necessitating study in its own right.

Lewis Coser was the first contemporary sociologist to treat seriously the functional aspects of social conflict. Tracing his work directly to that of Simmel, he defines social conflict as a "struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals."

1Ibid., p. 9.


He specifies that his interests lie more in the neglected functions than in the dysfunctions of social conflict. 1 Coser accepts Simmel's thesis that "conflict is a form of socialization" and interprets Simmel to mean that 2 no group can be entirely harmonious, for it would then be devoid of process and structure. Groups require disharmony as well as harmony, dissociation as well as association; and conflicts within them are by no means altogether disruptive factors. Group formation is the result of both types of processes. The belief that one tears down what the other builds up, so that what finally remains is the result of subtracting the one from the other, is based on a misconception. On the contrary, both "positive" and "negative" factors build group relations. Conflict as well as cooperation has social functions. Far from being necessarily dysfunctional, a certain degree of conflict is an essential element in group formation and the persistence of group life.

Coser makes an important distinction between conflict (which always must involve social "trans-action") and hostile sentiments (which are merely predispositions toward conflict behavior.) 3 This is the distinction between the sociological and psychological approaches to the study of conflict. The sociologist must deal with interaction in the conflict situation, a phenomenon quite distinct from psychological predisposition to conflict. 4

This approach is further facilitated by Coser's distinction between "realistic" and "non-realistic" conflict. Realistic conflicts are characterized by rivalry over specific ends or objects; non-realistic conflicts are not issue-oriented but result from the need for tension release on the part of one of more participants. In addition, realistic conflicts present "functional alternatives as to means", while in

---

1Coser, op. cit., p. 8.  2Ibid., p. 31.
3Ibid., p. 37.  4Ibid., p. 52.
non-realistic conflicts there are only "functional alternatives as to the objects." Means other than conflict may be employed in realistic conflict; in non-realistic conflict there is no such choice. ¹ The realistic/non-realistic distinction:

should help to avoid the fallacy of trying to explain the social phenomena of realistic conflict entirely in terms of "tension-release". For example, a worker engaged in strike activity in order to increase his wages, his status or the power of his union, and one who releases tension against the boss because he perceives him as an Oedipal figure, are dissimilar social types. ²

Both Simmel and Coser view conflict in an unnecessarily restricted sense. Coser, for example, states that "if the desired result can be attained as well or better by other means, such other means may be employed. In such instances, conflict is only one of several functional alternatives." ³ In defining conflict simply as the "opposition of alternatives", the present study includes as conflict certain phenomena described by Coser as functional alternatives to conflict.

The most recent serious attempt at a theory of conflict is by an economist, Kenneth Boulding. He recognizes both functions and dysfunctions of conflict but his approach is rooted in the belief that: "it is the process of conflict toward some kind of resolution which gives it meaning and which makes it good." ⁴ Conflict, according to Boulding, is a "situation of competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future (field--W.H.W.) positions and in which each party wishes to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the other." ⁵ Lacking either awareness of incompatible wishes, conflict does not exist.

¹Ibid., pp. 49-50. ²Ibid. ³Ibid. 
Boulding distinguishes between three levels of social conflict: conflicts between individuals, between what he calls groups, * and between organizations. Particularly the first and third categories are relevant to this study. Boulding may be read to mean opposition of alternatives is a prerequisite for change. "... if a hostile meets a hostile, both simply remain hostile ..., and likewise when a friendly meets a friendly. When, however, a hostile meets a friendly, a conflict of images is set up, and there is a chance of change in the image." 2

One may ask, however, whether Boulding has not grossly over-simplified the dynamics of change. Does a meeting of likes always preclude change?

In Boulding's theory conflicts are ended by avoidance, reconciliation, compromise or award. In avoidance loss of contact removes the source of the conflict. Boulding sees conquest as the most extreme form of avoidance. The three remaining processes are types of "procedural resolution." When avoidance is impossible, conflicts may be transformed

*Boulding defines 3 a group as the "unorganized subpopulation of persons that exists as a social fact because of its presence in the image of the persons concerned as a significant classification of the total population." Examples would presumably include race and religious affiliation. The present paper employs a different definition of a group. For our purposes, a group is defined 4 as "a social unit (1) which consists of a number of individuals who, at a given time, stand in more or less definite interdependent status or role relationships with one another, and (2) which explicitly or implicitly possesses a set of values or norms of its own regulating behavior of individual members, at least in matters of consequence of the group"

1Boulding, op. cit., p. 105. 2Ibid., p. 139.
3Ibid., p. 105.
by various procedures or replaced by other conflicts. In **reconciliation** the parties change their value systems so that they have common preferences in their field of action; conflict is eliminated when both parties come to desire the same state of affairs. In "**compromise**" each party is willing to settle for something less than his ideal position rather than continue the conflict. This is a result of bargaining between the parties themselves. In **award** both parties agree to accept the verdict of a third party rather than continue the conflict. Should institutions for procedural conflict resolution be inadequate or non-existent, violence is likely to result.  

Each form of procedural conflict has its appropriate set of procedures: 

... reconciliation is the result of conversation, argument, discussion, or debate that leads to convergent modifications of the images of the two parties. Compromise is the end result of a process of bargaining, in which mediation and conciliation may play an important part. An award is the end result of arbitration or legal trial.

While none of the forms or procedures is completely separate, there is generally a tendency for one to predominate. Frequently reconciliation and compromise are found together; compromise may depend upon some degree of reconciliation. Boulding suggests that the process of reconciliation is probably the least understood because the symbolic systems involved are complex and because very little research has been done on it. "We understand so little about the formation of value images that we can hardly be expected to understand the process by which these images are modified under the impact of mutual communication and discussion."

---

1. Ibid., pp. 308-322.  
2. Ibid., p. 310.
The present research on superordinate goals is closely related to the process of reconciliation.

Boulding suggests a number of propositions related to the process of reconciliation. He hypothesizes that reconciliation will be easier if "it is highly valued as a process by the contending parties," and that it requires flexibility of the value images of the parties involved. Rigidity of a person's value system may result from personal over-valuation of rigidity or perception of change as a threat to the person's self-valuation. He divides the value structure of the person's self-image into an inner-core seldom amenable to minor change but liable to catastrophic conversion and an outer-shell which is less rigid and therefore modifiable through discussion and argument. The success of the reconciliatory process depends upon whether the conflict affects the inner-core or the outer-shell of the value structure. \(^1\)

Over the past several years Muzafer Sherif \(^2\) has carried out a series of experiments related to the processes labeled by Boulding as reconciliation and compromise. Sherif has been investigating the effects of superordinate goals on the resolution of intergroup conflict. Such goals are ones "which cannot be easily ignored by the members of . . . antagonistic groups, but the attainment of which is beyond the resources and efforts of one group alone." \(^3\) An example from the novel *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch* \(^4\) is illustrative of the dynamics of

\(^{1}\)Ibid., pp. 311-312. \(^{2}\)Sherif, *Robbers Cave*.

\(^{3}\)Ibid., p. 22.

superordinate goals. The setting is a forced labor camp in the Soviet Union during Stalin's regime.

You might well ask why a prisoner worked so hard for ten years in a camp. Why didn't they say to hell with it and drag their feet all day long till the night, which was theirs? But it wasn't so simple. That's why they'd dreamed up these gangs. It wasn't like gangs "outside" where every fellow got paid separately. In the camps they had these gangs to make the prisoners keep each other on their toes. So the fellows at the top didn't have to worry. It was like this -- either you all got something extra or you all starved.

The superordinate goal in this case was survival.

A few other social scientists have developed ideas similar to Sherif's concept of superordinate goals. Daniel Katz ¹ suggests the possibility of developing common paths or common goals that do not require the sacrifice of basic ethical principles and yet contribute to conflict resolution by integrating the needs of both sides. "A common path," according to Katz, "means that it sometimes is possible to find a course of action which will satisfy differing objectives. This may be accomplished through the mechanism of "consistent reactive group participation" in which the participants both send and receive norms in a range of programs over a period of time. Katz puts three questions for research on consistent reactive group participation: ²

(1) What patterns of personality and attitudinal and social structure variables maximize consistent participation in functional and political groups?

(2) What are the prior conditions for the creation and development of these factors which make for this type of group participation?


²Ibid., pp. 36-37.
(3) Under what conditions will this type of group participation lead to reduction in aggressive conflict and war?

Others whose work implicitly touches upon the question of superordinate goals include Znaniecki, Schelling, Tillich, and Pire. Znaniecki found in a study of religious wars that "while they were being carried on, various non-religious conflicts between fellow believers were at least temporarily suspended." The imperative to defeat a common enemy may be treated as a special case of superordinate goals. Schelling in the *Strategy of Conflict* concerns himself with situations in which "the ability of one participant to gain his end is dependent to an important degree on the choice of decisions that the other participant will make." According to the theologian, Paul Tillich, war is "unavoidable as long as there is no overarching unity within which the particular power structures have found a common center."

Work toward superordinate goals has been implicitly described by Newstetter and Schwartz as a primary focus of social intergroup work. Father Pire, the Dominican recipient of the 1958 Nobel Prize for Peace, advocates "building bridges" by encouraging conflicting parties to work together to reduce the suffering of a third party. From such work comes understanding and reduction of conflict, he contends.

---

1Znaniecki, op. cit., p. 354.

2McClelland, op. cit., p. 89.

3Fromm, op. cit., p. 33.

The Robbers Cave Experiment

One of the most exciting and significant research contributions to the field of social work today is *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation* by Muzafer Sherif and his associates at the University of Oklahoma. The Robbers Cave was a closely controlled experiment designed to investigate the social processes of intergroup conflict and cooperation. It attempted to trace the formation, functioning, and change of the subjects' attitudes toward their in-groups and co-members and toward out-groups and their members within and as consequences of the setting of group interaction processes. That is, "group attitudes (both intra- and intergroup)" were started from scratch and were consciously produced "as a consequence of interaction processes in intra- and intergroup relations through the introduction of specified experimental conditions".\(^1\) The experiment consists of three stages, each introducing several hypotheses. The general hypothesis stated that: \(^2\)

Intergroup attitudes and behavior are determined primarily by the nature of functional relations between groups in question (and not primarily by the pattern of relations and attitudes prevailing within the groups themselves, nor primarily by the deviate or neurotic behavior of particular individuals who have suffered more than the usual degree of frustration in their life histories.)

In Stage One, in-groups with hierarchical structures and sets of norms were created through "the introduction of goals which arise as integral parts in the situation, which have common appeal value, and

\(^{1}\text{Sherif, op. cit., p. 34.}\)  \(^{2}\text{Ibid., p. 38.}\)
which necessitate facing a common problem, discussion, planning and execution in a mutually cooperative way." ¹ In Stage Two, intergroup tension was generated by bringing two in-groups into competition designed to create frustration in relation to one another. In Stage Three, superordinate goals were introduced with the aim of reducing intergroup tension. All three stages were carried to successful conclusions.

The experimental site was a Boy Scout Camp in an isolated wooded section of Oklahoma. It contained all of the usual facilities of a scout camp -- facilities for swimming, boating, hiking, camping, sports, etc. -- and was available for the exclusive use of the experiment. The total seclusion of the camp setting itself made possible strict control of the experimental environment. The experiment itself lasted for three weeks and used the researchers in the role of camp staff members.

The subjects for the study were twenty-two eleven-year-old, middle class, white, Protestant boys with social histories containing no abnormal degree of stress. The subjects with one exception were of slightly above average intelligence, none had ever failed in school and all had successfully passed the fifth grade. They had no serious physical defects. All "trouble-makers" and "problem" boys (as defined by school principals and teachers or observed by the researchers on school playgrounds) were eliminated from the sample. None of the boys had reached puberty, previously knew each other or was aware that an experiment was being conducted.

¹Ibid., p. 37.
The subjects were assigned to two groups carefully matched (in order of the factor's importance) in height, weight, general sports ability, special sports skills, popularity in school and neighborhood, special camp-related skills, swimming and previous camp experience. To prevent any unconscious bias, staff was assigned to a group by the flip of a coin.

To ensure that the subjects were kept unaware of the experiment (a) researchers were participant observers in the role of staff members, (b) recording was done out of sight of the subjects, (c) natural problems directly related to the conditions of the campers (e.g., food preparation when hungry) were used rather than abstract discussions about distantly related topics, and (d) problem solutions came as the result of group discussion rather than manipulation by the experimenter.

The data were collected principally by participant observers and included process records and performance estimates by subjects about themselves and other subjects. At certain points conversations were taped without the knowledge of the subjects.

Stage Three of the Robbers Cave Experiment is of greatest significance to the present research. It was initiated only after an unmistakable state of friction between the two groups was manifested in hostile acts and derogatory stereotypes. In the Robbers Cave Experiment one week was devoted to Stage Three. In this stage it was found that contact in itself did not markedly reduce intergroup hostility and in some cases increased it, that the introduction of superordinate goals did contribute to the reduction of intergroup conflict and that

1Ibid., p. 201.
the effects of superordinate goals were cumulative. In addition, superordinate goals were found to alter the significance of other influences; intergroup contacts, for example, in the pursuit of superordinate goals were found to be effective in reducing conflict.

Several criticisms of the Robbers Cave have been suggested by McNeil. He points out the inherent difficulty and perhaps danger of extrapolating to the larger social scene from a study of twenty-two carefully selected, normal, eleven-year-old boys and suggests that a more appropriate model might derive from the study of delinquents for whom open hostility produces less guilt, the concept of "fair play" is less cloying, the response to implicit social criticisms more contemptuous, and the drive to power is more tightly woven into the fabric of their being. With such raw material, the consequent experimental broth might resemble less the cup of friendship than the devil's brew.

McNeil also contends that the concept of superordinate goals used in the Robbers Cave Experiment has a Machiavellian twist which deprived the subjects of "the freedom consciously to contribute to the quality and extent of the reduction of hostility." Their peace was the unconscious by-product of what might have seemed to them only normal dynamic human relations. "An experiment in which education for superordination was a part of enlisting the conscious cooperation of the antagonists might produce a cessation of hostilities differing in kind and quality from that achieved at Robbers Cave."

---


2Ibid., p. 68. 3Ibid., p. 79.
A third criticism is made of the brief duration of the in-
groups as groups or as groups in conflict. Had the groups existed
longer and thereby developed greater group cohesion, would the effect
of superordinate goals have been the same? 1

McNeil goes on to conclude that "ideally, a systematic plan of
experimentation ought to be undertaken to explore the effectiveness
of superordinate goals on conflict in a variety of groups having
different characteristics and natural histories." 2

1Ibid. 2Ibid., p. 81
CHAPTER II - THE REPLICATION STUDY

Background

In 1962 research was initiated by Eisenstein et al., 1 which extended and modified Sherif's work. This thesis is one part of one stage of that larger study referred to hereafter as the Replication Study. 2

The Replication Study consists of three stages. Sherif studied conflict through the introduction artificial situations; in the Replication Study conflict is not artificially generated. It was therefore necessary as Stage One of the replication to establish the existence of naturally occurring conflict. This was accomplished by Biedenkapp, 3 Curran, 4 and Stovall 5 during the summer of 1962. In the Robbers Cave superordinate goals were contrived and injected artificially into the social process; the Replication Study is concerned with superordinate goals which arise naturally in the process of social interaction. This thesis, as a part of Stage Two of the Replication Study, is concerned with the existence of such naturally occurring superordinate goals.

1Eisentein, et al., op. cit.
2We refer to our research as the Replication Study although actually it extends the work of Sherif and differs from his work in several significant ways. See below.
3Biedenkapp, op. cit.
Stage Three of the replication investigates the effect of such goals in reducing intergroup conflict.

The Replication Study introduces the following modifications to Sherif: (1) sharp differences in the background of subjects, (2) a natural agency camp setting, (3) the use of some staff not related to the study, (4) a difference of duration, (5) the study of natural rather than artificial conflict and superordinate goals, and (6) the study of conflict between a social agency and its clientele rather than only between groups of the clientele.

The last two modifications are of particular importance. The study of natural conflict increases the practicality of transferring the conclusions of the study to conflict in the real world of social life. The study of conflict between a social agency and its clientele should suggest implications for the work of social workers employed by such agencies.

Twin Link Camp, the site of the Replication Study, is a social agency camp operated by the United Community Centers, Inc., of Brooklyn, New York, and has been in operation for seven years. It operates as two camps in one -- Teen Camp and Down Camp -- and thus differs from the Robbers Cave in having present campers in addition to those who are the subjects of the study. Down Camp is for younger campers than is Teen Camp and usually has in residence about seventy-five campers for periods of three, six or nine weeks.

In 1964, during the study for this thesis, Teen Camp included twenty-six teenagers, with girls ranging in age from fourteen to seventeen and boys from fifteen through seventeen. The Teens came to camp
for the entire nine week session. There were nine boys and seventeen girls. Four of the Teens were Negroes. All but one of the Teens was a resident of New York City. There was one sibling pair. Many of the Teens knew one another through previous city or camp experiences. The subjects, then, of the Replication Study differ from those of the Robbers Cave in age, sex, religion, race, parental socio-economic class, previous social history, range of emotional development, achievement in school, previous acquaintance with one another and number of individuals in the study. ¹

The physical settings for the two studies are similar. Both sites are located in isolated, hilly, wooded, rural areas. The setting of the Robbers Cave is described in Chapter One. Twin Link Camp is in the Foothills of the Catskill Mountains about one hundred miles north of New York City. Its twenty-one acres were at one time the location of a bungalow colony. Within the camp boundaries are found a swimming and boating area on the Roundout River, part of an old barge canal, wooded hills and a large athletic field. In Down Camp the campers live in cabins left from bungalow days; the Teens sleep in large tents on tent platforms. During the summer of 1962 the Teens erected a bathhouse for Teen Camp. Other camp facilities are used jointly by both camps and include a dining hall and kitchen, an arts and crafts building, and a recreation hall.

Camp Program, however, is not limited to the camp proper. The two camp buses make it possible to move groups out of camp to use the

¹For a detailed description see Biedenkapp, op. cit., pp. 20-21.
natural and cultural facilities of surrounding states. In 1964, Teen trips went to the folk festival in Newport, Rhode Island, and to Quebec, Canada.

Purposes of the Study - Hypotheses

The general hypotheses of the Replication Study is that:

Conflict can be reduced in intergroup relations with the introduction of superordinate goals.

Stage One

Stage One of the Replication Study was carried out by Biedenkapp, Curran and Stovall in 1962 and investigated the following hypotheses. Results are shown after each hypothesis in parentheses.

Hypothesis: When an agency has conscious goals and values, conflict develops in attempting to bring about behavioral change consistent with these goals and values. (supported)

Sub-Hypothesis 1: Conflict will develop between the agency and its clientele. (Supported)

Sub-Hypothesis 1A: Conflict will develop between Teens and staff due to differences in expectations. (supported)

Sub-Hypothesis 1B: Conflict will develop over the differences in the staff's and Teen's understanding of self-government. (supported)

Sub-Hypothesis 1C: Conflict will develop over resistance on the part of the Teens to discuss in a group individual problem which reflect a social problem of the group. (supported)

Sub-Hypothesis 2: Conflict will develop as a result of the formation of cliques within the Teens. (supported)

Sub-Hypothesis 2A: Conflict will develop when cliques form as a result of past relationships. (not supported)

Sub-Hypothesis 2B: Conflict will develop around the role of the boys as a sub-group and the girls as a sub-group. (not supported)
Sub-Hypothesis 3: Conflict will develop within the Teens when a sub-group accepts and identifies with the agency goals and values. (supported)

Specific conflicts which arose centered around: (1) race roles, (2) fraternization of girl Teens with staff, (3) smoking, (4) the development of cliques, (5) the question of whether certain Teens should be permitted to go on the Teen trip, and (6) the role of staff versus Teen self-government in planning program.

Stage One of the Replication Study demonstrated conclusively that conflict developed as the result of the give and take of natural social interaction when a social agency attempted to bring about behavioral change in its clientele through a conscious attempt to implement its goals and values.

Stage Two

In the Robbers Cave Sherif studied introduced superordinate goals which were consciously injected into the social process. These were fabricated goals which did not arise in the natural process of social interaction. Stage Two of the Replication Study investigates naturally occurring, not contrived, superordinate goals. This thesis is part of Stage Two of the replication.

Hypothesis: When an agency has conscious goals and values, superordinate goals arise in attempting to bring about behavioral change consistent with these goals and values.

Sub-Hypothesis 1: Superordinate goals will be found in both the area of program and the area of philosophy.

Sub-Hypothesis 2: Superordinate goals will occur as intermediate steps toward other superordinate goals.
Methodology

Twin Link Camp is a social agency camp which was not established exclusively for the purposes of research. This meant that the camp staff role of the researcher at times superseded his role as researcher. The needs and program of the camp came first. There was, however, no conflict between the research and the program in camp. The problem studied was compatible with the camp's goals and its philosophy that conflict can be used to effect behavioral change.

The setting of a social agency camp also affected the selection of research subjects. The interracial, non-sectarian nature of the camp may have led to a selecting-out process among potential campers by the campers themselves or their parents. There are persons who, for a number of reasons, would prefer not to attend a camp of this type. Camp recruiting was guided by a conscious policy of guaranteeing the interracial composition of the camp and of insuring that ability to pay did not determine attendance. No person who applied for Teen Camp, verbally accepted the camp philosophy and could pay the fee \(^1\) was turned away while spaces remained in camp.

Before being accepted for camp each camper and his parents were interviewed by the camp director or in his absence by the president of the community center board of directors who had been trained by the director to ensure interview consistency. During the interview the nature of the camp was explained. The campers learned: (1) that the camp would be a work camp with a minimum number of hours of physical

\(^1\)Scholarships are available.
work required daily (he might have to work as much as eight hours each
day), (2) that the camp would be non-sectarian and interracial, and
(3) that the campers would be encouraged to discuss any problems or
disagreements they might have through the camp structure of group
meetings of campers and staff, councillors, teen director, camp director,
and board of directors. If he agreed to accept these ideas, the rela-
tion of program to the general goals and values of camp was discussed.

It was pointed out that the only limitations on program
within the framework of the camp philosophy would be the availability
of funds, the availability of supervisory staff to guarantee the safety
of the Teens, and the willingness of the Teens to participate in planning
their own program. To as great an extent as possible campers would plan
and carry out their own program with staff supervision and guidance.

Parents were permitted one visiting day during the nine weeks of
camp. There were no restrictions about receiving mail; daily newspapers
and radio were available for camper use. Campers were not, then, iso-
lated totally from the events of the outside world. In addition, trips
outside the camp were possible as planned and carried out by the Teens.

Money was not kept in the possession of the campers but was
deposited in the camp canteen. The Teens were not permitted to smoke.

The researcher was related to the Teens as Teen Director. The
Teens were not aware that research was being conducted. Not all staff
members were related to the research project. Teen staff members who
were not involved in the research were told that research was going on
but were unaware of its nature. Other staff members related to the
Teens in specialty areas were not aware that research was being
conducted.
The researcher functioned as a participant observer in a dual role. In carrying out his staff responsibilities he at the same time observed the Teens' behavior. The Teens were under observation during their waking hours with the exception of a free hour following dinner. The hours spent in observation were computed on the basis of a fifteen hour day for four weeks or a total of 420 hours. ¹

The use of attitude questionnaires as a source of data collection was eliminated because of the difficulties of validation and because such use might have indicated to the Teens that research was going on. Such awareness could have affected the relationship between the staff and Teens and thereby prevented the continuation of research on the conflict between the two groups.

As a part of the normal program of camp, meetings were called either by the staff or the Teens for program planning and revision or for the discussion of group problems. The sole source of data used in this thesis consists of taped recordings of these meetings made with the knowledge and consent of the Teens. Such tape recording is accepted by the Teens as a normal procedure of camp and did not suggest to them that research was underway. They were at no time aware that research was being conducted.

The researcher arrived in camp several weeks after the campers. Therefore, he was not present in the initial stages of some conflicts. He familiarized himself with the conflict situation through conversations with the Teens and staff and by participant observation.

¹The researcher arrived at camp for the final four weeks - thus the discrepancy between the total hours and the nine week camp period.
The utilization of tape recordings as the sole source of research data made possible the elimination of one type of potential bias. All the speeches of every person during the taped discussion were collected. This material has been played back and extensive representative portions of it have been transcribed and constitute the data analyzed in this thesis.

Analysis of Data

A goal is a possible future state of affairs which a person finds desirable and toward the attainment of which he organizes his present actions. A goal may be desired by one party in a conflict without being desired by the other party or parties. A superordinate goal is one which is desired by both parties in a conflict and which cannot be attained except through mutual cooperation.

The existence of a superordinate goal will be considered demonstrated if (1) the record shows that the goal is verbalized by or may be implied from the actions of both parties to the conflict, viz: staff and campers, and (2) the goal cannot be attained without the cooperation of both staff and campers.

The presentation and analysis of data constitute Chapter Three.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In the following pages are presented excerpts from the transcriptions of taped discussions. The names of the speakers have been changed to guarantee anonymity. Names of staff members are typed in capital letters while lower case letters are used for the names of campers. Each excerpt has been identified by both the tape containing the original data and the pages it occupies in the transcribed record. Individual speeches are numbered to facilitate reference during the analysis of data. Each excerpt provides evidence for more than one hypothesis.

The following hypotheses are investigated:

Hypothesis: When an agency has conscious goals and values, superordinate goals arise in attempting to bring about behavioral change consistent with these goals and values.

Sub-Hypotheses:

(1) Superordinate goals will be found in both the area of program and the area of philosophy.

(2) Superordinate goals will occur as intermediate steps toward other superordinate goals.

The Data

Excerpt A (Tape 6, Side 1, pp. 49-71)

On the morning of 8/13/64 the Teens and staff met with the camp director to discuss the problem of a camper who wished to go home.
When the campers initially arrived at camp in early July there were among them three girls who were not accepted by many of the other campers because they "teased" their hair and used cosmetics such as eye shadow extensively. Most of the Teens accepted the camp philosophy that teenage beauty should not be spoiled by the excessive use of artificial makeup. These girls who did not conform and who rejected other camp values such as physical work found themselves excluded by and also excluded themselves from the group. This led to a deterioration of camper relationships which culminated the day before the researcher arrived in camp with one of the three girls going home. The meeting described below was called in accordance with the camp policy of discussing, socially, problems which affect the group.

When a second camper became insistent in her desire to leave also, the meeting was called at the request of the camp director and Teen staff.

A1 MYLES: We've got to keep the sparks of the fire down or otherwise we'll have to put it out. I just want to warn you about how careful you have to be -

A2 Hugh: The radio said there is a forest fire just about four miles away with a fire half an acre long.

A3 MYLES: They (staff) saw the fire from the road and called the fire department to put it out. The whole area is tinder dry and almost any spark could start a fire. We really have to be very careful. I would just like to ask a question of this group. What would your reaction be if I told you that a camper wanted to go home, that this camper feels completely unwanted, feels that there is no place for her here in this camp? What would your reaction be?

A4 Jimmie: I wouldn't be that surprised that somebody wants to go home because they feel they're being totally neglected. I for one treat about a third of this group almost like total strangers. Some other people are not so bad but almost do the same thing. I could see a person thinking that they weren't totally a part of the group.

A5 Joy: I think that some of us knew about it and have felt pretty upset. . . . We talk to the person.
Lilly: I don't know of anyone who is upset.

Mildred: I don't think this is anything that's been in just the last few days. I think it's been going on the whole summer and nobody has made an effort to do anything about it.

Lilly: You mean just that one person or everybody?

MYLES: Look, let's stop talking about 'that one person'. I just started it off in an impersonal sense because I just wanted to pose a question. ... I am talking specifically about a camper in this group named Jeanette who feels excluded from this group. Some of you may feel you are friends with her. Some of you may not. Whatever you may feel, basically Jeanette does not feel accepted in this group. And as far as Jeanette is concerned this has been a wasted summer and she wants to go home because at least if she goes home she can salvage something out of the summer. ... So let's get down to cases and talk turkey. . . .

MYLES: Now what's your reaction? It's one thing to sit around and theorize for six weeks about what might be, what should be, what isn't, what ought to be. Now here's a reality. Here's the product of your attitude toward one another. ... The product is 'I don't feel I belong and if I can salvage something out of the summer I better get out of here as fast as I can so maybe I can still make something of what remains'. ... This is reality. This is no more gobblety-gook. This is no more fancy talk. This is a plain simple product of your living together for six weeks in this place.

Jill: A couple of us were talking to Jeanette and telling her how we wanted her to stay but the things she said about how she has been cheated by the group sounded so true that (we) hardly knew what to say.

Jimmie: I think she (Jeanette) has a valid point. ... She has been neglected - by me and by everyone. ... For a while we had a close relationship but then I was treated almost as a stranger. ... This attitude between the two of us has just traveled on up to the present and nothing's been done about it. Today was one of the few days I talked to her - even said hello to her. It's a rare occasion.

Mary: I think we're all very, very intolerant people. We don't accept somebody who makes a mistake and starts over.

MYLES: What mistake? Look, don't talk to me about some person, some mistake. What big mistake did some person make that everyone was intolerant about?
Mary: Jeanette always acted different from us. She didn't always like meetings. She said to us she didn't think they were worth while so right away we were intolerant. Or about the smoking. (Editor: While Jeanette was in the infirmary she was stigmatized by the other Teens for giving cigarettes to children from Down Camp.) A lot of us just assumed that Jeanette was an untouchable because she had done such a terrible thing. . . . Not only has Jeanette been neglected. She's been completely ignored and treated like dirt.

Mildred: I think that she represented a lot of different things and that she thought differently from us. Most of the people I stayed with this summer were like me or had similar ideas. ... I think Jeanette was very different and she didn't like meetings. I don't think I really spoke with her. I spoke with people with ideas like mine.

Bernie: Up until maybe the last few days I never had any real relationship with her and I think it was maybe because of the other people she associated with. The great majority of the group rejected her on the level of friendship and she stayed with the other kids who were also rejected by the group. There was not enough looking at Jeanette herself but associating her with the other people she stayed with. In the last few days a relationship has maybe started but it took too long to realize that initial judgments are usually wrong. I prejudged her before I even knew her.

Joy: Are you finished?! Who do you think you are that you don't like the people she's staying with?

Bernie: Joy, I meant that that's a problem I have. I didn't mean that -

Joy: You said you didn't like the people she's staying with and the way she acted -

Bernie: I had also rejected the same people so it was easy to stick her with these people and not have to struggle with her separately. It was easier to stick them all together in one big group.

Myles: Anybody else? Anybody else got the crying towel out? You're the biggest bunch of phonies I've ever run across in my life. You know, at the drop of a hat it comes out. You turn it on and you turn it off like a faucet of water. If you're all so bright and you can all verbalize it so quickly and you can all understand it, how come you can't behave on the basis of what you're able to say? . . . Is this the only time you know but the minute you get away from discussing you can't act on what you know? What's the use of knowing? We've been hearing this kind of talk for six
weeks everytime something happens... and then we get up from the fire and do the same thing. Is this the level of our living? We ought to get you all mummy bags. You sit like a bunch of mummies. I expect the next minute for everybody to say 'please stay'. ... Isn't that the next step in the show - in your script? Why should she stay? Would any one of you think it was worth staying in this group in the same circumstances? Huh, Al?

**A23 Al:** I don't think so.

**A24 Myles:** Then why don't you talk up? Do I have to call you out by name?

**A25 Al:** If I was treated like this - well, maybe I've treated her like this - I think I - I know I would want to go home and I don't think I would care what they said... Even if they said 'we want you', I don't think I'd change.

**A26 Myles:** No one else has anything to say?

**A27 Tina:** I don't know what we can say after listening to you. I really want Jeanette to stay but I'm almost afraid to say it, because you're just going to say what has she got to stay for anyway.

**A28 Myles:** Know why you're afraid to speak out, Jeanette. For the same reason everyone else is afraid to speak. Most of you have done very little changing and most of you have tried very little to change... And you're afraid to talk because you know the script - not because I called it a script. If all of you knew it wasn't a script and all of you had been struggling and were willing to struggle, you'd tear me apart for calling this a script in a put-up job. But you haven't been willing to get by with the minimum. That's why we have what we have. That's why we have a split between Negro and white. That's why we have a split between so-called intellectuals and so-called non-intellectuals. That's why we have all kinds of splits in this group. This isn't a group. We've got a bunch of little cliques but we don't have a group - not yet. And six weeks have gone by. Do you consider yourselves a group? Do you have any sense of identity with one another? Do you have any real feeling for one another as a bunch - as people? - in a group and as individuals? You outrage each other's dignity every day!...

**A29 Lilly:** That's not what was meant.

**A30 Myles:** If the kids come away with it, you have to live with it whether it was meant or not. If the Negro members of this group came away feeling that the white members of the group feel they are overly concerned with civil rights then you have to live with the impact of what you're doing regardless of what your intent was. It's easy to make speeches. It's quite another thing to live...
together. An you don't want to struggle. You may talk all you want but you don't want to struggle because if you did, there'd be no difficulty in having talk going on right now. An you wouldn't let me do any talking. There wouldn't be any need for me to talk any more...

A31 Tina: I think like well a lot of us have been involved, particularly lately I think, around Jeanette and around other people in the group and... maybe you can call me phony... but yesterday and today I feel like different about Jeanette and the rest of the people in the group. I feel like I've been wrong and I don't want to feel that way.

A32 Joy: A lot of people don't care if she goes home--

A33 Jimmie: I can't hear you, Joy.

A34 Joy: (bitterly) Of course you can't hear me because you don't want to hear me--Jimmie! Tina, maybe you care but I'm sure that a lot of people like Jimmie and Bernie don't care and other people like Bob and Carl and--

A35 MYLES: Now don't start that--

A36 Joy: They don't care about anybody but themselves. And Jimmie is full of they don't like the people Jeanette associates with, that's why they don't like her. They say that she's nice now that last night she went against them. Now they like her. But they didn't like her before because she stayed with us. And they don't care if she goes home. They don't give a heck about anything but themselves.

A37 Jimmie: First of all, Joy, I never said that I liked anyone--

A38 Tina: But Jimmie! What do you mean?... You mean it's true you don't care about anybody in the group? Is that what you're saying?

A39 Hugh: That's not what he's saying.

A40 Tina: Well, tell me what you're saying because I don't understand.

A41 Jimmie: I'm just saying that I didn't ever say that I ever liked anybody and I don't think what Joy says is true. I don't think it's true at all. I don't think it's true about Bernie--

A42 Joy: (upset, almost crying): Jimmie! If you hate everybody why are you in this camp? You hate anybody and everybody! You don't care a thing about what anybody does. You don't care a thing except about yourself--

A43 Jimmie: I don't hate everybody--
A44 Joy (crying): Not much! You're never involved in anything anybody else has done except with Bernie . . .

A45 Bernie: First of all, Joy, . . . you're wrong when you think that Jimmie and I never go around with anybody else. . . . and we're not the same people -

A46 Joy: (still upset) Why? Because you put me and Sylvia together. You put me and Jeanette together. You think we're all a bunch of phonies - of, of, of non-intellectuals - ... You said it before that there was a bunch of kids that were rejected from the group -

A47 Lilly: I think she's right

A48 Tina: Bernie, why are you talking so defensive that you're not keeping up with what Joy's saying?

A49 Jimmie: I don't think she's being defensive.

A50 Bernie: I'm not being defensive. I heard Joy say it and in some respects she's right. I said before that I knew it was wrong. But I think that when Joy says the only reason we - I like (Jeanette) is because she went against us, that's not right because people don't change over night and you can't change people's attituded that they've had for a long time. I'm sure I haven't tried as hard as I could have. It took me six and a half week to get through some little bit of what I felt about some of the people. And then in the last couple of days - maybe it's wrong but - but I felt there was starting to get some little relationship and (I) was starting to stop thinking about myself for once and started to realize that maybe what I'd done about Jeanette was wrong. And it wasn't just because of this meeting or because I felt guilty or anything. It's just that I started to change an attitude and I don't think what Joy says is true to the extent she says it's true.

A51 Joan: Whether she's right or wrong don't forget that she's a person and she feels this way about you and she's saying all these things. Don't you care? You just keep saying I think she's wrong in some respect and right in others but I don't care what she feels. That is what you're saying.

A52 Jeanette: Maybe . . . I know that some girls in the group said they wanted me to stay. Well, I feel that - I know that we've had a lot of meetings and in meetings we say a lot of things about what we do wrong on trips and things - 'oh, we won't do this again' or 'we'll have more responsibility' and things. And yet we make the same mistakes over and we repeat them. It's like taking a chance. . . . I don't want to take that chance of having to rest of my summer ruined and the same mistakes made over -
A53 **Lilly:** What do you mean, Jeanette?

A54 **Jeanette:** Have you ever noticed that after a meeting everybody is so close together? . . . Everybody's talking to you about what happened. A few hours and everybody cligues off into little groups again and stays by themselves and leaves - I don't know but I feel like a drifting raft in the middle of the ocean looking for some place to dock and I don't want to take the chance of having the same mistakes made over.

A55 **Gloria:** I mean I don't exactly understand, Jeanette, but isn't that like not wanting to struggle?

A56 **Jeanette:** I've struggled and I want to. I've struggled very hard. And it hurt me more each time I struggled harder.

A57 **Joy:** . . . a lot of people just can't struggle any longer. Jeanette wanted to go home a long time ago . . . but stayed on and stayed on. It comes to a point that you must can't take it any longer . . . . She can't go on just for the sake of saying 'I struggled'. If she feels this way and she doesn't enjoy herself, why shouldn't she go home?

A58 **Tina:** . . . I can't answer like logically and I can't say well this is wrong and this is wrong and we weren't really neglecting you and we were really struggling because it's not true but I -- all I can keep saying is . . . that I want (you) to stay so much -- . . .

A59 **Lilly:** I still think that -- I know people are going to jump on me -- the group has rejected a lot of people and I think it's partly on the summer . . . (but) I think a lot of people . . . also rejected the group or persons in it. . . . I'm not defending the group but I think it's also partly on the people involved. . . . When people came up and saw what kind of camp it was, they had ideas about rejecting - everything. . . .

A60 **Jeanette:** I don't know; Nobody was excluded but me. I wouldn't be right to please everybody, to get to know everybody. I tried I mean I still wanted to. I mean I'd really love to stay but I have very deep feelings about staying because -- . . .

A61 **MYLES:** What has this whole meeting deteriorated into? . . . I think that whether you're aware of it or not it's deteriorated in that just a few people are talking and the rest of you are just sitting there as if it doesn't involve you at all. You see, from this point of view I think that Jeanette raises a very important question. I don't agree with her when she says 'I'd love to stay but how can I trust you?' There are no guarantees in this world
for anybody and what she's really saying is that she wants guarantees without having to struggle. . . . It just isn't possible. Human beings . . . make mistakes and they hurt one another even when they don't want to. If there is to be anything, there has to be the willingness to struggle on the part of everyone and not the request of guarantees to one from another. . . . The other thing is that we're raising here not the responsibility of the individual who is having difficulty but the responsibility of the whole group. . . . To raise the other responsibility at this time is really to water down the attempt to understand what has happened among yourselves. And then the reality is that we are not talking on a social basis but on an individual basis. . . . And no individual can guarantee anything. . . . The only way that anyone can be guaranteed that there can be a fruitful three weeks ahead is to the extent that everyone including the individuals are willing to struggle together. That means everybody has to be willing to turn themselves inside out. And this is what troubles me. There has been no attempt to understand -- only breast beating. . . . If as an organized group and as members of that group you had functioned in a certain kind of way, no person could say 'I want to go home because I'm not wanted'. . . . And this is where your responsibility lies -- your responsibility for creating the atmosphere in which we live. . . .

A62 MYLES: . . . You can't tell me that smoking could go on in this group without you knowing about it. If you didn't want smoking to go on, nobody could smoke in this group. . . . All kinds of things. Whether it's smoking, chewing gum, telling dirty jokes, behavior in the tents, whatever you want to call it, there is nothing possible in this place unless you permit it. . . . What you permit, exists. . . . You have to be willing to bother your head about something other than yourself and your own needs. And this within limited ways you have but basically you haven't been able to do. I can give you all kinds of examples. After the floor to the walk-in box was finished, you sanded down one side -- the side you could see. The side that you couldn't see, they didn't sand. I'm not saying it was deliberate but this is a way of thinking, of living, of behaving. It all comes out in all kinds of ways. If you treat a piece of wood that way, you'll certainly treat a human being the same way. . . . Basically, I'm saying you have what you created. And what you don't have you created also. And you could have a lot more if you only wanted to do it. And the wanting to do it is related to your willingness to take responsibility. Unfortunately, there's a crazy fear in our world around responsibility. We think that responsibility and freedom are opposites. . . . The reality is there can be no freedom without responsibility. There just can't be any. . . . in reality the ability to accept responsibility is a freeing thing. It's a liberating thing because having accepted responsibility it opens up possibilities you could never have otherwise. And you can see if even in your relationships. If you don't want to have responsibility, you can have fewer relationships among your selves and you have relationships that are not as deep and meaningful.
Only to the extent that you are willing to take responsibility for someone other than yourself can you have a relationship which develops some depth and meaning for you. . . . And now do you think anything is possible?

A63 Jimmie: It's possible.

A64 Tina: I think what's possible is what we want and I know what I want to do but I don't know what anybody else wants to do.

A65 Bruce: . . . I'm willing to struggle around certain people -- specifically Jeanette. We struggled for a while and I guess I set a limit on the amount of struggling I wanted to do and stopped. And right now I don't care whether she stays or goes. Tina said she wants Jeanette to stay here. Well, I can't say that. I would be lying if I did. I don't have any feelings for Jeanette. --

A66 Joy: I think it's sort what Bruce's saying. People don't care -- . . . They have no feeling . . .

A67 Mildred: Well I disagree. I want Jeanette to stay. I know after a lot of meetings I've said I'm going to try, I'm going to struggle and then -- (fades out)

Excerpt B (Tape 6, Side 2, pp. 71-85)

On the morning of 8/14/64 the camp director returned to Teen Camp to continue the discussion of the previous morning (Excerpt A). The attempt was made to deal with the question of relationships in camp by discussing the decision that the Teen director had made (and carried out) to leave camp in the middle of the season. She was replaced by the researcher. The first Teen director was a trained social caseworker who experienced a great deal of difficulty dealing with the group qua group. She had been a member of the Teen staff the previous summer and had decided to leave then but had been talked into staying against her desire by the Teens. In 1964 she left in spite of the arguments of the Teens and created considerable confusion and mixed feeling in the group. The
Teens thought the meeting would be a continuation of the discussion of Jeanette's wish to leave.

B1 **MYLES**: ... I'd like to start with a different question. This morning, I'd like to get your reaction to Jean's leaving camp.

B2 **Mary**: ... the staff really gave it to us the last two weeks of camp (last year) and I came ... really grateful that (they) had struggled and hadn't given up. This summer I was furious (because I thought Jean quit) and I think she just didn't want to struggle. She knew when she came that you can't always struggle just the way you want to. And I was really mad ...  

B3 **Tina**: I felt the way Mary did a lot. At first I was upset and now I'm confused. ...

B4 **Bruce**: When Jean left at first I was annoyed and thought the group was going to fall apart ... But then I saw it didn't ... and didn't feel bad any more. ...  

B5 **MYLES**: I would like not to hear from all the old standbys. I'm sick and tired of hearing from them.

B6 **Al**: ... After she left I really lost confidence in what she said and then when Ross came up ... I think she didn't supply some of the spirit as much as Ross does. He keeps on going and going. He keeps on pushing and pushing. Now I don't have any feeling for her at all.  

B7 **Joan**: Jean didn't want to struggle. It seemed to me that she was doing exactly what she told us not to do. I lacked confidence in what she said. ...  

B8 **Joy**: When she left, I felt terrible because I miss her so much. ... I really like her. Even if she gave up, I still like her as a person.

B9 **Derek**: I felt like somehow we had failed ... She tried to push us to struggle and we didn't struggle at all. And I think we failed because she lost confidence in us. She had to give up the struggle. She was not willing to struggle with people who would not struggle with their own problems.

B10 **Mildred**: I think we should have done a little more before Jean left because last year it was different. ... I think we sort of held back and didn't really understand Jean ... and she felt you people have closed minds so I'm not going to do anything more because you won't change anyway. ...
IRA: I remember that I tried to find the feeling here the day that Jean left and was surprised to find that it didn't bother the boys and girls very much. A few I talked to were surprised that Jean gave up. I didn't find anyone who tried to think more than that. . . . I feel that you don't trust the staff and that Jean left because you didn't trust her.

Tina, Mary, & Mildred: I don't think that's true, Ira!

Lilly: Let him finish. Let him finish.

IRA: . . . You don't come to us if you have problems. I remember yesterday that you said you couldn't discuss the problem because Myles was not here. . . . It might be that Jean gave up. I don't know. But what was the real reason that she gave up?

MYLES: Is that how all of you feel?

Derek: I didn't say that.

MYLES: How come only about four people out of all of you have spoken? The rest of you have no reaction of any kind. Is that what you're saying? . . . What's the matter, Rosa? You don't want to talk and somebody's signalling you to talk? . . . And what's with you? (to another Teen) Have you pulled your head up so that you can't hear anything? (group chuckling) You're praying, huh? (general laughter)

George: I want to know if I failed algebra last year, how can I take geometry? I want to know why when Jean leaves we don't discuss Jean any more (but) we go to Viet Nam. We forget all about it. We never got the foundation but we skip around to the next problem. Maybe the problem was too bitter, too hard. We just want to forget it and go on to the new problem.

George: And when I spoke to people why they wanted (Jeanette) to stay . . . they said so they can make it so other people won't leave. Right away Jeanette's left. She's gone. Forget it. We know she's going to leave. Everyone has that attitude. And now we're staying here to make sure that other people don't leave.

Rosa: I don't think --

George: Don't tell me what you don't think --

MYLES: Well talk already! You sit there like a bump on a log and you never say anything. --
B23 MYLES: ... In reality what you're asking for is perfectionism and there is no such animal. That's part of Jeanette's problem. ... if you fall down once then this destroys all the other times that you have tried or attempted or have even done what you might have done. ... I think that part of the problem is that basically Jean is an individualist and Jean sees people as individuals, as single units ... and Jean has not yet overcome her problem in this area. ... She could never accept the idea that any individual should have to modify his behavior because of anyone else. And she verbalized it one day when she said: "if the kids want to go swimming and I don't want to go swimming, why should I have to go swimming with them?" And that's why she couldn't accept the idea of working with groups. Because the group modifies your behavior or it demands of you that you modify your behavior at times when you may not want to. And being part of a group very often means doing something that you're not so excited about doing. And my suspicions is that perhaps Jean set the tone and this is why we are where we are around developing as a group. I think there was a lot of emphasis on individuals and individualism and not enough on the development of the group. ... Seriously, it seems to me there has to be a breakthrough here now. ... I think you've got to take responsibility from here on in. ... not this breast beating ... We need to sit down and talk to one another straight, openly and clearly. (We need to) try to clarify. ... And don't any of you go away with the impression that I'm saying the individual is not important. It's the group -- some mysterious thing called the group. The group is us and it's people. It's not a mysterious something which exists in the sky. But the group reflects needs and goals that are beyond any one individual and it reflects our strivings for social things, -- and a recognition that most of the things we want are related to other people and in wanting them we affect other people. And there are two ways for achieving them. One is to say I will get for myself and I don't care whom I hurt in the process ... I'm hungry and I will get whatever food I need and I don't care whoever else starves. The other is the concept that I'm hungry but there are other people who are hungry and together we can solve our problem of hunger. And so you associate yourself with other people in the solution of your individual problems. And this is what we mean by being a member of a group and being part of a group. ... 

... 

B25 MYLES: Unless you begin to think about these things and talk about them, all this talk is for nothing. And that's what you have refused to do. Last year we used the term "open up". You're all trying to relate to each other on a purely superficial level. You don't want to admit one another into your own thinking about one another. And so this is what happens. There are very few of you who feel you have any fundamentally close relations to anyone in this group. ... There are few if any close relationships that have been built out of this summer's experience. ... 

...
B26 MYLES: I never saw your constitution or your government so as far as I'm concerned you don't have any.

B27 Chorus of Teens: We do. We do! We told you about it!

Excerpt C (Tape 7, Side 1, pp. 86-92)

On the afternoon of 3/14/64 the Teens met with the Teen staff (without the camp director) to plan their afternoon program. Some Teens favored a continuation of the morning's discussion while others felt that more discussion would be fruitless. They expressed the idea -- not uncommon among the Teens -- that too much time was spent in discussions. The Teen director, Ross, established conditions which had to be met before program time could be used for continued discussion.

C1 ROSS: Okay, now we need to decide whether or not we want to have any meeting this afternoon. I'll tell you very bluntly I don't think you do. I don't think your actions have shown that you do. That became pretty clear to me this morning. It was just a lot of nothing. . . . There's not going to be the same kind of thing this afternoon. If we're going to meet, we're going to meet and people are going to talk and open up. It's up to you. If you don't want it then keep it.

C2 Tina: Well, I want this meeting very much but I'm not going to put myself in a position where I'm railroading things through. So if enough people don't want it --

C3 Mildred: I think it's very important for the way we relate to each other and the way Teens relate to staff and staff relates to Teens. I think it's an important issue and I think we should discuss it. I think I'm willing to say what I feel because I think it's important enough.

C4 Sylvia: I don't want this meeting because I don't think it will accomplish anything. I think instead of a meeting we should start improving the way we ought to act because I think most of us know what we are here for and I --

C5 Mildred: Well, Sylvia, to reply to what you said I think we did act after the last meetings and the hostility has grown. So I think that this is something that has to come out. If people aren't willing to express their feelings, that's something different but I think we should be willing to express our feelings. Because we can change things. We can change our actions.
IRA: ... I think this meeting is very important because to take me as a counsellor I don't know what I'm doing here. Really I don't know. I don't know your feelings about me and other staff persons here. I hear all the time complaining ... that you can't talk to staff. I don't know if anybody has ... tried to raise any problem with staff. At least with me no one came to ask me for help ... .

BECKY: Look, if we're going to have a meeting, can we decide if and if we're not, can we decide it? Because you have a commitment to Raul and he's expecting you. If you're not going, you should tell him you're not. . . .

Lilly: I don't see how we can function without this meeting.

Joy: We had the meeting this morning.

Bernie: I think that the meeting will be about how we relate and not just about Jeanette going home. It's the whole general attitude.

ROSS: What about it Irene? Do you want this meeting? You haven't said a word.

Irene: I want this meeting.

ROSS: Why?

Irene: Because -- to find out the way we really feel and if we really do want Jeanette to go home. ... I think that if it were Jeanette or anybody else, we ought to put it to the group.

Derek: I don't think we should have this meeting. I know if I speak, I'm just going to contradict myself and I know a lot of people do that --

Bruce: I think there is an awful lot to talk about.

Lilly: Well let's start.

Sylvia: I still don't want a meeting. Ethel's not feeling good and I don't want a meeting either.

Joy: If they don't want a meeting --

PAUL: Why don't we take a vote and get this over?

Lilly: Ross said we can't meet unless it's unanimous -- he said unless everybody agrees to open up and talk. . . . What if Sylvia doesn't want a meeting and Joy --
C22 Ethel: Well, I'll talk. We may not get anywhere but I'll talk. That's an opinion. I don't think we'll get anywhere but if you want to have a meeting, I'll have it.

C23 Mary: If you start off with that attitude --

C24 Willa: We have meetings and everybody talks a whole lot of crap and then you never get anything done.

C25 Lilly: So what do you want to do?

C26 Mildred: Willa, maybe the reason that nothing might come out of this meeting is because of our attitude toward each other and maybe this meeting can help --

C27 Lilly: (quietly) Has any meeting so far? . . . Becky, what are we supposed to do? I'm really curious.

C28 BECKY: Do the majority of you want this meeting?

C29 several Teens: Yes!!

C30 Derek: But when Ross says he wants everybody to open up and we know that --

C31 BECKY: If there is a small minority of people here who don't want the meeting and the majority want the meeting then have the meeting. And you know how to make people talk if you want them to.

Excerpt D (Tape 5, Side 1, pp. 1-16)

On certain nights each week evening program consisted of clubs -- special interest groups such as dramatics, ceramics, leather craft and folk dancing. These programs included campers from Down Camp as well as the Teens. They were sometimes overcrowded and understaffed. Club night, consequently, was not one of the most favorite Teen activities. On the evening of 8/12/64 several of the Teens decided to cut clubs and spend their time in various other more exciting enterprises. They did not attempt to raise their desire through the structure of camp. This excerpt is from the meeting called by the Teen staff on the night of 8/12/64 to inform the Teens of the staff decision to cancel
the Teen trip for which planning had recently started. In this excerpt the club cutters, many of whom were second year Teens -- a status dependent upon staff evaluation of a Teen's progress in maturity in his first year of camp and not granted to all returning Teen campers -- are taken to task by the first year campers.

D1 Bob: As far as I'm concerned anything anybody says here doesn't mean a goddamn thing.

D2 Gloria: You know, that makes me sick already. Because everytime anyone says that he really wants to try and he really wants to have a group, well, people say nobody's responsible, that's a lot of hot air and that's a lot of b.s, -- and that's the answer --

D3 Bob: It is a lot of hot air! It is a lot of b.s!

D4 Rita: Since the first week of camp people have been saying how much they guarantee these things, and how much they want it, and how much they love it -- and what the hell has happened since the second week of camp?

D5 Joan: Six and a half weeks ago we committed ourselves to this, to be good . . . the whole line -- around ten times every day. Like a ritual, you know . . . And after the first minute after we walked away like from saying our prayers . . . nobody paid any attention.

D6 Gloria: At every meeting . . . when we finally get enthused about something . . . there are always a few people who always say nothing's going to happen because we're always guaranteeing that things will happen . . .

D7 Carl: So why don't you show them that something can happen!

D8 Gloria: Because I can't do it alone! That's why, Carl!

D9 Carl: Did you ever try?

D10 Hugh: You convince people by doing things.

D11 Bernie: I think it's very convenient for Joan. At every meeting she keeps saying the same things over and she doesn't try to help things . . . Well, I don't see where these people have done a damn thing to help us carry out our responsibility.

D12 Joan: Because you have to be perfect to raise things?
D13 Gloria: No, I didn't say that but at every meeting there are a few people who always are saying 'well that's a lot of hot air, and I don't think we should go on this trip, and I don't think we should do this because we're not ready and we're not responsible' -- and this just makes me sick.

D14 Hugh: Do you think this is based on nothing? Do you think they just get the ideas out of thin air? They come from something. They come from hearing what we say -- from hearing each of us -- from hearing what we say and then seeing what we do -- and you come to a point where you just get pretty fed up.

D15 Tina (mad and sarcastic): So let's all go home! Let's go home because 'there's nothing we can do and the whole group is full of shit, . . . and the second year Teens are all phonies, so let's all give up'. . . .

D16 Derek: Bob and Hugh, were you saying that we made a mistake . . . and from now on you're going to paint us all black and you're not going to listen to anything we say? I know some people here do mean what they say sometimes and sometimes they don't think about what they're doing. . . . Like Ross said today you've got to set your teeth back and start all over again. So why don't you give us a chance to start all over again -- and staff, too. Maybe --

D17 Bruce: I don't understand why in a group where certain people talk about responsibility -- and I think the people who were involved tonight have been pretty responsible most of the summer -- when they do something wrong, it's like a tremendous image has been shattered and the walls come tumbling down. You have that image of the perfect Twin Linker in the second year Teens and the people elected to Council . . . We're not allowed to make a mistake or be irresponsible once in a while and we have to live up to every single thing that we say in a group. And it's impossible to do that. . . . there are times when you are going to be irresponsible and it's nothing to get hysterical about.

D18 Joan: Are you excusing your actions then?

D19 Lilly: I think that by saying that you're saying that we are special people so even though sometimes we're irresponsible this excuses it because everyone's irresponsible once in a while. . . .

D20 Bruce: That's not what I said. I said we're not special people so it shouldn't be such a special thing when we do something irresponsible.

D21 Bob: You're irresponsible all of the time. It's not an exception. It's the rule! (general commotion)

D22 Bruce: It wouldn't have been as if a pipe dream had been shattered. You would expect if from Carl.
D23 Lilly: (indignantly) What?!

D24 others: Let him finish.

D25 Bruce: You would expect it from Carl and that's why --

D26 Becky: Bruce, stop putting an image of yourself in other people's eyes. Nobody here has the image of the second year Teens as any sort of pipe dream! And nobody has an idea they are perfect Twin Linkers -- except perhaps yourselves!

D27 Derek: . . . I see the same thing here that we've been jumping on staff about. If we're going to excuse our actions for what we did tonight, we should excuse staff or what. Carl does or Jeanette or Sylvia for what they have done throughout the summer.

D28 Bernie: I think that Bruce is confused. Bruce, we're not trying to pick on people. This is another incident in trying to bring the group into perspective -- not just the six or seven who were out of clubs tonight but the whole group, the irresponsibility of the whole group . . .

D29 Hugh: . . . I think there's less of a reaction now than if it was Carl or the staff involved. Then the house would really come down.

D30 Lilly: I think that people who think this (Cf. to Bruce) are being very conceited because I don't feel the scene centers around --

D31 George: (interrupting) I think that --

D32 others: We'll you let her finish?

D33 George: Well, I've been trying to get --

D34 Bernie: But George, let her finish! She started to talk.

D35 George: And it seems like it's a contest who can get --

D36 others: Let her finish already! George!

D37 Lilly: Forget it -- I --

D38 Joy: No!

D39 Lilly: (pleadingly) I have nothing to say.

D40 George: . . . I think that when we go back to the city and we remember this incident we're all going to start cracking up and we're going to take it as a big joke --
D41 Bernie: That's you, George. That's not everybody.

D42 George: And I think I will. I don't like the way staff sits here and waits for our true confession . . . and then they say --

D43 Tina: Bernie, will you please stop it.

D44 Bernie: (who had been making faces indicating displeasure) Okay, I'm upset. Do you mind? (Tina gets angry.) Don't worry, Tina. I'm listening to him and then I'm going to blow up. So Okay?

D45 George: (sarcastically) Openminded. (general laughter) I think that staff sits here and says okay . . . we're not going to tell you yet. You've got to give a little more confession and a little more sin and then we'll give you the formula for repentance.

D46 Hugh: I'm wondering what meeting you are at because if doesn't sound like the one I've been at . . .

D47 Joy: If George has a different opinion, he has a right to express it.

D48 Hugh: (losing temper) I didn't challenge his right to express it! I stated that --

D49 others: Hugh!

D50 Hugh: -- sorry, I lose my temper easily.

D51 others: (cut him off)

D52 Lilly: Let him say something!

D53 George: And Hugh, you're another --

D54 Lilly: Let him say something, George!

D55 Bernie: You're just defending yourself because you're being attacked, George.

D56 George: Of course I am. If I'm jumped --

D57 Ross: Let's cut it right here! Okay, look. George raised that Tina asked where do we go from here. Staff consciously refrained from saying anything at this point because it depends just like I said this afternoon -- it depends what you want . . . Unless you do want there's not a damn thing that the staff can do in terms of forcing anything to happen. And if you want then you have the answers because the answers are here in terms of the total structure of camp and everything that we've ever talked about here.
D58 Tina: But that's not true because that's what I've been doing since the beginning of camp because I know what I want but every-time I've been wrong the staff says just think about it and every-thing. I don't know exactly what I can do.

D59 Ross: And so you're ready to quit.

D60 Tina: No, no! I'm asking for help.

D61 Sylvia: Well, how come every time anyone says anything staff thinks it's a bunch of b.s. I mean everything I say . . . I really think that most of the kids here say the things they mean.

D62 Bruce: They don't always do the things they mean but they say the things they mean.

D63 Tina: Sometimes the things you say change.

D64 Bernie: Maybe the answer's just that Tina says she doesn't want to give up, that she doesn't want to quit, that Ross says do you want to just pack up and leave and she says no that she wants to stay. Basically that's what we're looking for. If everybody's willing to try again and not give up, this to me is . . . the answer that I'd be looking for in myself . . . Then maybe this three weeks we have left can be the best three weeks yet. Maybe if we just look hard enough, the answer is lying on the top.

D65 Mary: I think, Bernie, it's something a lot of people have been trying to raise in different ways (People misinterpreted the way George raised it) . . . some of us do have a commitment but we just feel lost . . . I think that the thing I learned tonight was when I'm lost and upset and I've got problems that two wrongs don't make a right. And I shouldn't just go and behave like an inbecile be-cause I feel I'm getting no guidance or that nobody cares or anything like that. You don't fight irresponsibility with irresponsibility. If I feel that I'm not learning anything or that I'm not learning to be responsible, well I'm not going to do something stupid which is what I did tonight.

D66 Lilly: Well I think this meeting has had no value unless some of us have realized that the world doesn't center around us and some of us did get off our high horse. I think we're trying to excuse our-selves by saying that we're responsible most of the time and this time we're irresponsible so it doesn't matter.

D67 Ross: . . . if we're going to accomplish anything in the remainder of the summer, it will demand a tremendous determination on the part of each one of us. And it can't just be in any kind of wishy-washy way in which things have tended to go at times in the past. You know, after we say the Three Penny Opera Paul suggested in sort of a jest that maybe a theme song for Teen Camp ought to be the "useless song". Well I don't agree with this song.
Mary: I don't understand this song. Do they mean it’s useless to try and try again?

ROSS: ... if we believe hard enough and try hard enough as a result then things aren't useless. ... In fact, they can become very, very positive and excellent ... But it's going to depend on how each person approaches it and what he's willing to commit of himself and how everytime he sinks in the mud or gets slapped in the face ... he comes back and he fights again. And I can't say this too much.

Tina: I know and I want to do whatever I can but I don't know how -- and I don't just want another abstract answer. ...

Mary: ... If each individual doesn't give up and you say that even if everybody else gives up and I don't, it has to work then it will have to work ... Maybe for the first time people like me, a self-righteous second year Teen, are realizing that I’ve got a lot to learn and that I can do a lot of stupid things and back-track on some things I've accomplished. What I'll say is that I shouldn't give up on myself. ... It's like what Jeanette did tonight. Jeanette told me because ... for the first time Jeanette really realized that we all need help and we all make mistakes. Even if we have more problems than somebody else, we shouldn't say that we don't have the right to help somebody else and we should take it easy, too. ...

BECKY: May I say something? Tina, you said you wanted to know how to erase what happened. I think it's an unnecessary concern for two reasons. ... if you require that people be pure before they help other people or criticize other people then you've go to forget about helping or criticizing because nobody is pure. (Secondly) when you make mistakes you can't always correct them. I'm not sure that Teen Camp can correct its mistake around Jeanette because she's been excluded for the whole summer and she wants to go home. ... It may be a mistake you just can't ever correct and you'll have to accept. But that doesn't mean that you've failed as people. And I think that you know more about what has to be done than you think you do but, as Myrna said, it's harder sometimes to do what you know is right. Nobody tonight was ignorant of the fact that they should be at clubs and nobody is ignorant of where they should be during rest hour or of what they ought to when somebody asks them to take over kp. But it's a very hard thing not to do what you want to do at the moment and to do what you should do in terms of your larger value system. ... And what Ross said is right. You really have to decide that you're going to commit yourself no matter how much it hurts.

Gloria: Bob, the thing that was bothering me was that I know that much of what you said was true and we really do need to change but I don't understand how you can change people's attitudes ...
D74 Al: . . . You don't try to change people completely. Like Ross said, you have to grit your teeth and keep on working. You don't stop --

D75 Mary: . . . I think that every one of us has been very (self) righteous because when we've seen someone like Carl saying 'you show us', we haven't even shown him! . . .

D76 Ross: Well look, it's getting late. At the beginning of the meeting I made a statement about the Teen trip. The statement stands until it can be demonstrated by the actions of the group in living together that the group would be capable of undertaking the tremendous responsibility and of profiting from a trip such as we had begun to talk about. So at this point it's up to all of you. There's no diagrams, no map that we can draw that says this is the way. But there are changes that can be seen in what's going on in terms of consideration for other people, and a little bit of appreciation for the feelings of people and a little concern for persons who have been left out of the group, concern for persons whose ideas may differ in some ways from those you others hold, for persons who have been excluded because of actions which the group doesn't appreciate . . . and in many ways. So let me just say that I can't over-stress really how much confidence I have in everybody here. . . . And the same goes for all the other staff we have in Teen camp. . . . we have a lot of faith in what you all can be . . . but all this faith is meaningless unless you are willing to accept the challenge and are willing to try. We think that you can. -- Good night.

Excerpt E. (Tape 5, Side 1, pp. 16-48)

On the evening of 8/12/64 the Teen trip was canceled by the staff as a result of a series of serious irresponsible actions by the Teens which culminated in the club cutting incident described in Excerpt D. Teen program for the afternoon of 8/13/64 had been planned before the cancelation of the trip and was to have included a planning session for the Teen trip. When no other program was planned by the Teens, the staff planned afternoon program for them. This was interpreted by the Teens as the undermining by staff of the Teen self-government. The following excerpt is from the record of the meeting called during rest hour on August 13 by the Teen Council to discuss staff's action.
El Al: Is everybody here?

E2 Ross: Three girls are on their special activity doing research in the library in Kingston.

E3 Tina: I think they should be here.

E4 Bruce: It's pretty impossible right now. Everyone else is here.

E5 Al: I suggest that the people who called this meeting inform the group what the meeting is called for.

E6 Bruce: The meeting is called to explain why we're not having a Teen trip and to ask questions --

E7 Hugh: No it isn't.... It's to ask staff why they planned program for the afternoon....

E8 George: And second we wanted to know why the program that was planned is not allowed to happen.

E9 Ross: Who's the chairman of the Council today? (general discussion and group decides upon Lilly)

E10 Lilly: Well I know that some people came running up to Teen camp very excited that staff had by-passed the government and had planned program for this afternoon because the program planned for this afternoon was a Teen meeting on our trip and Ross had said since we're not having a trip it was obvious we were not having a meeting. And some people wanted clarification about why we would not be able to have this meeting because we were not having the trip. So they wanted to raise some questions about this.

E11 Al: I think it's pretty clear why we're not having a trip. We had a whole meeting last night and Ross said it's only in our actions and if people don't understand --

E12 Derek: No, he said if we show maturity maybe we can go on a trip. So if our actions improve, why can't we be all ready for the trip?

E13 Mildred: In a way I agree with Derek because if we're going to make any reservations at all it can't be something we do at the last minute. If we're going to be staying with people or are going to want information on areas through letters then we're going to have to have time for this. But then again if from the other side we make reservations and tell people we're going to come, we can't cancel at the last minute either so I really don't know what to do --

E14 Hugh: I think there are things you can do and which have to be done if there's any possibility of a trip and I think Ross last
night offered the possibility of a trip if our behavior improves and we're more responsible -- so we may not be able to go but if we don't plan, we won't be able to anyway.

E15 Lilly: This wasn't the question that the meeting was called about.

E16 George: Ross, I would like you to tell us why you by-passed the program committee and what was your reasoning for not having the planned program.

E17 Ross: It's very, very simple. The program which was planned was to plan a trip -- a trip which at this time is not being held. The program committee planned no other program to take the place of that program. Because there was no program planned for this afternoon and because no person from the program committee even raised the possibility with any staff person of whether any other program should be planned, the staff took it upon itself to set up this program for this afternoon -- a program which included clubs.

E18 Rosa: Well, I don't think you had any right. I mean, even though none of the kids on the program committee did go to staff I don't think you were right in telling us that we had to go to clubs. I think you should have said to somebody on the program committee why don't you plan something.

E19 Al: I was talking to Ross and since last night the people on the program committee knew this and they should have gone to staff and they should have asked if they could have the meeting and it would have been all cleared up and we could have planned a program during rest hour and had our meeting.

E20 Mary: . . . I think that Ross can say well heighty-teighty they didn't plan any program but he could have just suggested to somebody well we're not having this meeting so why don't you plan something. I don't think he had any right to undermine the government.

E21 George: And you said the reason we're not going on the trip was because we're not responsible. Until we are responsible there won't be a Teen trip. Well, I feel we should have the plans ready because let's say you say we're responsible and it's the last week of camp. We're not going to be able to go on the trip unless we have the plans ready. I thought we should still have this meeting so that plans would be ready if Ross okayed that we could go on the trip.

E22 Mary: I think there's something that we have to realize right now and it's the idea that if we go on any kind of trip at all, we're going to have to do a lot of sacrificing. (She explains the time left in camp) . . . I think that everybody's getting righteous all of a sudden about we can have a trip . . . and I really want a trip . . . because I know that I'll remember it. . . . if we had all been responsible about it, we would have started planning about the second or third week in camp. . . . I think that I would like for
us to . . . work . . . to make it worthwhile about this trip even if it's just something around this area for a couple of days. . . .

E23 Al: Well, I don't know who says we have to be back in camp for the whole last week.

E24 Mary: I didn't say we have to be but I think it isn't fair to the rest of camp if we stay out of camp for the last weekend because there are so many things to be done.

E25 George: And anyway if it comes to that, what we will do if we want to make sacrifices is to work nights and we can still have a full trip. Because a two day trip -- we can forget it! We can just go on an overnight.

E26 Lilly: We're not discussing buses. We're not discussing time. I thought that people had other feelings about this that we should discuss. The people that seemed to are shutting up.

E27 Bruce: See Ross, right now I think you said there is going to be no trip but a lot of people feel that's a lot of hogwash and that we're really going to have a trip. We're going to have to struggle around being responsible in the group but well really have the trip before the end of the summer . . . they don't really think that we're not going on a trip.

E28 Hugh: The possibility of going on a trip was always there. I mean he didn't say 'we are not going on a trip; there's no possibility that we will'. There's a possibility that if we change in our behavior that we do.

E29 Bruce: Then I think we ought to start assuming that we're not going on a trip at all and there's no possibility at this moment.

E30 Hugh: But if there is a possibility --

E31 Bruce: I'm saying that there is no possibility at this moment and let's assume if from there.

E32 George: There isn't any sense in that.

E33 Al: That means you're not going to struggle. Wait a second! If you say we're not going on this trip, you're not going to struggle.

E34 Bruce: That's not true at all.

E35 Al: What are you going to struggle for if not a trip? Tell me please!
E36 Bruce: Why shouldn't I struggle?

E37 Lilly: You mean we're just struggling because of the trip?

E38 Al: No, it helps but it shouldn't have to.

E39 Hugh: But it does!

E40 Bruce: Hugh, would you let him finish?

E41 Al: Ross said we have to change our attitudes and struggle with other people and --

E42 Lilly: But not because of the trip --

E43 Al: That's a good part of it!

E44 Hugh: I mean if you struggle, no matter what the motivation, if you struggle and you change, you still have changed for the better, even if it's because you want to go on a trip. . . . And I don't think having the possibility of a trip if you reach a certain point as a motivation is anything very evil. I think we shouldn't need the trip but if there is something that can help, I don't see why we should completely ignore the possibility.

E45 Bruce: Right now I don't think people are thinking it's a possibility. I think they're thinking it's definite and --

E46 Mildred: Bruce, maybe people are thinking we're going to be responsible so there's going to be a trip. But I think there's a difference from that and what you're saying.

E47 Hugh: People are assuming we can meet your point. People are assuming that we can be responsible. . . . And maybe this will supply the motivation. . . .

E48 Mary: I don't exactly agree with Bruce semantic-wise. I agree that there are people who think you struggle and you get a reward -- here come the trip. . . . I say if we struggle and if we get this trip, don't just expect to be struggling and then go on the trip. If we struggle and really take responsibility, part of the responsibility might be sacrificing part of the trip -- if we get to go on the trip.

E49 Lilly: I think three people are doing all the talking.

E50 George: What do you think, Gloria?

E51 Gloria: I just thought that staff was disregarding our whole government and I wanted this cleared up.
E52 Bernie: I think one or two persons felt like this and then by their actions created ... a whole atmosphere of general chaos. ... They were like rabble-rousing and trying to get everyone else to feel the same way. After seeing an exhibition like this I don't see how we could possibly go on a trip because it showed utter lack ... of responsibility ... .

E53 Hugh: I think that people have very strong feelings and they weren't able to control them but after a few helpful hints from Erica ... people came back under control.

E54 Paul: I have some questions about all of this. There are some people in the group who feel very strongly that staff has ignored their government and there's hardly any reaction from the majority of the group ...

E55 Joy: Paul, did you plan this just to get a reaction? ... We were supposed to have a meeting ... and you had no right to change it without informing us. ...

E56 Joan: I don't understand. You didn't contact the program committee. ...

E57 Kathy: ... I was in tent two on my bed and there was this hysteria about having a meeting. ... I came out and there were people jumping about. They told me staff wasn't needed in the meeting. ...

E58 Al: First of all, I believe there was several kids who came running up the hill and they said 'come on, come on, meeting, meeting!' and I said I'm not moving from here because I knew it was not in the procedure ... Lilly came out of the tent and said they've finally decided to take away the government.

E59 Kathy: My point is this. ... If we went directly to the person who is responsible -- and this is why we put up the government -- then we know exactly what to do if some mistake is made. When we set up the government this was clarified ...

E60 George: ... does Ross think he was right in forging ahead of the program committee? Everyone in the program committee probably thought that the meeting was still in effect.

E61 Derek: When this thing happened we didn't realize we were responsible to somebody and we went to council for it. When some people realized their screaming ... was pretty irresponsible they decided to bring it to council.
E62 Mildred: I don't see why any of the staff hesitated to bring it to the program committee because they're part of the government, too, and we decided that they have a vote . . .

E63 Rosa: . . . Well, I don't think the staff was right . . . The staff should help the kids have a better government and they can't . . . if staff goes off and makes their own decisions and don't bring it to the group . . .

E64 Mary: I think the government has enough problems functioning and enough mistakes to make without us consciously going and breaking procedure.

. . .

E65 Paul: . . . You see we both have a kind of double standard in terms of the government . . . When it's convenient to function in the channels of the government then the government is the most important institution in Teen Camp. When it is not convenient for us to do it, we ignore it completely . . .

. . .

E66 Erica: I'd like to hear the rest of your feelings and reactions to what staff has done -- because as I heard it everybody stated that we had taken away the government and we had deprived you of every right possible --

. . .

E67 Hugh: . . . At one point it looked like staff was completely ignoring the government -- which basically it was. There was doubt as to just how far this was going, whether it was just ignoring the program committee or bypassing the government or whether it was completely taking the government out . . . First there was hysteria and then logic and we decided if we give up on the government then we're completely destroying it . . .

E68 Rosa: . . . After all the staff had no right. If you're going to have a government, you have it and you carry out or else you just don't have it . . .

E69 Derek: Ross, I think this is related to what happened last year -- last year, the kids said, staff took away our government and Myles came up and gave us hell and bawled us out and we're not going to let it happen again.

E70 Mary: I said (to Ross) well, are you taking our government away because if so, you're becoming a dictator and this is something else. Then I'll have to go to clubs . . . if you're not taking the government away, you have no right to plan program in this way because you're undermining the government . . . I disagree with this use of (staff) veto. This is vetoing the government . . .
The second reason for this meeting was that some people felt it wasn't fair -- I mean that staff shouldn't have taken away this meeting about a Teen trip because they thought we should have a Teen trip.

... 

In other words you want to know why you can't go on a Teen trip.

Yes. (general laughter)

I think it's been made pretty clear why we can't go.

Is it clear to you Jimmie? to you Hugh? I'm sure if we went around the room half of the people wouldn't know why we can't go. I'm not clear.

(sarcastically) I'll give you a good example of why not. Because of the very responsible way in which today's issue was raised.

At first it was irresponsible and then it was corrected!

I've felt lately that the campers have been jumping down staff throats at every opportunity in a most irresponsible way --

... I'm not going to go (on a Teen trip) with people who reject everything I say or most of the things we say. ... I'm not going to tell Tina or Rosa or anybody on the trip something and see them running around because they reject what I say as staff. I want to know that we are responsible to the government and for them to follow the right channel. ...

I'm not willing in terms of safety and in terms of my own embarrassment with people who might go out of their ways to help us to take out of camp a bunch of people who use as an excuse for the kind of behavior that went on last night 'I didn't think'. ... And I'm also not willing to go out of camp on a trip in which personal relations become very intense when there are the kinds of relations there are among kids in this group. I'm not willing to put a single person in a position where she has to ride in a busload of people none of whom gives two damns about sitting next to her. ... But I agree that a good deal of what goes on is in terms of relation between Teens and staff.

I think if we don't watch ourselves we could also use this (Teen/staff conflict) as an excuse for a lot of things we do.

Now the staff agrees in terms of the philosophy of this camp that it is important for campers to have the opportunity to question staff members. But there is also included in the camp
philosophy the need for procedure and order and structure. So you can have a government and you can function democratically provided you do it in an ordered structured way. And this doesn't interfere with the established authority of staff. Staff is prepared and wants to and has dealt out some of its authority to campers. And . . . we've been pretty satisfied with the way this responsibility has been handled so far. But once this responsibility is not handled properly, staff must take over.

...  
E83 Rosa: ... I don't think you should wait until the last minute and tell us we can't go. If you don't think we have improved, you should tell us our bad points and then we could try to improve them . . . why didn't you tell us at the beginning we can't go?

E84 ROSS: If the question comes up why weren't we told from the beginning we can't go, it's because first of all we care -- we care about everybody here and we want the best possible kind of experience that there can be for everyone here. So if it's at all possible . . . we're going to fight like the devil to help them work out. Now if as the fight goes on -- sometimes battles are lost because you don't win all the time -- then new decisions come up . . . And sometimes additional changes are possible beyond that, too. We know they are possible . . . and the condition which determines possibility is whether or not you want them and whether or not you show by your actions and the way that you are living with people that you do want them.

E85 Derek: ... now I get the feeling that we were placing too much value on the trip and not on the problems that Ross has been talking to us about all summer -- our relationships to one another and to the staff --

...  
Analysis of Data

Sub-Hypothesis (1): Superordinate goals will be found both in the area of program and the area of philosophy.

The data reveal five superordinate goals related to program and five superordinate goals related to philosophy. The evidence for this conclusion is presented below for each goal in turn beginning with those related to program.
Programmatic Superordinate Goal Number 1: Having Joint Teen/Staff Meetings Around Mutual Concerns.

One of the central parts of program at Twin Link was meetings which were called either by the staff or by the Teens for program planning and revision or the discussion of group problems. It is from excerpts of the tapes of these meetings that all of the data for this thesis were secured. In a fundamental sense, then, the existence of these recordings of meetings which actually occurred between Teens and staff and which illustrate that both Teens and staff did at times willingly participate in meetings is evidence of their superordinate nature. These meetings could not have occurred without the cooperation of both Teens and staff.

In addition, both the Teens and the staff verbalized their desire to have these meetings. The meetings on 8/13/64 (Excerpt A), 8/14/65 (Excerpt B), and 8/12/64 (Excerpt D) were called by the camp staff. The meetings on the afternoon of 8/14/64 (Excerpt B) and 8/13/64 (Excerpt E) were called at the request of the Teens.

At various times the record shows dialogue directly related to the desire to hold meetings. Mary (A15) and Mildred (A16) noted that one reason for the group's rejection of Jeanette was that she didn't like meetings and felt they were valueless. The rejection resulted from the contrary evaluation of meetings by the group. Jeanette recorded her later acceptance of meetings (A54) when she noted that meetings bring the group closer together. In the dialogue from Cl through C28 ROSS, IRA, Tina, Yvonne, Mildred, Lilly, Bernie, Irene, Bruce and Ethel indicate their desire to have a specific meeting.
Sylvia and Derek are in opposition. Finally BECKY asks if the majority want the meeting and is met by a chorus of 'yeses' from the Teens. Later Lilly (D65) suggests that a meeting has been worth while if the Teens have learned from it. Bruce (E4) favors a particular meeting so strongly that he is willing to begin it even though not all the Teens and staff can be present. Al (E58) describes the fervor with which the Teens called a meeting which led to a Teen/staff meeting.

The evidence supports the claim that the goal of having joint Teen/staff meetings around mutual concerns is superordinate in quality.

Programmatic Superordinate Goal Number 2: Having a Teen Government.

During the summer of 1964 a Teen government existed in Twin Link's Teen Camp. Each camper was a member of one of its constituent committees. Each day the Teens' program was planned by the program committee and work assignments were made by the work committee. Both of these committees carried out their responsibilities in an acceptable manner with prodding by staff. That the government existed and functioned adequately is evidence of its superordinate quality. It could not have operated without the hard work of the campers and the permission and struggle of the staff.

In addition, the record contains specific references by both staff and Teens which indicate a desire for Teen government. When MYLES (B26 & 27) says he has never seen a Teen constitution or government and therefore so far as he is concerned they haven't any, the Teens assert vigorously that they did inform him and they do have a government. On the afternoon of 8/13/64 the Teens reacted very
strongly to program planning by staff which they interpreted as a staff move to "become dictators", to undermine or abolish the Teen government. Bernie, Hugh, KATHY and Al all comment upon the strong reaction and upset experienced by the Teens at that time (E52-E58). The question is raised especially sharply by George, Rosa and Mildred of why the staff planned program and did not use the proper channels for so doing (E16-E18, E62-E68). Others who expressed concern and interest in the government during this incident included Hugh (E7, E67), ROSS (E9), Lilly (E10), Al (E19), Mary (E20, E64, E70), Gloria (E51), PAUL (E54, E65, E82), Joy (E55), Derek (E61, E69), ERICA (E66) and KATHY (E79).

The evidence supports the claim that the goal of having a Teen government is superordinate in quality.

Programmatic Superordinate Goal No. 3: Having a Teen Trip

During their pre-camp interviews the Teens were informed that one of the many types of program possible in camp was a Teen trip to an area of interest outside of the camp proper. They knew that in previous years Teens had traveled to Berea, Kentucky, and to an Indian reservation in New York. In 1964, before the period studied by this thesis began, a trip had been taken to the annual Folk Festival at Newport, Rhode Island. The Teens began to plan a longer trip to study the social problems of coal mining in Appalachia. They were told by staff they could not have a trip unless their actions changed to show they could accept the responsibility of a trip. Ultimately, near the end of the summer the Teens planned and carried out a trip to the province of Quebec in Canada. This trip could not have been carried
out without the permission and cooperation of the staff and without long hours of work by the Teens to guarantee that the trip would not affect their previous commitments to various camp work projects. They were prepared if necessary to work around the clock in shifts to finish these projects to make the trip possible. The fact that the trip was held and the work projects completed is evidence of the superordinate nature of the trip goal.

The Teens and staff also verbalized their desires around the proposed Teen trip. The record has numerous indications of this desire. In the meeting in which the trip was taken away ROSS (D75) encouraged the group that they might be able to change enough to have a trip. It depended upon them. Bruce (E6, E27) shows his support for a trip by misinterpreting the reason for which a meeting was called and explains to ROSS that most of the campers believe there will be a trip. Derek, Mildred, Hugh and George (E12-E21) show their desire for having a trip by arguing that plans for one should be ready in case the Teens improve their actions sufficiently to be permitted to have one. They argue forcefully that without proper plans no trip will be possible even if behavior improves. Mary (E22) argues for a trip even if it can only be a two day one around the area. She stresses the possible need for sacrifice by the Teens. Al (E23) argues that there is no need to be back in camp for the whole last week. The trip, he says, should not be cut so short. George (C24) responds that if sacrifices are necessary we can "work nights and we can still have the full trip". Hugh (E28, E30, E44) re-emphasizes that the trip is possible if the Teens change. Mildred (E46) agrees that many Teens think they will change and the trip will therefore be possible.
Bernie (E52) wants the trip but thinks that Teen irresponsibility has
made it impossible. KATHY, BECKY and ROSS (E76, E78, E84) would like
the trip but point out the reasons why they currently would not be
willing to undertake it. Derek (E85) ends the excerpt "Now I get
the feeling that we were placing too much value on the trip and not
on the problems that ROSS has been talking to us about all summer."

The evidence supports the claim that the goal of having a
Teen trip is superordinate in quality.

**Programmatic Superordinate Goal No. 4: Providing a Good Experience
For the Campers.**

One of the goals of camp is to provide the most exciting,
stimulating and enjoyable experience possible for the campers. This
means that administration and staff do everything possible to make
the summer a good one. While fun is not the sole component of a
"good" experience and opportunities for growth and struggle around
ideas are more important than constant amusement, it is hoped that the
campers will find pleasure in the activities of camp. It is of concern
to staff and administration when campers feel that their experience is
negative. The desire to have a good time is a normal attribute of
active teenagers and as such is not as likely to be verbalized as are
certain other more unique goals (e.g, the philosophical goals of camp).
The present record contains only a few references to this goal. It is
more usually expressed in the normal action of group life than in words
and may not be verbalized except when it is missing.

Myles (A9) points out to the group that Jeanette feels the
summer has been wasted and that she wants to go home so that she can
salvage something from its remnant. Jeanette (A52) affirms that she doesn't want to take the chance of having the rest of her summer ruined. Joy (A57) argues that if Jeanette doesn't enjoy herself, she should be able to go home. ROSS (E84) states that the staff wants the best possible experience for the campers. Mary (E22) says many people want the Teen trip because they will remember it. Probably much of the desire to participate in the trip and other camp programs is related to the fun of the experience.

The references above in and of themselves would not be adequate to demonstrate the existence of the superordinate goal of having fun in camp. However, taken in the context of the total camp experience the goal of having fun in camp may be accepted as superordinate.

Programmatic Superordinate Goal No. 5: Fire Prevention

A very simple superordinate goal is represented by the need to exercise great care with fire in camp. Fire is always a hazard in camps. This was especially true in New York state during the extremely dry summer of 1964. During the latter part of the summer several forest fires burned only a few miles from camp. MYLES expresses this concern explicitly (A1, A3) and Hugh (A2) responds with great concern in his voice. The concern of the Teens was further illustrated when they volunteered to the state department of forestry as fire fighters.

The evidence supports the claim that the goal of fire prevention is superordinate in quality.
Philosophical Superordinate Goal No.: Struggling for Change

One of the key philosophical tenets of Twin Link Camp is the concept that change is possible through struggling with people around ideas. Every instance in these data in which one person questions the motivation, mode of thought or behavior, or goals of another person is evidence in action for the presence of this goal. Almost every speech recorded in the data embodies evidence of this kind. When, for example, a staff member (A10) sharply puts before the Teens the results of their experience in social living, he is struggling and grappling with them for change. When a camper (A13) says she thinks the campers are all very intolerant and don't accept people, the goal of struggle is implicit.

In addition to this evidence of action which in itself is conclusive proof of the superordinate quality of the goal of struggle, the data are permeated with explicit verbal indications of this goal. MYLES (A28, A30) "If . . . all of you had been struggling and were willing to struggle, you'd tear me apart for calling this a script in a put-up job. You haven't been willing to struggle." When Jeanette says she doesn't want to take risks, Gloria (A55) asks her if that's not like saying she doesn't want to struggle. Later Gloria (A72) again expresses her willingness to struggle. Similarly, Tina (A58, A64, D57, D59), Jimmie (A63), Mildred (A66, B10), Derek (B9, D16), Gloria (D2, D6), Joan (D5), Mary (D64, D70), Lilly (D65), BECKY (D71) and Bernie (D63) all accept the goal of struggle. Al (B6, D73) praises ROSS for pushing and pushing without let-up and says the Teens must grit their teeth and go on. Bernie (D63) says "If everybody's willing to try again and
not give up . . . this is the answer that I'd be looking for in myself." Mary (B2), Tina (B3), Bruce (B4), and Joan (B7) all criticize Jean for quitting the struggle and leaving. Joy (B8) says she likes Jean "even if she gave up". She says (A57) that people who can no longer struggle should stop. Jeanette (A56, A60) claims to want to struggle but complains that it hurts. Bruce (A65) accepts then rejects struggle. MYLES (A61) stresses that things are possible only through struggle. ROSS (D56, D66, D68, D75) emphasizes that what happens depends upon a person's will to come back and fight again.

The evidence supports the claim that the goal of struggling for change is superordinate in quality.

**Philosophical Superordinate Goal No. 2: Acceptance of and Concern for People.**

In its attempt to help its campers to learn to live together as social persons Twin Link is concerned with the quality of relationships which develop between individuals in camp. Stress is given to concern for people which leads to an acceptance of the "richness of difference" and which precludes the demand for perfectionism. Shortcomings are recognized and struggled around but persons are not rejected because of their shortcomings. The struggle concept described in the first philosophical goal frequently finds active expression around this goal of positive relationships. In a real sense this goal (and the others described below) may be considered objects of the goal of struggle. We are not concerned with struggle merely for its own sake. Struggle is toward an end -- in this case the end of the acceptance of and concern for people by other people.
In this excerpt when MYLES (A9, A10) raises the question of Jeanette's feelings, Mary (A13, A15), Bernie (A17, A21) and Al (A25) verbalize a certain level of concern in a form of lamenting and breast-beating. Tina (A27, A31, A58) verbalizes concern for Jeanette saying she wants her to remain in camp and cares about her. She (A38) reacts with great shock when Jimmie says that he has never claimed to like anyone in the group. MYLES (A28, A61, A62, B23, B25), Lilly (A27, D23), Bernie (A50), IRA (B11, C6), George (B19), Mildred (C26, E13), Derek (D16, E85), Mary (D70, E22, E24), ROSS (D75, E84), KATHY (E79) and BECKY (E80) indicate concern for others either explicitly or implicitly. Tina, Lilly, Irene, Bruce, Ethel and Mary (C2-C23) show their concern for the topic by advocating a meeting on the subject of relationships. Jimmie (A49) and Joan (A57) show a concern for the feelings of specific individuals. Joy (A18, A20, A34, A36, A42, A46) and Jeanette (A52, A54, A60) show their desire for acceptance as persons by strongly reacting to being stereotyped. As Jeanette puts it, she feels "like a drifting raft in the middle of the ocean looking for some place to dock." BECKY (D71), Joan (D12) and MYLES (D23) point up the danger of demanding perfectionism and faultlessness and of excluding persons who don't measure up. No one can be perfect they emphasize.

The evidence supports the claim that the goal of acceptance of and concern for people is superordinate in quality.

**Philosophical Superordinate Goal No. 3: Acceptance of Social Responsibility.**

A second object of the struggle process as it is perceived at Twin Link is the acceptance of social responsibility by the campers.
This means that staff struggles with the Teens to help them develop a sense of group identity and the acceptance of responsibility for others in the group. (Cf. MYLES: A28, A61, A62, B23; ROSS: D75; BECKY: E80).

Several references to the acceptance of social responsibility are implied or specifically indicated in the data. Mildred (B10), BECKY (D26), Derek (E12, E61) imply the acceptance of responsibility. Gloria (D2, D13, D72), Bernie (D11, D28, D41, E52), George (E21), KATHY (E57, E79), PAUL (E76, E78, E82), Tina (E77), and ROSS (E84) reflect the acceptance of this goal in their speeches. Mildred (E13, E46), Hugh (E14), and Mary (E22, E24, E48) speak responsibly regarding the Teen trip. Bruce (D17, D20, D22) accepts the goal of being responsible but argues that Teens can't be responsible all of the time and that the second year Teens shouldn't be so strongly criticized for their irresponsible actions. His position is attacked by Joan (D18), Lilly (D30, D65), BECKY (D26) and Mary (D64, D74). Mary notes that one cannot fight irresponsibility with irresponsibility. The more responsible Teens should show the others how to act.

The evidence supports the claim that the goal of accepting social responsibility is superordinate in quality.

**Philosophical Superordinate Goal No. 4: Seeking Understanding and Clarification of Ideas.**

A third object of the process of struggle is to encourage the Teens to strive for the understanding and clarification of ideas. This occurs in a number of forms. The primary approach is through participation in group discussion. A never-ending attempt is made
to get the Teens to "open up" -- to express and critically consider their feelings and ideas. It is also necessary that the rights of all persons to express their ideas be guaranteed.

The data contain numerous examples of the acceptance of this goal on the part of both staff and Teens. Each time a Teen speaks, for example, documentary evidence of the acceptance of "opening up" to some extent is presented. There are also many explicit verbalizations of the goal. MYLES (A14, A22, A24, A26, A28, A30, A61, B5, B17, B22, B24, B25), ROSS (C1), IRA (C6), and BECKY (C31) are involved in the struggle to get people to talk. Tina (C2), Mildred (C3, C5), Irene (C14), Bruce (C16), Lilly (C21), Ethel (C22), and Derek (C30) all express their willingness to discuss and the importance of discussion of various issues. In numerous speeches (D24, D32, D34, D36, D38, D42, D46, D38, D50, D51, D53, E40) one or more Teens urge another Teen to stop interrupting a speaker and to let the speaker's ideas be heard. Mary (D67), Lilly (A53, C21, C25, C27, E26, E71, E75), Gloria (A55, D72), George (B18, E16, E50, E60), Derek (C30, E12), Tina (D69), Joy (E55), and Rosa (E83) ask questions indicating their desire for clarification of ideas which are being expressed.

The evidence supports the claim that the goal of seeking understanding and clarification of ideas is superordinate in quality.

**Philosophical Superordinate Goal No. 5: Matching Words With Actions.**

Struggle has been presented as struggle toward ends such as acceptance of social responsibility, discussion of ideas, and concern for people. Philosophical adherence to these concepts is of little significance unless the philosophy is put into practice. This leads
to the demand that persons match their words with their actions, that what they do should be consistent with what they say. This is the real heart of the struggle concept which permeates and underlies the other ends described above. The battle for such consistency is a constant struggle. MYLES (A10, A22, A38, A30, A61) expresses the concern of the staff when he asks "If you're all so bright and you can all verbalize it so quickly and you can all understand it, how come you can't act on the basis of what you're able to say?" When Jean, the Teen director, left camp, many Teens were upset because they felt she was not willing to practice the struggle which she verbalized. (B2, B3, B4, B6, B7). When the second year Teens cut clubs, Bob (D1, D3), Rita (D4), Joan (D5, D18), Carl (D7), Hugh (D10, D14), and Lilly (D19, D65) reacted strongly to the gap between words and deeds. Tina (D57), Bruce (D61), Mary (D64, D74), Jeanette (A52), KATHY (E79), PAUL (E78), BECKY (D71, E80), Gloria (D72), and Hugh (E14) all indicate their acceptance of the principle that actions should be consistent with philosophy. Rosa (E18, E63, E68), Mary (E20, E64, E70), George (E60), and Mildred (E62) are quick to criticize staff for action which they feel are not consistent with the philosophy of camp. MYLES (B23) points out that people living together are bound to make mistakes at times and hurt others but that they should struggle to reduce the word/deed gap even though perfection is never possible.

The evidence supports the claim that the goal of matching words with actions is superordinate in quality.

CONCLUSION: The data supports the first sub-hypothesis. Superordinate goals have been shown to occur both in the area of program and the area
of philosophy. This also validates the major hypothesis that when an agency has conscious goals and values, superordinate goals arise in attempting to bring about behavioral change consistent with these goals and values.

Sub-Hypothesis (2): Superordinate goals will occur as intermediate steps toward other superordinate goals.

Under Sub-Hypothesis (1) the presence of ten superordinate goals has been documented. The second sub-hypothesis is concerned with one aspect of the inter-relationship of superordinate goals. Once again reference is made to the data to test the hypothesis.

The data include two clear examples which support the second sub-hypothesis.

(1) Struggling for Change in the Philosophical Goal Areas as a Prerequisite of the Teen Trip.

When, as a result of a series of unacceptable actions by the Teens, the Teen trip was canceled by staff, the possibility was left open that the trip could be regained by behavioral change on the part of the Teens. There would be no trip, ROSS (D75) said, unless the Teens demonstrated "by the actions of the group in living together that the group would be capable of undertaking the tremendous responsibility . . . of a trip . . .". This idea was accepted by the other staff members (E76, E79, E80) and by the Teens. Al (E11), Derek (E12), Hugh (E14, E28, E30), George (E21), Bruce (E27), and Mildred (E46) all accepted verbally the contingency of the trip upon struggle leading to improved action, acceptance of responsibility and maturity. When Bruch (E32) argued that the group should not plan on having a trip,
Al (E33) accused him of being unwilling to struggle. Al (E35, E41):
"What are you going to struggle for if not for a trip? . . . ROSS said we have to change our attitudes and struggle with other people and --." Lilly (E42: "But not because of a trip!" Al (E43): "That's a good part of it!" Hugh (E44, E47) argues that using the trip as motivation for change is not evil.

The data portray the superordinate goal of struggling for change in the philosophical goal areas as a prerequisite for attaining the second superordinate goal, the Teen trip. Sub-Hypothesis (2) is supported.

(2) Seeking Participation in Discussion as a Prerequisite of a Meeting Around Relationships.

On the afternoon of 8/14/64 the Teens met to plan afternoon program. ROSS (C1), the Teen director, told them that they could not have the meeting around interpersonal relations which many said they wanted unless they all agreed to open up and talk. Mildred (C3, C5, C25) said she was willing to open up because she felt the topic was very important. Lilly (C8, C21), Bernie (C10), Bruce (C16), Ethel (C22), Derek (C30) and several other Teens (C29) all implicitly accepted the condition set forth by ROSS. BECKY (C31) noted that the Teens "know how to make people talk if you want them to." The meeting was held.

The data portray the superordinate goal of participating in discussion as a prerequisite for a meeting around interpersonal relationships. Sub-Hypothesis (2) is supported.
CONCLUSION: The data support the second sub-hypothesis. Superordinate goals have been shown to occur as intermediate steps toward other superordinate goals.
CHAPTER IV - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The world of social interaction is a world of conflict. Conflict has been viewed traditionally as dysfunctional and seen as the source of social breakdown. A primary concern of the profession of social work is with the human effects of social conflicts. The emphasis of social work has been on the elimination of conflict.

From another perspective conflict is considered the essence of social life. It is seen as the process and dynamic component of human interaction. In this light its functions as a force for ongoing social change become apparent. The concern of social workers becomes one of sharpening conflict and channeling and harnessing it for constructive ends.

This thesis has described one part of one stage of a larger study of the process of intergroup conflict. The larger study is a replication with modifications of Sherif's Robbers Cave Experiment, a study of the effects of superordinate goals upon intergroup conflict and cooperation. This thesis studied naturally occurring superordinate goals, goals which are desired by both parties to a conflict but which can be attained only through some form of mutual cooperation. It is hoped that an understanding of such goals may enable more systematic control of conflict.

The thesis studied conflict between the staff and the clientele of a democratic, interracial, non-sectarian, co-ed teen work camp. The
subjects were dissimilar to one another in age, sex, race, religious belief, socio-economic class, achievement in school, and range of emotional development. They had lived together for approximately six weeks in camp before the data for this thesis were collected. Data collection was on tape recording of group discussions which occurred as a normal part of the camp program. The subjects were aware of the recording process and accepted it as a normal procedure of camp. The recordings were transcribed and analyzed following the camp season. The researcher functioned in the dual role of staff member and participant observer. At no time were the subjects aware that research was being conducted.

The findings of the study are as follows:

(1) When an agency has conscious goals and values, superordinate goals arise in attempting to bring about behavioral change consistent with these goals and values.

(2) Superordinate goals were found to arise both in the area of program and in the area of philosophy.

(3) Superordinate goals sometimes occur as intermediate steps toward other superordinate goals.

Suggestions for Additional Research

Superordinate goals are seldom discrete or isolated social phenomena. Even a short period of social interaction may include a complex of superordinate and ordinary goals action upon, influencing, pulling with or straining against one another. Are superordinate goals ever mutually antagonistic? How does the existence of one superordinate goal affect the development of another? Under what circumstances are particular types of superordinate goals likely to arise?
From Boulding's theory of conflict we might hypothesize:

(1) that superordinate goals will be less likely to arise if the values they affect are central rather than peripheral to the client's value system, and (2) that superordinate goals will be less likely to arise if the conflict involved is of relatively long rather than relatively short duration. Are these hypotheses valid? If so, what are their implications for the development of superordinate goals affecting long established and (in some quarters) cherished values such as racial or religious discrimination.

This thesis has shown that one superordinate goal may be contingent upon another. The relationship may not always be so direct or so simple. Under what conditions are superordinate goals mutually affective?

Superordinate goals are not static. What at one temporal point may be a superordinate goal may be reduced, through the struggle (another possibly superordinate goal) of its opponents, to the status of an ordinary goal. What is the nature of goals that are more likely to be so changed?

Finally, we must concern ourselves with the wide range of relationships of particular types of superordinate goals to particular types of social conflict. Our ultimate concern with superordinate goals is with their effect upon the conflict which is the essence of human existence.
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