

FREEDOM, CONFLICT AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATION: AN ILLUSTRATIVE ANALYSIS

by

John Richmond Carlson

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Sociology

APPROVED:

---

George A. Hillery, Jr.  
Chairman

---

Steven K. Paulson

---

Joel J. See

July, 1974

Blacksburg, Virginia

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Deeply felt appreciation is due the members of the organizations which this writer was privileged to visit and observe. While their answers, comments, and criticisms were essential to this study, my deepest gratitude is for their love, spiritual guidance, and friendship.

I am also deeply indebted to Drs. Steven Paulson and Joel See whose encouragement and help were always available. I hope that this work has in some way benefited each of them.

A special thanks is due Professor George A. Hillery, Jr. for the questionnaire data used in this paper as well as field notes and other personal observations. The extent to which I am indebted to him for ideas will be apparent to anyone reading this work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Acknowledgements	ii
	Introduction	iv
<b>CHAPTER</b>		
<b>I</b>	Theoretical Framework, Part 1	1
<b>II</b>	Theoretical Framework, Part 2	14
<b>III</b>	Method of Illustration and Operationalization of Variables	24
<b>IV</b>	Illustrative Analysis, Part 1: Varieties of Goal Relationships	
	The Monasteries	31
	Caphas, A Rural Commune	37
	Martin House, A Student Community	43
	The Dormitory	47
	Two Prisons	52
<b>V</b>	Illustrative Analysis, Part 2: Examination of Data	59
<b>VI</b>	Conclusions	73
	Bibliography	75
	APPENDIX A	78
	APPENDIX B	82
	APPENDIX C	84
	Vita	85
	Abstract	

## Introduction

Freedom, usually thought of as a political phenomenon, is also a consequence of relationships between people and their social environment. Freedom, then, is subject to sociological inquiry, and the task of this thesis is to explore the relation between freedom and social organization.

In particular, freedom will be examined in the context of organizations, the problem being one of finding some organizational structure which may be related to the members' perceptions of freedom in the organization. Towards that end, the search will be concentrated on an element common to both organizations and their members--purposiveness, or goals. Goal orientation, crucial to understanding organizations in general and man as a social animal, would seem to hold promise as a means for finding a basic relationship between organizations and men.

The importance of this search would seem to increase with the value of freedom, the time men spend in organizations, and the explanatory power of whatever variable or relationship is found. The remainder of this thesis will be concerned with the search for and the illustration of an explanatory schema for perceptions of freedom within social organizations.

## CHAPTER I

### Theoretical Framework, Part 1

The present attempt to relate freedom and conflict to organizational structure has been inspired by the work of Professor George A. Hillery, Jr. In comparing freedom and the social organization of a dispersed collection of human groups, Professor Hillery found what appears to be a qualitative difference between communal organizations and formal organizations.

"This difference apparently depends on whether the group is organized primarily to obtain a specific goal. If the group is so organized, then it is a formal organization, if not, then it is a communal organization." (Hillery, 1971, p. 51)

The specific goal of formal organizations was defined according to the way it is used by Parsons (1960, cf. Hillery, 1968) and includes the following characteristics. It is an identifiable output which can be contracted for or exchanged as an input to another "subsystem" of the society. Furthermore, this output (or lack of it) must affect the functioning of another subsystem (Parsons, 1960).

This goal specificity is related to freedom through the hypothesis that "only if a group is not primarily oriented to the attainment of a specific goal will it maximize the freedom of its members" (Hillery, 1971, p. 58, original italicized). The same article relates the above hypothesis to the exclusion of the family from goal-specific organizations and to the effect of a specific goal in causing people to be less important than goal attainment.

Freedom is conceived of as requiring both a set of alternatives and the discipline on the actor's part to choose one of the alternatives, accepting its consequences, and foregoing the other alternatives (Hillery, 1971). Alternatives to choose from and the discipline to make a choice seem to be only necessary and limiting factors of freedom however; the actor's definition of the situation determines the character of freedom in any particular, concrete situation (Hillery, 1971). The choice of an alternative that includes many rules governing behavior and excludes nearly all other alternatives can be seen positively in terms of freedom by an actor if the choice is voluntary, as for example, a monk contrasted with a prisoner (Hillery, 1971). Our language seems to contain this idea in a less developed manner in the expression "a free choice."

The definition of the situation is affected by organizational characteristics as well as individual characteristics in so far as orientation to a specific goal de-emphasizes individual needs: "Anything which places people first seems to increase freedom, as the people will define it" (Hillery, 1971, p. 63). The tendency of goal-specific organizations to exclude familial behavior also is linked with unfree situations since ". . . freedom seems somehow associated with the family" (Hillery, 1971, p. 63). To exclude the family from free situations or to include it in unfree organizations is both rare and difficult (Hillery, 1971).

In any particular situation, freedom is thought to be defined in terms of one of three dimensions: discipline, autonomy, and license (Hillery, 1973).

Freedom viewed in terms of discipline is a belief that freedom is possible in the particular situation and obtainable by putting the group's needs ahead of immediate, personal desires. The member of such a group, then, while sacrificing for the sake of his group finds his own freedom within the group. Thus, to a point anyway, a "give and get" principle may be operating here such that greater discipline and sacrifice might obtain greater freedom also. For the group to function properly requires the members to discipline themselves to fulfilling their roles for the group.

Another definition of freedom refers to autonomy. Freedom here springs from the actions of the individual under the restriction that the actions not bother or hurt anyone else. The group is not the locus of freedom but is a limiting factor on it.

The third dimension of freedom is simply a complete lack of regulation or restriction. Freedom becomes maximized when the group is no consideration at all. This differs from autonomy in that, here, the group is not a legitimate restriction. Freedom of autonomy and freedom of license may be seen as separate facets of a more general freedom of choice (private communication from George A. Hillery, Jr.).

The relationships between these three definitions can be seen through two reference points; the group, and the individual. When freedom is seen as disciplined, the group is the locus of freedom which is shared by individual members. The survival and well-functioning of the group is more important than any individual's desires; thus, sacrifice for the group is expected and legitimate. Furthermore,

sacrifice and concession is legitimized not only to the extent necessary for the preservation of the group, but sacrifice and concession are also expected, and legitimate, to insure that the group performs particular functions not necessary for mere survival.

In the freedom of autonomy, the only legitimized concessions are those necessary to insure that the group survives and that other members are not impinged upon. The group is important, perhaps necessary, but freedom is located outside of its functions.

Freedom as license defines no legitimate concessions or sacrifices by the members. With the survival of the group removed as a restraint on individual action, the question arises of how such a group survives at all.

An effect of organizational structure on the feelings of individual members has been posited in the hypothesis that organizations which are oriented towards achieving specific goals do not maximize their members' freedom (Hillery, 1971a). Behavioral consequences of this relationship can be seen in the proposition that ". . . deprivation of freedom increases conflict" (Hillery, 1971b, p. 1, original underlined).

This proposition was suggested by the observation that in instances when communal organizations had their boundaries imposed upon them, as was true of certain kinds of concentration camps, antagonism increased, especially as the members' control of activities within the boundaries decreased (Hillery, 1971a). "In each case, if the members of a community believe that their freedom has been deprived, they will respond with behaviors that can be called acts of antagonism and



conflict" (Hillery, 1971a, p. 56). Whether the members would feel deprived of freedom or not was seen to be a function of the members definition of the situation (Hillery, 1971a). Of course, intragroup conflict can function both positively and negatively for the survival of a group (cf. Coser, 1956), an observation which will become more relevant later in this study.

The above discussion has presented some observations of the effects of an organizational characteristic (goal specificity) on individual perceptions (perceived deprivation of freedom) and behaviors (intra-group conflict). While the distinction made between communal and formal organizations does have significant empirical support, within the communal organizations are some groups which suggest additional investigation. Some of the communal groups, the monasteries and religious communes, while not giving primacy to a specific goal in the sense used above, do have very definite purposes. In addition, these groups are much more restrictive and demanding of their members' behavior than are some less purposeful communal organizations. Given the above discussion, these more purposeful and demanding communal organizations would be expected to exhibit greater perceived deprivation of freedom and conflict than other communal organizations. However, examination of communal organizations shows that within that category purposesiveness seems inversely associated with perceived deprivation of freedom and inter-group conflict. Since the goal specificity of a group would seem to be prior to perceived deprivation of freedom and conflict among its members, modification of the proposed relationships would best be undertaken by focusing efforts on goal specificity.

More precisely, what will be sought in this work is a construct that orders organizations by perceived deprivation of freedom and conflict both within as well as between the present categories. Since goal specificity does order the groups to an extent, it would seem wise to carry investigation further into the general area of goals and purposefulness. In that direction, the following section will examine the concept and uses of goals in the sociological literature, particularly searching for uses of goals as organizational characteristics affecting members' attitudes and behaviors.

What is easily the most striking aspect of the concept of goals is the great variety of definitions and usages. When viewed against the sociological model of man as a purposive, rational, social animal, the lack of agreement on the concept is quite disturbing. The extent of dissensus is such that there is little agreement among sociologists about how other sociologists use the concept. Zald notes that "In focusing on goals and goal achievement, at least five perspectives used by sociologists and social psychologists can be distinguished . . . ." (Zald, 1963, p. 206). Another survey posits six categories of goal usage (Perrow, 1968). Comparison of the two treatments (see Appendix C) shows them to have two instances of equivalent categories, another instance where a category of one treatment includes two categories of the other schema, and to have a total of four categories that have no counterparts. Noting that both treatments cite a broad range of literature to support their respective schemas, this writer will forego any attempts to pose and discuss categories of goal conceptualizings but will treat individual cases, noting similarities among them.

Easily the most well known treatment of goals is that of Parsons'. Parsons defines one important form of organization, bureaucracy, by its ". . . primary of orientation to a specific goal . . .," a specific goal having the characteristics noted earlier (Parsons, 1960). Organizations are viewed as social systems integrated by institutionalization with the culture system and also bounded by other social systems and the personality systems of participants (Parsons, 1960, 1961). The organizational value system is a subsystem of a higher order value system, primarily, and legitimizes the organization in terms of its function for the superordinate system, usually society (Parsons, 1960). The goal of an organization is correspondingly seen as a function for some other system. Profit, for example, ". . . cannot be the primary organization goal because profit making is not by itself a function on behalf of the society as a system" (Parsons, 1960, p. 21). The four functional imperatives, then, establish types of goals (as functions) by which organizations can be classified according to their primary function for society (Parsons, 1960).

Goals are of import to the organization not only for legitimation, but also in terms of maintaining equilibrium with the organizational environment (Parsons, 1961). Organizational goals adapt the interchange between the organization and its environment to reflect conditions in the environment (Parsons, 1961). It should be noted that commentators tend to stress the conceptualization of goals as functions for the larger society but fail to note that goals also provide functions for the organization by way of legitimation and equilibrium of inputs and outputs.

Aside from the various functions, Parsons notes that as well as orientation to specific goals, organizational features are partially determined by type of goal (Parsons, 1960). However, the specifics of these goal related features are never elaborated by Parsons.

Such an elaboration has been undertaken by Katz and Kahn using a classification of organizations very similar to that of Parsons. They note the relation of the organizational goal function to some "second order characteristics" (Katz and Kahn, 1966). One of these, the "nature of the throughput," differentiates between organizations which change people and those which change objects (Katz and Kahn, 1966). For organizations which change people, "The internal procedures and forms must attract and motivate temporary members who are to be trained or treated" (Katz and Kahn, 1966). Another such characteristic differentiates between intrinsically rewarding (expressive) and instrumental role performance (Katz and Kahn, 1966). The two end types noted are voluntary associations and ". . . some job which offers no satisfaction beyond the paycheck" (Katz and Kahn, 1966, p. 118).

These two characteristics indicate a shortcoming of the schema: failure to include cases of non-voluntary membership such as that of prisoners, many asylum inmates, and draftees. Another writer notes that for the relation between goal function and structure, ". . . the overlap and ambiguities present in the classification by major functions are so great that the distinction itself becomes practically meaningless" (Hall, 1972, p. 45).

Another adaptation of goals as functions posits a category of "output goals" which refers to the organization's intended input (function) for society, and an additional category of "maintenance goals" (Gross, 1967). The maintenance goals are the four functional imperatives of social systems renamed and focused specifically on the organizational level (Gross, 1967). A useful schema for finding an organizational "goal structure," by itself it does not explain the attitudes and behaviors of individuals.

Goals as functions are used in a different sense than above by a classification of four types of values which actions can serve (Warriner, 1965). Organizational purpose is operationalized as the "Assumed Value Function" which is based on the man hours devoted to the activities serving the particular value types (Warriner, 1965). The writer does not elaborate any relations between the assumed value function and behavior.

What this writer feels is the most useful of the goal as function approaches is Etzioni's (1961) assertion that different means of obtaining compliance are necessary for organizations performing different societal functions. Since Etzioni's terms are quite descriptive of his concepts, the best description of this relation of organizational goals to structure is his own summary:

"Organizations that have order goals tend to have a coercive compliance structure; those that have economic goals tend to have a utilitarian compliance structure; and those that serve culture goals tend to have a normative compliance structure" (1961, p. 88).

The conceptualizations of goals presented above reflect at least to some extent what can be broadly called the systems approach to organization. "The starting point for this approach is not the goal itself but a working model of a social unit which is capable of achieving a goal" (Etzioni, 1960, p. 261). The same article claims as benefits of this approach (1) a more realistic assessment of organizational effectiveness, (2) realization that the decision makers in organizations must compromise with the environment, and (3) a partial antidote to the researcher's biases in favor of other professionals and "liberal" ideals. Assertions about systems approaches see such as distinctly contrasted with the specific goal model and are particularly concerned with organizational effectiveness (Etzioni, 1961, and Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967).

With the exception of Etzioni, the above approaches to goals (as varied as they are) seem to offer little in the way of relating organizational characteristics to attitudes and behaviors of members. They might also be criticized for underestimating the effects of rational self evaluation for organizations and for not developing adequate treatments of informal organization (Gouldner, 1959). If as Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) suggest, an open systems approach focused more specifically on the organizational level is used, then in the writer's opinion there would be little to distinguish the systems approach from any approach based on the "goal model." Indeed, reviewing the concepts of goals leaves a distinct impression that there is as much variation within as between any of the suggested approaches or

schools of thought, suggesting that there may be as many concepts of and about goals as there are writers.

Some of the problems in using a goal model for examining organizations are attributed to comparing different levels of analysis:

"Goals as norms, as sets of meanings depicting target states, are cultural entities. Organizations, as systems of co-ordinated activities of more than one actor, are social systems" (Etzioni, 1961, p. 258).

This gap between the abstract and the concrete might be less problematic if goals were more clearly specified. Such a more exact specification could follow Ackoff and Emery's (1972) conception of ends, goals, and objectives as intended and obtainable outcomes which vary as to the number of environments and the time interval involved. Differentiated from these are ideals which are outcomes ". . . which can never be obtained but can be approached without limit" (Ackoff and Emery, 1972, p. 57). This approach could relate intentions, varyingly abstract, to particular situations (environments and times) on the more concrete level of organizational operations.

In a similar vein, organizational goals may be thought of as a duality of "official" goals which are abstract and serve as legitimation for the organization's operations, and "operative" goals which are more concrete and capable of use for setting priorities and making decisions within the organization (Perrow, 1961).

Decision making as such is the basis for one search for a meaningful concept of organizational goals. Simon (1964) posits a complex organizational goal which is a set of constraints that limit alternatives in organizational decision making. These criteria both generate

proposed decisions and test their satisfactoriness (Simon, 1964). Organizational decision makers are seen as sharing a largely common set of constraints but differing as to which of the constraints are used to generate or test proposals (Simon, 1964). Noting that most organizations are hierarchically structured, the same article suggests that the organizational goal refer to the constraint set of the upper level roles in an organization.

The goals or criteria of an organization, while more or less abstract on a general level, are definitely not absolute for any organization, but are affected by relatively concrete level organizations and individuals. One possibility is that goals reflect an organizations response to its relatively concrete environment. One exploration of this view posits four modes of organizational goal-setting resulting from varying degrees of environmental influence on goal choice (Thompson and McEwen, 1958).

However, goals as abstractions might also be:

". . . intended states of affairs that do not adequately describe the desired states or the activities that would constitute their achievement. Such intangible goals do not provide adequate guidance for group action, and as a consequence, more tangible substitutes are developed" (Warner and Havens, 1968, p. 540).

The same authors note that this "goal displacement" tends to substitute tangible goals relating to the maintenance of the organization as a system.

A combination of the two preceding views could see the inability of intangible goals to direct behavior to be a result of being so



abstract so as to be irrelevant to the organizational situation.

These goals could then be displaced via the four modes of goal setting to respond to the organizational environment, in the process becoming more tangible, more directive of behavior, and maintaining the organization.

## CHAPTER II

### Theoretical Framework, Part 2

One might be tempted to conclude from the foregoing review of the concept of organizational goals that the utility of the concept should be rejected on the basis of the marked lack of agreement on definition and usage. Nevertheless, there are some concepts that may be of aid in this study's attempt to order groups by perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-group conflict. The frequent observation that goals are abstract and are linked to the organization and particular roles through a continuum of sub-goals and various levels of policies, rules, and operating procedures will prove useful for the theoretical framework of this study.

Given this continuum, the goals of an organization may be divided into two groupings: those goals which operate on a cultural level (cf. Etzioni, 1960) and those which operate on the same level of analysis as the organization. The first, more abstract grouping is where the official goals of an organization (cf. Perrow, 1961) would be placed, with the operative goals (cf. Perrow, 1961) falling in the more concrete grouping.

Within this framework, the official goals of an organization, operating on the cultural level, would seem to be somewhat normative, at least in relation to the operative goals. The official goals would be directly valued by society according to norms universal to the culture and also by individuals both in terms of these cultural norms and norms and values peculiar to the individual or some group

to which he belongs. The official goals, in turn, would justify the operative goals, the operative goals being indirectly valued.

The argument being made here is that the member of an organization will feel the operative goals of the organization to be justifiable according to two criteria. Most importantly, are the official goals positively valued by the member; are they justifiable as ends? When this is true, then, do the operative goals seem to actually contribute to attainment of the official goals?

This study will concentrate upon the first requirement. What is proposed is that the members' valuation of an organization's official goals is done in terms of the members' own personal goals. The nature of this response to the official goals would have a great effect on the organization, especially in matters of role performance and in the members' attitudes towards the organization.

It is this relationship of official organizational goals to the members' personal goals that is proposed as a variable that will order organizations according to perceived deprivation of freedom by their members, and also, then, by intra-group conflict. After a short clarification of what is meant by members' goals, the next portion of this study will detail the relationship of official organizational goals to members' goals (hereafter called "the goal relationship") as a variable. Immediately following the presentation of the proposed variable, its links with freedom and conflict will be discussed.

What is intended here by "members' goals" is simply the ends the members are pursuing as individuals, that is, what they themselves wish to accomplish or move towards. Some writers distinguish personal

ends as "motives" which, while not clearly defined, seem often to refer to any reason for a member's behavior. In contrast, members' goals refer to conscious and valuated ends, ends which have an identifiable content and elicit emotive reactions from the members. This can be seen to exclude subconscious phenomena such as drives, though such phenomena could be in part responsible for conscious goals. The members' goals, then, refer to abstract, somewhat normative phenomena operating at a level of analysis comparable to official organizational goals.

As a variable, the goal relationship may be seen as a continuum on which three broad classifications may be placed. At one pole is the goal supportive relationship in which the organization directs resources towards goals that the members are also pursuing. In this case, the set of official organizational goals and the set of the members' goals have elements common to both of them. The impact of this relationship on other variables would increase both as the number of common goals increased and as the strength of members' valuation of the common goals increased. This last specification is consistent with the viewpoint that the tendency is for members to respond to the official organizational goal, not vice versa.

At the other extreme are goal opposed relationships in which the official organizational goals are the basis for directing resources towards the thwarting of the members' pursuit of their own goals. Put another way, there are common elements to the sets of organizational and members' goals, but the character of valuation, the algebraic sign, of these common goals is opposite. As will be shown later, it may

often be that the common differentially valued goals will appear contingent on the members entrance into the organization. As with goal supportive relationships, the effects of goal opposed relationships will become greater as the number and strength of valuation of common (though oppositely valued) goals increases.

Between the polar types are goal irrelevant relationships. In these cases the official goals of the organization direct resources neither towards nor against goals held by the members. There are no elements common to the sets of organizational goals and members' goals. The official goals of the organization relate to the personal goals of members only as the organization's efforts to obtain role performance aid or hinder the pursuit of personal goals. Thus, in the goal irrelevant situation, the members' and official organizational goals are mutually irrelevant as ends, being related only as means through role performance. The members' organizational role is directly effective in pursuing organizational goals and is indirectly effective (through some medium such as money), in pursuing personal goals. Role performance will be of major importance in linking goal relationships with perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-group conflict. Before the effects of goal relationships are elaborated, the multiplicity of both organizational and personal goals and the heterogeneity of the members' personal goals must be dealt with.

The multiplicity of organizational goals, often noted in the literature, coupled with the multiplicity of the personal goals of any particular member and the variation in strength of valuation of personal goals is the reason for seeing the goal relationship as

continuous and not as discrete. As noted earlier, the number of a member's personal goals also included in the official organizational goals and their strength of valuation may vary. Thus, the most goal supportive relationship possible would be where all of a member's personal goals were included with positive value in an organization's official goals. The most goal opposed relationship possible would differ only in placing negative value on the member's goals.

Goal irrelevancy between a member and an organization would reach a zenith when there were no common personal and official goals. These three pure types of goal relationships would seem quite rare, with no discrete gradations existing between them. The concrete case of goal irrelevancy would most likely be a small set of common goals that are not strongly valued.

While the number of both personal and organizational goals lead to viewing goal relationships as lying on a continuum, the differences among members' personal goals suggest the following remarks. It seems that differences in personal goals among members of the same organization might occur especially along hierarchical lines, that is, personal goals might be similar within, and different between, organizational strata. The implication of this is that the goal relationship may also be different between strata, which would suggest that an organization as a whole can not be considered as having any particular goal relationship.

The possibilities of both a multiplicity of organizational and personal goals and that there are differences of personal goals along

hierarchical lines with the additional possibility of differences in goal relationships within a stratum leads to the following research considerations. One such consideration would be that the organizations studied have very few and very identifiable official goals, these goals having been made explicit to the members. In addition, it would be wise to limit an exploratory study such as this to similar classes of members between organizations, thus minimizing hierarchical effects.

This study, then, will use organizations with relatively few and easily identifiable official goals and will focus on the goal relationships of their "lower participants" (cf. Etzioni, 1961). This category includes subordinated members, clients, customers, employees, and inmates as subcategories (Etzioni, 1961). Subordinate members and inmates would be appropriate characterizations of the lower participants to be studied here.

Having discussed the goal relationship as a variable, the task remains of proposing some linkage of it with perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-group conflict. To the extent that a goal relationship is supportive, an organization can depend upon a member's motivation towards personal goals to provide some measure of role performance. The organization offers an alternative, the role, that directly works towards the member's personal goals. To the extent this pertains, the member could choose an alternative that is acceptable on its own merits. The efficacy of the role in pursuing the member's personal goals would tend to justify the restrictions it imposed and the member would be unlikely to perceive a deprivation

of freedom. In the situation outlined above, the elements of a freedom of discipline can be seen.

Intra-group conflict would be expected to be low in this case since low perceived deprivation of freedom would produce little antagonism. However, while the antagonisms that may arouse conflict would be lower in goal supportive relationships, this commonality of personal and organizational goals could also be a basis for more intense conflicts. The more an organization involves the personal goals of its members the more it might involve the total personality of the members. Coser (1956, cf. pp. 67-72) associates greater personality involvement in a group with more intense (though not necessarily more frequent) intra-group conflict. A commonality of goals does not assure agreement on means, and it is this disagreement on means which produces the most intense conflicts (Coser, 1956). On the other hand, this commonality of goals also may be seen to provide the basis for limiting the divisiveness of such conflicts to matters of secondary importance (Coser, 1956).

In a goal supportive relationship, Etzioni's (1961) "normative compliance structure" would be expected. While Etzioni associates different compliance structures with different types of organizational goals, this writer prefers to see the compliance structures in conjunction with the relationship between organizational and members' goals. The normative aspect of goals would produce what Etzioni (1961) terms "moral involvement" for members who hold official organizational goals as their own.



A characterization of the type of bureaucracy which would operate under these conditions can be seen in Gouldner's "representative bureaucracy" (1954). The rules operating in representative bureaucracy are established mutually by workers (lower participants more generally) and management (or higher participants, elites) and are justifiable by both categories in terms of their own values (Gouldner, 1954). Though the two groups may have different values, enforcement of the rules violates neither set of values (Gouldner, 1954).

In contrast to the goal-supportive relationship stands the goal-opposed relationship in which the members' personal goals can not be expected to provide motivation to perform an organizational role. In order to obtain role performance in an organization that opposes the members' personal goals, the members' alternatives must be reduced to only those alternatives acceptable to the organization. This reduction might come about in two ways. First, alternatives can be reduced by making them impossible, not an object of choice. Such things as impassible walls and barricades, shackles, and ball and chain can accomplish this. Alternatives, even when available, can be made unacceptable because of their consequences. Solitary confinement, additional time as a member, and persecution of family can be used to make the results of choosing certain alternatives unacceptable. The two means of reducing acceptable alternatives are often used simultaneously with the armed guard being a possible combination of the two.

Without any alternatives acceptable as either ends or means in terms of his personal goals, the member in a goal-opposed relationship

would feel deprived of freedom. The resulting antagonism of this relationship would be manifested as conflict.

If reducing peoples' alternatives can be seen as efforts to control them, it would seem that:

"Social unfreedom and control are overlapping categories. By preventing A from doing X, B makes A unfree to do X and controls his behavior" (Oppenheim, 1968, p. 555, italics removed).

The attitudes of members towards organizations which hold them in goal-opposed relationships would be expected to be "alienative" (cf. Etzioni, 1961). Alienative involvement is associated with "co-ercive compliance structures" (Etzioni, 1961).

Gouldner's (1954) "punishment centered bureaucracy" would characterize the types of rules and procedures which pertain to goal-opposed relationships. In this situation, classes such as labor and management can be said to initiate rules against each other. Such rules are deemed justifiable by only one of the classes and are viewed by the other classes as an imposition (Gouldner, 1954). Punishment centered bureaucracy is directly associated by Gouldner with a "dissensus in ends" (1954, p. 244, italics removed).

A comparison of the effects of the two polar types of goal relationships on perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-group conflict yields the central contention of this study, that: the perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-organizational conflict of an organization's members will increase the more the members perceive the official organizational goals as being nonsupportive of their personal goals.

Lying between goal-supportiveness and goal-opposition on the goal relationship continuum, goal-irrelevancy would also be expected to fall between the two end types in terms of the levels of perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-organizational conflict associated with it. In Etzioni's (1961) terms, the orientation of the member towards the organization would be "calculative" with an associated "utilitarian compliance structure."

### CHAPTER III

#### Method of Illustration and Operationalization of Variables

The remainder of this thesis will be concerned with an illustrative examination of the relationships proposed here. A study group of seven organizations including both communal and formal groups have been selected from a continuing study of human organizations by Professor George A. Hillery, Jr. Each of these groups has been administered a questionnaire which has measures of both perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-organizational conflict with additional attitudinal and socio-demographic information which will be described later.

This paper will focus on the organizations as the units of analysis. The concern here is with the organization as a collective composed of the individuals in the organization (Lazarsfeld and Menzel, 1969). Therefore, the number of cases for the study is seven. Selection of the particular groups to be used is purposive, the object being to obtain at least two cases for each of the three divisions of the goal relationship continuum.

Attitudes concerning freedom, levels of conflict, and socio-demographic variables can be obtained for the organizations by aggregating their members' responses to the questionnaire. The best method of aggregating individual responses so as to characterize a group would be one which was not affected by extreme cases, that is, an aggregative measure reflective of typical members. In comparing means, modes, and medians as indicators of typicality, Blommers and

Lindquist conclude that ". . . when the purpose of an average is to portray or represent the 'typical' score in a collection, the median of the collection should usually be the average employed" (1960, p. 118). The authors note that the median turns out to be the score that is closest to all of the other scores.

Each of the groups will be described in terms of its ideology, if any, and a set of characteristics which in addition to providing the reader with a picture of the organization will introduce variables which may affect the proposed relationship of the goal relationship with freedom and conflict.

As an organizing framework for describing the organizations, their characteristics will be organized into three clusters: social morphology, co-operation, and bio-social practices. These clusters are a rough adaptation of the three focal components around which other characteristics of cities and villages revolve (cf. Hillery, 1973a). The purpose of their adaptation and use here is to provide a common basis of description of the groups, a description of the distribution of authority within each group being added to reflect the more formal nature of these groups compared to cities and villages. Particular variables within each cluster were selected because of availability of information and relevance in describing the organizations.

The social-morphological cluster includes the following analytical properties for the group (cf. Lazarsfeld and Menzel, 1969). Ages for the respondents at the time of questionnaire administration has been determined to within a month by asking them both the year and month of their births. Sex was also determined by the questionnaire.

Marital status has been reduced from six response categories on the questionnaire to three ordinal classifications of marriedness. The present levels of marriedness and the response categories they include are: (1) married, includes "married" and "common law married;" (2) previously married, which combines "separated," "divorced," and "widowed;" and (3) "single, never married."

There are two variables concerning the backgrounds of the respondents. Size of place of background was operationalized by the question:

"What is the size of the community in which you lived for the longest period of time before you came here?"

The response categories are: (1) "farm or open country;" (2) "town or village of less than 2,500 persons;" (3) "2,500 - 9,999;" (4) "10,000 - 49,999;" (5) "50,000 - 99,999;" (6) "100,000 - 999,999;" and (7) "1 million and over."

The following question asked,

"If the community mentioned in question 12 was a suburb of a city, what was the size of the city?"

Responses were the same as for the previous question. The community size was taken to be the response to the second question if that response was larger than that for the first question, otherwise, the response to the first question is used. Combining the responses to the two questions would produce ambiguous results.

Responses concerning educational attainments were combined from seven original categories into five classifications which roughly increase as to number of years of education. The classification is:

(1) "did not complete fifth grade" and "fifth, sixth, seventh, or eighth grade," (2) "some high school but did not graduate," (3) "graduate from high school," (4) "some schooling beyond high school, but did not attend college" and "attended college (including junior college) but did not graduate," and (5) "college graduate or beyond."

The following global properties (cf. Lazarsfeld and Menzel, 1969) of each group's social morphology have also been tapped. Both physical characteristics and means of integration of space will be described as well as structural freedom. Structural freedom refers to restrictions of movement both out of and within the group. High structural freedom is indicated by no restriction on the members' movements while low structural freedom is seen in the denial of movement. In between these conditions is the case where the members' movements are allowed by permission only (Hillery and Klobus, 1974).

The number of lower participants in the organization is also a global property of the group and is known for the seven study groups.

Analytical effects of structural freedom may be garnered from responses to the questions:

"Do you usually spend part of each day away from the group (that is, off the premises or outside of the territorial boundaries?"

"How many nights have you spent away from the group during the past month?"

The second cluster of components concerns the extent and means of co-operation for the group. Co-operation both between members and between the members and the organization will be described.

Three types of co-operation may be defined. Mutual aid is characterized by particularistic criteria of interaction and by a lack of specification as to what is to be exchanged, the limitations of risk for the parties, and length of time involved. There are no specific criteria of successful performance for mutual aid.

Contractual co-operation specifies what is being exchanged, the risks each party undertakes, and at what time performance is expected. This type of co-operation has specific criteria for judging its success or fulfillment.

Both of the above types of co-operation are based on some notion of reciprocity in contrast with non-reciprocal co-operation which is based solely on social power. "Power is the ability to introduce force into a social situation; it is the presentation of force" (Bierstedt, 1950, p. 733). The same article defines force as sanctioning and reduction of alternatives.

The third cluster of components of the group is bio-social practices. These concern the rules and customs of the group in regards to sexual behavior and meals. These regulations and customs can be seen as global properties of the organizations.

Description of the three focal clusters will be preceded by a note on the group's ideology, if any. Mention will also be made of the structuring and location of authority and social power.

After each group has been described via the framework presented above, the goal relationship of the lower participants with the organization will be discussed. Information concerning the goal



relationships of the groups has been garnered from personal experiences, interviews with members, official literature of the organizations, and from the sociological literature. The particular sources of information available for each group will be noted in the discussion.

Since each respondent has not been personally tapped as to his goal relationship but is being classified according to membership in a certain class of members, individual level effects of the goal relationship attached to his class can not be properly discussed. Thus, individual effects can not be strictly separated from structural effects for the independent variable (cf. Tannenbaum and Bachman, 1964). However, in so far as the characterizations of the goal relationships of class members holds true, it is valid to compare aggregative effects across groups, the procedure which will be used here.

The final stage of this illustrative analysis will be to note if the classification of the organizations by their goal relationships with their lower participants will order the groups also with respect to the dependent variables, perceived deprivation of freedom and conflict. The definitions of freedom within the groups will also be discussed.

In view of the illustrative purpose of this paper, the discussion will be based on cross-tabulations of the goal relationships and the dependent variables. The possible spuriousness of the relationship of interest could also be examined via use of cross-tabulations with control variables.

Operationalization and verification of measures for perceived deprivation of freedom, definitions of freedom, and intra-organizational conflict are presented in Appendices A and B.

All of the cases used in the following analysis have valid answers for all of the questions measuring perceived deprivation of freedom. In addition, the respondents were included only if they had at least five valid responses to the seven item conflict scale after their responses were handled as per Appendix B. The cases upon which any of the figures presented are based satisfy both the above requirements in addition to having valid responses for the item in question.

## CHAPTER IV

### Illustrative Analysis

#### Part 1: Varieties of Goal Relationships

##### The Monasteries

Two of the organizations used in this study are monasteries of the Order of Cistercians of the Strict Observance, a Roman Catholic order which follows the Holy Rule of St. Benedict. The Holy Rule of St. Benedict is a detailed prescription for a monastic life, prescribing prayer, poverty, chastity, and obedience for the monk. The ideology will be considered in more detail later.

There are four formal statuses among the monks: postulant, novice, junior professed, and the fully professed. The hierarchy of authority is very simple, there being an abbot, a prior who assists the abbot, and the monks themselves. The novices are under the additional authority of the novice master. Since the abbot, prior, and novice master are not distinguished in each of the two samples, they will be considered lower participants along with the other fully professed monks, novices, and postulants. Since there can only be three such elites in each sample, their effect on the results may be discounted. Furthermore, the persons who occupy the three positions in question must also adhere to the Holy Rule and enjoy the same food and facilities as do the other monks.

At the time the questionnaires were administered to the two groups, the following social morphological characteristics were observed. One house, called "Palisades" here, had approximately 70

monks living there from whom 46 respondents valid for this study were obtained. A comparison of the total sample with other information about the nonrespondents found the only significant difference to be that ". . . the sample population is more apt to communicate with the outside world" (Hillery, 1974, p. 11). The median age at Palisades was 43.4 years with a range of 22.9 to 75.2 years.

The second monastery, Bernard, is a daughter house of Palisades and had between 15 and 17 members, 13 of whom can be used as respondents for this study. Ages ranged from 27.2 to 75.2 years, the median being 47.2.

Educational backgrounds at both monasteries ranged from less than eight grades completed to college degrees. At Palisades 15 (33%) of the respondents had completed college; with a comparable figure of 3 (23%) at Bernard.

Both monasteries had people who had previously lived longest in cities (ranging to over 1,000,000 inhabitants) and on farms. Median community size for Palisades respondents was 75,000, the figure for Bernard being 84,000.

Palisades respondents had been there from 0.6 to 47.4 years, the median being 20.6. At Bernard the median time in that group and other monasteries was 22.1 years, ranging from less than one month to 56.6 years.

Spatially, each monastery is divided into the "enclosure" and the sanctuary. Only monks, and occasionally male guests, may enter the enclosure which includes the monk's dormitory facilities, the

infirmary, kitchen and dining hall, offices for the abbot and prior, and a library, all as part of the abbey proper. Also part of the enclosure are the farmlands, bakeries, brick kilns, and whatever other industries are present. A guest house for male guests and retreatants is located within the enclosure at Bernard and outside of it at Palisades. Women are not permitted to enter the enclosure, and male guests are expected to enter the enclosed part of the abbey only in the company of a monk.

The sanctuary is open to the general public, being one of the few places in the monastery where women are allowed. While the enclosure is demarcated with signs and closed doors, the monastery generally does not have walls between it and the world, the land being simply fenced in as any other private property. However, the monastery does limit structural freedom. According to the Holy Rule a monk must ask permission of the abbot to leave the monastery grounds. However, no one will attempt to stop a monk from leaving if permission is not granted, nor are there any legal grounds for preventing free exit. In short, the monks stay or leave by their own choice; it is the guests who are not structurally free within the monastery, though they may leave at any time.

Though structurally free to leave the grounds, very few of the monks do so. At Palisades 43 of 46 respondents (94%) reported that they did not spend any part of each day outside the group. Only 6 (13%) of the respondents spent one or more nights each month outside of the group. The figures for Bernard are very similar; 2 of the 15

monks (15%) reporting staying overnight outside of the group each month, with the great majority of the residents, 12 monks (92%), not spending a part of each day outside the group.

Turning to the focus of co-operation, the monks can be seen to co-operate almost solely through mutual aid, both with each other and with the monastery as an organization. The monks receive no salaries or wages, but are provided with all that is necessary to live, including medical treatment, regardless of their contributions to the monastery in terms of labor. The monastery supports hermits, invalids, and working monks alike. Sharing in the monastery is almost total since the monks own nothing of their own except toiletry articles and their habits (robes).

Individual monks have essentially no co-operative relationships outside the monastery. The monastery as a whole co-operates contractually with outside agencies in order to obtain resources, but will extend mutual aid to neighbors in need.

Focusing on the bio-social aspects of the monastery, it should first be noted that the monks are celibate and chaste. It has been noted that seemingly all relatively successful communes somehow regulate their members' sexual practices (Hillery, 1973), the monastery's method of doing this may be noted for its simplicity and explicitness.

All meals at the monastery are eaten in a dining area. Eating together may be judged a significant aspect of the monks' routine. At Palisades 76% (38) of the respondents felt that eating together was important or very important. Bernard's 14 valid responses to the

same question yielded 9 answers of important or very important (64%).

"The monastery is 'the school of the Lord's service in which the monk devotes his life to truly seeking God'" (Our Lady of the Holy Cross Abbey, 1958, p. 7, references for inner quotations omitted in the original text). This is the official goal of the monastery; to provide a setting wherein the monk can confront God.

"The Order, the Rule, the monastery is there to provide the means by which one follows a calling to the love and service of God" (Kelty, p. 5).

The Holy Rule provides three main avenues, or operative goals, by which the broader purpose of confronting God can be done. These are the performance of the Divine Offices such as vespers, Lectio Divina which is reading guided by prayer, and manual labor (Kelty). The monastery is simply a place where people gather in order to facilitate the pursuit of these goals.

"One joins such a community in the expectation that here one will find like-minded brethren in search for a common goal" (Kelty, p. 5).

Conversation with individual monks showed that the idea of the monastery as a situation where monks can follow their vocation is widely shared. This writer found no one to disagree with this idea. The novice master of the monastery which this writer visited held that the monastery existed for the monks more than the monks existed for the monastery.

However, the same monk also noted that there is a separation of the monastery's goals from those of the monks in that the monastery

has to take in new members and "make a living." This is a clue to a reason why any organization will always have some goals that are different from the members' goals. The reason is simply that the organization will have certain needs such as recruitment and maintenance in this example, which are not shared by the members as individuals. This suggests that a variable in maintaining a truly goal supportive relationship with the members could be the extent to which the goals peculiar to the organization as an organization are kept subordinated to the common goals of the membership.

Evidence for the goal supportive relationship of the monastery to its members is the subordination of efficient operation to the needs of the monks for an atmosphere in which they can maintain a contemplative frame of mind. One example, again from conversation with the novice master, was of assigning a monk to farm work after discovering that he was "climbing the walls" in the bakery. Other monks also noted the efforts of the organization to find the members jobs in which they could maintain a contemplative attitude. The use of an expensive piece of farm machinery at another monastery was discontinued because it was too noisy.

The most telling evidence along these lines is that the monks work only enough to maintain themselves at subsistence level and to discharge their obligation to treat each guest as Christ. Each monk's organizational role very directly serves the personal goals of finding union with God. Note that there is no medium of exchange between the organization and the member.



Among the monks, personal goals would seem to be very similar, centering around the pursuit of union with God. The extensive screening which takes place before the whole monastery votes on allowing a novice to make full profession serves, among other things, to maintain ideological purity and an assure agreement on goals within the monastery. Most applicants are not accepted.

The monasteries, then, will be characterized as being in a goal-supportive relationship with their lower participants.

In terms of the proposition being examined here, the monks should be expected to perceive little deprivation of freedom since the official goals of the monastery are supportive of their personal goals.

#### Caphas, A Rural Commune

Caphas, another of the study groups, is a radical Christian commune located in one of the south-eastern states. It was founded in the 1940's with a goal of teaching advanced farming techniques to impoverished tenant farmers in order to free them from the tenant system and its accompanying poverty. Caphas followed the example of the early church in the book of Acts and had a pooling of personal resources. This form of communism, in addition to the community's pacific and bi-racial witness has led to much conflict with outsiders.

The community is now involved mainly in selling pecan products, arts and crafts items, and books and taped speeches by its charismatic founder (who is now dead). Proceeds from these activities, in addition to maintaining the commune, are used for the building of low cost housing for people who otherwise could afford no more than a shack.

Caphas is actually two organizations, the Corporation and the Fellowship, that have a common membership and location. The Corporation is the legal entity which is in the business of selling the items mentioned earlier for the purpose of generating funds for projects such as the low cost housing.

The Fellowship is composed of the participants of the Corporation who live on the premises and who have made special commitments to the Corporation. They form what might be considered the church of Caphas.

This writer has visited Caphas three times for a total of twelve days, administering the questionnaire in September 1973. There were approximately 25 members at that time from whom 18 respondents meet the criteria adopted for this study. Additional information includes field notes from two other investigators in addition to notes taken by this writer and interviews specifically concerning the goal relationships.

The respondents of Caphas included 6 males and 12 females. Ages ranged from 19.3 to 60.8 years with a median of 26.0. Married respondents numbered 8, 8 more people were single, and 2 had been married but were no longer so.

Backgrounds were quite varied as to size of place lived longest in, ranging from farms to cities of over 1 million inhabitants. The median size of place lived longest before coming to Caphas was 16,000 persons.

College degrees were held by 9 respondents, 6 had some college or technical school training, and 3 held high school diplomas.

Lengths of time members had been at Caphas varied from less than a month to 30.8 years, the median occurring at 1.9 years.

Spatially, Caphas is integrated by function and dwelling units. The original location of the farm is still a focus of activities with the pecan, sewing, and arts and crafts industries, communal dining hall, and the homes of around half of the members located there. The bulk of the land is in farming. Not all of the members are concentrated in the central village but are also living in the two low cost housing villages and in a farmstead a mile away from the central village. Because of the two low cost housing villages and the employment of wage laborers by the industries located in the central village, many of the people located spatially within Caphas are not members of the commune.

Members of the commune are divided into two categories: "partners" who have given all of their possessions to the commune and are committed to stay indefinitely, and the volunteers. Volunteers are either short term (less than one year) or long term. Volunteers do not give up their possessions and have a more definite period of membership.

The only formal hierarchy of authority at Caphas is a six-person board of trustees that has final responsibility for the affairs of the Corporation that operates the industries. Three of the trustees are not members of the commune. In addition there is a co-ordinator of activities who is responsible for assigning volunteers to jobs. There are only four people in these positions and the positions are

not full time, that is, the office holders have a "regular" job also. In light of this, with the observation that the persons in authority do not receive additional compensation because of their positions, they will be included in this study along with all other members, both partners and volunteers.

In terms of structural freedom, Caphas is very open. There are no walls or barricades to separate the commune from the outside or to restrict movement within. Permission for movement is needed only in regards to entering people's homes. This structural freedom was used by 10 (56%) of the respondents to spend at least one night a month outside the group.

On a daily basis the communards tend to stay on the commune, only 4 (22%) of the respondents reporting spending part of each day outside the group. However, the isolation of the commune still must be considered low because of the frequency of people leaving for overnight and a steady stream of casual visitors. Also the members interact daily with the wage laborers in the industries.

The focus of co-operation for Caphas is marked by a dualism of contractual and mutual aid systems which follows the lines of the Fellowship and Corporation. The adult members each have an assigned job within the Corporation for which they receive a place to live, noon meals on weekdays, and a monthly allotment of spending money from which all other meals, clothing, and expenses must come.

Between the members a considerable amount of mutual aid occurs in regards to such things as babysitting, coffee breaks, and lending of items. The members can be seen to co-operate contractually with

the Corporation while the Fellowship exhibits mutual aid relations. Co-operation with the outside is contractual in regards to the selling and purchasing of various items and the hiring of wage labor for the industries.

Bio-social practices at Caphas are regulated only in regard to sex and drug use, extra-marital sex and illegal drug use being banned. People at Caphas are either part of some family, each of which has a separate house, or live in one of the several houses filled with single people. The noon meal on weekdays is eaten together in a dining hall while all other meals are cooked and eaten in the separate houses. On Sundays a pot-luck dinner is held in the dining hall.

The official goal of Caphas as most broadly stated is seeking ". . . a new life of partnership with God and man" (from an official pamphlet). This goal is pursued through three ministries: communication, instruction, and application. The first ministry is simply evangelism through tape recordings, records, books and speaking engagements. Instruction is also an evangelical effort but is directed more towards people who are already searching for a new way of life and takes the form of "discipleship schools" and retreats. Short term volunteers are part of the work of the instruction ministry.

In terms of both money expended and amount of labor, the ministry of application is much more a focus of activity for Caphas than are the other two ministeries. Application is performed by building low cost, interest-free housing. These three ministries can be seen to be the first level of concrete operative goals for the Corporation.

On the other hand, the Fellowship has no concrete goals but is rather loosely organized around the premise (and goal) that the members are the body of Christ in the world. The adverb "loosely" refers to a nearly complete lack of any concrete manifestations of the official goal through operative goals, policies, and rules.

The personal goals of the members seem also to be split between the corporate goals of the three ministries and goals centered around the Fellowship. Those people who named the first type of personal goals were also specific about which ministry was most important to them. They were surprisingly explicit in naming not only a particular ministry but also in asserting the importance of that particular goal over other goals.

The other class of personal goals emphasized themes of spiritual and personal growth, and of living together as Christians, often expressed as a concern for "community." Now, while these two classes of goals are different, some members noted that there need be no conflict between the two.

The differences among the members concerning goals were centered around differential emphasis of operative goals. No one expressed opposition to any of the official or operative goals but expressed views concerning the priorities of them. In each case the official goals of Caphas can be seen to be supportive of the personal goals of the members.

In this observer's estimation, the goal relationships between the monastery and the monks seems to be more supportive than the

relationships at Caphas. The monks seem to have both a greater commonality of goals among themselves and to have more of their personal goals subsumed into the goal structure of the monastery than is the case at Caphas. This may be a result of the more articulated and highly explicit ideology of the monastery, an ideology which includes the canons and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church in general and particular explicit interpretations such as the Holy Rule which are emphasized within the order.

Caphas' ideology is much less explicit since the commune is non-denominational and stresses a somewhat negative value on doctrine and theology as such. This difference in explicitness and elaboration of ideology may be related to differences in the extents of goal supportiveness through the selection of members. Where the ideology is more explicit and elaborated, there are fewer possibilities of different emphases and interpretations of mutually held broad and abstract values.

#### Martin House, A Student Community

Martin House is a co-educational community of university students which is sponsored by the Lutheran Church in America and the American Lutheran Church. It was founded fourteen years ago out of the desire of a small group (between ten and fifteen) of concerned students for a place in which to live as Christians and from which to conduct a relevant campus ministry, in short ". . . a community of witness in the heart of the university" (Kvaalen, 1962, p. 1).

By the period of this writer's membership (academic years 1969-70 and 1970-71) Martin House had increased to a plateau of around thirty-five members. The questionnaire data was obtained in May, 1971, yielding 23 responses considered complete for this study.

Ideologically, the community had also changed. The members were no longer committed to a particular faith, but included Roman Catholics, Jews, Protestants of several denominations, avowed agnostics, atheists, and one follower of the Old Religion (a witch). This mixture was a result of an attempt to stimulate a search for spiritual values by having such a group confront the claims of Christ.

The authority structure is headed by the Lutheran Campus Council which oversees the campus ministry in general. Concerning Martin House, the council hires a community director and an assistant director. These two people are usually graduate students and work part-time for the community. They are responsible for daily management of the kitchen, daily budget decisions, maintenance, resolving personal problems between members, and scheduling chapel meetings and seminars. Other members of Martin House participate in decision making through two committees and group discussions.

The respondents can be described social morphologically as being split evenly between the sexes; eleven females and eleven males, with one non-response. All of the respondents were single; and had a median age of 22.4 in a range of 18 to 27.8 years.

The respondents' size of place where they had lived longest ranged from farms to cities of over 1,000,000 inhabitants, the median value being 200,000.



Spatial integration is mostly from function and sex. Sleeping quarters were in four old frame houses, two for males and two for females. A newer brick structure included the community kitchen and eating area, a lounge, piano, and altar.

Structural freedom was nearly total within and without the Martin House. The only restrictions on members' movements concerned entering people's rooms without knocking. Every one of the respondents did leave the premises each day, with 16 (70%) of them spending at least one night each month away.

Co-operation was mainly contractual between members and the organization. The member paid a monthly fee for which he received food, lodging, and benefits of the program such as seminars, chapels, and guest speakers. Many instances of mutual aid occurred with the organization also. These included letting members' bills accumulate for several months without interest or penalty and performance of maintenance duties by some of the members.

Among the members, mutual aid relationships were prevalent, becoming more pervasive as the school year wore on. Mutual aid activities included school work, automobile repairs, and help with chores.

Occupationally, the members of Martin House were very homogeneous. Except for a civil engineer engaged to another member, all of the Martin House people were students. A few of the members were also employed as graduate assistants by the university.

For the bio-social focus, Martin House can first be noted to exclude the family and to officially ban sexual relations among the

members. The degree to which this ban was observed varied considerably from year to year and was viewed as basically unenforceable.

With the exception of Saturday evening, the members ate all meals on schedule in the brick house described earlier. The evening meal was served family style with the whole community together. The other meals were served cafeteria style.

When interviewing for selection into the community, prospective members were told that the purpose of Martin House was to confront, "in community," the claims of Jesus Christ. As noted earlier though, members were deliberately selected from a wide range of religious positions. This reflected a compromise in the campus council between a desire for evangelism on the one hand, and a desire on the other hand for a confrontation with new ways of living, a learning experience. While most council members held somewhat to both positions, there were council members who wanted Martin House to be a camp revival and other members who had a quasi-experimental attitude towards the community. This writer was a council member during the year preceding his entrance into Martin House.

Whatever the official goals of Martin House, they were never central purposes of the members. The members' primary objectives were centered in the university; school work came first. In fact, for both years of this writer's membership the grade point average for the community was above 3.0 on a four point scale. That the community director took care to compute this figure each semester is an indication of the priority of the university.

Given that the members were serious students, the goal of confronting Christ's claims within the context of community still could have been held by the members. The evidence indicates that this was true for only a few. For instance, the bi-weekly chapel meetings were attended regularly by approximately ten members. In a similar vein, a bible study group was attended by around five members while three times that number were interested in a photography group.

Reasons for the members' participation in Martin House varied from member to member and can be seen in terms of three modal types. One group of people, never more than a few, were at Martin House for religious reasons secondary to their quest for a degree. Another group, the bulk of Martin House's members, were there searching for "community." Community, however, seemed to be a mirage shimmering invitingly in the distance but never being reached. No one knew for sure what it was. The third mode of purpose was simply a place to stay with reasonable rates and good food. About as many people openly admitted this position as did for the official goals espoused by the council and staff. From these observations the relationship of the official organizational goals to the goals of the members can be seen as generally irrelevant.

### The Dormitory

Located in the same university town as Martin House is another of the study groups, a men's dormitory. This writer spent two academic years in this dormitory system. The questionnaire was administered

during the first semester of 1970 to one house of 42 men, yielding 34 respondents usable for this study. The entire dormitory had around 450 residents.

A house, such as the one studied here, is an administrative sub-unit of the dormitory and comprises all of the men living on one story of one wing of the dormitory. Each house has a house advisor who is hired by the university to supervise the forty odd residents of the house. Supervision includes enforcement of rules, reduction of noise, personal and academic counseling, and scheduling of house activities such as parties.

House advisors, in turn, are under the supervision of the dormitory's head resident, usually a graduate student. The advisors and head resident are the people responsible for seeing that rules are enforced, a studious atmosphere maintained, problems between residents resolved, and approved house functions held. Advisors and the head resident live in the dormitory. Maintenance of the physical plant and food preparation is performed by a non-resident staff.

Within the house, the residents elect officers to aid the house advisor in planning house events. Of the 34 respondents only one may possibly not be a lower participant, the house advisor being a formal staff member.

Social morphological characteristics of the respondents are relatively homogeneous, everyone being single, male, and between the ages of 18 and 21 inclusive. The median age is 19.2 years.

The sizes of the places where the respondents had lived longest ranged from farms through cities of over 1,000,000 people. Median value for this variable is 22,000.

All of the residents had completed high school, and 2 already had a college degree.

Most of the residents, 21 (62%), had entered the group 3 months before hand. Of the remainder, 9 (26%) had come the previous year.

Spatially, the dormitory residents were evenly distributed in double occupancy rooms along both sides of a corridor. The only locked doors were those on private rooms, all other areas except the cafeteria being open at all times. This structural freedom was used by 31 (93%) of the members to spend at least one night each month away from the dormitory. On a daily basis, 26 (76%) of the residents leave the group.

Co-operation between the dormitory and the residents is almost solely contractual. Members sign a housing contract stipulating fees to be paid and the facilities and services provided in return.

Between the members, mutual aid relationships become more noticeable as the academic year progresses. These relationships usually start between roommates and extend later to a few other residents. Activities involved here are lending of items such as typewriters and sports equipment, co-operation for game playing, and aid with studies.

For the focus of bio-social practices the dormitory may be noted for regulating sexual practices through limiting the hours women were permitted in members rooms and by requiring doors to be left open

when members had women visitors in their rooms. There was also a policy of reassigning homosexuals to "straight" rooms and requiring them to undergo psychiatric treatment.

The majority of dormitory residents ate in the dormitory cafeteria, a few making other arrangements often due to dietary restrictions. A whole house ate together only once or twice a semester, the occasion being a supper with a house from a women's dormitory.

Officially, the dormitory's goal was to provide inexpensive housing and food for male students. In addition, the dormitory's literature stressed the goal of maintaining a "standard of conduct" among the residents. This goal was operationalized through a set of rules effectively barring sex, drinking, use of drugs, and "pornographic" literature among other things.

As with Martin House, the dormitory residents were primarily oriented towards something outside of their organization. Those residents oriented towards academic pursuits could not achieve their personal goals through their roles as dormitory residents. Goal achievement for these people came by performing the role of student, a role with a much broader range of goals than those included in the role of resident.

In addition to academically oriented members, the dormitories had an appreciable number of people whose efforts were directed mainly towards non-academic pursuits with coursework often running a poor second. The dormitories tended to have many of these people because freshmen and sophomores, often without an area of academic

interest and pushed into college by threat of military conscription, were required to live in "approved housing," an item which was always in short supply. For the non-academically inclined, the dormitory's official goals were not important personal goals since the dormitory's orientation was towards the members' role of student.

In actuality, most of the residents held both academic and non-academic interests, but the point remains that these interests were broader than the official goals of the dormitory. While food and shelter were indeed important to the residents, it should be noted that these items were available in any number of other situations and that, indeed, the dormitory residents considered their situation to be one of the more undesirable.

Contributing to the undesireableness were the policies derived from the official goal of maintaining a high standard of conduct. These attempts at affecting in loco parentis supervision definitely were not perceived by the residents as being supportive of their personal goals of achieving independence.

The characterization of the relationship of the official goals of the dormitory to those of the residents is that of irrelevancy. Official goals of the dormitory such as providing food and shelter are positively valued in terms of the member personal goals while official goals concerning personal behavior were negatively valued. In contrast to prisons (the next situation to be covered) and monasteries, both the range of goals involved and their intensity of valuation are relatively small for the goal relationships of the dormitory.

## Two Prisons

The final two study groups are a men's and a women's prison. Each will be described separately in regard to the focus of social morphology, after which they will be treated together. Since these two groups have not been personally observed by this writer, the discussion concerning goal relationships is based upon the literature about prisons, especially Clemmer, 1940; Giallombardo, 1966; and Sykes, 1958.

The women's prison receives all of the female felons of a mid-western state. When the questionnaire was administered in August, 1970, there were 68 prisoners of whom 30 respondents meet the criteria for use in this study. Their ages ranged from 17.0 to 48.2 years, with a median of 26.5. Married members numbered 11; there were 10 who had been married but were so no longer, and 9 were single.

In terms of their backgrounds the respondents place of longest residence ranged from farms to cities of over 1,000,000 in population. The median population of the above was 50,000. None of the respondents had completed college though over half had finished high school. Length of membership in the group ranged from .2 to 14.5 years, the median value being .8.

Spatially, the prison was integrated by the program of rehabilitation and by the requirements of deprivation attached to the role of prisoner. This prison was not surrounded by any sort of barrier and there were no armed guards. The women lived in cottages and were ordinarily not restricted as to their movement within the prison boundaries, though some of the prisoners were locked in at night.



This structural freedom stopped at the boundaries, permission from the warden being required for leaving the premises. For each day, 3 (8%) of the respondents reported leaving the group. At least one night each month outside of the group was recorded by 10 (27%) of the women.

Co-operation between the prison and its lower members is generally non-reciprocal. The prisoners will be taken care of whether they contribute anything or not. Where prisoners are paid for their labor, a contractual relationship can develop, but the fact stands that the prisoner does not have to perform in order to be fed. What operates between the prison and its members is not co-operation but coercion.

Between the prisoners themselves both contractual and mutual aid co-operation develops. Contractual relations occur in the buying and bartering commonly noted in prisons while mutual aid relationships occur between friends, sharing of foodstuffs sent in from the outside being an example. Coercion also exists between prisoners in regards to getting scarce goods as exemplified in the role of the gorilla (Sykes, 1958).

For the bio-social focus, the prisons may first be noted for their prohibition of any sexual activity and the exclusion of the family. Homosexual relations are carried out through a stable system of roles (cf. Sykes, 1958; and Giallombardo, 1966), this system is probably being more stable for women than for men (cf. Giallombardo, 1966 and Clemmer, 1940)

The men's prison is a medium security institution which receives all the male felons from the same state as the women's institution.

In December of 1970, 43 cases which meet the criteria for this study were obtained from a population of 627 inmates. The 43 cases used here were taken from an original sample of 45 respondents.

These 45 cases came from a list of 80 names selected by spinning a circular file and selecting the name that fell open when it stopped. No significant differences could be established between the respondents and the non-respondents at the .30 level for marital status, education, and for having lived outside the prison since commitment (Hillery, 1971b). These were the only comparable bases of comparison available.

Ages for the respondents ranged from 18.6 to 31.8 years with a median of 21.9. Marital statuses were as follows: single, 23 (60%); married, 10 (23%); widowed, divorced, and separated, 7 (16%); there were 5 non-responses for this item.

The median size of the place where the respondents had lived longest was 66,000; with respondents coming from farms and cities of over 1,000,000 persons. Over one half of the respondents, 27 (64%), had not finished high school. There were no college degree holders among the inmate respondents. The respondents had been in the prison a median of .9 years, ranging from .2 to 5.8.

Spatially, all of the inmates are contained within one large building, the integration of this space being primarily related to custody. There is also a differentiation of space according to function such as office areas, cell blocks, shops, and dining hall. There are extensive barriers such as thick walls, locked doors, and barred windows between the inside of the prison and the outside world, and between areas within the prison. There are also armed guards.

These barriers are used to restrict almost totally the prisoners freedom to move both out of and within the premises. In the case of solitary confinement, structural freedom can be seen to be nil (Hillery, 1974a).

As would be expected, travel outside of the premises by the inmates is quite limited. Part of each day was spent outside by 5 (12%) of the respondents while only 2 inmates (5%) spent one night each month on the outside.

The official goals of American prisons, as reported in the literature, typically divides into three concerns: custody, maintenance, and treatment (terms from Giallombardo, 1966). Custody refers simply to keeping the inmates confined. The maintenance goal is a concern with having the prison be relatively self-sufficient in terms of having the products of prisoner labor offset as much of the prison's expenses as possible. Treatment, or rehabilitation, is the goal of retraining the inmate into patterns of behavior appropriate in the general society, and of teaching vocational skills which will enable the prisoner to keep a productive job after leaving the prison.

Concerning this triad of goals, Giallombardo comments that:

"The basic conflict between the competing goals of self-maintenance and custody on the one hand, and treatment on the other, is a structural weakness of prisons . . . (1966, p. 73, italics in the original).

As for the outcome of this conflict, the same author notes that the prison personnel consider treatment as a legitimate goal

". . . only when the predominant tasks of maintenance, custody, and internal order are clearly in equilibrium" (Giallombardo, 1966, p. 73).

While the above was the case for the men's prison in this study, it should be noted that the warden of the women's institution placed considerable emphasis on rehabilitation. The inmates did not wear uniforms, participated in a work-release program, and were allowed to go into town on certain occasions.

Custody, though not very apparent in the relative openness of the women's institution, was still of primary import. Inmates who escaped were, of course, returned to the prison after which they lost many of the privileges given them in pursuance of the goal of rehabilitation.

The three official goals of the prison relate to the prisoners' personal goals as follows. Custody as a goal can only be seen as strongly opposed to the personal goals of the prisoners. Simply stated, the primary goal of the prison is to make the prisoner unable to achieve or even pursue his personal goals. This may be seen in terms of revenge, prevention of crime through example of the consequences, protection of society, or any combination of these; but in all cases the prisoner is deprived of mobility, money, freedom of association and seemingly any other means of directly pursuing his own ends.

The maintenance goal of the prison can hardly be seen as supportive of the prisoners' personal goals either. This goal arises only from the financial considerations of the state, the prisoners would seemingly be unable to care less about the contribution of the prison to the

state. A goal irrelevant situation would seem to be operating for this official goal.

In cases where the prisoner is paid for doing such work as license plate manufacture, road work, and rock quarrying, the prisoner's work role may function for his own goals through the medium of money. The official goal however is still irrelevant as an end for the workers.

Treatment can be seen as the only official goal of the prison that might be in a supportive relationship with the prisoners' personal goals. However, the extent to which this is true would seem to be limited by the adoption of the inmate culture which emphasizes values that are at variance with those of society and the prison. Clemmer (1940) refers to this process as "prisonization." One of the attitudes connected with prisonization that is especially relevant is a ". . . recognition that nothing is owed to the environment for the supplying of goods . . ." (Clemmer, 1940, p. 300). A negative attitude towards authority is also noted by the same author as typical of prisonization. Neither of the above two aspects of prisonization can be seen as being of aid in training the prisoner for life on the outside.

Prisoners with long remaining sentences can also be expected to have little interest in acquiring attitudes and skills that will be of no use to them for some time. Inmates who are old also may be expected to exclude treatment goals from their personal goals.

Given the lesser priority of treatment relative to custody, even those inmates who hold treatment goals would be expected to

perceive the official goals of the prison as opposed to the inmates' personal goals.

## CHAPTER V

### Illustrative Analysis

#### Part 2: Examination of Data

The primary examination of the relationships proposed in this thesis will be to see if the classification of the seven study groups by their goal relationships in regards to their lower members will order the groups also by perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-group conflict. The goal relationship and median Likert type responses for perceived deprivation of freedom and conflict are presented in Table 5.1.

While only three divisions of the goal relationship continuum are made here, it can be noted that within those groupings distinctions concerning goal supportiveness could also be made. The women's prison with its greater emphasis on treatment in comparison to the men's institution could be said to offer more support for the members' goals.

In a similar vein, Martin House, though its official goals are vague and not primary for the members, offers more support for its members' goals than does the dormitory. In the discussion of Caphas, it was noted that its official goals are probably less supportive of the members goals than is the case for the monasteries.

As an aid to the examination of the tables, Kendall's tau corrected for ties will be used to indicate the extent of association within these seven groups. Very cautious interpretation of the figures is required, since the seven groups are not representative of any defined population.

**Table 5.1: Median Likert Type Responses for Perceived Deprivation of Freedom and Intra-Group Conflict by the Goal Relationship of Each Group.**

Goal Relationship	Name of Group	Perceived Deprivation of Freedom <sup>1</sup>	Intra-Group Conflict <sup>2</sup>
Supportive	Bernard	15	8
	Palisades	15	7.5
	Caphas	15.5	8
Irrelevant	Martin House	16	9
	Dormitory	17	8
Opposed	Women Inmates	21.5	9
	Men Inmates	23	10

<sup>1</sup>Range of possible values: 5-25

<sup>2</sup>Range of possible values: 7-14



While only three values of the goal relationship are distinguished in the previous discussion and in all of the tables in this paper, the taus presented will reflect six values. Based on the above discussion, the monasteries will be considered as most goal supportive, followed by Caphas, Martin House, the dormitory, women's prison, and men's prison. This procedure will reduce the number of pairs tied on goal supportiveness to one, the monasteries.

Examination of Table 5.1 shows that the classification of the organizations by their goal relationships with lower members does indeed order the groups according to perceived deprivation of freedom. Tau computed with six values of the goal relationship is 1.0, which would be significant beyond .005 for a sample size of seven.

Table 5.1 also suggests that the goal relationship orders the groups according to perceived deprivation of freedom within the categories of formal and communal organizations as had been hoped.

Groups such as the monasteries, Caphas, Martin House, and the dormitory can be seen as communal organizations because of their lack of orientation to specific goals as defined earlier. Within the category of communal organizations, then, the goal relationships order the groups by perceived deprivation of freedom.

However, some of these groups have purposes which are quite similar to specific goals. The housing of students by the dormitory and the building of houses by Caphas might well be argued as being specific goals according to the criteria noted earlier. If these groups were to be considered along with the prisons as formal

organizations, the ordering of perceived deprivation of freedom by the goal relationships would still stand.

While there is support for the expected effects of the goal relationship on perceived deprivation of freedom, the contention that the goal relationship, through perceived deprivation of freedom, would affect conflict within the organizations is also supported.

Intra-group conflict is clearly ordered between the two end types of goal relationships and their respective scores for perceived deprivation of freedom. However, there are ties on intra-group conflict between groups in the middle classification of goal irrelevancy and groups in the polar classifications. Also, within the goal relationship groupings, intragroup conflict is not perfectly ordered by perceived deprivation of freedom (compare Palisades with Caphas, and Martin House with the dormitory).

Despite the numerous ties and imperfections in the ordering of intra-group conflict by perceived deprivation of freedom, there still seems to be a tendency for higher levels of perceived deprivation of freedom to be associated with higher levels of intragroup conflict. Tau for this relationship (and for goal supportiveness and intra-group conflict) is .76, and would be significant beyond .05.

It should be noted that intra-group conflict is conceived of as being related to goal relationships only through perceived deprivation of freedom. Thus, the ties between adjacent ranks of goal supportiveness might be attributed, in part, to the indirectness of the relationship.

Concerning the definitions of freedom within the organizations, the theoretical framework of this study would lead one to expect

supportive goal relationships to be associated with definitions of freedom as discipline. In a goal-supportive relationship, alternatives would be available to which the member could commit himself without feeling deprived on account of alternatives foregone or denied to him.

In goal-opposed relationships there would be no alternatives to which the member could make a commitment, and freedom would be defined in terms of choice (see Appendix A). Freedom in goal-opposed situations would be expected to refer to having a choice in the first place rather than in terms of disciplining oneself to accept the consequences of a freely chosen alternative.

An examination of Table 5.2 reveals support for the relationships proposed above. The two groups which score highest on freedom as discipline are, indeed, goal supportive and the lowest score for freedom as discipline belongs to a goal-opposed group. However, one of the goal-opposed groups, the women inmates, has a higher score on freedom as discipline than does Caphas which is goal supportive. Also, Caphas is tied on freedom as discipline with Martin House, a goal-irrelevant group.

Tau for the relationship between goal supportiveness and freedom as discipline is .67; this would be significant beyond .05 for a sample size of seven. Thus, while there is a tendency for the goal supportive groups to define freedom in terms of discipline more than do other groups, there are notable exceptions.

Table 5.2: Median Likert Type Responses for Freedom Defined as Discipline and Freedom Defined as Choice by the Goal Relationship of Each Group.

Goal Relationship	Name of Group	Freedom as Discipline <sup>1</sup>	Freedom as Choice <sup>2</sup>
Supportive	Bernard	17	15.5
	Palisades	17	14.5
	Caphas	14	16.5
Irrelevant	Martin House	14	18
	Dormitory	13	15.5
Opposed	Women Inmates	15	12
	Men Inmates	12	9.5

<sup>1</sup>Range of possible values: 4-20

<sup>2</sup>Range of possible values: 5-25

Comparison of the scores on freedom of choice yields some very interesting results. The organizations where the lower participants are expected most to define freedom in terms of choice have the lowest scores for that measure. What seems most likely to be happening is that the prisoners are so deprived of the ability to choose that it is unrealistic to define freedom in terms of choice within the prison.

Thus, there is little relationship between goal supportiveness and freedom as choice for these seven organizations' lower participants. Tau is equal to .40, and would not be significant at the .10 level.

Comparing the relation between the two definitions of freedom for the groups shows the goal-irrelevant groups and Caphas to be similar while the monks and prisoners show a different pattern. A possible explanation of these patterns might lie in the differences in structural freedom between the monasteries and prisons on one hand, and Caphas, Martin House and the dormitory on the other. Greater structural freedom seems somehow to be associated with a relative increase in the definition of freedom as choice as compared to freedom as discipline.

Having seen in Table 5.1 that the goal relationship does seem to order perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-group conflict, the task becomes one of searching for alternative explanations for the observed relationship. Since intra-group conflict is seen as a behavioral consequence of perceived deprivation of freedom, the examination will focus on the precedent relationship of the goal relationship to perceived deprivation of freedom. As before, information will be presented in tabular form with the groups ordered according to the

goal relationship and within that variable according to perceived deprivation of freedom.

Since the primary relationship of interest is perfect for the groups studied here, the search for alternatives will be concerned primarily with possible antecedent variables to the goal relationship and especially to perceived deprivation of freedom. Such an antecedent variable would appear in a table in the same ordering as the goal relationship and perceived deprivation of freedom, though the direction might be opposite.

Analytic properties of the respondents have been divided into demographic and background characteristics. Examination of Table 5.3 reveals that sex and marital status show no patterning in conjunction with the ordering of the groups. The taus for neither of these were significant at the .30 level.

Age, however, does show a more definite patterning, with the more goal supportive groups tending towards older ages. The tau for age and six values of the goal relationship is .59, which is significant at the .05 level.

While the non-randomness of the groups used here prevents any strong assertions, it does not seem unreasonable to expect ages to be higher in goal-supportive groups because there is a lesser tendency for members to leave--i.e., less out selection being initiated on the members part.

In Table 5.4, background characteristics can be compared for the groups. Size of place where the respondents have lived longest shows no relationship to the goal relationship.

Table 5.3: Demographic Characteristics of Groups by Goal Relationships.

Goal Relationship	Name	Median Age	% Male	% Female	% Single
Supportive	Bernard	47.2	100	0	100
	Palisades	43.4	100	0	100
	Caphas	26.0	33	66	44
Irrelevant	Martin House	22.4	50	50	100
	Dormitory	19.2	100	0	100
Opposed	Women Inmates	26.5	0	100	30
	Men Inmates	29.9	100	0	60

Table 5.4: Median Background Characteristics of Groups by Goal Relationships.

Goal Relationship	Name	Education	Past Job <sup>1</sup> Prestige	Size of Place
Supportive	Bernard	4	36	84,000
	Palisades	4	34	74,000
	Caphas	4.5	48	16,000
Irrelevant	Martin House	4	27	200,000
	Dormitory	4	31	22,000
Opposed	Women Inmates	3	32	50,000
	Men Inmates	2	22	66,000

<sup>1</sup>Hollingshead Two Factor Index, reversed so that higher scores indicate greater prestige.



Educational achievement, however, also occurs somewhat as would an antecedent variable. Tau for this variable and the relationship is significant beyond .10.

If it might be assumed that people wish to avoid membership in organizations which are opposed to their personal goals, then education might be seen as an aid in avoiding selection into such organizations. This seems a more likely explanation than that of education being directly related to perceived deprivation of freedom.

The prestige of the occupation usually held before entering the group is also related positively to membership in more goal supportive groups. Tau for this relationship is .63 and is significant beyond .05.

It should be noted that this variable is somewhat a function of education and that the argument above concerning education might be expected to apply here also. Parallel with education, higher occupational prestige might be seen as indicative of the kinds of resources that enable one to stay out of goal opposed situations, and is thus related to selection for the goal relationship and not directly to perceived deprivation of freedom.

Aside from analytic properties of the groups' members, variables pertaining to the members' experiences with the organizations might also be examined. In Table 5.5 the number of lower participants in each organization shows a tendency to decrease as the groups become more supportive. Tau computed with six values of the goal relationship is  $-.59$  in this instance, and is significant at the .05 level.

While no inference from this selection of groups is intended, thought upon the relation of group size and the goal relationship

Table 5.5; Number of Lower Participants in Group and Median Length of Group Membership in Years.

Goal Relationship	Name	Number of Members	Length of Membership
Supportive	Bernard	15 <sup>1</sup>	22.1
	Palisades	70 <sup>1</sup>	20.6
	Caphas	25 <sup>1</sup>	1.9
Irrelevant	Martin House	35 <sup>1</sup>	.7
	Dormitory	450 <sup>1</sup>	.2
Opposed	Women Inmates	68	.8
	Men Inmates	627	1.1

<sup>1</sup> approximate

suggests that the observed pattern in the data at hand may be reflective of some more general tendency. While the largest organizations such as corporations are probably goal irrelevant for their members, among organizations in which the members eat and sleep there is a possibility that goal supportive organizations tend to be smaller than the other two classes of organizations. In goal opposed situations such as the prison in-selection is based solely upon one factor such as conviction. All convicts are selected and retained into the organization for convicts regardless of almost any other traits, that is, only one organization is needed to contain people labelled as criminals (for any one sex and criminal jurisdiction).

In contrast, in-selection and retention for goal supportive organizations is based upon several requirements. Looking at the monasteries and Caphas for examples, subscription to some creed is one requirement. Depending upon the elaborateness of the creed, this basis of selection alone could actually pose many requirements, that is the number of "articles" in the creed. In addition, the member will have to adhere to the rules and procedures of the group or out-selection will be initiated by the organization. Rule violation in the prison has the opposite result--more "time."

Aside from the requirements of the organization, a set of requirements held by the member for the organization must be fulfilled or out-selection is initiated; in this instance, by the member. The result is that the number of people who satisfy the organization's requirements and are, in turn, satisfied by the organization are relatively few for any goal-supportive group as compared with the

number of people who satisfy the single criterion of membership set by goal-opposed groups. If this is the case, then the size of the group is only related to the goal relationship and not to perceived deprivation of freedom, and the central thesis of this paper stands.

Returning to Table 5.5, the length of membership in the organization also shows some ordering by goal relationship. The tau is .49 and is significant below .10. It would be tempting to consider the differences in length of stay to be a result of increased out-selection operating in goal opposed relationships, that is, people do not wish to stay in such situations and thus leave after relatively short times. While it is likely that most prisoners would indeed leave prison at the first opportunity, it should be remembered that prisoners do not control the out-selection of their group.

## CHAPTER VI

### Conclusions

This paper has examined at the group level the contention that the degree to which the official goals of an organization coincide with the personal goals held by its members has attitudinal effects and resulting behavioral consequences. The attitudinal effect, perceived deprivation of freedom, was shown to be ordered perfectly by the classification of the groups according to their goal relationships. Intra-group conflict, the behavioral consequence of perceived deprivation of freedom, tended, in turn, to be ordered by perceived deprivation of freedom. Education and past occupational prestige were noted to be possible selectors for goal relationships while age, size of place lived longest, and number of lower participants were noted to be possibly consequent to goal relationships.

What this study suggests is that members may define their situation within an organization in terms of how they perceive the official goals of the organization to relate to their personal goals. If the actors perceive the official goals of the organization as being directly supportive of their personal goals, then the operative goals of the organization are not as likely to be viewed as depriving the actors of freedom.

Freedom, then, is not a condition resulting from some absolute property such as number or extent of restrictions, but is an attitude of the members relative to the organization. The import of this study for the individual is in the refocusing of attention from

properties of the organization to a very basic relationship involving the individual and the organization. The suggestion made here is that the member who feels negatively towards an organization might wish to consider the basic purposes of that organization in trying to locate the source of dissatisfaction.

Before closing, a warning is due the reader concerning measurement. As has been already noted, the goal relationship has not been so much measured as it has been characterized for a class of members called "lower participants." The reader should be aware that a truly adequate test of these ideas as hypotheses would require that each member be directly tapped concerning his particular goal relationship with the organization. If this were the case, then the goal relationship could become an analytical property of any class of members and individual effects could be more strictly separated from the proposed structural effects (cf. Tannenbaum and Bachman, 1964).

In closing, this writer hopes that this study has illustrated the potentiality of the ideas presented here and that more stringent research into these ideas will be suggested by these findings.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackoff, Russell L., and Fred E. Emery  
1972 On Purposeful Systems. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, Inc.
- Blommers, Paul, and E. F. Lindquist  
1960 Elementary Statistical Methods in Psychology and Education.  
Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Coser, Lewis A.  
1956 The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: The  
Free Press.
- Etzioni, Amitai  
1960 "Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis: A Critique  
and a Suggestion," Administrative Science Quarterly  
5 (September):257-278.
- 1961 A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. Glencoe,  
Illinois: The Free Press.
- 1969 A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New  
York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Gross, Edward  
1967 "The Definition of Organizational Goals," British Journal  
of Sociology 20 (September):277-293.
- Gouldner, Alvin W.  
1954 Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Illinois:  
The Free Press.
- 1959 "Organizational Analysis" in R. K. Merton, Leonard Broom,  
Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., eds., Sociology Today: Problems  
and Prospects. New York: Basic Books:400-428.
- Hall, Richard H.  
1972 Organizations Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs,  
New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hillery, Jr., George A.  
1968 Communal Organizations: A Study of Local Societies.  
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1971a "Freedom and Social Organization: A Comparative Analysis,"  
American Sociological Review 36 (February):51-65.
- 1971b "A Comparative Analysis of Social Conflict," paper read  
before the annual meeting of the American Sociological  
Association.

- 1973 "The Family and the Residential Community: The Case of the Commune," manuscript.
- 1974 Our Lady of the Palisades: A Study in Freedom, manuscript.
- Hillery, George A., Jr., and Patricia A. Klobus  
1974 "Freedom in Confined Populations," manuscript.
- Katz, Daniel, and Robert L. Kahn  
1966 The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Kelty, Matthew, O.C.S.O.  
"Aspects of the Monastic Calling," booklet.
- Kvaalen, Arnie  
1962 "The (Martin House) Community: A Strategy for the Foundation for Lutheran Students," manuscript, the bracketed words have been changed to protect identity.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul H., and Herbert Menzel  
1969 "On the Relation Between Individual and Collective Properties," in Etzioni, 1969, pp. 499-516.
- Nie, Norman H., Dale H. Bent, and C. Hadlai Hull  
1970 Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nunnally, Jim C.  
1967 Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oppenheim, Felix E.  
1968 "Freedom" International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, David L. Sills, ed., Crowell Collier and Macmillan, V. 5:554-559.
- Our Lady of the Holy Cross Abbey  
"Hidden With Christ," booklet.
- Parsons, Talcott  
1960 Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- 1961 "An Outline of the Social System" in Talcott Parsons, Edward Shils, Kaspar Naegele, Jesse R. Pitts. Theories of Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.



Perrow, Charles

1961 "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations,"  
American Sociological Review 26 (December):854-866.

1968 "Organizations: Organizational Goals," International  
Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. David T. Sills,  
ed., Crowell Collier and Macmillan:305-311.

Simon, Herbert A.

1964 "On the Concept of Organizational Goals" Administrative  
Quarterly 9 (June):1-22. Reprinted in Etzioni, 1969:  
158-174.

Tannenbaum, Arnold S., and Jerald G. Bachman

1964 "Structural Vs. Individual Effects," American Journal  
of Sociology 69 (May):585-595.

Thompson, James D., and William J. McEwen

1958 "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting  
as an Interaction Process," American Sociological  
Review 23 (February):23-31.

Warner, W. Keith, and A. Eugene Havens

1968 "Goal Displacement and the Intangibility of Organizational  
Goals," Administrative Science Quarterly 12 (March):539-555.

Warriner, Charles K.

1965 "The Problem of Organizational Purpose," Sociological  
Quarterly 6 (Spring):139-146.

Yuchtman, Ephraim and Stanley E. Seashore

1967 "A System Resource Approach to Organizational Effectiveness,"  
American Sociological Review 32 (December):891-903.

Zald, Mayer N.

1963 "Comparative Analysis and Measurement of Organizational  
Goals," Sociological Quarterly 4 (Summer):206-230.

## APPENDIX A

### Freedom Scale Validation

This appendix will examine the validity of the measures of perceived deprivation of freedom and the definitions of freedom as discipline, autonomy, or license. Multiple-group factor analysis can be used to test the correlations of items with the underlying dimensions the items are hypothesized to be tapping (cf. Nunnally, 1967, esp. pp. 343-347). This procedure not only can be used to evaluate items but also provides information concerning the amount of empirical distinctiveness between hypothesized factors.

Perceived deprivation of freedom has been originally conceived of by Professor Hillery as being measured by the items presented in Table A-1.

As can be seen from the item-factor correlations, the scale items do indeed tap the same underlying factor. An obliquely rotated principal factor analysis was also performed on the scale, and only one significant factor was extracted (i.e., Eigenvalue of 1 or greater; cf. Nie, Bent, and Hull, 1970). Perceived deprivation of freedom will be operationalized as the sum of the responses of these items.

The initial discussion of this paper noted three definitions of freedom that might be seen in different groups; freedom as discipline, freedom as autonomy, and freedom as license. A multiple-group factor analysis was performed on the scales as originally formulated, the results indicating that three of the items were not correlated with any particular factor and the scales for autonomy and license were not

Table A-1: Item-Factor Correlations of Perceived Deprivation of Freedom Items with a Single Centroid (Group) Factor.

Item	Perceived Deprivation of Freedom
I used to have more freedom before I came here than I do now.	.70
The people in charge here should be more considerate of the members.	.53
I feel that I do not have the kind of freedom that I should have.	.77
I feel as if some of my freedom has been taken away.	.73
I wish that I could leave here so that I could find a place that would let me do more of the things that I want.	.74

empirically distinct. Two of the remaining items did not correlate with their hypothesized factors but tapped one of the other factors instead.

These two items were placed into the scales to which they seemed more appropriate and another multiple-group factor analysis performed. The results of this analysis showed that the scales of autonomy and license were still not very distinct and thus they were combined and the final analysis performed; the results of which are shown in Table A-2. Professor Hillery had indicated in conversation with this writer that he expected that autonomy and license would be highly related. He prefers to see the two definitions as separate facets of freedom of choice, the term adopted here for the combined scales.

While the fourth item in the discipline scale has only a modest correlation with its factor; it remains in the scale because it does add variation to the scale score and because it was desired not to reduce the number of items for that factor.

In all three analyses,  $R^2$  was inserted into the diagonal element of each item in the correlation matrix of the nine items.  $R^2$  is the lower bound of an item's communality with all of the other items, and thus the figures here may be seen as conservative estimates of the item-factor correlations.

Table A-2: Item-Factor Correlations of Freedom as Discipline and Freedom as Choice Items with Group Factors.

ITEMS	Freedom as Discipline	Freedom as Choice
FREEDOM AS DISCIPLINE		
Freedom here is closely linked with the idea of sharing and sacrificing	.71	-.06
There is freedom here, but to have it, each person must give up something to help others	.56	.10
Freedom here is disciplined and each makes concessions to help the others	.49	-.08
There is little opportunity to sacrifice here <sup>1</sup>	-.31	.17
-----		
FREEDOM AS CHOICE		
I enjoy living here because there is complete freedom from restrictions	.06	.82
The only real restriction here is not to do anything that would in any way do harm to the community	.24	.52
My freedom is greatest here because I can spend all the time I want doing the things that I want	-.01	.61
We have little or no rules or regulations to live by	-.03	.60
This place allows people to do what they want	.07	.73
-----		
CORRELATION BETWEEN FACTORS		.09

<sup>1</sup>reverse scoring

## APPENDIX B

### Intra-Group Conflict

Intra-group conflict is measured by asking if the member was personally involved in the following situations with other members within the past week.

- (1) A discussion in which some disagreement occurred (include rejection, withholding information or withholding help).
- (2) A discussion in which some tension occurred (include withdrawal of help).
- (3) A discussion in which some antagonism occurred (include deflating someone's status, or aggressively asserting oneself).
- (4) A disagreement in which shouting occurred.
- (5) A situation in which physical force was used on someone (include pushing, shoving, etc.; do not include inflicting physical harm or use of weapons).
- (6) A situation in which some physical harm was done to someone (cutting, punching, bruising--do not include use of weapons or billing).
- (7) A situation in which weapons were used or where someone was billed (include threatening with weapons, such as rocks, guns, knives).

The response format for each of these items is: yes, no, or uncertain. Of the 207 cases considered as valid for this study, 38 (18.4%) had no response to at least one of the scale items and were excluded from the evaluation of the scale.

The coefficient of reproducibility for the scale is .95 and the coefficient of scalability is .76. Since both of these are well above the commonly accepted minimum figures, the scale may be considered cumulative and unidimensional.

Of the 38 missing cases, 30 were from the women prisoners, that group having not been asked the question concerning shouting. Note that the coefficient of reproducibility indicates that 95% of the time all of the items less difficult than any passed item will also be passed. Thus, a positive response to the missing question has been inserted for those women answering the next most difficult item, antagonism. Negative responses are inserted if the antagonism item is not passed.

In fact, the high coefficient of reproducibility suggests that it would be erroneous for 95% of cases not to insert positive responses for all items less difficult than the most difficult item passed. This has been done for all cases in which at least five of the seven conflict items have valid responses. Since the scale is indeed cumulative, five of seven items would provide at least 71% of the information available in the complete scale, and would generally tend to underestimate the levels of conflict.

APPENDIX C

The following chart compares two writers' classifications of the usages of the concept of organizational goals in the literature. Categories which are equivalent (though not necessarily identical) appear side by side.

<u>Charles Perrow (1968)</u>	<u>Mayer Zald (1963)</u>
"societal functions"	"goals as functions"
"investor goals"	"goals as serving external clients"
"derived goals" not necessary for survival, but necessary to understanding the peculiarities of a particular organization	"goals as executive values" stresses executive interpretation of abstract official goals --and-- "staff perspective on goals" stresses variation in ends of sub-groups and interest groups within the organization
no equivalent category	"goals as official mandates"
"output goals"	no equivalent category
"system goals" goals necessary to maintain equilibrium or for survival	no equivalent category
"product characteristics"	no equivalent category



**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**

FREEDOM, CONFLICT AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATION: AN ILLUSTRATIVE ANALYSIS

by

John Richmond Carlson

(ABSTRACT)

This thesis proceeds from the observation of Professor George A. Hillery, Jr. that groups which are oriented towards achieving specific goals (formal organizations) show greater perceived deprivation of freedom and conflict among their members than do groups which are not so oriented (communal organizations). A variable, the goal relationship, is suggested as possibly ordering groups according to perceived deprivation of freedom and conflict within the categories of formal and communal organizations as well as between them.

The goal relationship is defined as the perceptions of organizational members of the extent to which the official goals of an organization support their own personal goals. In hypothetical form, the contention of this thesis is that the perceived deprivation of freedom and intra-organizational conflict of an organization's members will increase the more the members perceive the official organizational goals as being nonsupportive of their personal goals.

An illustrative analysis of this contention is undertaken at the group level for the lower participants of seven organizations. The results indicate strong support for the hypothesis, though cautious interpretation of the results is suggested because the seven organizations studied do not represent a known population.